

Flying Spaghetti Monster

In What World Does Mockery Mean Good?

It seems rather household nowadays, as tea is to luncheon or spaghetti is to meatballs, to compare the Judeo-Christian God to a fable, fairytale, daydream or psychological disorder. Come to think of it, it could be one of the most reheated dishes to come out of the academic kitchen (to call it a spread would be far too becoming). It is so often used now, with all intents and purposes, to mock any who believe in the very idea of God – excuse me – ‘imaginary friend’. The very same who grumble, “Why won’t god just show himself to Me!” as they split their peas from their potatoes, do not even acknowledge the plain fact that they have already deemed God a psychological disorder – so what good would a bottle of medication do you? Yet, even still, how could one’s imagination be wrong if it is commonly acceptable to believe all interpretations are mind-made alongside right and wrong itself? Which bitingly shows a hearty uncertainty on the subject. – So! What is with all the mockery? If God cannot be a wrong belief, why such hostility? All those ‘un-fare’ comparisons show a bloated reluctance to be open minded – puffed up, swollen and full with their own belief. Another bite could never do. So what do they do? Vacuum seal those leftover remarks and repackage it as fresh meat for all who find pleasure in the *mock du jour* – just more daily bread I suppose. If you are curious as to which particular item on the menu I’m pointing too, it is the *flying spaghetti monster*, plated and served in full force after a theist mentions the Cook upstairs, “Just because you say I should believe in a god, does not mean I should believe in a flying spaghetti monster!” — Got me there! They can dish it out, but why would anyone want to stomach it?

This pedestrian oratorical device, more like a bauble found in the bottom of a cereal box, can only emerge from a spiteful disposition. One that heavily relies solely on what is physical, requiring material “evidence” to downgrade any intuitive interpretations (even if the interpretation of the material is evidentially dependent upon one’s imagination). And seeing as how it is such a fun toy to use, let’s play it out from a *naturalistic perspective*:

Consider the fact that we do not know where we came from, nor do we know when the earth’s abrupt eruption to corruption and back to life again occurred, nor do we know what that original single cell-like form in the beginning stages of evolution looked like. We all needed to evolve from a singular something. So why could it not be something that vaguely looks like what they claim? – Emerging from the primordial soup, a flying radioactive celluloid pseudo-spaghetti creature. There's no evidence to suggest we didn't! Why couldn't we evolve from an early ancestral *sea anemone*, which over millions of years ago, plus or minus, reproduced the ability to detach itself from the seabed and float to the surface – which then over another million years or so, give or take, evolved into an aerial anemone? Why not? – The Tyrannosaurus Rex evolved into the Kentucky fried chicken (seriously look it up). So why couldn't this seabed-spaghetti-creature learn to take flight over a very long grueling process of time through the aid of dense radioactivity? In our postmodern paradigm, magic is merely a balance of probabilities – just give time and chance a chance – and a scientist to stamp it. After all, that's how we got here.

Anti-theists cannot throw historical science jabs if the premise of their belief is open for revision, notwithstanding the transparent motivation to spare themselves extrinsic moral accountability. We cannot mock people, or God for that matter, when we're dealing with the

origins of universal existence and why we are here and alive in our present condition – when imagining this point in time everything appears fringe reality – how then does the idea of God sound farfetched? In greater context, God provides a simple yet more perceivably authentic explanation for why information could have pre-existed our current universe in order to create everything we see, feel and understand today.

Yet there are many who still piously regurgitate, “Religion is evil! Religion is stupid!” (In fact, they made a church about it: *flying spaghetti monster*) such as publically outspoken militant anti-theist Richard Dawkins at his ‘Reason Rally’ in Washington D.C., “Mock them, ridicule them... in public! Don’t fall for the convention that we’re all too polite to talk about religion. Religion is not off the table. Religion is not off limits. Religion makes specific claims about the universe which need to be substantiated and need to be challenged, and if necessary, need to be ridiculed with contempt.”¹ A strong resolve followed by a soft pat on the back by Stalin. In such a pious yet sour community, you may wonder how on God’s green earth is this way of thinking ever going to institute global peace? Mockery never coexists in the pursuit of peace; on the contrary, it exemplifies that our natural disposition without God’s presence is inherently evil; a deviation from what is good. Unfortunately, from the anti-theistic perspective, there is no real reason not to mock people. If you don’t like them – why not? As Hume’s Law suggests, you cannot derive ‘ought’ from ‘is’ – you cannot posit moral law from hunk of flesh – because in that world, we’re all somebody’s dinner. Perhaps Dawkins served it best once again, “The total amount of suffering per year in the natural world is beyond all decent contemplation. During the minute that it takes me to compose this sentence, thousands of animals are being eaten alive, many others are running for their lives, whimpering with fear, others are slowly being devoured from within by rasping parasites, thousands of all kinds are dying of starvation, thirst, and disease. It must be so. If there ever is a time of plenty, this very fact will automatically lead to an increase in the population until the natural state of starvation and misery is restored. In a universe of electrons and selfish genes, blind physical forces and genetic replication, some people are going to get hurt, other people are going to get lucky, and you won't find any rhyme or reason in it, nor any justice. The universe that we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil, no good, nothing but pitiless indifference.”

Now if it were truly a universe of table scraps and “pitiless indifference”, contempt for God or someone’s imaginary friend seems rather daft, no? It’s just pointless squabbling. And if Dawkins were right, and that world he so eloquently described were genuine, *true goodness is measured by hunger and appetite*, temporal passions and immediate pleasures, which means violence and ridicule is but a step to achieve that feeling passing by (as is cannibalism mind you). Genuine goodness thereof is subjugated to preference, popularity and opportunity, since permissibility is a matter of interpretation, or better yet, imagination. I suppose in a world without a relational God, where conscience is perpendicular to logic, where true friendship is momentary and imaginary one’s are as real as they need to be, the doctor’s orders could be far more appetizing if the living were a decadent folk.

¹ On 24 March 2012 at 2:55 PM, Richard Dawkins propagated militant atheism at the "Reason Rally", encouraging his audience to "Mock them [believers], ridicule them in public."
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uPqqp8KVuQU>

From a Biblical position, humanity was intentionally designed in the Image of God. This means more than just a shadow of a physical representation, it means to be ambassadors of virtue. A Biblical Christian ought not go out of their way to intentionally mock that image for sheer indulgence or anything of the like – God’s original intent of design was “good”. And it would not be arbitrary to advise conscience is the one thing we ought to feed more often. The God of the Bible uses moral law to describe our essence and our conscience needs moral law to keep us conscientious, to discern authenticity from popular opinion and household facts. In a world where cooking supper is equally as virtuous as eating somebody else’s, it begs the question: Who or what created the Flying Spaghetti Monster – God?! And if anything can be cooked up in a primordial soup, what does everything boil down too? Just food for thought.

Matlock Bobechko | September 8, 2016 – 3:52 PM EST
