

3. Atheism Verses “God”

Shockingly, most of our universe is comprised of dark energy. This mysterious force cannot be seen, tasted, felt, smelled, heard, nor even detected with instruments.(1) Yet its existence is firmly established. Also, this force having incredible power is concluded, since other celestial bodies are supposedly overcome. (Extremely powerful effects require even more powerful causes).

Yet since “God” cannot be seen, tasted, felt, smelt, or heard, nor be detected by instruments, millions of people deny there’s a god, and millions more aren’t sure. Yet what could cause intelligent creatures, as the effect of powerful celestial objects being overcome creates the inescapable conclusion that there’s an even greater entity behind it? Although human brains are the most complex physical structure in the universe(2,3), most people cannot practice brain surgery; nobody can create the smallest part of a human brain, and nobody can even create an ant brain. Yet atheism seems to imply that the effect of great intellects like Da Vinci’s either resulted from a cause of lower intelligence or one with no intelligence whatsoever.

Again, dark matter and dark energy are largely unquestioned among scientists. Astronomers say they exist, so that settles that. Actually, nothing establishes the existence of dark matter and energy except their alleged effects on their surroundings.

Many argue that similar evidence for the existence of a supreme being meets or exceeds the evidence establishing the existence of dark matter and other elusive entities, via spectacular complexity, order, power, and intelligence in the surrounding world to establish God’s existence. Therefore let us closely examine theistic claims.

I hereafter define “God” as a supreme personal being, distinct from the world, and creator of the world. I shall apply Ockham’s razor (philosophic rule that potential causes should not be multiplied unnecessarily) to eliminate multiple such gods and universes from this present discussion.⁴ Note the following indispensable scientific principles:

Newton’s first law: Bodies at rest remain at rest and bodies in motion remain in straight line uniform motion unless acted upon by an external force.(5) Newton’s third law (His second law does not apply to this discussion): Every force or action generates an equal and opposite force or reaction. Also, causes always have corresponding effects.(6) So is not the reverse equally true: every effect has its corresponding cause? Show me something that has no cause. If you cannot, what cause precedes physical matter, since cause and effect is basic physics and biomechanics?

A manifest house implies that someone prepared a blueprint, cut material, transported materials to the worksite, assembled it, painted it, and someone supervised everything. Even if the house descended earthward ala The Wizard of Oz, we’d know something caused its existence. We would never believe it existed without being caused by someone or something. Furthermore, the cause must be adequate and the effect cannot exceed its cause. Houses cannot be made with one bag of concrete and two sheets of plywood. Additionally, causes always precede their effects.

Cause and effect going back in time like an endless row of dominoes is inconceivable; Logic demands a beginning. The physical universe is not eternal, having always been here. Something that always existed would transcend the natural and be a god in its own right. Observably, matter is the ultimate effect, implying the greatest cause, while science says that cause had to precede the universe. Natural laws and processes that are themselves part of the universe could not precede the universe or be greater than it. Therefore must not the physical Universe’s great causation transcend nature ala the supernatural?

“If God created Matter, who made God?” some reply. Yet if God had a beginning and we discovered his beginning’s cause, that wouldn’t be satisfactory. Some would still wonder what caused the cause that caused God, what caused the cause that caused that cause, ad infinitum. Skeptics sometimes admit that they cannot explain the physical Universe’s origin through merely natural means, but argue that believers are likewise stymied because they cannot explain God’s origin. However, believers see matter as supernatural in origin, created by a supernatural God.

Supernatural by dictionary definition: 1a: of, belonging to, having reference to, or proceeding from an order of existence beyond the physical universe that is observable and capable of being experienced by ordinary means: transcending nature in degree and kind or concerned with what transcends nature. 2a: differing from the natural only in degree by being much more than natural or normal: superhuman, preternatural. 3a: ascribed to agencies or powers above or beyond nature or based upon such an ascription: initiated, effected, continued, or supported by means that transcend the laws or observed sequences of nature.(7) Supernatural does not mean a-natural or not natural. It only means supernatural.

Contrarily, deniers of anything supernatural are ipso facto limited by natural laws to explain the Universe. Humanists have inadvertently knighted Sir Isaac Newton’s unrepugnant laws as de facto standards, since humanists consider human thinking as the highest intelligence, Isaac Newton encapsulating this particular realm. Modern physics experts such as Stephen Hawking have not supplanted men like Newton. Newton’s laws still stand, defying modern cosmology. Ironically, modern cosmology serves as a self-imposed quagmire to atheistic scientists, since celestial discoveries regularly supplant current cosmologic models, which need evermore complex construction to avoid violating natural laws.

To recapitulate, Matter is the ultimate physical effect. Elements of cause and effect dictate that this effect demands a cause, which cause preceded and was greater than this effect. So does logic dictate that only an almighty god could be an adequate cause of the Universe? President Thomas Jefferson said to his ne-phew Peter Carr in 1787: “Question with boldness even the existence of a god; because, if there be one, he must more approve the homage of reason than blindfolded fear.”(8) Questioning is great, but we need answers.

Arguments against God’s Existence

The following major arguments are abbreviated representations of actual arguments by atheists. Each one is answered:

Argument: Theology is Backwards: “The ancient world was polytheistic. Modern society, generally monotheistic, advanced far beyond it. With more advancement, you’d logically proceed to zero. Besides, modern theologians embrace evolutionary cosmology and accept that Earth will end from our sun becoming a red giant and enveloping our solar system. They also deny the existence of angels, Satan, Hell, and Christ’s resurrection.”

Response: some primitive civilizations practiced polygamy while civilized societies practice monogamy. One committed relationship being better than polygamy does not mean that lacking a relationship beats monogamy. Theism, being one relationship, compares to monogamy.

Besides evolutionary cosmology contradicting historic Christianity, Christianity teaches that Earth will end when God decides to end it. If He allows a red giant star to destroy it, that would be His prerogative, but we cannot know that. Cowardly leaders allow troublemakers within the Church who deny basic Christian doctrine to compromise their beliefs.

Argument: Existence of Evil: “Nature’s horrible brutality and man’s inhumanity to man negate the notion of an incredibly powerful, loving God, who would instantly eradicate evil. If he wants to, but cannot, he’s impotent. If he can but doesn’t want to, he’s wicked. Perhaps he both cannot and doesn’t want to eradicate evil.”

Response: First, this argument is already suspect since atheists generally don’t show *weltschmerz* (unhappiness or discontent which results from comparing the world’s actual state with its ideal state). Atheistic groups lack the charitable work that religious groups do to alleviate suffering and injustice. So evil isn’t a serious concern; rather, it’s an excuse to dismiss God.

Secondly, if evil was impermissible, creation would lack free will, being tantamount to preprogrammed robots. Freedom to commit evil separates advanced life from nonliving things. Thirdly, if evil was eradicated, everyone would be eradicated, since everyone is evil by the Christian standard. God’s tolerance of horrible evil shows His greatness, by giving everyone opportunities to develop their own path and character, regardless of slowness and brokenness.

Finally, the endurance of evil from Earth’s beginning to its end would be a microsecond compared to timeless eternity. God can punish evil on His own time, instead of the timeframe dictated to Him, and abundantly compensate everyone’s misfortunes.

Argument: “Atheists focus on what’s important now, the present life, not a supposed afterlife. Believing that there’s only one life causes us to cherish it, unlike spiritualists, who are careless about this life.”

Response: False; atheists have higher suicide rates than believers.(9-11) Also, Japan has the longest life expectancy of all countries.(12) Yet in Japan, the idea of reincarnation: not only one afterlife, but many, predominates. And denying that there’s life after death breeds indifference since you supposedly won’t answer to God in an afterlife for mistreating people. You may also refuse to risk your life to protect others.

Argument: Theology is Offensive: “Theists are responsible for almost all the persecution, pain, misery, ignorance, misunderstanding, and superstition on Earth.”

Response: Like theists, people who believe that round objects roll downhill are responsible for almost every problem imaginable. Those who believe in purple people-eaters aren’t guilty. And only those who understand fire have been arsonists. Lumping together everyone who believes in God into one big category is like lumping everyone who believes in gravity into one big category.

Argument: Science verses Religion: “While theology is akin to reading a chicken’s entrails as a message from the gods, science is the organization of objectively verifiable sense experience. Science, meaning “to know,” adequately explains life’s existence.”

Response: Quoting Lactantius: ‘Religion is the cultivation of truth. In contrast, superstition cultivates falsehood.....The worshippers of the gods imagine themselves to be religious. However, they are actually superstitious.’ (*Divine Institutes Chapter Twenty-eight* AD 310).

Scientific minds “knew” that airships like the Hindenburg should be hydrogen-filled, predicted that every spaceflight fatality would be successful, and “knew” that radium and uranium cured many ailments, which cured nothing and killed people. Doctors advocated smoking; numerous scientists believed in Martians and Venusians. Scientific minds advocated bloodletting therapy, treating epilepsy with

animal feces, and melancholia with arsenic. Modern scientists still haven't agreed, considering hormone replacement therapy alternately harmful and beneficial, and fats and carbohydrates alternately harmful and beneficial. Yet we don't dismiss science. So instead of an either or fallacy, reject all errors of both "religion" and science, and embrace the good in both.

Argument: Science Deserves Absolute Fidelity: "Every religious system failed me; most were a complete fiasco. Besides, spirituality is intangible wherein nothing can be proven. On the contrary, everything in the physical realm is tangible and many scientific principles have been absolutely proven. In Reason we trust."

Response: Most religious people acknowledge every scientific fact that atheists do. And most atheists don't spend their time doing scientific research. They spend their time griping: "Uncle So and So was a terrible person who claimed to be a Christian. Therefore there is no God." That's emotionalism, not science. Notably, atheists and religious people are alike: both think that spreading their ideology is the best way to better humanity. Instead, genetic engineering, selective breeding, advanced technology, and similar means are the most effective ways to better our world. That's science, which has been advocated by religious people.

Argument: Logical Positivism or Non-Cognitivism: "Any argument which includes within itself a precept that hasn't been concretely proven (such as anything supernatural) or that which cannot be readily observed, recreated scientifically, or calculated mathematically, is fallacious and illogical. Therefore philosophy is also worthless."¹³

Response: Logical positivism is self-contradictory. By using the standard by which logical positivism operates, we cannot prove that logical positivism is true. Besides, logical positivism is a philosophical argument itself, and a dangerous one besides. Terrible crimes are only condemned by the philosophical argument and value judgment that such things are bad. Logical positivism cannot judge such actions, especially since they may benefit the perpetrator. Atheists bespeak of value judgments for self-preservation, not wanting to be victimized. But this emotional appeal is an artificial contrivance to fill this hole in atheism. Logical positivism consistently applied would also negate the Big Bang and Evolution.¹⁴

Argument: "The existence of God is absolutely un-provable" OR "You can never know with one hundred percent certainty if there's a God or not."

Response: Since few things are positively certain, "beyond a reasonable doubt," always valid in any court of law for anything, should be the standard. To those who refuse to believe, nothing can be proven; but evidence beyond a reasonable doubt appeals to those who love truth.

Three Theories or Accounts of the Universe's Origin

Knowledge that the universe is speedily expanding refutes antiquated Creationist notions, but also refutes antiquated Evolutionary notions. The Big Bang Theory now dominates philosophy. However, two contenders vie or have vied for the crown; the Steady State Theory and modern Creationism. Before explaining these views, some facts supply necessary background information:

All sizable objects have gravitational pull. The more massive the object, the greater its gravity. And since every celestial body's gravitational well pulls objects towards its center, bodies like Earth not only pull people, they pull themselves into themselves. Space rocks have tiny amounts of

gravity, asteroids much more. Moons have more gravity than asteroids and cannot have oblong shapes; their gravity presses them round. Planets have greater gravity than moons, and our Sun much greater still. Giant stars with less density and many times our Sun's mass are naturally vulnerable to collapsing. That is similar to why giant insects in monster movies don't really exist; their exoskeleton would be so heavy it would crush the soft body underneath. Collapsed stars initially become novae or supernovae, since liberated electrons and protons, subject to quantum physics, not gravity, violently dissipate. That leaves neutron stars, a solid collapsed mass. A teaspoonful of such matter would weigh tons. The biggest collapsed stars compress beyond solid neutrons, creating a so-called "black hole" which also pulls in additional matter.

So the entire physical universe having originally been one big mass is an insurmountable problem. That mass could squash itself into oblivion a decillion times over. That's why Big Bang advocates usually declare that the original mass was tiny, such as basketball-sized, to avoid obvious contradiction to science and logic. However, that creates another insurmountable problem; small masses break into even smaller pieces, they don't birth much greater masses.

Higgs Bosons, or "God Particles" would have nothing to do with giving particles emanating from a Big Bang their mass. Neither would they constitute a First Cause in place of God. That is because standard particle physics, which includes the Higgs Boson, only applies to the universe at relatively low temperatures. As you extrapolate back, the universe would be increasingly dense and hot. As these temperatures become insurmountably high, standard particle physics would no longer apply. The standard model explains subatomic particle dynamics governed by the strong nuclear force, weak nuclear force, and electromagnetic force. It would be too hot and dense for these forces to exist separately. They would have to be unified into a single force: the Grand Unified theory, which would precede the era of particle physics. And before this, gravity would need to be involved: the theory of Quantum Gravity, where only a single particle type and single force would exist for this early era. To go forward, subatomic particles, including Higgs Bosons, would first need to be created. Hear a lecture on the God Particle.¹⁵

And with the entire physical universe compressed into one solitary point, there would be no other sources to draw upon. Both variations of the Big Bang Theory also contradict Newton's first law: bodies at rest remain at rest unless acted upon by an outside force.

There's also a theory that quantifiable matter constitutes only a fraction of the universe. Another constituent, "dark matter," may cause galaxies to speedily expand outward. Ironically, this theory advocated by Big Bang scientists can explain the expanding universe, rendering the Big Bang unnecessary. Besides, the extreme speed at which space objects move may be as natural to them as slower speeds are to terrestrial objects. There's no standard to determine how fast space objects should move. Therefore, postulating a monstrous cherry bomb effect is uncalled for. Besides, the universe is not expanding out from a center into space; the whole universe is expanding uniformly.

A foundation of modern physics is that nothing can travel faster than the speed of light. And scientists agree that our observable universe is around 91 billion light years across, its actual size probably much larger. {a light year is the distance light travels in a year} But scientists agree that the universe is only around 13.8 billion years old. That violates basic mathematics. But instead of abandoning their theory in light of common sense, they postulate that besides the galaxies expanding, empty space expanded like a blown up balloon. Conveniently, there's no evidence whatsoever to support this.

16-18

The Steady State Theory (the universe as a giant lava lamp) doesn't violate Newton's first law and disposes of the need for a First Cause. However, according to Newton's third law, we'd be back to that infinite row of dominoes again, natural matter being supernatural. Additionally, the universe has not been observed both expanding and contracting, just expanding.

Although the Big Bang Theory and Steady State Theory violate logic and science, those who believe that God carefully designed the cosmos might sound like they believe in “presto chango!” I reject that untenable notion. Since I, a mere human, have dreams so vivid that they’re often indistinguishable from reality, perhaps God, being incredibly more capable, slowly and carefully formed the universe of physical and spiritual reality from His mind, as one’s dreams emanate from one’s mind. However, this supernatural Being was able to go a step further, making His dreams reality. Quoting *Shakespeare’s Tempest Act Four Scene 1* “We are such stuff as dreams are made of; and our little life is rounded with a sleep.”¹⁹

****Free Will****

Imagine life’s origin as pure science; quantum mechanics from previous universes acting upon a singularity, causing the alleged Big Bang. After life’s formation, everyone would continue to completely obey physics; complex particles hitting particles hitting particles. Free will, synonymous with having choices, would be impossible. We would be like billiard balls endlessly striking each other or lines of tin soldiers, striking those in front because of being struck from behind.

Although the natural world is incredibly more complex than these simplified illustrations, any deviation to predetermined physics could never exist regardless. Supercomputers could then predict the future for everyone and everything for millions of years with 100% accuracy.

You cannot sneak chance into the equation to create variables. Chance would add nothing; its cause and effect physics must be impacted by free will to create its variables. For example, supercomputers with robotic arms could always roll dice the same way. Without outside interference, dice could never roll differently until the robot or dice wore out. Human inability to roll dice consistently is only due to limited ability to calculate; physics rolls the dice.

For atheists to be right, nobody could ever exercise free will. Free will, defined, is the ability to make choices. And without free will, good and evil could not exist. Rather, since free-willed acts are causes without effects, supernatural spirits must reside in all who possess free will so as not to violate the natural law of cause and effect. Logically, supernatural spirits could not originate from the merely natural; they must originate from a supernatural First Cause; namely God.

My point is simple; we are not puppets to physics or mere wind-up toy robots. Although determinism controls us from a biological standpoint, we are also of supernatural origin, having the responsibility of choosing between good and evil.

How can “Heaven” and “Hell” be fixed final states without contradicting free will? Some choices have permanent consequences, like bringing new life into the world, or murder. Your culmination of bad choices can amount to murdering your soul. Your culmination of good choices can result in permanent godliness, total purity. Such complete incorruption would never choose corruption, like choosing to never eat a rusty tin can instead of a gourmet meal.

Futile Pursuit of the Infinite

Since ancient times, men have pursued pi, the ratio of a circle’s circumference to its diameter. Though it was proved in the nineteenth century that pi is a transcendental number and it’s impossible to algebraically square a circle, people have expended time and energy memorizing pi into millions of decimal places and using computers to calculate pi into 200 billion decimal places. This pursuit achieves absolutely nothing, since perfect circles don’t exist in nature. With the naked eye, perfect circles apparently exist, but magnifying them reveals squared off irregularities. Why pursue something that’s infinite but that

cannot possibly love or benefit you in any way, while not pursuing the concept of an infinite, loving, benevolent God?

How Others Feel

Feeling hurt by believers is a major cause of irreligion (the other being the desire for unrestricted thoughts and actions). Yet consider how the other side must feel. God is someone so real to me He's like the sun, and dearer to me than anyone in my entire life. I love Him greatly. Besides claiming He's nonexistent, some even portray dedication to God as stupid or deranged. Imagine these sentiments applied to the most important person in your life. That's how it comes across. Although speaking against irreligion speaks against an ideology, it doesn't speak against anyone's personal relationship. Besides, declaring oneself an atheist because organized religion is corrupt resembles a robbery victim gathering his entire life savings and every possession and throwing them into the street so he could never be robbed again.

Some atheists postulate an afterlife, surmising that the cosmos will continually implode and explode endlessly, an endless recycled consciousness. However, final judgment and justice are necessarily denied. For example, a kind relative passes on; he's now nonexistent. An extremely evil person passes on, becoming equally nonexistent. Whether you've lived a righteous or evil life becomes inconsequential. In the final analysis, nothing matters.

What is Truly Tangible?

Ancient philosopher Plato divided existence into two realms: the perfect, eternal, and invisible realm of ideas, and that of familiar objects. Because all physical objects undergo change and decay, a truth about such objects at one point in time will be false at a later time. Plato took the extreme position that ideas such as mathematics and philosophy were the only worthy knowledge.⁽²⁰⁾ Interestingly, this would also elevate spiritual concepts, since such concepts have been perennial ideas.

The supernatural may seem surreal and unattainable since that concept seemingly lacks substance. However, matter lacks substance, being 99.999999+% ethereal emptiness. If we could produce an exploded atomic model, we would see promenading marble-sized orbs. Peering through a telescope would reveal petite spheres seemingly miles away, yet interconnected to the orbs like incessant whirligigs.

Though matter is mostly space, we sense solidity when touching something because the electrons orbiting atomic nuclei patrol this emptiness. For example, a plate spinning showman is present at every plate station although he's not constantly present anywhere. When touching solid objects, your outer electrons interact with the object's outer electrons, causing electron repulsion and redistribution. Since everyday forces aren't strong enough for both sets of electrons to integrate, you sense solidity. This certainly seems untenable and begs incredulity. Since we're already forced to believe in things so wispy, ethereal, and incredible, let's embrace what is truly logical: the supernatural.

Arguments against Organized Religion

Here are arguments against organized religion, although they have no bearing on the existence of a God. Although Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity was primarily used to help create thermonuclear bombs instead of benefiting society, Einstein's formula isn't falsified whatsoever. Notice the following arguments against organized religion and my responses.

Religious people tout Pascal's Wager (named after 17th century philosopher Blaise Pascal). According to Pascal's Wager, "If there was no God, your religious belief and practice was a relatively minor inconvenience. However, if there is a God and you did not believe, then the terrible consequences infinitely outweigh any inconvenience that having faith could cause. With the risk to payoff ratio so stacked in favor of belief, any wise person should believe in God."

Argument: "Pascal's Wager fails, since there isn't just one possible god, there are many, which are purportedly very jealous. If one god exists and you don't believe, you're in trouble, but if another exists and you don't believe, you're in equal trouble. There are over a hundred possible gods, and according to religion, believing in false gods is much worse than simple unbelief. Considering these things and recalculating the odds, we see that belief is worse than unbelief. Besides, I cannot believe in a sadist who would torture people endlessly. Furthermore, living by a gambler's wager is no way to live."

Response: I cannot believe in said sadist either. The rebuttal to Pascal's Wager has a fatal flaw by excluding the doctrine of Annihilation-ism: the punishment of the condemned ceasing when their sins are avenged, while the saved have eternal joy. Say a thousand angry gods would punish people for a trillion years, yet loving the right one gets you eternal life. The risk to payoff ratio would be INFINITELY stacked in favor of faith since infinity is infinitely larger than a thousand times a trillion. I explain Annihilation-ism in 9.Afterlife. And Christians don't live by Pascal's wager, they live by Faith. Pascal's wager is simply a line of reasoning aimed at those without faith, to consider faith.

Argument: "Regions with high crime, poverty, illiteracy, and obesity rates have high rates of churchgoers. And most churchgoers are hypocrites. Eliminating organized religion will eliminate hypocrisy. President James Madison said 'During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy, ignorance and servility in the laity, in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution.....' Today's Christians are mean, antisocial, and paranoid. So Christianity is a pernicious influence."

Response: This evaluation is correct; many "Christians" are terrible. However, Christianity was established by Jesus Christ, a wonderful man. What he advocated was never a bad influence; it was always good. The problem is that because of Christianity's promises of comfort, it attracts all kinds of troubled and disturbed people who want a crutch for their problems. It also naturally attracts mean and nasty people with its promise to destroy one's enemies. Then those people abuse and distort Christianity.

Let's say that Christianity never existed; these same unpleasant people would still exist. Instead, there's the XYZ Group, with similar alluring points as Christianity would have. These same people flock there, and now we complain about the "pernicious influence" of the XYZ Group, and again confuse cause with effect. Concerning hypocrites, they cannot exist without a strict moral code to violate. Hypocrites within organized religions are proportional to their moral code; the higher the code, the more people violate it. Besides, valuable things foster counterfeits.

Argument: "Most churchgoers are too ignorant to defend their faith, and many have been duped by charlatans. Moreover, a six grader who's an atheist can defeat an adult Christian in debate. Eliminating organized religion will eliminate ignorance and deception."

Response: Missing link hoaxes have duped unbelievers ("Java Ape-man" came from parts of an elephant's leg, "Piltdown Man" came from filed down ape bones and teeth discolored with bichromate of

potash, “Southwest Colorado Man” was based on a horse tooth, and “Nebraska Man,” the missing link “proof” in the infamous 1925 Scopes evolution trial, was based on a pig tooth.

In America, the atheist minority conspires against the believing majority, while the majority slacks off. Children’s atheist rhetoric comes from their parents, who use their children as puppets. Likewise, a Christian sixth grader can defeat an adult atheist in debate in areas where atheism dominates, probably for the same reasons I just mentioned. And no atheist alive can defeat me in debate.

Argument: “Religiously motivated atrocities and abuses are quite shocking; a long compendium of such blatant hypocrisy exists. I assume that the Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh was a Christian, as were other terrorists. Infamous religious leader Jim Jones lead over nine hundred people to commit suicide by drinking cyanide. Furthermore, Islam is religion of terrorism.”

Response: Atrocities under atheistic regimes such as Lenin’s, Stalin’s, and Pol Pot’s were a hundred times greater (*An Atheist Defends Religion*).⁽²¹⁾ Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh identified as agnostic and Unabomber Ted Kaczynski was an atheist. Moreover, Jim Jones was atheistic. His hero was Mao Tse-tung; his goal was always Marxist revolution, and he only used religion to wean people out of “the opiate of religion.” Jones openly despised religion among his operatives. One Jonestown survivor admitted that calling themselves a church was only to gain legitimacy; there was never any Scripture study.⁽²²⁻²⁴⁾ And Islam is not a religion of terrorism.⁽²⁵⁾ If nuclear war ever occurs, it will be because scientists invented nuclear bombs (all sophisticated weaponry comes from scientific minds).

Argument: “Wars are over religion. Eliminating organized religion will eliminate warfare. As President George Washington said: “Religious controversies always produce more acrimony and irreconcilable hatreds than those which spring from any other cause....”

Response: Though the founding fathers of the United States were not Christians, neither were most of the early inhabitants, the founding fathers and most everyone else certainly believed in God. And living in the 21st century information age, not the 1700s, I know that all wars are about race. Although many wars are fought between people of the same MAJOR race, they are always of either a different sub-race or family clan (“micro-race”). This is the only common denominator in all wars. And one’s religion usually comes from one’s race/culture.

Argument: “There are hundreds of religious hate groups, yet no known secular hate groups.”

Response: Atheistic Soviet and Chinese governments murdered mega-millions of their own citizens, torturing and wrongfully imprisoning many others. If that isn’t hate, what is? And vicious street gangs aren’t religious groups. Anti-religious or secular groups aren’t noticed for their secularism because people usually identify themselves by what they believe and practice, not by what they don’t believe nor practice. If I like gardening but not fishing, I don’t identify as someone who doesn’t fish, I identify as a gardener. Secondly, the total number of religious “hate groups” is only a small fraction of that of hateful secular governments.

Argument: “Religious belief is based on cultural/regional predilections, which take precedence over individual choices. On the contrary, atheists are freethinkers.”

Response: Non-religious people are also guilty of herd mentality, as most atheists have been radical leftists intent on overthrowing traditional values. And since religious people range from extremely conservative to extremely liberal, believers are the real freethinkers in this respect.

Argument: “The United States, the most religious country among developed nations, puzzlingly tolerates and perpetuates manifold injustices. Besides, atheists are often more moral than religious people. Life could improve if we stopped believing in God.”

Response: Religion is a discipline and way of life, not mere belief. Believing in God doesn't make you godly any more than believing in turtles makes you reptilian. Besides, most atheists have a religious background, while many religious people don't. So ironically, many “non-religious” people have had more religious influence in their lives than those who profess religion. Now compare how many prisoners were going to Church every week when they were arrested with the percent of others who attend Church every week.

Argument: “Ludicrous and contradictory theology exists, such as charismatic hollering and falling down, dancing with snakes, lackadaisical faith only, bibliolatry, and failed predictions of Christ's eminent return, rapture, and the world's end.”

Response: Various groups created these distortions after Christ's advent, not Christ. The early Church was free from these errors.

Argument: “The Bible is comprised of stories of horrible and outrageous conduct, shows laughable ignorance of common knowledge, and has many contradictions. This book was apparently written by a sadistic serial killer or maniacal clown. If you want to become an atheist, read the entire Bible. Thomas Paine, founding father of the United States, called it the words of a demon, and denounced Christianity.”

Response: Neither Jesus Christ nor his disciples ever said that “The Bible” represents God, never said everything therein is true, never said it was God-authored, and never endorsed the entire “Bible,” although we have gratuitously posited that they did. They taught others to believe on God Himself.

Thomas Paine also denounced atheism. His book's full title was: *The Age of Reason; Being an Investigation of True and Fabulous Theology.*(26) He just made the typical mistake of attributing the entire “Bible” to Christians. The offensive stories Paine read were all written by Jews, not Christians. These writings, which Christians unfortunately call “God's Old Testament” is really the Jewish Tanakh. So your contention should be with the Jews.

Argument: “The vast majority of “Christians” don't believe their profession. With polygraph machines (“lie detectors”) universally implemented, almost everybody would fail. Advanced brain scan techniques, inherently more accurate than polygraphs, would be even better to expose this whole façade. And Friedrich Nietzsche said “I'll believe in the Redeemer when the Christian looks a little more redeemed.”

Response: Excellent point: few are true. Nietzsche also had a point, although an inaccurate one. That is because Christ is not dependent upon the hoi polloi. They can either conform to His character or not. And in the next life, when wickedness will be destroyed, the righteous will shine brilliantly like polished emeralds.

Bottom Line

One leg of atheism consists of complaints against organized religion. The worst examples and arguments of those claiming piety are magnified; the best examples and arguments are ignored. Straw man fallacies present weaker or distorted versions of Christianity, which “burn down” or disprove the distortions. The other leg consists of exploiting science and evolutionary theory to ridicule, intimidate, and compromise religious people. There’s no middle ground between unbelief and faith. So reject relativism, the coward’s way out. Either believers are overgrown children having imaginary friends, or unbelievers wallow in neurotic denial. Adults agree on what’s real or not.

I respect self-described atheists more than those who affectate faith. Phony belief is treacherous. We must begin with an honest self-assessment, and be unafraid to admit when we’re wrong. The philosopher Antony Flew was an atheist for sixty years. However, he went on to write *There is a God; How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed his Mind*.²⁷

Conclusions

Perhaps the concept of God makes people feel uncomfortably small, making them resist the inescapable logic of God’s existence. But people ARE incredibly small. Just as a million Earths could fit into the sun, some stars could contain a million suns; and there are trillions of them amongst quintillions of galaxies stretching octillions of miles in every direction. Again, theories of stellar and planetary evolution are continuously refuted by endless exceptions to these theories; an endless parade of stars and planets behave contrarily to and consequently crush every evolutionary model by breaking every preconceived pattern.

Upon seeing a miniature replica of our solar system nobody would say it could have come about without designer and maker, though it is but a puny imitation and tiny fraction of a much larger, intricate galaxy. Yet many claim that the entire system of galaxies came about without designer and maker; incongruous indeed.

Summarily, religiosity is used to oppress others and make oneself and others like oneself dominant. And the downtrodden often get blamed by the religiose for their predicament instead of being helped by them. However, irreligion removes moral obligations, denies justice, steals hope from the downtrodden, and denies everyone’s hope for life after death. One side has been illogical, the other, unscientific; both have been unethical.

I take a third position: If a completely independent all-powerful God lovingly created fragile, needy creatures, godliness would be defined as nurturing and uplifting the weak and downtrodden. True followers, as defined by Christ, are loving. Once upon a time, our grand cosmos and all life was fashioned; with God, dreams do come true. 4.A Third Option compliments this present dissertation.



