

## UNPACKING THE THINGS PEOPLE SAY

**"I feel so upset that people would burgle my house. It is not what they took. I just don't feel safe in the house anymore."**

People say you should think the best you can of everybody and give everybody the benefit of the doubt. If they really believe that then why don't they tell people who say the above, "They didn't mean to hurt you but they just meant to take what they stole. Don't take it so personally. Don't do them the wrong of thinking of them as worse than what they are"? Why don't they protest when the courts sentence them primarily because of the upset they caused? Why don't they blame the victim's attitudes? They are just two-faced. If you love the sinner and hate the sin you will do your best to avoid saying anybody sinned. You will only do it if you get absolute proof that they sinned and were not forced or mentally sick. You will accuse them as leniently as possible.

**"He fell and hit his head because he had too much to drink. In the hospital he had the decency to say that he was sorry for giving the hospital and his family this trouble."**

So you think he should be sorry for bothering you - how unselfish of you! So he is to be praised for degrading himself by giving in to your selfishness? So the injury would be fine if others didn't get the trouble! What kind of self-respect is that?

In a computer class x is feeling down for y and z completed their exercises no problem and x feels he can't use computers. The tutor tells y and z not to say they got their exercises finished quickly for it makes x feel bad.

Translation: What does x want? For y and z to be as bad as him? Does x want his feelings protected instead of realising the others should not be thought about and he should do his best and forget about their success?

**"Please do not bring children on to the premises. We do not take responsibility for injuries to children that may occur."**

#Translation: If parents or guardians bring children here and the children are hurt then they shouldn't have brought them here in the first place. This is harsh and unfeeling.

##Translation: If a child is hurt on our premises it is getting no compensation. Tough. No compensation means suffering more. But that is not our problem and we refuse to be bothered. We are sorry but not as sorry as we would be if it were us or our children. Even Jack the Ripper felt a bit sorry for the prostitutes he carved up.

**"You will be fine".**

We all reassure people by saying this. But God might have other plans and Jesus said that we are not to presume that we know what tomorrow will bring and that it is a sin to. It is the sin of presumption. If we are sinners we don't know we will be fine and so saying to somebody they will be fine is saying they are not sinners.

If it is a problem for an unbeliever in God to say someone will be fine then how much more of a problem is it for a believer to say it? Religion wouldn't last long if it ceased to be so hypocritical.

**"I know I should have got the doctor when she was ill. She is dead now. But she would have died anyway. This comforts me."**

Translation: Thank goodness she died anyway for it helps me to feel better about what happened.

**"Don't be upset at what Clara said to you. She is only jealous of you".**

We are all influenced by what the people around us say to us no matter if they are right or wrong.

Jealousy deludes you into seeing faults in the other person that are not there. The jealous person who condemns you is no different in the essential ways from a person who condemns you because they really do see those faults and the faults are there. And you are expected to be upset about critics who have the hurtful truth about you and who are not afraid to say it.

Clara may be jealous but she wants to harm you. To say you should not be upset about that is to say you should not be upset at all when anybody would hurt you for whatever reason.

**"He was in a lot of pain. He's at rest now."**

Translation: Be glad he is dead. People are better not coming into existence to suffer. People are better dead than suffering too much. You are selfish for mourning him. You are selfish for thinking that a person is so valuable that they should exist even as they suffer.

**"I pray that you will get the job"**

Translation, I want to influence God to get you the job by making other suitable candidates sick, by killing them, by making their car break down, by making them tired so that they perform badly at the interview, and on. I pray that you get the job regardless of who needs it as much as you or more. I want you to be warned by me praying for this for you despite all this. I therefore want you to be as bad as me. If you really believe God does what he wills you will feel no different if I pray or not for God does what he pleases. You are pleased when I pray for you for you feel that prayer is twisting God's arm and controlling him.

**"John: Your dad hit my son. He is only a little boy. I am going to the police. Ann: Please don't, if that comes out he will lose his job and we will have to go into care. John: All right but if he touches my son again I am going to the police".**

Translation, It is wrong and cruel if I go to the police. But if he touches my boy again I will do this wrong and cruel thing. Condone me by thanking me for my mercy.

If he hits my boy again even if he doesn't hurt him as much as he did before I will get him punished.

**"I know Jethro has done wrong to you. But you better not say anything about it to him. It would only lead to a falling out."**

If Jethro falls out with you because you stand up to him then he is not a true friend anyway and is no loss.

If you think Jethro would fall out with you for standing up to him then you have a very low opinion of him and it is no loss to him if he never has anything to do with you.

**"Faith in others is a good thing."**

A person will be happier if you love them because you know them and not because you have faith in them. To know is to be sure. To have faith is to have a lesser degree of sureness. It is to be less sure. Faith is a necessary evil. It is not a good thing.

**Jane is friends with Anna. She sees Ernie, Anna's husband, with another woman. She informs Anna. People may say, "She was only interested in splitting up that marriage. She was always jealous of how happy Anna and Ernie were."**

If she was jealous that does not mean her main motive was to satisfy this jealousy. She might have enjoyed imparting the bad news but the jealousy could have been a lesser motive than her wish to help Anna by telling her the truth.

To say she was only interested in causing trouble is to judge her as being totally jealous. It is a false and exaggerated judgement. Who can know it was her only motive? To say she was chiefly interested in causing trouble doesn't make much of a difference. Yet these assumptions must be made if her action is to be condemned.

If Jane can't do it for any main reason except for jealousy the Church forbids her to tell. Jealous acts are sinful. The Church is concerned about the morality but not about Anna.

Society and the Church condemn those who rob banks. They refuse to assume that the robbers wanted the money to better life for their children. They judge like that. They make assumptions. And then they claim to be acting and thinking lovingly towards the robbers!

**"I am sorry I dragged it out of you."** A girl thinks her lover has cheated on her and she drags what she thinks is the truth out of his best friend. If the friend lies that the lover was doing something nice for her and was not cheating on her she will say, "I am sorry I dragged it out of you."

How could she be sorry when she felt she had to drag it out of him and be sure? She thought he was cheating and needed to know if he was. There is a false wisdom in hindsight even if the hindsight is wrong. People like to think themselves wiser after the event or what they think the event was.

**“I don’t want to put you to any trouble”.**

Altruism is doing good for others without the least concern for yourself. You would die to do the act if you needed or you would go to Hell forever to do it. The altruist cannot say, “I don’t want to put you to any trouble”, this for his philosophy contends that it is best for everybody to be altruistic. It has to be his will that others be altruistic and put themselves to trouble.

The egoist can desire that other people would not burden themselves for him.

**“You should take his wife away from him for if you don’t somebody else will”.**

We may find ourselves asked to do something we feel or think is bad for, “if you do not do it somebody else will”.

So, is it all right to steal for somebody else will do it?

Is it good to murder somebody who will be killed soon?

Maybe you are doing the bad person a favour by preventing them from doing wrong by doing it before they get the chance.

But the person wants to do it and has already sinned so letting them do it by not doing it before they do makes no difference. However, you should not do wrong to prevent wrong but do right to prevent wrong.

You are admitting that the act committed by the other person would be wrong but are claiming that this justifies you doing it yourself. This is a denial of human equality. You are saying that you are more important than the other person.

You do not even know if the crime will be committed for the future is a mystery to us. You would be committing a sure evil to prevent a possible evil.

It is better for a person to be willing to steal or murder or whatever than for you to be willing to do the same over that person.

**“Calm down a bit. Remember it was not all John’s fault when he slept with your wife. She wasn’t forced to sleep with him”.**

That is saying that you should resent both half and half. But when both are equally in the wrong that means that if you should resent John with all your power you should also resent the wife as much. The absence of logicity in the advice shows just how terrible it is to believe in free will. If you deny free will and change your emotions towards bad people as a consequence you will avoid being torn by resentment.

**“You had no business hurting that son of a bitch for he wasn’t harming you”.**

Here the person is being condemned for hurting somebody who deserved to be hurt. The vast majority of people have a morality that craftily sides with the evil person against the less evil person who attacks him for being evil. They hide it well. Morality is popular because people like to take the high moral ground though they will often alter the rules they were given to suit themselves. They encourage the evil person to take the high moral ground, “He had no business attacking me”, as if he never did the same and worse.

If a person does wrong or what many only see as wrong but which is not other people have a right to dislike it. If you don’t care about right and wrong except when it happens to you then you are living and practicing egotism and not egoism. As long as you are okay to hell with everybody else. Strictly speaking, it is an uncaring insult to tell anyone to mind their own business when they castigate what you have done for it does affect them even if you didn’t do it to them.

There is a dilemma then. To say the person shouldn’t have been hurt for he wasn’t hurting you is to say that you not being hurt entitles you to respect him. That means that what he deserves for doing to others doesn’t matter so the others don’t matter. The only way out of the dilemma is to deny free will. That way you can forbid attacks on evil people and not have to make dirt of the perpetrators to do it.

Attacking a person shows just how humble and repentant for their wrongs they really are for they will usually respond with

outrage. You will see then that human beings are really selfish and that altruism is just a facade.

**"I promised my wife I would steal the money. But how could I have the right to keep an evil promise like that?"**

Christianity forbids lies. Also it says promises must be kept but you can break promises like that. What about the idea then that the promise must be honoured but it is overridden by something more important than prevents you keeping it. It is like a promise you should keep but cannot. It is like promising John your bicycle but when you are about to give it to him he drops dead. The promise is not broken or dishonoured but prevented. A false promise is bad for the same reason a lie is so Christianity will have to honour bad promises better!

**"My sister Mary won't come to my wedding because I am marrying a divorcee and her Catholic faith says my marriage is a mockery of her faith and her God."**

Mary expects you to support her faith by supporting her decision not to come to the ceremony. If you know her faith is not true, you are expected to support her all the same. Where is her support for you? Her idea of support would be asking you not to go through the wedding.

The Roman Catholic Church claims the right to cause upset and division. It bars Protestants from its altar. What right has a religion to do this when it knows from its moral philosophers that for most things there is just no way to work out what is right and wrong? Any ethics book will tell you that and demonstrate it. The faith is a disgrace.

**"Steal from him for he would do that to you".**

But he hasn't yet. You cannot be sure that he would do it until he does it. Your stealing from him will be something you will be sure has happened. His inclination to steal from you is not so certain. It is illogical to do harm over probable or possible harm for the latter is less certain.

You don't do a real harm to avoid or dodge a possible one.

These days it is common for people to perform actions that they believe to be wrong because everybody else is doing them. But wrong is still wrong no matter how many do it. Evil is increased the more people do wrong not decreased.

**"I feel sorry for John for he had to leave his job and he was not the only one doing wrong".**

If John did wrong he has to pay for it. The others getting away with it has nothing to do with it or him and does not justify you feeling sorry for him. The assertion implies that we should feel bad if somebody is caught doing wrong and yet those who would say such a thing are glad to see many types of criminal caught.

**"I'm only thinking of you".**

When a person wants to go and tell the boss off for letting bullying go on in the workplace and risk getting fired a friend will advise against it and say he or she is only thinking of her or him. In other words, it does not matter as much about the others as about her or him. This is elitism. Falling in love leads to it too.

**"We are all ageing and will die. You are not alone and that is the consolation."**

Translates as: "You should be glad that others will have the same terrible fate as you". It is hard to beat that for selfishness. Others enduring suffering similar to you should disturb you more than you already are, not less. The saying which is a soft way of advising people to be glad that others suffer too is something we all agree with and it proves that human nature is not selfless at all and is selfish in being selfless for being selfless is a pretence. Altruism infers that you should wish only you had this fate and that every other person should wish the same thing to themselves. To tell people that they are not the only ones to have been cruelly dumped by a beloved girlfriend or boyfriend or not the only ones to be laid up with the flu is to grievously insult them and yet it is an insult that is often unnoticed.

**"Glad it is them and not us" or "Rather you than me".**

People tend to be more fascinated by bad news than good news. They get more pleasure out of bad news than good news. Why else are the newspapers so popular despite being about human evil and human problems? Do people hate the unfortunates? Possibly, although they do not know them. Some men hate all women though they don't know all women. Or is it that they are just delighted that the terrible things have happened to others and not them? I am sure of my existence but

less sure of that of others. Therefore I am more sure that I deserve to suffer for my sins if I am free than I am that others should suffer. It follows that I ought to wish that it was me instead of them.

Ignoring that, if I am glad that suffering is their experience and not mine then I am glad not I think because they deserve it but because it is their experience and not mine. That is evil and cruel for it is not their fault that they cannot experience what I experience. It is like gloating over a racist attack on a black person not because they deserve it but because they are not of my race. I do hate them if I let myself feel relieved that it is not me.

People who are sick in hospital with pneumonia or some other illness feel grateful and are asked to feel grateful that they are not one of the worse off patients such as cancer patients or so on. They are happy that others are suffering and not them. What kind of love of neighbour as oneself is that?

**"Be grateful for your lot for there are people worse off"**

This adage is very basic to the world's "morality".

If people really believe it then why don't they tell bullied students to continue at a school though they would be safer elsewhere?

Imagine if you told somebody who had cancer that there are people worse off?

If people want to make the adage real for you when they pray for you then they should keep their prayers.

**"What's done is done".**

You cannot change the past. What is done is done but people use the cliché to justify forgiveness. The cliché aspires towards condemning people for being punitive but it upholds a double standard when it allows rewards for good works which are in the past and cannot be reversed either. Forgiveness cannot be granted on the grounds that the past is immutable and unalterable for it would be malice to pardon a person based on such a deceitful and unfair standard. Malicious forgiveness is a contradiction.

**"I feel sorry for Fr Paul. I know he covered up for priests abusing children but it is so hard on him and he can't undo the past."**

Compassion is an unpleasant feeling and should be reserved for the most deserving people. Why degrade yourself to lament for Fr Paul when there are babies starving in the world? Transfer your energy to that cause. Paul is stealing your compassion for he certainly wants it.

Given that most people believe in free will and hold that nobody is innocent and that punishment is for your own good and still have compassion for one another so that they have mercy we see that compassion in the context of saying that the past cannot be changed no and so what? is clearly saying the sin does not matter. If it does not matter then the criminal should be apologised to by society for they made a fuss about laws being broken and then they turn around and make out they never mattered. How could you have compassion on people who deserve to suffer? People say you can't punish everybody so you have to have pity and forgive but why not just not punish instead of forgiving? Forgiveness given because you can't punish is grudging and is not forgiveness but only looks like it. You would not be loving yourself as much as your neighbour if you let yourself get upset or think you should get upset over somebody that deserves to suffer. Many Humanists luckily deny free will for free will implies that compassion is always evil. It means the criminal can take no satisfaction in people's compassion for he knows they are having it because they are made that way and not because it is right. It's false. The love your neighbour as yourself doctrine as taught by God, Moses and Jesus is just a call to be false and two-faced and self-deceiving.

**"If you won't go and get those chest pains seen to for yourself then do it for me".**

That is telling the person to love you more than himself. It shows how wrong and hypocritical the early Christians and Jesus were to say that love your neighbour as yourself was the basic rule of morality.

**"I like Adam. Any harm he did he did it to himself".**

So Adam is good because he harms himself not you? That is loving yourself more than your neighbour. If you loved your neighbour as yourself you would be as opposed to his harming himself as you would be you.

**"Please go out and make friends for your own sake."**

The person that says this is taken to be an altruist. But is it altruism to tell people to make friends to avoid having a bad life for themselves? Of course not! It is telling people to have friends not for the sake of the friends but for their own.

**Son says, "Mammy the Protestant woman over the road called me a Papist scumbag."**

**Mother says, "Son, ignore her. She is the one with a problem".**

If you are to hate the sin as Jesus said, - he said you are better losing limbs than sinning - you have to worry about it even if you can't do anything about it.

If you care about the woman, and she has a problem, she needs help or counsel and the advice is really saying that she should be left with her problem even though it could make her do evil again.

Also, not to care is not to care about the woman. If everybody took that kind of advice, nobody could be described as bullied. They would be to blame for how they respond emotionally to the abuse so that it is really them doing damage to themselves not the bully.

An altruist cannot give this advice.

Neither can an egoist. The woman if she values her son because he is her's will be egoistic in relation to him. But to say hatred should be ignored is to go against that egoism. It is really egotism on her part.

**"I got a reward from Mr Chamberlain. It was \$1,000. I found his briefcase with a million dollars in it. He is so kindly."**

When you think, you can notice things, things that we just turn a blind eye to. You can see how much we invent our morality. Say people have free will. If they do they deserve blessings and or punishments. I am about to lose a vast fortune. Some person does something, foil robbers or something, that results in me keeping it. I would have lost all the money without that person. That person is entitled to half the money in justice for that is what he or she deserves. But the Church never supported this view which shows that it invents its love and its justice and twists everything so a religion that opposes love and justice as it must see them is hardly likely to be a channel of real revelations from a good God. As deniers of free will, we don't accept that half of what is gained must be parted with.

**She had a baby and she wasn't married. She is no better than a whore. She is a whore that sold herself for nothing!**

This insults all women who sell themselves. What about the woman who sells herself once to get food for her baby? These words are insulting her and judging her.

If you believe that prostitution is always wrong and that a prostitute is a whore then it must be worse to give your body for nothing than to give it for money to survive on. Then you are entitled to call an unwed mum a whore even to her face for it is the truth. She might not like it but society approves of loads of things being said to people that they don't like. For example, what teenager wants to hear that his or her homework is very bad? Plus would it make sense for the woman not to be offended by, "You had sex and had a baby and you were not married," and offended by being called a whore when that means the same thing?

**"I wrote that textbook to help people and not for praise."**

If you didn't write it for overt praise, you wrote it that people would have a good opinion of your work which is the same as them having a good opinion of you. You didn't write the textbook for the sake of writing the textbook. You wrote it to please people and so that they would praise it. You also wrote it to praise yourself. You wrote it for praise after all.