

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

Introduction

Psalms 14:1 - 1 The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God...

According to an atheist, belief in God is irrational due to lack of evidence. That is, because it is impossible to physically prove whether or not God exists, it makes no sense to believe *that* he exists at all. But if I were to ask the atheist, “Do you believe you exist?” More than likely, the answer will be “yes, of course I do”. And if my next question is, “Can you prove that you exist?”, he would eventually discover that furnishing proof of his own existence is problematic. In order to begin proving his existence, he must first **already** exist to do so. Thus, any attempt of this particular proof requires that he first presuppose it to be true in proving it to be true.

This is an example of the logical fallacy known as circular reasoning: Proving something by presupposing it already. So, it’s inescapable that an answer of “yes, of course I exist” means that he must accept his existence without the benefit of proof. And thus, the very atheist who finds it unreasonable to believe in God’s existence given lack of proof finds it perfectly reasonable to believe in his own existence given lack of proof.

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

The Circular Reasoning Trap

The opening illustration reveals what I call the **circular reasoning trap** of our existence. It is the mandatory, inescapable reality shared by all human beings that certain aspects of our existence are outside of our grasp to prove. In fact there are several other examples like this. If I asked you to prove you had a brain, then it would be relatively easy for you to do so by consulting a radiologist and getting an x-ray image taken of your head. However if I asked you to prove you had a *mind*, you would have a problem. This is because you ultimately have to use *your mind* to come up with a proof of your mind's existence. So to even attempt the proof mandates that you accept its existence without proof; and thus fall again into the same circular reasoning trap.

Another example is the existence of information. The scientific definition of information is the immaterial, abstract, intangible concept of mind that is encoded and transmitted to communicate ideas. Also it's not bound to its medium; that is, the information can remain the same although the medium may change. This means that I can say "hello", where the information is encoded as sound frequencies produced by my voice-box and transmitted through the air; or I can write the word "hello", where the information is encoded as ink from a pen onto a piece of paper. So, if I asked you to prove that information exists, you would have a problem because you would ultimately have to provide information in your proof of its existence. This means again that a key aspect of our existence is outside of our grasp to prove, and therefore mandates our acceptance of its existence without the benefit of proof.

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

The Surrendering of Reason

Faith is the surrender of the mind, it's the surrender of reason, it's the surrender of the only thing that makes us different from other animals. It's our need to believe and to surrender our skepticism and our reason....

- Christopher Hitchens, English Intellectual, Skeptic, Atheist

Generally speaking, a typical atheist thrives on reason. To an atheist, simply having **faith** without reason is out of the question. The idea that some “mystical imaginary god” who takes the credit for being responsible for our existence is for fools who don’t value reason and logic. As stated by the late staunch atheist Christopher Hitchens, to simply defer the explanation of your existence to faith in a mystical creator is to surrender your mind, and to reduce you to the state of that of an animal.

On the surface, this sounds acceptable; even compelling. Based on our knowledge of human nature throughout history, it’s clear that people have had the real tendency of using religion to oppress others. How dare I allow others to spoon-feed me the story of creation and thereby make myself gullible to their indoctrination and control? How dare I voluntarily lay aside my ability to reason and evaluate the believability of the story of creation? Wouldn’t I want the ability to intellectualize my existence and thus free myself from the possibility of others’ control through religion?

But here’s the problem. It’s not enough to hold to a rational position without following its logic through to conclusion. For example, a rational argument can be made by an atheist that, from what we know in science, it is impossible that an invisible god created everything out of nothing. Again, this sounds reasonable. But let’s follow this through to conclusion. God either exists or He doesn’t; so if a deliberate and intelligent, higher being (namely the invisible God) didn’t create everything out of nothing, but everything in fact **does** exist, then the only other possible explanation is that our existence is the result of a random natural process of nature. So somewhere in the vast emptiness of space, back in the eons of time passed, a random and impersonal event called the ‘big bang’ happened; from which everything that is anything emerged into being.

But what atheists don’t seem to realize is, the prerequisite that there was no intervention of an intelligent mind works against their argument in terms of science. For example, the human being is composed of mind, consciousness, and physical body. If we were to focus particularly on the physical body, we see an elaborate system of information encoded throughout as DNA – *a digital self-referenced error-checking self-adapting manufacturing and information system defining the entire life-span of the physicality of the human*

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

species; which is smart enough to preserve its own existence by safe-guarding against proliferating through interaction with their counterparts not of its own kind. So according to the atheist's rational argument, we **must** concede that DNA is a product of mere chance; and that randomness is responsible for the existence of information (as in DNA). But wait a minute... doesn't science also say that information **cannot** be the result of randomness? The law of nature with regard to information (a well-known scientific law) states this **explicitly**.

So this scientific law does not support the atheist's rational argument. In fact, the law insists that information must derive from an intellect (as in deliberate, intelligent mind); so the only viable explanation of our existence according to this law is that we were indeed created by the invisible creator God.

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

The 'Real' Reason

The belief that “all men are created equal under the law” allows us as citizens to expect equal treatment and equal rights; regardless of gender, race, or economic status. And more importantly, that belief allows citizens to expect that justice be served on our behalf from the higher moral authority when those rights are infringed upon by others. In short, morality demands accountability. From this standpoint, it is unavoidable that a higher being responsible for the creation of all men be ***rationally suited*** to see all those he created as equal; and accordingly hold all equally accountable to that standard from a moral standpoint.

However, morality does not exist in the animal kingdom. Neither dogs, nor cat, nor lions, nor tigers, nor bears have any sense of “right and wrong” – they are all driven by instinct. Sure, some animals are predisposed to being domesticated; in that a dog may be well-trained that attacking a person is unacceptable; but the ability to tame an animal is not to be confused with morality. Morality requires the bestowing and defending of the intrinsic value of an individual from a higher authority; opposed to mere instincts which are geared towards survival. So to a domesticated animal, not attacking a person is just a method of survival rather than being a moral disposition.

The ‘real’ reason that atheists are attracted to the idea that God does not exist is simple – no God would exist to be accountable to. What atheists find in the animal kingdom is an excellent scape-goat opportunity to avoid accountability. If they can effectively reduce their existence to being the result of a random process of nature, then there can be no legitimate basis for being demanded upon with morality from a higher being. Therefore, any sense of morality they may have is rationally equivalent to an instinctual method of survival (as in a well-trained dog). All of their actions in life would hence be driven by their DNA, opposed to conscious free-will; and thus there can be no fault imputed upon them from a higher creator for making a morally wrong choice.

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

The Fool Has Said in his Heart There is No God...

It is literally impossible to actually be an atheist. According to the Bible, a person must convince himself that he is an atheist. The atheist convinces himself that life is utter futility, while making significant efforts **at the same time** to deny it... starting with getting out of bed in the morning. God would insist that getting out of bed is for accomplishing purpose in life, not for accidentally stumbling through existence. This is why the Bible specifies that he must 'say in his heart' there is no God. So if the Holy Scripture is worth its salt, then there should be reasonable legitimacy in its characterization of atheists as 'fools'.

What would a fool do?

A fool expresses contempt and hatred for someone he doesn't believe exists.

- An atheist routinely spends a significant amount of effort targeting someone he doesn't believe exists with hostility and defamation.
- 'The creator' is designated by an atheist as having audacity and hubris for insisting pain and suffering upon 'the created'; while the very definition of audacity and hubris rests in the fact that 'the created' demands entitlement from its creator.

A fool relies on the very fallacious reasoning he scolds others for relying on.

- Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. An atheist who scolds others for holding to their belief in God by way of non-sequitur reasons also holds to the blatant non-sequitur that God does not exist due to lack of evidence.
- An atheist routinely reduces the very faith he uses to make future plans and take risks (i.e. getting behind the wheel of a car) to ontological fallacy the convenience of a debate.

A fool can't furnish proof of his own existence but demands proof of his creator's existence.

- If something is created by something else, any attempt for it to prove itself to exist results in circular reasoning. It must prove it exists by presupposing it already to be true based on whatever was provided to it by its creator.

A fool uses intelligibility to defend what would be a non-intelligible universe.

ATHEISM: THE INTELLECTUAL FRAUD

- An atheist uses logic and information to prop up the very idea that would render logic and information meaningless.
- The atheist actually disproves a non-intelligible universe by relying upon logic and information; and therefore proves that an intelligible God doesn't 'not' exist.
- An atheist thinks intelligibility to be derived from an accidental byproduct of natural phenomenon, but will never look for intelligibility occurring accidentally anywhere in his practical life.

ATHEISM IS AN INTELLECTUAL FRAUD.