

The Folly of Atheism

They never give up, do they? While atheists like Hitchens and Dawkins do their best to influence public opinion with their books, other atheists like Michael Newdow are busy bringing lawsuits against those who would make prayer, or anything else Christian, part of our political and/or legal processes. Newdow's most recent legal threat comes against the inauguration prayer and an oath that includes "so help me God."

Before we begin, let me say that atheism isn't necessarily the smartest position to take in a world that oozes with things that could exist only if God actually existed and one such "thing" is what some have called volitional freedom; or, freedom of choice. In other words, atheists in general and Newdow particularly, write and live as if men and women can actually choose between opposing views when such freedom cannot exist in a purely atheistic world.

To make the point, let's take a simple test. This may be a first for most of you, but I think it necessary to test your knowledge of the "debate" and its purpose before going any further. I know what most people think about tests and I have no reason to believe that any of my readers will feel any different about this one. Some of you may, in fact, be tempted to bypass this section by moving on to the next. If you do so, however, you will miss one very important and perhaps embarrassing point; and I really don't think this particular test will present any real challenge at all; so, here goes.

The test revolves around the most basic assumption of the debate process; so, pick a debate, any debate. Pick a debate between any rival positions you want, it really doesn't matter. Pick the debate between Newdow's attorneys and those who will represent the constitutional right of those Newdow intends to silence. Go ahead. Pick one. Now answer the following questions as honestly as you can and we will go from there. Please answer the following questions by checking "yes" or "no."

1. Do atheists think that debates serve a purpose? Yes____ No____
2. Do atheists assume that an audience is free to choose sides in a debate based on the evidence? Yes____ No____
3. Do atheists try to persuade the audience to accept their worldview via the debate platform? Yes____ No____

I realize that such obvious answers to such simple questions appear intellectually insulting, but it makes the point that I have been discussing. No sane person would engage in a debate, about any matter whatsoever, if they actually believed that said debate had no purpose before an audience that they believed had no choice.

So, to answer the above questions for you – not that you really need the help – Yes, atheists do assume that debates serve a purpose. The second question is no less simple. Yes, atheists who engage an opponent on any given issue assume that the audience before whom they stand is capable of choosing sides based on the evidence. And yes, atheists try to persuade the audience to accept their view on the matter in question, whether in debate or in writing. The fact of the matter is that every debate purposes, without fail, to convince someone that one position or another stands superior to another and the controversy raised by Newdow is no different.

Michael Newdow and his partners in unbelief, even when arguing their cases before the courts, are helplessly bound to the assumption that men are free to choose when such freedom should not be part of their atheistic world to start with.

The only way choice can be legitimized is if God actually exists. If Newdow were the least bit consistent with his own worldview, he would realize the useless idea of argument because argument and logic exist only in a theistic world. In an atheistic reality, men are simply determined to do what previous conditions dictate, and that is about as good as it gets.

Newdow, realized or not, lives more consistently with belief in God than he would be willing to admit. Just ask him. I bet he would say that he “chose” atheism over theism because of the evidence - the very thing that his atheistic worldview disallows.

There really should be some kind of law against atheists using theistic assumptions to advance their own agendas.

Tony