

Religion makes itself feel better about innocent suffering by condoning it - the tendency to condone suffering is universal

Religion fools people by making out that though it is hard to fit God and evil together the fact remains that God opposes evil totally and has nothing at all to do with it. God makes all things but they say this does not mean that God creates evil.

During the Covid 19 pandemic, it was found that horror film fans who had a regular dose of their favourite viewing felt less fear and stress. The horror story of Jesus' death, the horror story of Hell, the horror story of Satan, probably did the same thing in Christian circles. And does. But as we are not islands, the Christians are spreading a dangerous lack of fear. Fear warns and sometimes it is needed. Christians have always done that and then innocents suffered.

Christians who see the terrible things that happen such as famine and plague and dying children and who see it is not possible to blame humans for it except in some cases may be treating this as a horror film and using it to feel less fear and stress. The miracle of how you can feel that good about something that could happen to you can be explained by thinking, "God has been great so far to me so why should that not continue? I'm safe."

Christians say that evil is not a thing or power but a lack. It is good not being good enough. But if good can be bad that is far worse than evil being a power. Poison that looks good is worse than poison that looks like excrement. Good being bad is worse than evil being a power. Thus belief in God is inherently immoral because it denies that God being good can create evil. Eradicating evil matters more than what you think evil is and it is the truth that seeing evil as a power is the best to drive people to battle evil.

It is bad in itself to condone the evil of God or religion or whatever. The bigger the evil the worse your condoning is. As God is the maker of all, it follows that it is better to risk condoning what Hitler did than what God did. You need a good long complex explanation as to why you should not condone. The risk of condoning is bad in itself too. If you take a chance that is wrong as well.

Why are we drawn emotionally and other ways to helping a baby that falls down a well while if we had the power of magic to go to starving children in Africa and feed them for a week we would not use it? This shows that even acts that are labelled as altruistic and other-interested in fact are more selfish than one lets on. It shows how rare real other-interest is. The inconsistency of human nature is a bigger trait than anything else. We can ask about that and then ask if human nature is generally other-regarding or selfish.

Freud showed that if human nature wants to do something that is considered unacceptable and suppresses it will lead to them doing worse perhaps before they realise it. If people want to see others suffer and repress that it will come out as wanting a God to hurt others. The more they say it is justified the more they are showing their repression.

Many defenders of the existence of a loving God in the face of evil have been caught lying. Christian apologist Timothy Keller for example altered and misquoted a philosophy paper (Alston) to make it look like any argument against God from evil was bankrupt. Even believers would have to admit that somebody using such tactics is very callous for suffering is very real and he will condone it even if it is definitive proof that a loving God does not exist.

Keller wrote, "Just because you can't see or imagine a good reason why God might allow something to happen doesn't mean there can't be one" (page 23, The Reason for God). So he admits that if he became God or got God's powers that he would send rabid dogs to devour human babies just like God would. The "can't be one" is not the issue - the question is does the evidence favour the possibility? That shows Keller is just regurgitating a chimera!!

Believers in God deny that God is to blame for the evil and suffering in the world and lay the blame with human beings misusing the free will that God gave them. To say anything different would be to say that God is evil or at

least has no concept of morality for evil by definition is that which should not exist or be tolerated. If God uses evil for a purpose he uses it because we force him to need it. To imagine that we create evil and force God to have a plan to deal with it that can be a very painful plan is pure misanthropism. It is a very very serious accusation and needs to be seen as such. People who would accuse you would just as easily pretend to care when they think God is letting evil befall you.

PEOPLE GET BLAMED JUST BECAUSE YOU WANT TO BELIEVE IN GOD

Religion says when evil and suffering happen they are permitted by God. What does permitted mean? It means that God does not miraculously intervene to stop the evil and suffering. They happen not because the fault is in him so the fault is in us. Religion does not reason what a God would or wouldn't allow. No it looks at evil and suffering and it cannot deny they exist. So it ends up thinking, "Evil and suffering exist and are brute facts so we must make them fit our God theory." The cart is before the horse and that would be laughable only it is real people who suffer and die and who are degraded by religion's nonsense. The cart before the horse is simply condoning.

Belief is not the same as trust. To condone evil so you can believe in God is dreadful and worse than doing it because you want to trust. It is turning people's real pain into ammunition for a theory.

TRANSLATION

Is to say God has a plan when people suffer, no matter how much, to say:

+ I am so good as a person that I choose to see the good in all that happens. (Arrogance and refusing to look at the picture realistically - you cannot just push the evil into the background)

+ I am so good I am in a position to judge what is good. (Arrogance)

+ I am better than the person who does not see the good. (Arrogant and judgmental)

+ The person who sees no good in their suffering is making it worse by not seeing and looking for the hand of God. (Arrogant and judgmental)

+ They are at risk of misleading or not guiding others. (Arrogant and judgmental)

+ If they cannot see the good then I can. (Arrogant and judgmental)

It is saying one or any number of these things. Human nature can say one thing but you need to see into their minds to know exactly what they mean!!

THE BRAIN PLAYS TRICKS WITH PAIN

People can suffer something terrible. The seemingly same thing can happen. It may in many ways actually be worse. And yet they don't seem to be in as much agony this time. They are not. Their psychological state is not as devastated as you would expect or as would be natural. The reason is that the brain has ways of learning to enjoy enough of it of it enough. There is no pain. Pain is a collective word for pains. So it is very complicated.

There is something deceptive in how pain is a warning sign and the brain does that with it.

That is one issue.

The other issue is that when your pain is down to the pain others suffer, you hate to see them suffer and it hurts you, the same enjoyment is going to creep in. It definitely creeps in quicker.

God designed this if he exists so how against evil is he?

People may feel that God uses the suffering. That comes across as an effort then to enjoy it in some way.

OTHERS NOT ME

The way we all feel that bad things happen to others not us is a form of condoning. You are telling the illnesses and miseries to go to other people and thus that you have nothing to fear from them. You talk as if you believe God gives you protection he will not give to others. An atheist doing this may not realise she is doing God-talk.

NUMBER GAME

Religion gets people to stop being mad at its God by saying, "Look how there is far more good than bad around!" The amount does not matter. We must be compassionate enough to be outraged if a virus torments only one baby even if nobody else knows what suffering is like. The answer is a placebo and hugely offensive and disgraceful. It is okay for an atheist to remark that life is more good than bad for she does not claim any God has set it up that way. But to say a God is doing it and even worse to worship that God is terrible.

Even if there is a God we don't know for sure. Thus there is something bad about human beings saying there is more good than bad thus the bad should be allowed by a God for what right have we to judge that even if we are right? It is not our place and we could be right or wrong.

EVEN THE GOD IDEA INFERS BELIEVERS CONDONE

God is infinite meaning everything about him is, not a number too great for us to imagine, but literally numberless. Infinite is that which is great without end or limit. Christians use this doctrine to argue that as God is good it means he is unlimitedly good thus evil is his complete opposite. The distance between God and evil is infinite. This calls us to be like God and to oppose and hate evil as much as we can.

This tells us that we cannot ever understand how far from God and good evil is. Any view of evil we have will be watered down. It may not feel that way but it is. We cannot care the way God cares. Our caring for another no matter how deep is idolatrous for it is a mere imitation of how God cares.

CONDONING

If you condone evil you cannot admit it. You pretend to be good and to love goodness.

You cannot ask to be considered innocent until proven guilty if the evil is great. Asking is evil. And what bigger evil is there than what happens in the universe under God's watch? This is about you not God - are you the kind of person that wants your terrible irresponsible view to be respected? Are you the person who if given a choice would decree, "Let this evil happen for it is God's will. Let those babies die terribly" though you could be wrong? How dare you if you are!

TESTABLE OR NON-TESTABLE?

The person may condone evil in a testable way. For example, if you say John stole the money to feed his children you can be proven wrong.

The sneakiest hypocrite will condone evil in a NON-TESTABLE way.

The hypocrite tries to avoid being proven to be a fake.

The hypocrite encourages evil with a pious smile - his evil looks good.

There is more condoning and stronger condoning involved when evil is condoned and protected from anything that exposes its true nature.

If something could be an example of condoning, it has to be treated as condoning. Making any exceptions

gettisons the principle, "Oppose evil and work against it and be aware of its subtlety".

People naturally find it easier to believe that when others suffer it is part of a plan. They don't find it as easy when it is themselves or their loved ones who suffer. When they suffer or the latter suffer, instead of the plan being about the greater good, the plan suddenly becomes one where God has something amazing planned for the sufferers. He is letting them be hurt because he has some lovely surprise that makes it all worth putting up with.

A baby suffers now. To say God has a plan is saying that God is right to do nothing right now as long as he acts later. That is an appalling outlook. It is the now that matters. The present moment should take priority over everything else. If God is not helping now how can you say he will help later? How can you say he should? It is no answer to say that it is God looking after the person not you thus you cannot be blamed for agreeing nothing is done now right away. It is human and right to care about the right now. Denying that instinct for a belief is self-abuse and degrading to the victim. God cannot ask you to do it. And what about the risk that you are telling yourself the future for the person will take care of itself because you don't really truly care?

To say, "God, your will and nobody else's be done" is saying, "I believe the suffering should happen if it happens." But that is too serious for mere belief. It risks being the kind of person who would let that suffering happen if you could and all in the name of faith and faith could be wrong. Faith is no justification for such extremism. Faith is self-destructive and will lead to emotional problems and addictions if it is taken that far.

RETROSPECT

Many are who say that something terrible or potentially terrible happened in their lives. They say that now it does not bother them and they see them as being among the best things that happened to them or at least good and fine are betraying those who now suffer abominably. It can only water down how terrible their experience is and how it should not be happening. They are giving them a reason to feel ashamed of how angry and hurt and distressed they feel in response to their troubles. They deny they do this and that is rubbing salt into the wounds. And their buzz now is about them trying to compensate themselves with warm nice appreciative feelings so they deny their memories of the horrors or dilute them to make it seem worth what they have now.

CONDONING AS A COMMUNITY

Individuals condone. Even more people condone being part of communities and religions and societies that enable evil to happen or make it possible. For example, if Muslims all became Quakers that would be the end of Islamic terrorism. But they wouldn't do that. People feel disconnected to evil that is not directly done by them. But they are indirectly connected and making it possible and they worry not about it. A high and mighty person can run an abattoir where animals are cruelly slaughtered and feel okay about it as long as he is not doing the slaughtering. Yet making evil possible is worse than doing it directly. You have less control over evil you make possible at a distance than the evil you do directly.

ASSUMING IS CONDONING UNDER ANOTHER NAME

God would give clear evidence that he is at work through evil. You need evidence and there is none. You just need a few clear examples and God would need to open his mouth and talk us through it. God should be explaining instead of letting man explain for him for it is not man's place. John's explanation of what I do means nothing for only I can explain. It is insulting and arrogant of him to try to explain. If I am hurting people and he is trying to explain that I mean well but am mistaken or something he insults the victims. The arrogance and stupidity of those who say they know what God is doing is staggering. For example, some say the crucifixion of Christ made his glorious resurrection to eternal life possible and shows God's plan. But it is absurd to say that Christ needed to be crucified.

It is about evidence not assuming. It is too serious of a matter to guess about. Condoning always involves assumptions and a lack of regard for evidence.

Religion says we should worship God though he has made terrible viruses and diseases. But there is no should about it. We have the right to refuse. The terribleness of these things overrides any right God has to expect us to

believe he is doing right. The should lies behind all attempts to reconcile God with evil and it is bad in itself thus no reconciliation can work. Religion wants to influence people and it cannot do that if it starts to say, "You MAY worship God." It is too weak and turns religion into something as unimportant as what you may have for breakfast. All God's defenders do is show themselves to be spiritually bankrupt.

THE "IT COULD BE WORSE" METHOD OF CONDONING

The view that we should not be too annoyed when things go wrong for there are people being tortured and slaughtered in the world is common. That something worse exists does not make a bad thing less bad. It may make you feel less bad about it. You are using the suffering of others to benefit yourself. And the godly do it as much as the ungodly.

THE STOICS

The Stoics argued that unavoidable suffering and disaster will come to you so you must be resigned to it for it only makes it worse to try and resist and to complain. This advice is all me me me. Why? Because to accept your own suffering means judging the suffering of others as unavoidable as well. You may be wrong but you have to assume it is inevitable for it is better for them to accept it, in case it really is inevitable and because you have to assume it for you cannot really comprehend the complexities of another's life. Our natural instinct is to do what the Stoics did and that instinct is stronger than any other. Thus we should assume that those who say God lets others suffer are condoning that suffering. They may be saying God is cruel or just does not care but they are still condoning what happens.