

When religion cares more about nature being predictable than about God stopping babies from suffering

Religion refuses to care enough about suffering that it will see it as totally intolerable - instead it resorts to imagining that God uses it for a good purpose for he is good. To convince itself, it tries to bring some good out of it and then pretends that the suffering is worth it. Easy said when you are not the one suffering! Better to see suffering as useless and random and uncaring. That should propel you to do more about it and to do it for people as opposed to trying to do it just to give yourself faith. Don't be that selfish.

It is often argued by believers that "because the universe operates through natural laws, God though he has the power will not use it to prevent intense suffering. God cannot use spectacular miracles to save us from natural disasters. If God kept intervening to stop terrible suffering, we would seem to live in an unpredictable world. It is said we need the world to be regulated so that we can gauge the outcomes of what we do. The assumption is that if the universe is usually predictable we can make moral choices. Predicting what may happen helps us decide what the best thing to do is. We know the gun is not going to turn to cheese when we are about to shoot somebody dead."

That is a blatant and insulting excuse. A smart God could avoid the need for spectacular miracles. And a certain amount of unpredictability is fine. It is better for the universe to lose predictability than for one baby to die tragically.

The believers make the assumption is that moral choices matter more than regularity for that is all the regularity exists for! Since it is a greater good that humans make free moral choices, God cannot intervene. (Cannot or will not? Will not seems nearer the mark!)

So there are several things wrong with the Christian argument against God not protecting us better.

First, there is no need for any miraculous divine interventions to stop or prevent extreme suffering. Why didn't God set up a world that was less prone to earthquakes for example?

Second, why not do hidden miracles to help people in the face of terrible danger?

Third, as for the notion that nature would be chaotic if God changed it about all the time, we must remember that believers think that God tampers all the time anyway miraculously with nature but we don't see what he is doing or how or when. We just see that something must have happened.

Fourth, a balance between tampering miraculously and keeping nature reliable and unchanging could be reached.

Fifth, to say that God lets earthquakes happen and there is a huge human and animal cost in lives and suffering just so that some people including you may be able to be moral is extreme arrogance. How dare you make out that it is so important for you to be able to be virtuous that the cost in lives and suffering is worth it. That nasty assumption is behind the virtue of believers in God. It is a good copy of virtue but it is not virtue at all. It is abhorrent.

Sixth, the best objection to the argument is that God could put a protective shield around us - a forcefield to guard us from the worst dangers. Science will be able to do that one day anyway so why didn't God build it into natural law? We would still have enough freedom and nature would still be predictable,