

HOW ATHEISTS DENY EXISTENCE OF A CREATOR

Is there a creator of this universe? Or did this mind-bogglingly vast 93-billion-light-year wide universe emerge out of nothingness by itself without any external intervention?

Throughout human history, there have been people, referred to as atheists, who simply did not believe in the existence of a creator or god.

However, during the last two centuries, atheism has undergone a transformation from a mere absence of belief in the existence of god *to a belief in the non-existence of god*. This new extreme form of atheism has turned into a virtual dogma. Atheists of today can be divided into two broad categories.

Atheists as Part of Communist System

Following Karl Marx, since governments of the former Soviet Union, Eastern European countries and China held atheism as an official dogma and routinely used force to enforce it, this form of atheism is irrelevant to any discussion as to whether there is a creator of the universe or not.

Atheists of Modern Times

Atheists of modern times claim to be thinkers, or followers of those thinkers, who believe in the non-existence of a creator of the universe. Of these atheists, let us discuss the four most famous ones, i.e. Friedrich

Nietzsche, Bertrand Russell, Christopher Hitchens and Richard Dawkins.

Since this book is meant to be short, only a brief description of those atheists' approach and arguments, and the response is provided below.

Atheists - Non-Serious Attitude

It is unfortunate that when seeking to find answers to the most vital question facing human beings, instead of demonstrating a serious and mature temperament, these famous atheists seemed to draw a curious joy from their notoriety, their wisecracks and from stoking up new controversies.

This makes one wonder if the driving force behind those people's intellectual pursuit in this field was not merely a need for attention or vanity or just fun.

Friedrich Nietzsche

German philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche, shocked the world by proclaiming that 'god is dead' but then he went on to warn again and again that since religion provided the moral foundation for our society, abandoning it could result in the total collapse of societal values.

Bertrand Russell

The greatest philosopher of the last century, a great humanist and the most articulate thinker of his time, Russell decided to engage in religious debates through correspondence with senior Christian clergy for pure fun, using his great intellect and wit just to make the clergy appear mediocre.

But beyond exposing faith as lacking direct physical evidence and how religion had led to intolerance and wars through history, Russell has not made any serious contribution to answering the question as to whether we have a creator or not.

How can history, or Russell's view of it, contribute anything in determining if there is a creator of the universe or not?

Christopher Hitchens

Christopher Hitchens was the most famous atheist of our times. He died in 2011.

Hitchens disqualifies himself from making any contribution to a discussion about the existence of a creator since he confessed that he would be *horrified if evidence were to emerge proving the existence of a creator.*

Hitchens called himself 'an antitheist' and said that a normal atheist may be looking for truth, but as an 'antitheist', Hitchens was 'relieved that there's no evidence' for there being a creator.

Richard Dawkins

Richard Dawkins is a zoologist and the most famous living atheist and evolutionist.

In 1859, Charles Darwin proposed his theory of evolution through his book 'On the Origin of Species', according to which, every offspring is slightly different from its parents, a difference that makes it more or less suitable to its environment.

According to Darwin, over thousands of generations, through a process called natural selection, new species emerge that are more suited to their environment, while others get eliminated.

But Darwin believed in god and he never claimed to know how the *first* life form emerged from dead matter.

In contrast, Dawkins takes the theory of evolution to a new extreme level, claiming that the theory explains even the emergence of the *first* life form from nothing, despite the fact that no scientist has ever been able to create a single cell in a laboratory.

In a 2016 study published by the British newspaper 'The Independent', 80 per cent of British scientists said that Dawkins misrepresents science and scientists in public.

And sadly, Dawkins, too, has failed to demonstrate that he is a balanced, mature and sincere seeker of truth. He too loves debates, creates drama and loves to abuse and stoke up controversies.

For instance, the god of the Old Testament gave Moses Ten Commandments that included: honor your father and mother, do not kill, do not steal, do not be a false witness against your neighbor, etc.

But the following is how Dawkins describes the same god.

'The god of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust, unforgiving control-freak; a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic cleanser; a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully.'

By this time, perhaps, Dawkins ran out of his chest of abuses.

WHY ATHEISTS ARE WRONG?

Apart from pointing out that all the faiths are devoid of any direct physical evidence, offering wisecracks and witty quotes to ridicule religions and citing historical instances of violence that had been fueled by religion, atheists have not brought anything helpful to the table for determining if this huge universe was created by an external power or not.

Also, apart from introducing such far-fetched ideas like 'a multiverse' to defuse the impact of the Big Bang Theory on atheism, no atheist has offered any reasonable alternate theory as to how this entire universe came into existence as they are aware that any such theory would also be subject to the same impossibly high standard of direct physical evidence that they demand from the followers of different faiths.

As for their reading of wars, the fact is that most wars in history, including World War I and World War II, were fought either for territorial gain, greed or more power. Even the Holocaust, the most horrible crime in modern history, was committed for reasons that had nothing to do with religion.

Atheists' Insistence on Direct Evidence of God

By refusing to accept god without direct evidence, atheists succeed in appearing to young people as logical while portraying the followers of different religions as superstitious and mediocre people who

would believe any fairy tale without requiring direct evidence.

A leading atheist of our times, Christopher Hitchens, famously said that 'what can be asserted without evidence [belief in a creator] can be dismissed without evidence', which later came to be known as Hitchens' razor. It was a clever twist of phrase.

The only problem was that it was not correct.

Do atheists always demand direct evidence before accepting a fact? No.

Did Hitchens refuse to accept his parents as his parents before obtaining direct evidence to prove it? Did he refuse to accept any of his three children as his children without conducting a DNA test first?

The simple fact is that every day, all of us, including atheists, deduce hundreds of facts from indirect or secondary evidence.

We all routinely use a set of information as indirect evidence, Fact A, for deducing or believing the existence of another fact, Fact B, without ever seeing any direct evidence for the existence of Fact B.

For instance, if Hitchens saw several fire brigade vans driving in the opposite direction with sirens blazing, Fact A, he would have concluded that a building must be on fire, Fact B, without himself having seen that building on fire.

And if Hitchens were to return to his flat and discover that it is all tidied up, Fact A, without waiting for direct evidence, he would conclude that someone from *outside* must have entered the flat and tidied it up, Fact B, because a flat could not tidy itself up.

And if an atheist were to find a table and a few chairs in a jungle, would he refuse to deduce that a carpenter must have made them until such time that he

personally saw with his own eyes the carpenter making that furniture?

Then, despite seeing that the design and the functioning of our own bodies are far superior in sophistication and complexity to anything human beings are themselves capable of making, Fact A, how can atheists refuse to accept that an external, far superior power must have created our bodies, Fact B?

Also, in order to claim that there is no human being in a castle, one would be expected to have first searched every nook and corner of that castle.

And here, human beings have yet to travel to another planet within our solar system, let alone to any of the billions of stars within our galaxy, which itself is just one of the hundreds of thousands of other galaxies.

As for life on Earth, while evolution is now widely accepted as a proven scientific phenomenon, it cannot explain how life actually began on Earth.

An Oxford mathematician and a most respected theistic voice in the world, John Lennox, has aptly said:

‘There are not many options – essentially just two. Either human intelligence ultimately owes its origin to mindless matter, or there is a Creator. It is strange that some people claim that it is their intelligence that leads them to prefer the first to the second.’

Atheists and evolutionists would have us believe that on the lifeless Earth, through a passage of millions of years, somehow, dust, rocks, water and air interacted with one another to form millions of *different* types of life forms, that can find sources of energy that are suitable to their bodies for the performance of their bodily functions and that also somehow know how to procreate to continue their species.

Nothing can be more absurd than this because nature, by its very nature, is disorganized.

Despite the passage of millions of years, no shoreline of any ocean or river in the world has become a straight line. Countries have to build concrete walls on both sides to keep their irrigation canals in a straight line. The River Nile, after flowing for virtually tens of thousands of years, has yet to run in a straight line to the Mediterranean Sea.

Also, while the Earth has existed for more than four billion years, today, not a single mountain in the world is perfectly shaped as a cone, a rectangle or a ball. It is rare for anyone to find even a small stone that is perfectly shaped as a ball or a cube.

How then can the same nature, that could not even develop one straight shoreline in millions of years, have made millions of kinds of such highly complex life forms?

Is it then not self-contradictory for an atheist not to see the existence of trillions of life forms as indirect or secondary evidence, Fact A, leading only to Fact B, that it must be an external designer with unimaginably great power and knowledge who must have created all these life forms on Earth?