

The Jocaxian Little Blue Devil

João Carlos Holland de Barcellos
translated by Debora Policastro

In my many years of atheism, since I was about 12, I could gather many arguments against God's existence. Some refer to the Catholic God, which has very well-defined features, some to gods who have a more blurred definition, therefore harder to be logically analyzed. Anyway, in almost every case, God has always the characteristic of, at least, being the creator of the universe and being endowed with awareness and intelligence.

Among the arguments I gathered, the most recent and what I consider to be the most stunning one because it is extremely simple and yet devastating, is the "Jocaxian Little Blue Devil". Below, you will see the summaries of the main anti-God arguments and evidence, starting with the one that entitles this text. (The names in brackets '[']' next to each argument are the names of the probable authors of the original idea or the person from whom I got to know the idea).

1 - Argument: "The Jocaxian Little Blue Devil" [Jocax]

It is said that God is an entity necessary to answer the question:

"How did the universe begin?"

If we answer with the same question "How did God begin?" the theist would say that God does not need a creator, for he is his own cause, or that he has always existed, or that he is beyond our comprehension. And it is no use trying to counter-argue saying that we can use the same arguments replacing the word "God" with "universe". The theistic mind requires a creator for the universe, whether you like it or not. However, there are other qualifications that are attached to this god-creator and are usually ascribed to God as a way to satisfy our psychological needs (i.e. goodness and/or omniscience and/or omnipotence, and/or perfection, among others). But, from the finding that this is not absolutely necessary to create the universe, comes the "Jocaxian Little Blue Devil" argument.

If you say that God created the universe, I MAY EQUALLY SUPPOSE that it was not God who created it, but the "Little Blue Devil". But this little devil is not as almighty as God, he does not have God's omniscience, he is not as good as God, not as perfect as God and, in order to create the universe, he ended up dying due to the amount of effort he made.

My little devil, being much less complex than your God-Almighty, should be PREFERABLE in "Occam's razor" terms to God! Therefore, before evoking God as the creator of the universe, you should evoke the "Jocaxian Little Blue Devil". Otherwise, you would be acting illogically by adding unnecessary assumptions to the 'creator of the Universe'.

Comment: there is no need for a creator with all the features of a "God" to create the universe. It would be enough having power to create it. Thus, the affirmation that says that a "God" is needed so the universe can exist lacks rationale.

2 - Proof: Contradiction to the FACTS [Epicurus / Hume]

If God is Good, then God does not want unnecessary suffering.

If God is powerful, then God can do anything.

Logic: If God can do anything and does not want suffering, he can prevent suffering.

Fact: 40 million children died recently drowned by a tsunami (death with suffering).

Conclusion: The hypothesis (good and powerful God) cannot be true, once it contradicts the observed fact.

Comment: Some may argue that the suffering was necessary because some people needed to "learn". It is possible to counter-argue that by asking what the children learned by drowning. It is possible to counter-argue against the "original sin" by asking if it is fair that the innocent pay for the guilty. But that would not necessary, once a good and almighty God could teach anybody anything without having to sacrifice innocent lives with tragic deaths. If God had to sacrifice so many lives, it means he is not powerful enough or not good (in the human sense of the term). It seems that the original argument refers to Epicurus, though its formalization is from Hume.

3 - Proof: internal contradiction (inconsistency) [Sartre (?)]:

God is OMNISCIENT, therefore he knows everything that happened and will happen.

God gave men freedom; therefore men are free to choose.

Contradiction: If God knows everything that men will choose (factual knowledge) it means that men have NO freedom of choice. (Everything was planned in God's mind and men could not change it).

Follow the demonstration [by Jocax]:

Suppose the existence of God Almighty. Then, it logically follows that:

1- God is omniscient.

2- Being Omniscient, God knows EVERYTHING that will happen.

3- Knowing EVERYTHING that will happen, he knows everything you will do and choose, even before you existed.

4- If God knows everything you will do and choose, you cannot do anything different from God's prediction.

5- Since you cannot do anything different from the divine prediction, you must necessarily and mandatorily follow it.

6- If you are obliged to follow God's prediction, it is impossible for you to choose or do

anything different from it.

7-If it is impossible for you to choose or do anything different from the divine prediction, you do not have free will!

As we wanted to demonstrate.

Comment: before a man is born, even before he gets married or does any kind of choice, his fate would already be planned in God's omniscient mind. So, nothing the man could choose would be different from the path already laid down by God. Thus, the so-called "Free Will" would be nothing more than an illusion. This means that either the man is not free to choose, or God is not omniscient. This is one of the most striking logical evidence against the existence of God.

4-Argument: By the Occam's Razor [Jocax (?)]

-There is no evidence that God exists.

- The set {Universe + God} is more complex than the set {Universe}.

By the Occam's razor, we should discard the first hypothesis of a universe with God in favor of the second, which is very simple, once it requires at least one hypothesis less.

Comment: We can make a metaphor of this argumentation through the "Nail Factory" argument:

First, we must agree that if we had to choose between two hypotheses for the origin of everything, we would have to stick with the more likely one. And if we wanted a more scientific explanation, we should stay with one of several physical theories about the origin of the universe, like the one that says that the universe emerged from the quantum vacuum: the particles would have been created from a "quantum fluctuation of vacuum". This is only a theory, which cannot be proved, but it is much more reasonable than the premise that there was a HUGE Nail factory (God) that made all the nails, but no one dares to ask about its origin.

The idea of comparing God to a "nail factory" is described below:

There is evidence of "nails" (elementary particles). Someone says that there must be a creator for these nails, and proposes that there must be a huge and complex "Nail Factory" (God). But this is NONSENSE. Besides the fact that there is no evidence on the Nail Factory existence, it would be FAR more complex than the nails found. So, by the Occam's Razor, it is much more logical to assume that the nails have always existed than that the great "Nail Factory" has always existed and is hidden somewhere that can only be known after death.

5 - Argument: God, if he existed, would be a ROBOT [By Andre Sanchez & Jocax]:

- God is omniscient, omnipotent and knows everything that happened and will happen.
- He also knows * all * of his OWN future actions.

- It means he should follow all his already planned actions, without being able to change them, exactly as a robot follows its programming.

Conclusion: God, if he existed, would not have free will. It would be a robot, a kind of automaton that must forever follow his programming (his own prediction) without being able to change it.

Comment: God's omniscience would lead himself to a tedious prison from which nothing could go out even if he felt like doing it. He would be stuck in his own cruel omniscience.

6 - Proof: If God existed, there would be no imperfection [unknown author]:

If God existed and was perfect, everything that he created would be perfect. Mankind, being his creation, should also have been created perfect. But how could a being created perfect be corrupted and become imperfect? If mankind was corrupted, it was not perfect, it was corruptible!

Conclusion: God could not be perfect, once he generated something imperfect.

Comment: A perfect being wants perfection, and even if God had created men with free will - we have demonstrated above it is an illusion -; if men were perfect, they would have made perfect choices and would not be corrupted.

7 - Argument: Origin of God [unknown author]:

The argumentation of the *intelligent design* according to which the complexity of nature requires an intelligent creator collapses when no one offers any explanation about the origin of God. Once again according to the *intelligent design* argument, God, as an extremely complex and intelligent being would need to have an intelligent creator, who would be the "God of God": the creator of God. This "Creator of God ", once he is smarter than God, accordingly to the same argument, should also have an extremely intelligent creator: "God of God of God ". And so on, ad infinitum. It is possible to see that the argument that something complex needs a more complex being to be created is NONSENSE.

Comment: the *Intelligent Design* is largely used nowadays to teach religion courses in some Brazilian and American states, as if it was science.

8-Proof: The universe could not be created. [by Jocax]

Suppose God exists. If he had an infinite intelligence, he would not need to spend time deciding something or processing information. Thus, he would not spend any time deciding to create the universe. That is, the Universe would have to be created in the very moment God was created. If God was never created, then the universe could never have been created as well.

Comment: If there is movement, there is time. If there was no time, nothing could have moved.

9- Proof: God cannot be perfect. [unknown author]

If God was perfect, he would not have any needs; he would be self enough. However, if he decided to create the universe, it happened because he had a need for this creation, therefore he was not self enough, he was imperfect.

10- Proof: If God existed, he could not be perfect. [Jocax]

Many believers take physical laws and their “magical” constants as evidence of the divine wisdom once it is supposed that a little alteration in them would cause the universe to collapse and be destroyed.

However, they forget THESE laws, specially the second law of thermodynamics, provide the inexorable, slow and agonizing collapse of our universe, showing that there has been a SERIOUS FLAW in its conception, what would make it unfeasible in the long run.

Comment: the second law of thermodynamics is known as the law that says that the entropy in a closed system is never reduced. We can consider the whole universe as a closed system once nothing enters or leaves it.

11 – Proof: If God existed, he could not be good. [?]

God, hypothetically omniscient and omnipotent knew everything that would happen BEFORE he decided to create the universe. He knew everyone that would be born and what each person would “choose” for his/her life. He even knew that a huge TSUNAMI would come and drown 40 thousand children. If he had the power to make the universe slightly different, maybe he could have prevented this tragedy. But, knowing EVERYTHING that would happen in the future, knowing all deaths, all the disasters and calamities, God put his plan into practice and started watching from the front row seat. This is not worthy of a generous being.

12-Proof: by the universe definition, God could not have created it. [Jocax (?)]

noun

•everything that exists, especially all physical matter, including all the stars, planets, galaxies, etc. in space

So, the universe can be defined as the setting of all that exists. Therefore, if God existed, he could not have created the universe, as he would be a part of it!

Comment: The believer could then only set God as the creator of matter/energy and not of the universe itself.

13- Proof: by the current laws of Physics, it would be impossible for God could to exist [unknown author]

Quantum mechanics has a fundamental law called “Uncertainty Principle”. According to this law, it is IMPOSSIBLE, regardless of technology, to know the exact position and speed of a particle. That means that physically it is impossible that a “Omniscient God” exists, once he would know the exact position and speed of a particle and that would violate a fundamental pillar of modern science.

14 – Proof: If God existed, he would be sadistic and selfish [Renato W. Lima (?)]

It is intended to show that God needs to create an imperfect world; otherwise the world would be himself. It would be possible to argue that creating a clone of himself would be better than creating an imperfect world to, sadistically, watch it suffer. However, knowing that the world is not perfect does not imply that one must refuse assistance when necessary, as long as there is enough power for that and one does not desire that evil happens. If God had really created imperfect beings like us and different from him, he would be selfish, as he wanted to be the only perfect being and owner of power. And selfishness is definitely not a good thing.

15 – Argument: Igor’s Theorem [Igor Silva (?)]

If we had to choose one of the options below, which one would be more likely or easier to happen?

- A- A dead person resurrecting and ascending to heaven (without rockets) or
- B- Someone writing lies in a piece of paper or book and people believing in it?

- A- Someone who has performed miracles that go against the laws of Physics or
- B- Someone writing lies in a piece of paper or book and people believing in it?

- A- A totipotent being (God) existing and creating the universe or
- B- Someone writing lies in a piece of paper or book and people believing in it?

Comment: This text is a simplification of Hume’s argument:

[...] “No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish” David Hume «*Of Miracles*» (1748)

16- Argument: By the Kalam’s Theorem [unknown]

The Kalam’s theorem claims that nothing can be extended in an infinite past time because if there was an infinite time in past, it would take an infinite time since this past until our present. So, an infinite time means never. That way, we would never have our present. But this is an absurd once we are in the present. Similarly, if there was a God whose existence extended until an infinite time in past, we would never have this present. Therefore it is not possible for a God that exists in an infinite time in past to exist.

17 – Argument: For the unnecessary of a Cause [Jocax]

The origin of the universe and its laws can be satisfactorily explained through the Jocaxian-Nothingness (JN). The JN explains in a logical way that the cosmos could emerge from the Jocaxian-Nothingness, once this Nothingness would not have laws that restricted whatever. Thus, due to the lack of laws, events could happen. That eliminates the necessity of a conscious creator like God to explain our cosmos.

Portuguese Version: <http://www.genismo.com/religiaotexto32.htm>