



THE RELIGION OF ATHEISM

From a Christian Perspective

Atheism is a belief system with a set of rules that people use to deny God. This essay will look at the development of atheistic history and why people choose to be atheists. It will look at the ethics and morality of atheists and some of the more extreme 'beliefs' of atheists.

Phil Smith

MA – Applied Linguistics, Biblical Archeology; PhD in Biblical Archeology; Doctor of Religious Education

The Religion of Atheism

Atheism is a belief system with a set of rules that people use to deny God. As sin and evil increases in the world so does strong motives of people openly denying God. I have quoted extensively from an article entitled 'Atheism' written by Mariano and published on the 11 June 2009. This essay will look at the development of atheistic history and why people choose to be atheists. It will look at the ethics and morality of atheists and some of the more extreme 'beliefs' of atheists. Their arguments against Christianity will be discussed along with a comparison between them and Christians. It is easily seen that Christians out shine those of Atheism by far in health, emotions and helping the poor. Christians even live longer! Atheism have adopted and moulded themselves to not only science but to world wide ideologies which have seen people count as nothing.

Atheism, in a broad sense, is the rejection of belief in the existence of deities and particularly Jesus Christ. In a narrower sense, atheism is specifically the position that there are no gods. It is a belief but that belief has to do with the absence of belief that any deities exist. Atheism is contrasted with theism, which in its most general form is the belief that at least one deity exists. Early Christians were referred to as atheists because they didn't accept the gods of the Greeks and Romans. But atheists prefer the meaning, 'lacking belief in a god.' They also contend that since God is not real, there was no creator and thus people were born atheists, not religious. People were taught religion. In a related word, 'agnosticism' can be defined as to indicate doubt or scepticism of a deity. In some senses, agnosticism is a stance about the similarities or differences between belief and knowledge, rather than about any specific claim or belief. There are other terms associated with atheism such as strong, weak, positive, explicit or critical atheism which generally refer to a lack of a god belief. Militant atheism or antitheism refers to atheists who consider the belief in God as a dangerous and ignorance superstition and go out of their way to remove it from the public sphere. Others have tried to classify it as religion in its own right, which I believe is the case. Some actually replace God by a sense of nature worship or even go so far as neo-paganistic thinking. Some cosmologists spiritualize the awesomeness of the universe while others, for example, evolutionists promote evolution as more than mere science, as an ideology or secular religion as an alternative to Christianity. But even evolution is a religion; it is a belief system and in many instances take the place of God.

Well, according to Mariano, this was the goal of Huxley who followed Darwin and also Herbert Spencer. Harvard entomologist and socio-biology's Edward O. Wilson also says that the evolutionists now have an 'alternative mythology' to defeat traditional religion. Richard Dawkins, who wrote, 'Is Science a Religion?' says that science does have some religion's virtues. But none of this is new; Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon in 1760 wanted to establish a new Christianity based on humanism and scientific socialism with a priesthood consisting of scientists, philosophers and engineers. The author states that science is indeed just a faith. This is shown in its extreme with the zealot and bigotry demonstrated by scientist as much as religious people. We must recognize that there are many in world at large which is very indifferent to Christ, his birth, his passion, and his death. Yes, there are many who just don't care. Sam Harris who in his article Selfless Consciousness without Faith said that they should find ways of meeting emotional needs that do not require the abject embrace of the preposterous. In his book, Rational Mysticism, he uses the words spirituality and mysticism in a positive sense. A faith in a scientific hypothesis can create a spiritual practice of a conceptual scheme. The Humanist Manifesto of 1933 states in order that religious humanism may be better understood we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which we believe the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate. This requires a new statement of the means and purposes of religion.

People also choose atheism because of philosophy, science, emotion, rebellion or various combinations. There is a strong sense of rebellion sometimes associated with it; they enjoy living in their sins and do not wish to be told that their sins are wrong. There has become a strong adversity to being told they are living in sin. They become so antagonistic to the idea of someone or a deity being over them restricting them in any way. One such person, professor of philosophy and law, Thomas Nagel says, 'I am an atheist and I want atheism to be true and am made uneasy by the fact that some of the most intelligent and well-informed people I know are religious believers. Gary Wolf, contributing editor to Wired magazine says that there is a need for more agnostics and would embarrass people by asking who was an atheist. He wants people to declare themselves. But the agnostic needs evidence of a God to believe and the atheist say that there is no God. Supposedly, Darwin became an atheist because of his growing resistance to Christianity which was influenced by the tragedy of his daughter's death. I can see where some of the people are coming from. In attending Bible College with young Christian believers wanting to share their faith with non-Christians, they could be fairly blunt sometimes and that comes over very personal with those they are speaking to. So, similar to Darwin, Ted Turner became suicidal after the breakup of his

marriage to Jane Fonda along with his loss of control of Turner Broadcast. His breakup was partly caused by her decision to become a practicing Christian. The atheist William Provine, professor of the history of science at Cornell University said, 'Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us, loud and clear, and I must say that these are basically Darwin's views: there are no gods, no purpose forces of any kind, no life after death, no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning in life, and no free will for humans. When I die I am absolutely certain that I'm gonna be completely dead, that is just all, that is gonna be the end of me. It really grieves my heart when people are so adamant like this, for when they come before God their sorry will be so intensified. This leads me to think of the rich man and the poor beggar who ate the crumbs off the floor under the rich man's table. When in hell, the rich man begged Abraham to send that person to touch his tongue with a drop of water. This is such a sad story.

Well, atheists differ on the issue of ethics and morality; some claim that there are absolutes and some do not. Since they don't recognize ethics, their non recognition makes it go away. Even though it's thought that atheists can make any statements about anything, the question is whether it's viable or not. They can muse on issues of morality and conclude whatever they want. Further more, they often use games to uncover the fundamental principles governing our decision-making mechanisms. Dan Barker, co-founder of the Freedom from Religion Foundation, claims that Darwin has given what is good and refers to Jesus as a moral monster. He thinks that things like abortion are a 'blessing' for woman. Recently in New Zealand, a law change give women the right to abort babies at maturity. This is virtually murdering babies. The majority of the New Zealand public was against this but government no longer listens to the majority. The minority now has such a strong voice that what the majority thinks is no longer important. Baker continues by saying that atheism and free thought and true humanistic morality is more useful and reasonable than the negative baggage of theology, judgment and hell and the supernatural. Dan Barker says that people should decide whether they want to be known as a good or ethical person if one wants to. But this attitude brings on evil of all sorts; what is good and ethical if there is not acceptance of what is good. Well, others believe that one should be good, otherwise others can treat you like you treat them. Some even believe that rape, for example, can play a beneficial role in evolution and is part of evolutionary strategy. This comes down to sick and perverse evil thinking that has no boundaries. Furthermore, he says that if he had the ability, he would wave a magic wand and get rid of religion over rape. Atheists often admit that their value judgment is as random as any product of evolution. Any idea of rape being wrong is as

arbitrary as the fact that we've evolved five fingers instead of six. We cannot admit that things might be good or evil, cruel or kind.

Thus atheism defines evil as being based on personal preferences. In teaching English as a second language, we have a set of verbs known as modal verbs. These verbs include words like may, might, should, could, need to, ought to, would, etc. So, the idea of 'should' or any word that expresses a need for permission goes against the argument for the problem of evil without first providing an absolute definition of evil. Atheism discredits condemnation and condemnation discredits atheism. To them condemnation is just an expression of personal moral preferences. However, they are able to think through moral issues and come to a conclusion. Just to remind you, I'm quoting from Mariano again here; the Greek philosopher Epicurus said, 'if a perfectly good God exists, there is no evil in the world. Since there is evil, no God exists. This is false dichotomy, of course, since a perfectly good God would allow free will thus his syllogism fails. This idea actually comes from the idea of 'Euthyphro Dilemma' which was fostered by Plato in 380 BC and also Socrates. More specifically, the question is phrased, 'is something good because God proclaims it to be good or does God proclaim something to be good because it is good?' The next point states, 'does God proclaim something to be good, because it is good?' But for the Christian, God does not merely exhibit attributes but He is the attributes. He did not arbitrarily invent ethics since His very nature is the ethos. Perfect goodness is an essential part of His character, not something outside Him, thus goodness reflects the nature of God. It does not come from His commandments. Interestingly, the fact that evil is in the world, it is one of the very best reasons for rejecting atheism.

The extremes of atheism say, for example, parents who are raising their children according to their own faith; this should be considered, 'child abuse.' Don't think this is silly; we hear statements like this more and more in these days. Furthermore, they say, placing a label on a child as being Muslim or Christian or any such names is also child abuse. Hitler, in fact, said the same thing, 'It is evil to label children with their parents' religion.' But look at what Hitler did, he mass murdered six million people during his short reign. Interestingly, atheists would deny this to children but would not deny their own teachings to children. Furthermore, this thinking is what drove Stalin, Hitler and Mao into killing one hundred million people. Many atheists put forth questions such as 'why would God?' or 'If God was...' with their own presupposed attributes of God. Another favourite question is, 'who made God?' They simple do not accept that since God is outside of time, He is uncaused and uncausable and in God's timeless realm there is no such question as 'Who made God?' since

this is a time space domain based question which simply does not apply. Atheists have even used science to make their arguments appear sounder. They even use science as a way to get atheistic thinking into the classroom. This argument encapsulates the denial of God from the standpoint that it's not natural because it doesn't have a physical nature. They say that the supernatural can not exist nor occur because this goes against the laws of nature. But from a Christian view, God created the laws and He holds the patent on them. He put them into place and can manipulate them as He sees fit.

In terms of beginnings, many scientists have a hard time agreeing on when, where and – most important – how life first emerged on the earth. “Julius Rebek, Jr. ... created a synthetic organic molecule that could replicate itself.” Gerald F. Joyce stated that these created molecules, “only replicate in highly artificial, unnatural conditions.” “Even if scientists do create something with lifelike properties in the laboratory, they must still wonder: All, so often, you will hear about incredible claims in regards to findings in seculars and scientific realms that seemingly goes against Christianity. However, nothing goes against God but know that God is in control regardless of those who believe differently. Is that how it happened in the first place?” Yet, we have also heard that the simplest bacterium is so complicated from the point of view of a chemist that it is almost impossible to imagine how it happened. But atheists continue to use science and evolution collectively to re-direct attention to Biblical answers of life recomposing these questions as if there has never been an answer to them and then turning it all into a world view. Questions like what our life means; why we are here and where we came from! Richard Dawkins even says that Darwin made it possible to become an intellectually fulfilled atheist by theorizing evolution into a story. This story replaces the story of Christ and redemptive plan for us. Dawkins goes on to indicate, even though the story of evolution is not real, it's a believable substitute.

Yet, in spite of this, it is seen that conservative religious people are much better of physically, mentally, and emotionally. They give more of their time to others for help than non religious people. They give 54% more money to help out people than less religious people to charities. There is less suicide associated with conservative religious people than atheists. Those who even go to church have 1.87 times less chance in death than those of non religious people. Christians are happier than those who do not have religion in their lives. They have much greater purpose in life than those who are not Christians. They are less affected with the idea of superstition. And this goes in the face of the atheists and agnostic. Interestingly, church attendance and membership in a conservative denomination has a powerful negative effect on paranormal beliefs, higher education does not. One such study

concluded that self-described atheists were indeed susceptible and demonstrated irrational behaviour to those things. Yet Atheists claim that secularist societies are superior in every way. But what about the communist societies of the world of which there is really only North Korea left. These societies took away the freedoms of the people and all of them were cash strapped and poor. It took away all the incentives of the people to work. Basically communism didn't work. These were the height of atheistic societies. In addition, of those countries, fifty-two atheist leaders had over 148 million people killed from 1917 to 2007. This is three times more than all the human beings killed by war, civil war and individual crime in the whole of the 20th century combined.

To conclude, we have a complete breakdown of what Atheism is and how it has affected humanity. We see how they are making inroads into western society at great lengths pushing their ideology in science, politics and all levels of schools. As they grow in strength and finance, they push further and further using politics, science and education to proclaim their religion. Even though the facts are easily seen by all, people will believe anything but the truth. This reminds me of the ideology of Marx and communism. People were told lies upon lies which were obvious in everybody's eyes but never the less, they believed and accepted it. The Atheistic societies of communism have fallen, yet Atheists are still declaring that Atheistic societies are better but when compared with Christian belief, Atheism can't stand. I believe the author was clear and to the point in this article. However, it is an article of merely facts of Atheism and their beliefs. It is obviously biased but I do accept to some measure that how can it not be. I would have liked to have read some good news along with it. The section on communism was also good for we see how communism has come to nothing. How are Christians fighting this ideology? Are we fighting it? Or is the presence of Christians holding the tide of Atheistic ideology back? It would have been good if the author had have shown a little encouragement.

But none of this is new; we can trace these ideas back to Plato and others throughout thousands of years. For example, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon in 1760 wanted to establish a new Christianity based on humanism and scientific socialism with a priesthood consisting of scientists, philosophers and engineers. And this is what we have today. Christians are saying this in the courts all over the world but these priests are in positions that block anything that is brought about them. As a Christian, the Bible teaches us that we already have the victory in Christ! But we learn from this ... we have a hope in Christ that out figures Atheism ten times over. Thankyou!

References

- Apologetics and Outreach – CC310* by Jerram Barrs downloaded from Covenant Theological Seminary at <http://www.worldwide-classroom.com> (24 lectures with lecture notes).
Textbooks – Richard Appignanesi, *Introducing Postmodernism*, 2 ed. (NY, NY: Totem Books, 1970) and Jerram Barrs, *The Heart of Evangelism*, (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2001).
- Christian Apologetics* by Dr Ronald Nash downloaded from Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando, Florida at <http://www.biblicaltraining.org/classes/institute/classes> (29 lectures). Textbooks – John Davis, *Evangelical Ethics*, (P & R Publishing, 3rd Ed., 2004) and Ronald Nash, *Poverty & Wealth: Why Socialism Doesn't Work*, (w. Pub Group, 1986).
- Grez, S. J. (1996). *A Primer on Postmodernism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. ISBN-13 978-0802808646 (200 pages).
- Klein, F. (2005). *Supernaturalism and Historical Study: An Account of resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead*. Quodlibet Journal: Vol. 7, 2 (5 pages).
- Klein, F. (2005). *Supernaturalism and Historical Study: An Account of resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead*. Quodlibet Journal: Vol. 7, 2 (5 pages).
- Lewis G. (1963) "What Does Biblical Infallibility Mean?" *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological*
- Marianco (2009). *Atheism in Dead*. (35 pages) from www.creation.com/atheism
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *Historical/Legal Apologetics*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (20 pages) Downloaded 2009 from <http://trinitytheology.org/>
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *How to Use Apologetics*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (40 pages) Downloaded 2009 from http://www.brethrenassembly.com/Ebooks/Apol_20U1.pdf
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *Leading Questions*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (20 pages) Downloaded 2009 from http://www.brethrenassembly.com/Ebooks/Apol_20U1.pdf
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *Logic and fallacies of Logic*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (80 pages) Downloaded 2009 from <http://trinitytheology.org/>
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *The Tools of Integrated Apologetics*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (20 pages) Downloaded 2009 from <http://trinitytheology.org/>
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *Introduction to Integrated Christian Apologetics*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (70 pages) Downloaded 2009 from http://freebooks.itz4u.com/Ebooks/Apologetics/ApolBooks/10A1_Intro_To_Integrated_Apologetics.pdf
- Philip, J. C. & Cherian, S. (2007). *Pre-suppositions and Classification of Christian Apologetics*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (33 pages) Downloaded 2009 from http://freebooks.itz4u.com/Ebooks/Apologetics/ApolBooks/10A1_Intro_To_Integrated_Apologetics.pdf

Philip, J. C. (2007). *Analysis of Scientific Truth*. India: A Calvin research Group Academic Resource. (20 pages) Downloaded 2009 from <http://trinitytheology.org/>

Stewart, D. (1998). *The Case for Christianity*. Murrieta, California: Aus America Publishers ISBN 1-877825-20-4 (175 pages).

Uduig, A. (2005). *Philosophical Objections to the Knowability of Truth: Answering Postmodernism*. Quodlibet Journal: Vol. 7, 2 (5 pages).