

INSTEAD OF BEING SO SURE NATURAL EVIL DOES NOT REFUTE GOD RELIGION SHOULD SAY "MAYBE IT DOES!"

The free will defence says that God is all good so evil comes from us having abused our power to line up with God or rebel.

However, most innocent suffering has nothing to do with human activity. Nature hurts. Babies die in plagues. Religion however insists that God can be pure love and let that happen for it is only natural evil. Evil is blamed on human beings abusing God's gift of free will to hurt others.

This is a challenge to how religion thinks it has the right to be so sure that natural evil cannot really refute God's love for it is not truly evil. We will learn it has no right and has no business bringing arrogance into something so serious.

First

Natural evil is evil that just happens and nobody does it. It is not evil in the way somebody deliberately hitting you is. The latter is moral evil.

The admission

The god believers have to admit that it is at least possible that that non-chosen or non-caused-by-free-agents evil disproves the love of God.

If the problem of natural evil could disprove the love of God or the free will defence then why?

* Because it is suffering.

Who cares if evil people are happy and do not suffer as long as they do not harm anybody? We have to punish because of the world we live in, we need to try and stop evil using punishment, but it is pity we have to. God does not have to punish anybody. God does not have to discipline anybody. To disagree is just to wish for your pound of flesh.

It is insane to say it is wrong for a scientist to build a machine to cause volcanoes and it is okay for God to do it. That denies that the action is just bad in itself regardless of any consequences. It is insulting and misanthropic and unfair. And the reason it is okay for God to do it is because he is bringing benefits out of it then what? Then the scientist can do it as well so that is not a reason. And what if the scientist is God's instrument? Then the scientist doing it is the same as God doing it. A god like that who is not a moral agent is not a god we can connect with. It would be evil to offer a God like that and then excuse his role in natural evil. And even if there is a God it does not follow that the God you adore is him for to adore your image of God is to adore your image of God not God. That is what you are saying allows natural evil! Human nature is so eager to adore copies of God that if you want to be found innocent of condoning natural evil so selfishly and for your self-made God you have to go to big lengths to prove it. The matter is that serious!

What right has man to say it is different for God to do earthquakes and plagues? Even God cannot say it without proving it for it is a proving matter!! It is easy for man to say it and that is why it is so terrible to say it. So much for the Christian doctrine that God is daddy and servant!!

* Because it is undeserved suffering? This suggestion stands out as spiteful for it insinuates that if natural evil caused undeserved suffering there would be no problem with it! It amounts to saying an earthquake is a good thing if it hurts those who deserve it. Wanting the wicked to be judged and put in prison is dignity. Wanting them to be caught up in a volcano just because they deserve it and will get what they deserve is not.

The alternative then is to say that natural evil is not about what you deserve or don't deserve. God does not consider that when setting it up. But a God who gives you what you deserve or one that hurts you as you do not deserve is not an indifferent God. He cares enough if he is going to be spiteful. You deserve to be thought of as a deserving person if nothing else. So if he does not care about your dignity as a deserving person he is worse than a bad God. He is indifferent and cold.

* Because any good comes not because of it but in spite of it. It is just wholly inexcusable - period! This excuse is terrible and unfeeling. The good coming about in spite of the natural evil has nothing nothing at all to do with making it even a little good. A PERSON CAN BE GLAD THE GOOD RATHER THAN JUST COMING COMES IN SPITE OF EVIL. IN OTHER WORDS THEY ARE GLAD THE EVIL WAS THE WAY IT WAS DONE FOR THEY ARE GLAD THE EVIL

WAS DONE IN THE FIRST PLACE! BEING GLAD THAT JOHN GOT A MILLION POUNDS FOR LOSING HIS ARM IS VINDICTIVE WHEN IT ENTAILS BEING GLAD HE DIDN'T JUST WIN IT.

* Because evil has to happen after we do evil for we must experience and get the natural and bad consequences of our evil. TRANSLATION: WE CREATE THE BAD RESULTS. BUT WE DO NOT. THEY JUST FOLLOW. GOD CREATES THEM IF ANYBODY DOES. IF GOD JUST STOPPED HOLDING THINGS IN EXISTENCE RIGHT NOW YOU WOULD NEVER FACE THE RESULTS. ITS A NASTY UNSYMPATHETIC DOCTRINE.

* Because a God who sends earthquakes and viruses to torment people against their will can hardly claim to allow evil to happen because he wants to respect people's freedom to do evil? TRANSLATION: IF EVIL IS OKAY AS LONG AS NO PERSON IS DOING IT THEN EVIL DOES NOT MATTER SO WE HAVE NO RIGHT TO COMPLAIN IF A PERSON DOES IT. EVIL DOES NOT BECOME EVIL JUST BECAUSE A PERSON IS DOING IT. TO SAY DIFFERENT IS MAGIC AND SUPERSTITION.

* Because it makes no sense to say that evil is a side-effect of the gift of free will and not from God when God does and sends natural evil. Religion has no explanation as to how free will can be to blame for evil when there is evil that is not down to free will. It just ignores the problem and that is evil in itself.

* Because moral evil cannot be possible unless natural evil exists. So for that reason natural evil is worse than moral evil. TRANSLATION: WHAT OPENS THE DOOR TO EVIL IS WORSE THAN ANY EVIL IN PRINCIPLE. AN EVIL CAN BE LESS BAD THAN YOU EXPECT BUT OPENING THE DOOR MEANS ANYTHING HOWEVER TERRIBLE CAN HAPPEN. IF NATURAL EVIL IS BETTER THAN MORAL EVIL THEN THAT MAKES NO SENSE. IT MAKES MORAL EVIL POSSIBLE AND SETS THE STAGE FOR IT. SO IT IS AS BAD IF NOT WORSE.

* Because the notion that natural evil is remote from the creator and not directly caused by him is nonsense though it is basic to the argument that an all-good God cannot harm. It contradicts the doctrine that God causes all things out of nothing and things return to nothing if he withdraws his creative power. There is no indirect strictly speaking. Everything is a miracle. The doctrine that God does not directly do harm is incoherent and ridiculous and insincere. TRANSLATION: THE UNIVERSE IS DIRECTLY CREATED BY GOD MEANING THAT ALL THAT HAPPENS IN IT IS DIRECTLY CREATED TOO. IF YOU DIRECT GREEN PAINT AT A DOOR AND KNOW THE HANDLE IS THERE AND SPRAY IT ANYWAY YOU CANNOT SAY THAT THE HANDLE SHOULD NOT BE PAINTED SO IT WAS INDIRECTLY PAINTED.

Therefore the natural evil refutes God argument is 100% correct.