

Date: 9/20/2019 10:51:36 PM

Subject: Reply ID wa3r

Some Fallacies of Theists: An Attempt to Save
Catholics' & Other Believers' Souls

by Nate A. Lindell
created 20 Sept. 2019

"What makes man choose good over evil?. Prove it." Father John asked me, then bravely blocked me from emailing a reply. This is the first fallacy typical with religionists :

1) Plugging Their Ears

It manifests in many forms a) crying, b) blocking you from emailing them, c) seeing you as less than human, a "thing," & worst, d) seeing you as an enemy, thus something to be disregarded or attacked when they can't justify their beliefs or you decline to play make believe with them.

It's delusional, as exemplified by Father John, who asked me to keep an "open mind," while closing his own.

Delusions are a beach to crack! When someone has built their whole view of truth & reality (i.e. their psychoepistemology) on someone's imagined/inspired "spiritual" reality, and part of that belief system is that it's the real or highest reality (and to question that is a sin that will get you eternal torture in hell), you can't reasonably dispute that because the belief is not based on reason. (Why people are so prone to such delusions is another issue, worth further consideration...)

2) Labelling Things Evil

Father John asks why some people "choose" good over evil. First, as I've demonstrated before (see my prior post, "Do We Really Have A Choice"), we don't have free will, although we feel/think we do. Secondly, what's the definition of "good" & "evil" we're using here? If by "good" you, Father John, mean what the Catholic Church wants one to do, that would include remaining silent about being raped by priests, playing along with a corrupt org, & at various points in history (as exemplified by the majority of Popes) killing competitors, fornicating with prostitutes & boys/girls, murdering disbelievers & scientists, then that definition of "good" is arbitrary & describes "evil", to me.

A less arbitrary definition of "good" (vs. "evil") may be exemplified by "the Good Samaritan" story in the Bible: helping someone in need without expecting anything in return. What makes people do that? Having done so & doing so on a regular basis, I believe that it's either innate or developed moral consciousness that causes one to act in this manner. Now,

assuming Jesus told the Good Samaritan story, then Jesus himself recognized that religionists were not "good" simply because they embraced religion, and Atheists (that's what "Samaritan" is a metaphor for, as those familiar with biblical era & area history -- such as the Catholic professor of such, whom I visited with at Terre Haute USP in 2014 [as I said, Father John, I'm neither closed minded nor ignorant -- I actually do know it all :) !] told me, as Samaritans abandoned their Israelite traditions, & mixed with Gentiles) are not necessarily "evil."

This isn't a matter of "calling evil good & good evil," unless your definition of "evil" is rejecting religion or rejecting Catholicism. If that is your definition of "evil", then there are multiple reasons that people do "good," such as

- a) they were born into it, had no opportunity to believe otherwise;
- b) they were desperate for or sought the benefits that may come from joining the religion (e.g. Muslims & Jews in Inquisition-era Spain, when joining the church saved their lives & property, Natives in South America facing Conquistadors, a lonely prisoner...);
- b) they're gullible;
- c) the possibility of eternal burning in hell scares them
- c) they despise the alternative religion (e.g. hate Muslims)

But I think such "goodness" is actually evil, certainly anti-American, one reason I despise the Taliban -- such goodness is oppressive of one's true self. I don't support nor care to pursue such "good;" living like that for eternity would be hell, not heaven.

Now, there's no hope of me persuading Father John nor most believers of the fallacies of their beliefs: their brains literally won't absorb the validity of my arguments; it's like trying to prove two plus two is four to someone who's been brainwashed to believe that two is a trick, is a made-up number, or someone who prefers to "believe" a lie because they benefit from pretending....

3) The Burden of Proof Isn't On Me

By demanding that I prove people do good on their own, without God, Father John expects me to disprove God's existence, as other believers expect, when they've not first presented even a prima facie/apparent case that God exists, let alone the specific God that they expect me to believe in. There's nothing to disprove, & whenever Atheists do so using conceptual mathematics, logic, physics, etc, believers simply imagine more curtains behind which their God "may" be hiding behind -- not surprising, as questioning God's existence is a fatal sin! (Apparently their Almighty God is insecure....)

Conclusion

People do good in the Good-Samaritan sense because the empathetic, impulses suppressing, rational & pro-social components of their brains developed in a healthy, typical manner, without such development being interrupted by trauma of various kinds. This is explained in such books as Parental Incarceration, Routledge(2016 or 2017).

Beliefs in God may scare some into being pseudo-good, but no intangible spirits nor Gods can nor do cause the physical/neurological processes that result in one doing good (it

does require a lengthier explanation for me to articulate how neurons, interneural connections & synaptic activity cause any/all human behavior -- such a "material theory of mind" has not yet, as far as I know, been ENTIRELY articulated by neuroscientists; I've been working on it, but have been distracted by litigation....). This theory is more rational and proven than "God did it."

Final Thoughts

My blog is for grownups, those who seek & cherish truth and understanding certainly not people who want me to play make believe with them. That may narrow my audience to three or four people, but THOSE three or four people - homo sapiens sapiens, very wise apes - are precious to me!

Don't expect me to hold my tongue should you get on b.s. Come correct, as will I.