

What if violent or formerly violent religion has the best evidence that it is from God?

Belief is caused by evidence. Suppose some violent religion turned out to have the best evidence that it was the true faith. Does that mean we must believe in that religion or that we are obligated to believe in it? No. We may still have misinterpreted the evidence. Or it may be that contrary evidence has been lost or we have not seen it. Also, I can argue that as this religion advocates violence or harm that I have the right to refuse to believe in it no matter how much evidence there is for its being the true faith. The rule of the Catholic Church for example that all are obligated to check Catholicism out and join it when they see the evidence in favour of this religion being the one true faith is ridiculous. It is arrogant and bigoted. There can be no such obligation. No God has the right to command us to join any religion.

If the evidence for Christianity were very strong, it would not be strong enough to justify believing in a faith that teaches God was right to encourage Abraham to sacrifice his son to him and was right to command through Moses that gay people and adulterers be stoned to death and that genocide was to be commended. Evidence isn't good enough for that - you need proof. You would need absolute proof that the Church and its gospel can save you from eternal Hell. Where is it? It does not exist.

There is indecency in a person who would believe God could command such awful heinous things without proof.