

WHY DO PEOPLE WANT TO BELIEVE EVIL IS UNREAL?

Religion says God did not make evil for it is not real but is just good getting disordered. Evil is an abuse of good so in that sense it is not real.

Do believers who want evil to be a non-thing but just a lack think that God is good therefore that must be what evil is for he has nothing at all to do with evil? Or do they think evil would be a lack whether there is a God or not? The ONLY justification would be if evil really is an absence of good. It has to be a fact that even a God cannot change. A fact does not care and should not care what you want it to be or what God wants it to be. To not give a damn about it being a fact that evil is a lack and to care only about defining evil in a way that will fit a creator God would be evil itself. It would mean you have an evil motive and are not concerned about evil really being a non-thing. It is about distorting your head so you can believe in God.

If evil is a lack regardless of whether there is a God or not then there is no need to get a God to rub it in. You don't need God to do good and work for good for good takes care of itself.

God gives you an extra reason for declaring evil a lack. What is wrong with that? It is that it is not a reason for you have the reason. It is one thing to say a person is making good absent but another to say they are making a good God absent. It is overkill. You do not have the slightest right to accuse somebody or yourself of more than what you need to accuse.

The good works done by religious people have nothing to do with showing that the religion is good for God by default causes a disconnect with real goodness and brings suspect motives in.

Religion that argues for a totally loving God will rarely admit that it considers suffering no matter how unbearable to be neutral – neither good or evil or both if you like. What is neither good or evil is also both good and evil.

Now if suffering is neutral then why battle to stop it? Why bother?

Not all neutrals are equal in value. It is better to be neutral about whether to have tea or coffee than to be neutral about whether babies should be saved from certain death. So religion is advocating neutrality for something very bad and that is warped. It contradicts what we need to believe about neutrality.

Religions that see suffering as neutral still argue that causing suffering deliberately is evil. But it makes no sense to see a world where somebody causes mild suffering to many to be worse than a world where everybody suffers terribly and it is nobody's fault. Those religions are well on their way to leading people to feel that freely causing suffering is neutral.

Many argue that harm and suffering are not enough to justify or lead to moral principles. But look at what is being said. It is being said it is non-moral or immoral to try and make it enough!!

