

thoughtlife

UNREASONABLE ATHEISM

Truth, Rationality, and the Existence of God



Rand Wagner

UNREASONABLE ATHEISM

Truth, Rationality, and the Existence of God

written by:

Rand Wagner

© Copyright 2012 Thoughtlife.com and Rand Wagner,
All rights reserved.

Cover Art "Atheist Logo" at:
[http://johnnyslowhand.deviantart.com/
gallery/?offset=24#/d359h9v](http://johnnyslowhand.deviantart.com/gallery/?offset=24#/d359h9v)

For my wife, Kaylee, who encourages and challenges me and who has continually spurred me on to write. Thanks for all your love and support.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	6
Introduction	9
Is the God Question Important?	11
Is God a Psychological Projection?	13
"For" and "Against" God	15
The Argument <i>For God From Truth</i>	18
The Argument	18
Truth and the Irrationality of Relativism	19
The Relativistic Nature of Atheism	24
Atheism Defined	24
Atheism's Presuppositions	27
Atheism's Irrationality	29
God Exists- Don't Be Foolish	34
Bibliography	37
About the Author	39

“The heavens are telling of the glory of
God; And their expanse is declaring the
work of His hands.”

-Psalm 19:1

“That which is known about God is
evident within them, for God made it
evident to them. For since the creation
of the world His invisible attributes, His
eternal power and divine nature, have
been clearly seen, being understood
through what has been made, so that
they are without excuse.”

-Romans 1: 19-20

Introduction

Since the beginning of human experience, men and women have marveled at the existence and complexity of the universe around them. According to the great philosopher Aristotle, "it is owing to their wonder that men...first began to philosophize; they wondered originally at the obvious difficulties, then advanced little by little and stated difficulties about the greater matters, e.g....about the origin of the universe."¹

The obvious reality of the universe's existence and the resulting question of its origin caused the German mathematician and philosopher, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, to ask, "Why is there something rather than nothing?" In answering this question, he postulated the existence of a metaphysically necessary Being. Contemporary philosopher and New Testament scholar, William Lane Craig, agrees with the conclusion of Leibniz that there must exist a metaphysically necessary Being who carries within Himself the sufficient reason for His own existence and which constitutes the sufficient reason for the existence of the world.²

The existence of this necessary Being of philosophy, which Leibniz calls "God", is the same Being assumed by the writers of the Biblical texts quoted above. The above passages reveal that Christianity, in line with other theistic worldviews, considers God's existence to be evident from observation and experience of the world. In the book of Psalms, King David,

¹Aristotle. *Metaphysics* A. 2. 982^b10-15.

²William Lane Craig, *The Ultimate Question of Origins: God and the Beginning of the Universe*, July 13, 2002, <<http://www.leaderu.com/offices/billcraig/docs/ultimatequestion.html#text2>> (July 13, 2002).

proclaims that the universe shows God's glory and activity. The apostle Paul in his epistle to the Romans suggests that the external world reveals not only God's existence but also His nature. If it is true, as these men claim (similarly to Craig and Leibniz), that God's existence in reality can be deduced from reflection on the natural world, then the significance of this is beyond description.

Is the God Question Important?

Without a doubt, the question of the existence of God is the most essential and significant question of human experience. According to philosopher and author Dr. Peter Kreeft, whether actually true or merely a mental construct, the idea of God's existence is an idea that has either "guided or deluded more lives, changed more history, inspired more poetry and philosophy than anything else, real or imagined. It has made more of a difference to human life on this planet, both individually and collectively, than anything else ever has."³

Kreeft recognizes that throughout history the question of God's existence has had more influence on human life than any other idea. This influence stems from the tremendous import of the question and from the significant implications of its answer. The question of God's existence is immeasurably influential for human existence because whether or not God exists in reality determines whether or not there is any *ultimate* meaning, purpose, or value to life. Furthermore, it is through a person's belief or disbelief in God and his or her beliefs about God that all convictions and life principles are formed or not formed.

Human beings, as rational creatures, want to know if God exists. This desire stems from the longing to answer other essential questions such as: What is ultimately important? To what should I give my life? Is there anything worth dying for? What happens to me when I die? Or are there right, wrong,

³Peter Kreeft, Introduction to Does God Exist? The Great Debate, with J.P. Moreland and Kai Nielsen (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 11.

good, or bad actions? These questions exemplify the clearly identifiable human need to define the "good life," and to know what is really significant. At the end of the day, all other questions pale in significance to the question of the reality of God's existence; for the answer to this question affects every aspect of life to an infinite degree.

Is God a Psychological Projection?

The importance of the question of God and its obvious relationship to the significance of life has caused some thinkers to suggest that the idea of God is merely a psychological projection created by the mind. To them, God does not exist in reality. Rather, He is an “opiate” or “crutch” of a humanity that wholeheartedly wants God to exist and so creates the idea of Him to meet their psychological desire. According to psychologist Sigmund Freud, the idea of God originated in humanity as a result of fear and Voltaire believed that, “If God does not exist, it would be necessary to invent Him.”⁴

Are Freud, Voltaire, and others who declare that the idea of God is merely a psychological need created by the human mind right in their estimation? Not according to Kreeft, who suggests that the conclusion of these thinkers has been obtained through improper reasoning. He suggests that it is only reasonable to look for psychological explanations for the origin of an idea *after* we know, or think we know, that the idea is false. i.e. Freud and others beg the question by asserting that the idea of God is false because it is a mental construct, when it is the veracity of the idea of God that is the question at hand. Consequently, psychological explanations for the origin of the idea of God commit the genetic fallacy by deciding whether an idea is objectively true by looking at its subjective origin.⁵ J.P. Moreland, who received his PhD in Philosophy from the University of Southern California and who has authored several books in the area of philosophy of religion adds:

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 24.

The genetic fallacy is the fallacy of confusing the origin of a belief with its epistemological warrant, and faulting the belief because of its origin. Where a belief comes from is a different matter than why one should believe it...So it is an example of the genetic fallacy to fault the truth or rationality of theism due to the origin of the idea of God, even if one grants that the idea of God came from fears... But this form of argument cannot be used in place of rational assessment of the pros and cons of the case itself.⁶

Therefore, the explanation of God's existence as a mental construct resulting from psychological desire is not an adequate rationale for unbelief. Rather, rationale for the idea of God's existence must include independent reasons that stand on their own and are evaluated in their own right. These reasons typically are structured as arguments "for" or "against" God.

⁶J.P. Moreland, Scaling the Secular City (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), 229-30.

“For” and “Against” God

Throughout history there have been arguments “against” the existence of God, and arguments “for” His existence. The atheistic arguments “against” God’s existence can basically be grouped into five classes.⁷ These include arguments from the problem of evil, arguments from the apparent ability of science to explain human experience, arguments from epistemological and linguistic problems associated with the concept of God, arguments in objection to the arguments for God’s existence, and finally, arguments that point to the negative consequences of belief in God.

On the other side of the debate are arguments “for” the existence of God. These arguments include a mixture of simple and complex reasons to believe in God’s existence drawn from knowledge of the world as observed through philosophy, science, history, experience, etc. Some of the more common arguments include:⁸

- The argument from religious experience.
- The argument from miracles, especially the resurrection of Jesus.
- The ontological argument from the idea of God as including all perfections to including the perfection of actual existence.
- The moral arguments from objective morality, meaning, and purpose.
- The argument from objective truth.

⁷Peter Kreeft, Introduction to Does God Exist? The Great Debate, with J.P Moreland and Kai Nielsen (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 11.

⁸Ibid., 27.

- The aesthetic argument from the fact of objective beauty, e.g. sunsets, flowers, rainbows, etc.
- The argument from mind and rationality.
- The design argument from order and information in nature.
- The cosmological arguments from motion to a First, Unmoved Mover; from second causes to a first (uncaused) cause of existence; and from the impossibility of arriving at the present moment if time past is infinite and beginningless.

For centuries, critical thinkers on both sides of the debate have offered arguments for their position. However, the question nevertheless remains: "Which conclusion (God exists or God does not exist) is the *most* reasonable; the *most* consistent with reality?" Furthermore, is it true, as the Bible's writers assume that God's existence is evident from what He has made? Can the proposition "God exists" actually be deduced from humanity's common experience of the world? If God exists, then it seems reasonable to conclude that the world would in fact show Him in some way. Is it the case, therefore, that observation and reflection on the universe (whether its physical components or non-physical ones) make belief in God more reasonable than unbelief? Is there good reason to think that God exists *objectively* or is the proposition "God exists" a construction of the mind that has no bearing in reality? Simply put, Does God *really* exist or not?

The following analysis seeks to answer these questions. It attempts to show evidence which suggests that reflection on the nature of the universe indeed "proves" that God exists in reality; that the proposition "God exists" is true and, therefore, that belief in the existence of God is actually more reasonable and justified than unbelief. The following study argues "for"

the existence of God *from* the existence of objective truth and rationality.

The Argument *For God From Truth*

The Argument

The following analysis will demonstrate that if objective truth exists then God exists. The argument is as follows:

1. If objective truth exists, then relativism is irrational.
2. If atheism is relativistic, then atheism is irrational.
3. If objective truth exists, then either God exists or He does not. (There is no middle ground- the law of the excluded middle)
4. Objective truth exists
5. Atheism is relativistic
6. Therefore,
 - a. Relativism is irrational
 - b. Atheism is irrational
 - c. God exists (theism, in some form, is true if atheism is irrational, there is no middle ground)

In order to conclude that God exists, two things must be established. First, the existence of objective truth, and second the relativistic nature of atheism. If objective truth exists then relativism is necessarily false. If atheism is relativistic, then it is false as well. If atheism is false then theism must be true; i.e. God must exist.

Truth and the Irrationality of Relativism

In order to demonstrate that God exists in reality it must first be established that objective truth exists and that relativism is false. This section will confirm this to be the case.

It is an obvious fact of experience that not all people perceive or explain reality in the same way. Varieties of worldviews, which people espouse, compete as explanations of ultimate reality. These views of the world claim to explain reality as it actually is. They claim to be true. Worldviews that include the existence of God, for example and worldviews that exclude His existence are mutually exclusive. i.e. they are not both simultaneously true.

According to the Wikipedia Encyclopedia, when someone sincerely agrees with an assertion about reality, he or she is claiming that it is the truth. The truth or falsity of a statement is determined only by how it relates to the world, and whether it accurately describes (i.e., corresponds with) that world.⁹

Though there are various theories of truth, the idea that statements or beliefs are true if they agree or match up with reality is the view held by the majority of philosophers.¹⁰ Norman L. Geisler argues that "there may be many different ways to *defend* different truth claims, but there is really only one proper way to *define* truth, namely as correspondence."¹¹

⁹"Correspondence Theory of Truth" *Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia* <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Correspondence_theory_of_truth> March 13, 2006.

¹⁰Douglas Groothuis, "Facing the Challenge of Postmodernism," in *To Everyone an Answer*, ed. Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig, and J.P. Moreland (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 240.

¹¹Norman Geisler, quoted in *To Everyone an Answer*, ed. Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig, and J.P. Moreland (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 241.

When people attempt to explain their experiences, beliefs, or observations, they do so with statements and assertions that make claims about reality. These claims either relate to the actual state of affairs of the world or they do not. If they are consistent with the way reality actually is, they are said to be "true".

The existence of true propositions presupposes that there is an objective reality to know, and that there is something real to grasp. Objective reality, thus, is the way the world "just is." Consider the following example: If a car accident takes place, it is evident that the correct interpretation of the details surrounding the accident (who was involved, what happened, when it happened, etc.) may be difficult to ascertain, even from eyewitnesses. However, it should never be doubted that the accident happened, if it indeed happened, and that it happened a certain way. The truth of the matter is that something happened (a car accident).

Another example, which illustrates the objectivity of reality and truth, is... Suppose there are three individuals who have three different views or beliefs regarding the number of suns in the solar system. Person A thinks that there are three suns, person B believes there are no suns, and person C argues for the existence of one sun. Obviously, these three persons cannot all be correct, for the actual state of affairs, the truth, is exclusive in that there is only one sun. It might have been the case that none of the persons was correct, in the event that the actual number of suns was unknown. However, all three of them could not have been correct simultaneously, (even if the actual state of affairs was unknown) because they had mutually exclusive views of reality. In this example, because scientific discoveries have

shown that the solar system contains only one sun, person C's understanding is said to correspond with reality. He believes that which is actually correct, the truth. The solar system example effectively illustrates what is meant by truth as a correspondence to reality.

Now consider the various views that people have regarding the person of Jesus. Which view actually corresponds to reality? Islam teaches that Jesus was simply a great prophet who is now dead and buried but not God and to say that he's God is a sin. Christianity says that Jesus is God, risen from the dead, and now is located alive in heaven. Judaism teaches that Jesus was a bad man and led the people astray. Jehovah's witnesses believe that Jesus was a created being but not God. Mormons believe that Jesus was the Spirit brother of Lucifer but not God in the flesh. Of course, these worldviews, which contradict each other with mutually exclusive claims to truth, cannot be simultaneously true in reality. It is possible that they are all false claims but is not possible that they are all true. The purpose here is not to make a case for the deity of Jesus but to point out the nature of Truth as correspondence to reality.

Although different worldviews teach competing and contradictory views of reality, the current cultural landscape is one, which considers contradictory explanations of reality as equally valid and simultaneously true. The notion that "truth is subjective and culturally relative" is commonplace in contemporary society. Many people today heavily influenced by a "post-modern" culture deny objective truth and elevate subjectivity. The catalyst for this cultural trend is the underlying and pervasive reception of the system of thought known as Relativism. Relativism is evident in such commonly heard statements as "whatever is true for you is true" and "there is no absolute truth." These statements reflect the subjective view of truth rampant in modern culture.

In actuality, relativism is unfit as a system of thought despite its growth and dominance in culture. Ultimately, the objectively true laws of logic, which make any thought or coherent communication even possible, clearly demonstrate relativism's irrationality. Consider just two laws of logic. First, the *law of the excluded middle* demands that any statement is either true or false. Next, the *law of non-contradiction* recognizes that no statement can be both true and false.¹² This law of thought, which was organized (not invented) by Aristotle, argues that nothing can be and not be at the same time in the same respect. i.e. Nothing can possess incompatible properties; or can be what it is not.¹³ For example, if there is one God, there cannot be multiple gods, and there cannot be no God.

These logical principles, thus, expose relativism and any worldview that espouses it as irrational and inherently false. Douglas Groothuis, Ph.D, an author in the area of philosophy of religion and ethics argues that those who claim that these basic principles of thought are false must assert the principles in order to deny them. In so doing, they make a mockery out of all thought, language, and the very notion of truth."¹⁴ Moreover, he goes on to explain that the law of the excluded middle and the law of non-contradiction "trade on the same essential insight" in that "any factual statement and its denial cannot both be true."¹⁵ E.g. God either exists or He does not- There is no middle option.

¹²Paul Cox, Christian World View (San Bernardino, CA: Perspective Ministries, 1998), 9.

¹³Douglas Groothuis, "Facing the Challenge of Postmodernism," in To Everyone an Answer, ed. Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig, and J.P. Moreland (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 241.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., 243.

In light of these objectively true principles of reason, it becomes noticeable that statements commonly used by relativists such as “whatever is true for you is true” - “there is no absolute truth” – and “everything is relative” are self-refuting. The statements are themselves absolute and thus refute what they claim- that there are no absolutes. The position of relativism wants to make a statement that is non-relative, but the position, by definition, denies that possibility. It is internally contradictory.¹⁶

Therefore, without objective truth, reasonable thought is not possible. Any attempt to justify relativism is destroyed by the mere attempt to justify it. The above analysis has briefly exposed the irrationality of relativism. Next, let us turn our attention toward atheistic theory to uncover its relativistic nature.

¹⁶Paul Cox, Christian World View (San Bernardino, CA: Perspective Ministries, 1998), 9.

The Relativistic Nature of Atheism

The preceding syllogism, in order to be valid and sound, must first demonstrate the existence of objective truth and the irrationality of relativism. The preceding section accomplished this. Next, it must show that the premise "Atheism is relativistic" is also "true." If relativism is a defective system of thought, then atheism, if inherently relativistic, is a defective worldview as well. Therefore, if atheism is relativistic, then the existence of God is "proven" from objective truth and the irrationality of atheism. Is atheism inherently a relativistic system? The following analysis seeks to answer this question.

Atheism Defined

What is atheism? Atheism is the worldview, which denies the existence of the supernatural, and claims that "the universe and all that is in it is a product of the random application of presently operating natural laws."¹⁷ Atheism, the catchall term for other god denying philosophies such as naturalism, materialism, physicalism, scientism, secular humanism, atheistic existentialism, evolutionism, etc. is, according to the Encyclopedia of Philosophy, a view held by one who "maintains that there is no God; that is, that the sentence "God exists" expresses a false proposition."¹⁸ Etienne Borne author of the book, *Atheism*, suggests that "atheism is the deliberate, definite, dogmatic denial of the existence of God. It is not satisfied with appropriate truth or relative truth,

¹⁷Gerry Breshears, "Can Scientists Believe in God?"
<<http://www.westernseminary.edu/papers/Faculty/Creation.doc>>
(March 13, 2006).

¹⁸Quoted in Ravi Zacharias, *Can Man Live Without God* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1994), 16.

but claims to see the ins and outs of the game quite clearly being the absolute denial of the absolute."¹⁹ Madalyn Murray O'Hair, founder of the American Atheists, in her book *What on Earth is an Atheist?* asserts:

We atheists...try to find some basis of rational thinking on which we can base our actions and our beliefs, and we have it...We accept the technical philosophy of materialism...There are no supernatural forces, no supernatural entities such as gods...nor can there be. We atheists believe that nature simply exists. Matter is. Material is.²⁰

According to Ravi Zacharias, "Atheism is not merely a passive unbelief in God but an assertive denial of the major claims of all varieties of theism; atheism contradicts belief in God with a positive affirmation of matter as ultimate reality."²¹ Moreover, he maintains that "the atheist, often better described as an antitheist...asserts that God's existence is rationally unprovable and is therefore at best a meaningless proposition."²² Even though some philosophers advocate "soft" forms of atheism, such as secular humanism, these atheistic views of reality as writes Zacharias, "accomplish the same goal and end up denying God's existence either implicitly or explicitly. Any attempt to escape the ramifications of its absoluteness is unsuccessful."²³ Ultimately, in atheism there is nothing beyond the natural but more nature- no God or gods,

¹⁹Etienne Borne, Atheism (New York: Hawthorn, 1961), 61.

²⁰Ravi Zacharias, Can Man Live Without God (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1994), 17.

²¹Ibid.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

no soul, no spirituality, no miraculous, no life after death, no objective morality, no ultimate meaning, no ultimate purpose, no objective truth, no nonphysical reality whatsoever.

Atheism's Presuppositions

The popular idea that atheistic assumptions stem from an unbiased, critical, and scientific examination of the world is misleading and inaccurate. Most advocates of the atheistic worldview maintain that they are defenders of “free thought” in our culture. They call themselves scientists, and brag of being lead by the facts to the conclusion of atheism. They suggest that any view contrary to theirs is full of biased presuppositions that ultimately skew the facts and prejudice the observations. According to an atheistic worldview, anyone who attempts to explain reality from a theistic point of view is hopelessly painting a picture of the world that is false. They accuse theists of allowing religion to undermine free, critical, and supposedly unbiased reflection on the true nature of reality. Of course a theist’s belief in the existence of God is an assumption that, at times, may prejudice his examination of the evidence. However, the atheist’s views are likewise not exempt from biased presuppositional commitments. In support of this idea, consider the following statement by prominent atheist and Harvard geneticist Richard Lewontin. He writes:

Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a

commitment to materialism... Moreover, materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a divine foot in the door.²⁴

The atheist's boast that his quest for truth is untainted by religious presuppositions is ultimately a farce. Atheism claims to be true because of an unbiased examination of the facts of reality, but if truth be told, it is presuppositionally committed to *faith* in the philosophy of naturalism. This claim to be the unbiased and critical arbiters of truth and evaluators of reality is simply untrue. In fact, as the following will reveal, belief in the non-existence of God takes is less reasonable than belief in His existence.

²⁴Richard Lewontin, quoted in Gerry Breshears, "Can Scientists Believe in God?"

<<http://www.westernseminary.edu/papers/Faculty/Creation.doc>>
(March 13, 2006).

Atheism's Irrationality

Opponents of atheism recognize that it has an incurable flaw in the area of knowledge and rationality. "Rational" typically means that an idea is known and justifiable based on *reason* (as opposed to simply tradition, emotional grounds, blind faith, etc.). i.e. The idea is logical and not false. An idea is said to be rational if it corresponds to the laws of logic and thus to objectively true reality. A careful analysis of atheism reveals a problem so serious that it fails as a legitimate worldview worthy of adherence by rational persons. Atheism is indeed a worldview that is fundamentally irrational. Philosopher, Paul Cox, suggests the following problem:

If naturalism [i.e. atheism] is true, then human reason must be the result of natural forces. Natural forces are not rational, nor can they be the result of a rational cause [or intelligent mind]. It would follow, then, that human reason is the result of non-rational causes. If human reason is the result of non-rational causes, there is strong reason to distrust human reason, especially in its theoretical exercises. Atheism itself is an exercise of theoretical reason. If it is true, there are strong reasons to distrust theoretical reasoning. If theoretical reasoning should be distrusted, then particular applications of it should be distrusted, too. If atheism is true, we have strong reasons to distrust that it is true.²⁵

Dr. Cox reveals the inherent flaw of atheism in the area of knowledge. He points out that the theory is relativistic

²⁵Paul Cox, [Christian World View](#) (San Bernardino, CA: Perspective Ministries, 1998), 51.

and thus self-destroying. Philosopher Alvin Plantinga agrees and writes, “the scandal of atheistic skepticism is that I am relying on the very cognitive faculties whose unreliability is the conclusion of my skeptical argument.”²⁶ Even Charles Darwin himself felt the force of this objection in relation to his theory of evolution. He states, “With me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man’s mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust in the convictions of a monkey’s mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?”²⁷

The problem of knowledge and rationality for an atheist is insurmountable. Keep in mind that an atheist makes the claim that God does not exist while simultaneously affirming the existence of true debate. Since an atheist and a theist can agree that they disagree, it must follow, then, that there exists certain preconditions for true debate to take place. Indeed, both the theist and atheist assume the authority of reason and both see a correspondence between rationality and the external world. The atheist assumes that the proposition “God exists” and the proposition “God does not exist” are mutually exclusive. This assumption is inconsistent within an atheistic worldview because atheism at the ultimate level suggests that rationality is untrustworthy. Yet, at the same time, an atheist also assumes that reasoning has validity by the mere fact that he tries to make rational arguments. In other words, he acknowledges that thinking about the world is capable of genuine insight and can correspond to reality. According to well know Christian thinker, C.S. Lewis, “All possible

²⁶Alvin Plantinga, Warranted Christian Belief (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 219.

²⁷Paul Cox, Christian World View (San Bernardino, CA: Perspective Ministries, 1998), 51.

knowledge...depends on the validity of reasoning... [and] Unless human reasoning is valid no science can be true."²⁸

The atheist's acceptance of the validity of reason while necessarily denying its trustworthiness is further evidence of atheism's incoherence. Just as a theist is called to give an account of why he thinks God exists, an atheist must also provide "reason" for the existence of his rationality. However, if the universe is as the atheist claims- nothing more than the random application of presently operating natural laws with time and chance acting on matter in motion, then how can a non-physical and authoritative rationality be explained? And even if the existence of reason can be explained, on what basis can the explanation be trusted? How can intelligent minds arise by chance out of mindless matter in motion?

The atheist cannot consistently answer these questions. He must simply assert that the chemical reactions in his brain are true and that the chemical reactions in the theist's brain are false. But how can chemical reactions be true or false? Are they not all simply chemical reactions coming from mindless matter in motion, neither true nor false? Ultimately, the atheist must realize that according to his view, chaotic chemical reactions of mindless matter in motion cannot be objectively "true". If he makes the claim that his views are "true", then he is inconsistent with his own view, which necessarily denies the reality of objective truth. Any assertion of truth for an atheist is a contradiction because in his view there is no reason or rationality above physical and material causes. Again Lewis argues:

No account of the universe can be true unless that account leaves it possible for our thinking to be a real

²⁸C.S. Lewis, Miracles (New York: MacMillan, 1960), 14.

insight. A theory, which explained everything else in the whole universe but which made it impossible to believe that our thinking was valid, would be utterly out of court. For that theory would itself have been reached by thinking, and if thinking is not valid that theory would, of course, be itself demolished. It would have destroyed its own credentials. It would be an argument which proved that no argument was sound – a proof that there are no such things as proofs – which is nonsense.”²⁹

An atheist, therefore, who merely assumes a *difference* in value between his truth claims and those of a theist, by making any arguments at all, is inconsistent. He demonstrates the irrationality of his own worldview, which denies an ordered and rational life of the mind. In order for an atheist to be consistent, he would have to stop making truth claims, but even this attempt at consistency assumes the need for consistency, which is again inconsistent.

²⁹C.S. Lewis, Miracles (New York: MacMillan, 1960), 14-15.

God Exists- Don't Be Foolish

The foregoing analysis has given sufficient reason to conclude that God exists from analyzing the existence of objective truth and the relativistic nature of atheism. It is true that 1) Objective truth exists, hence, relativism is irrational. 2) Atheism is relativistic and, thus, it is irrational. 3) Objective truth requires either the existence of God (some form of theism) or the non-existence of God (atheism)- There is no middle ground (based on the law of the excluded middle). 4) Therefore, since relativism and atheism are irrational, God must exist.

The existence of objective truth and rationality clearly confirm the reality of God and the bankruptcy of atheism. Contemporary philosopher Ronald Nash agrees. He states:

It is hard to see why naturalism [i.e. atheism] is not self-referentially absurd. Before any person can justify accepting it on rational grounds, it is first necessary to reject a cardinal tenet of the naturalist position. In other words, the only way people can provide rational grounds for believing in naturalism is to cease being naturalists.³⁰

In light of the preceding discussion, it is evident that the conclusion "God exists" is undeniably more reasonable and more consistent with reality than the atheistic denial of God's existence. God has made Himself known to the world. Observation of the universe, especially the non-physical

³⁰Ronald Nash, "Miracles and Conceptual Systems" in In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History, ed. R. Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1997), 130.

realities of truth and rationality, reveal God and make belief in Him justifiable. We have demonstrated that the argument “for” God from truth and rationality “proves” God’s existence in reality and makes belief in His existence more reasonable than unbelief. Finally, that God’s existence is evident from what He has made is plain for all to see and, therefore, to assert that “There is no God,” as Psalm 14:1 indicates, is deliberate foolishness.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Metaphysics* A. 2. 982^b10-15.
- Borne, Etienne. *Atheism*. New York: Hawthorn, 1961.
- Breshears, Gerry. "Can Scientists Believe in God?"
<<http://www.westernseminary.edu/papers/Faculty/Creation.doc>> March 13, 2006.
- "Correspondence Theory of Truth" *Wikipedia Online Encyclopedia*
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Correspondence_theory_of_truth> March 13, 2006.
- Cox, Paul. *Christian World View*. San Bernardino, CA: Perspective Ministries, 1998.
- Craig, William Lane. "The Ultimate Question of Origins: God and the Beginning of the Universe." July 13, 2002.
<<http://www.leaderu.com/offices/billcraig/docs/ultimatequestion.html#text2>> (July 13, 2002).
- Geisler, Norman. Quoted in *To Everyone an Answer*. ed. Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig, and J.P. Moreland. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Groothuis, Douglas. "Facing the Challenge of Postmodernism," In *To Everyone an Answer*, ed. Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig, and J.P. Moreland. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Kreeft, Peter. Introduction to *Does God Exist? The Great Debate*. with J.P Moreland and Kai Nielsen. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990.
- Lewis, C.S. *Miracles*. New York: MacMillan, 1960.

- Lewontin, Richard. Quoted in Breshears, Gerry. "Can Scientists Believe in God?"
<<http://www.westernseminary.edu/papers/Faculty/Creation.doc>> March 13, 2006.
- Moreland, J.P. Scaling the Secular City. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Nash, Ronald. "Miracles and Conceptual Systems," In In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God's Action in History. ed. R Douglas Geivett and Gary R. Habermas. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Plantinga, Alvin. Warranted Christian Belief. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Wald, George. quoted in Gerry Breshears. "Can Scientists Believe in God?"
<<http://www.westernseminary.edu/papers/Faculty/Creation.doc>> March 13, 2006.
- Zacharias, Ravi. Can Man Live Without God. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1994.

About the Author

Rand Wagner was born on May 31, 1976 in St. Paul, MN. Rand grew up in a religious home, but that religion was always in flux, ranging from atheism, to new age, to Roman Catholicism. He was actually named after an atheist capitalist philosopher named Ayn Rand. When he was young, his family moved to Phoenix, AZ, where he attended Roman Catholic churches at various times and if he was asked his religion, his reply was, "Christian", although he did not know what that meant other than that he was loosely affiliated with Roman Catholicism. Rand attended Horizon High School in Scottsdale, AZ where he played varsity basketball, football, and baseball. As a sophomore he came to faith in Christ and began actively seeking to grow in the knowledge of God.

After high school, Rand was recruited to play baseball by Arizona State University but decided to attend Biola University on a baseball scholarship. At Biola, Rand became increasingly committed to the cause of Christ and its impact in the world majoring in Intercultural Studies with a minor in Biblical Studies. At the end of his college days, he became very interested in Apologetics, Theology, and Philosophy of Religion and pursued advanced graduate study receiving two Master's degrees in Theology and Apologetics from Western Seminary and Biola University Graduate School.

After graduate school Rand also completed technical college training in Funeral Service and went to work at a funeral home in the Pacific Northwest. During this time, Rand founded an organization called Thoughtlife which was organized as a non-profit, para-church ministry with the purpose of encouraging authentic and thoughtful faith. Its general goals have been to prepare minds for action (1 Pet. 1:13) and to defend the faith (1 Pet. 3:15). It has sought to accomplish these goals by offering cutting-edge lectures and

debates and other similar events which attempt to demonstrate the truth of the Gospel and the Christian worldview. The events not only have sought to prepare Christians to articulate the Faith reverently, intelligently, confidently and compassionately, but they have also engaged the un-churched community as well.

Following are the events which have been coordinated since Thoughtlife's beginning: Jesus: Fact or Fiction? (J.P. Moreland, PhD and Craig Hazen, PhD) - Christ Among Other gods: What About Other Religions? (Gerry Breshears, PhD) - Islam and Christianity (James DeYoung, ThD) - Untangling the Davinci Code: Diffusing False Thinking (Jan Verbruggen, PhD) - Effective Tactics in Defending the Faith (Nate Baxter, PhD) Is Christ Divided? An Answer to the Disunity Problem (Rex Koivisto, PhD) - Jesus & Truth: The Message for Modern Times (Brad Harper, PhD) - The Cross of Christ and the Problem of Evil (Rand Wagner, MA) - The Search for the Biblical Jesus (Ray Lubeck, PhD) - What is Hell? (Todd Miles PhD Cand.) Does God Exist? A Live Debate (Gary DeWeese, PhD - Ken Clatterbaugh, PhD - Jim Corbett MA - Michael Gurney, PhD Cand. Rand Wagner, MA- Moderator) - Trinity and Culture (Nate Baxter, PhD) - Does God Exist? A Live Debate (Rand Wagner, MA -Jim Corbett, MA) - Unlocking the Da Vinci Code-Live Simulcast (Lee Strobell and Erwin Lutzer) - Jesus: Legend or Lord (Paul L. Maier, PhD) – The Case for a Creator (Phil Fernandez, PhD) - The Resurrection: Myth, Hallucination, Hoax, or History? (Craig Hazen, PhD)

These events have been promoted to engage culture with the gospel and to provide educational opportunities for those who wish to be engaged and, in turn, engage others effectively in the world of ideas. This is Rand's lifelong passion. And it is also the catalyst for Thoughtlife's mission which is to: 1) Stimulate the mind and heart of others toward the truth and grace found in Christ. 2. Answer arguments offered to discredit the Christian faith. 3. Build an intellectual framework useful for contending for the Christian worldview in the marketplace of ideas. 4. Confidently make the case that it

is reasonable to place one's faith in Christ. 5.
Increase individual devotion to Christ and service to His church.

In addition to his ministry through Thoughtlife... Rand has worked vocationally in two capacities- serving as a Pastor in two churches and as a licensed Funeral Director in three funeral homes. Currently Rand works as a Funeral Director in Olympia, WA where he serves families by directing and officiating funerals. Rand is married to his beautiful wife, Kaylee, and has three sons, and one daughter.

thoughtlife