

Atheism and Agnosticism

Atheism is the lack of belief in a god, and/or the belief that there is no god.

Agnosticism is the view that the existence of God is "impossible" to be known or proven. Statistics show that up to 10 percent of people worldwide claim to be atheists or agnostics. The word atheism comes from the negative *a* which means 'no,' and *theos* which means 'god.' Hence, atheism in the most basic terms means 'no god.'

What are the best evidences or arguments for God's existence?

When studying the evidence for God's existence, there are three arguments that stand out among them all. They are called (1) The Intelligent Design argument (2) The Cosmological argument and (3) The Moral argument.

1. The famous Intelligent Design argument

The universe exhibits complexity in its structure that cannot be attributed plausibly to either chance or to physical necessity and therefore, this is best explained as a product of intelligent design. A person don't just think that a dictionary or anything with a high amount of complexity came into being by itself even though they cannot see or know who made it. One assumes that an intelligent being made it even though one don't know who made it. One single strand of DNA has 600 000 pages of information, and it is mathematically impossible for something so complex to be created by chance.

Mathematical scientists estimates that the probability for something to have been caused by chance, it has to be below the probability of 10^{50} , that is, a 1 with 50 zeroes after it. This is a huge number and this estimation is the highest probability anything can happen on chance according to mathematicians. If the number of probability is above 10^{50} , then its cause must be intelligent. This is not to say that most things under 10^{50} is probable to happen by chance, but only that it is impossible for something to be caused by change if it is above it.

If you take just the composition of the enzyme in the human component, which is the building block of the gene, the possibility of the human enzyme coming together by random chance, says Vikram Singhi, professor of applied mathematics at Cardiff in Wales, is $10^{40\,000}$, that is, a 1 with 40 000 zeroes after it. This is a number so high that it is beyond words. That is more than the atoms in this universe. Scientists estimate that there are about 10^{78} atoms in the universe. Since the enzyme is so complex, the possibility is zero that it can create itself. Put simply, the mathematical odds for a Creator or Designer is $10^{40\,000}$ to 1, or a 1 with 40 000 zeroes after it to 1, which, of course, is the same as zero possibility that the body could have made itself.

Barrow and Tipler, two physicists in their book the *Anthropic Cosmological Principle* list 10 steps in the course of human evolution, each of which is so improbable that before it would occur, the sun would have ceased to be a main sequence star and incinerated the earth. And they calculate the probability of the evolution of the human genome to be somewhere between 4 to the negative 180th power to the 100 000th power, and 4 to the negative 360th power to the 100 000th power.

... I must mention that as regards atheism and science, science totally devastates evolutionist notions. I was debating an atheist some time back about the falsity of evolutionism. We began talking about probability and he admitted that the odds are definitely against evolution: and he said, that with even the tiniest chance he still maintains “hope” that it could have happened. He even admitted there are no missing links, and lamented how they are all fakes, and that a real one will be found in the future: and that “science” keeps improving and correcting. I told him that Borel’s Law states that if the odds of an event happening are 1 in 10 to the 50th power or worse, it will never happen. He freaked out. That atheist evolutionist individual told me sorrowfully, that before he dies he will make sure he gets baptized; but that for the time being he refuses to believe in God. Borel’s Law absolutely devastates evolutionism. The atheist person I debated believed that probability was limitless in nature; but it came as a shock that it had a limit.

In the fictitious universe of the evolutionists, every tiny event needs odds of impossibility. Even in the most ideal imaginary universe that an evolutionist may attempt to mythologize about; every tiny part of it constitutes a scientific impossibility and a fiction. The French probability expert Emile Borel (who was the president of France’s Academie des Sciences) when speaking about the law named after him, said there is a single law of chance, that beyond which there is no

possibility of a chance occurrence no matter how much time elapses. When he formulated this law, Borel calculated that number to be one chance in 10 to the 50th power, the threshold beyond which things never happen, even with an eternity of time. Thus the evolutionist's main argument that an infinite amount of time allows for the impossible to happen, is shattered by statistical probability science - Borel's Law. Borel called his law the "Law of Chance," the threshold at which the odds of a chance event happening are/is impossible...

This proves that the cell and human existence cannot be caused by chance but that it must have an intelligent Creator. No one who sees a house that they do not know the builder of claims that the house made itself. If they did, we would think that they were crazy or a liar. Likewise, since DNA is more complex than countless of houses together, we know that it is impossible for it to have been made by itself and that an intelligent cause must be behind its creation. Again, not to claim that there are aliens, but let's hypothesize and say that astronauts doing a mission on the moon found buildings or spaceships of different kinds, but no owners of them. Would anyone but a liar or madman state that these complex things on the moon could have made themselves even though they could not see their Designers or Builders? Of course not. But DNA and a single cell is more complex than countless of houses or spaceships, and so this absolutely proves that the cell and human life must have had an Intelligent Designer. That cause is God. Concept and design necessitate an intelligent designer. The presence of intelligent design proves the existence of an intelligent designer. It's simply cause and effect. Thus, whoever contradicts such an obvious truth of logic is either a madman or a liar, and should be rejected as such. It is obvious that atheists are totally unreasonable and liars when they recognize and agree that many things that are only somewhat complex are caused by Intelligent Design, while they claim that things that are infinitely more complex than these objects, are made by chance.

Atheists would immediately recognize that structures or spaceships made by an unknown cause on the moon was caused by an Intelligent Designer. But when we are dealing with DNA and genetics, which is infinitely more complex, they refuse to agree to the very principle that they agreed to on the moon (which is that the best explanation for complexity is an Intelligent Cause). This shows us that all atheists are willful liars who reject the very principles that they agree to. As long as the Intelligent Designer is not God, they agree that complex objects are made by an Intelligence even though they do not know who made the object, but as soon as it is claimed that God is behind any complexity, they reject this obvious fact. Anyone with any semblance of logic are of course now able to see that the reason atheists

reject God is not lack of evidence, but that there are ulterior reasons for their rejection of God. Atheists understand that recognizing someone else than God as a Designer does not imply agreeing to the concept of being spiritually judged by them at death for one's evil deeds, or that one is required to adhere to and follow their moral rules. But agreeing to the existence of God implies all these things, and so, atheists choose the easy way out by lying about and denying obvious, irrefutable and scientific facts in order to escape having to deal with the distressing subjects of God's judgment, Hell and eternal damnation. It is thus scientifically proven that God exists and that atheists knowingly choose to lie in order to live a short moment of sin. Sad to say, they can only hide from their own dishonest conscience until the moment of death, for death is the moment that God has fixed for all of us to stand charged for one's crimes against one's conscience.

We know that design necessitates a designer. In fact, in accordance with this fundamental axiom, design detection methodology is a prerequisite in many fields of human endeavor, including archeology, anthropology, forensics, criminal jurisprudence, reverse engineering, crypto-analysis, random number generation, and SETI. And how do we recognize intelligent design? In general, we find "specified complexity" to be a reliable indicator of the presence of intelligent design. Chance can explain complexity alone but not specification - a random sequence of letters is complex but not specified (it's meaningless). A Shakespearean sonnet is both complex and specified (it's meaningful). We can't have a Shakespearean sonnet without Shakespeare. (William A. Dembski, *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance through Small Probabilities*, 1998.)

In accordance with our familiar axiom and in light of the tremendous advances we've made in molecular biology, biochemistry, genetics and information theory, the proof of God is all around us!

Through the microscope, we observe the *E. coli* bacterial flagellum. The bacterial flagellum is what propels *E. coli* bacteria through its microscopic world. It consists of about 40 individual protein parts including a stator, rotor, drive-shaft, U-joint, and propeller. It's a microscopic outboard motor! The individual parts come into focus when magnified 50,000 times (using electron micrographs). And even though these microscopic outboard motors run at an incredible 100,000 rpm (revolution per minute), they can stop on a microscopic dime. It takes only a quarter turn for them to stop, shift directions and start spinning 100,000 rpm in the opposite direction! The flagellar motor has two gears (forward and reverse), is water-cooled, and is hardwired into a signal transduction (sensory mechanism) so that it receives

feedback from its environment. ("Unlocking the Mystery of Life," video documentary by *Illustra Media*, 2002.)

When we apply the general principles of detecting specified complexity to biologic systems (living creatures), we find it reasonable to infer the presence intelligent design. Take, for example, the bacterial flagellum's stator, rotor, drive-shaft, U-joint, and propeller. It is not just by convenience that we've given these parts these names – that's truly their function. If you were to find a stator, rotor, drive-shaft, U-joint, or propeller in any vehicle, machine, toy or model, you would recognize them as the product of an intelligent source. No one would expect an outboard motor – much less one as incredible as the flagellar motor – to be the product of a chance assemblage of parts. Motors are the product of intelligent design.

Furthermore, the *E. coli* bacterial flagellum simply could not have evolved gradually over time. The bacterial flagellum is an "irreducibly complex" system. An irreducibly complex system is one composed of multiple parts, all of which are necessary for the system to function. If you remove any one part, the entire system will fail to function. Every individual part is integral. There is absolutely no naturalistic, gradual, evolutionary explanation for the bacterial flagellum. (Michael Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, 1996.)

The bacterial flagellum (not to mention the irreducibly complex molecular machines responsible for the flagellum's assembly) is just one example of the specified complexity that pervades the microscopic biological world. Molecular biologist Michael Denton wrote, "Although the tiniest bacterial cells are incredibly small, weighing less than 10^{-12} grams, each is in effect a veritable micro-miniaturized factory containing thousands of exquisitely designed pieces of intricate molecular machinery, made up altogether of one hundred thousand million atoms, far more complicated than any machinery built by man and absolutely without parallel in the non-living world." (Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1986, p. 250.)

Many examples showing God's design could be given. There are almost an infinite amount of examples. But here are a few:

The Earth and its size is perfect. The Earth's size and corresponding gravity holds a thin layer of mostly nitrogen and oxygen gases, only extending about 50 miles above the Earth's surface. If Earth were smaller, an atmosphere would be impossible, like the planet Mercury. If Earth were larger, its atmosphere would

contain free hydrogen, like Jupiter. Earth is the only known planet equipped with an atmosphere of the right mixture of gases to sustain plant, animal and human life. The Earth is located the right distance from the sun. Consider the temperature swings we encounter, roughly -30 degrees to +120 degrees Fahrenheit. If the Earth were any further away from the sun, we would all freeze. Any closer and we would burn up. Even a fractional variance in the Earth's position to the sun would make life on Earth impossible.

The moon is the perfect size and distance from the Earth for its gravitational pull. The moon creates important ocean tides and movement so ocean waters do not stagnate, and yet our massive oceans are restrained from spilling over across the continents.

Water is colorless, odorless and without taste, and yet no living thing can survive without it. Plants, animals and human beings consist mostly of water (about two-thirds of the human body is water). You'll see why the characteristics of water are uniquely suited to life: It has an unusually high boiling point and freezing point. Water allows us to live in an environment of fluctuating temperature changes, while keeping our bodies a steady 98.6 degrees. Water is a universal solvent. This property of water means that various chemicals, minerals and nutrients can be carried throughout our bodies and into the smallest blood vessels. Water is also chemically neutral. Without affecting the makeup of the substances it carries, water enables food, medicines and minerals to be absorbed and used by the body. Water has a unique surface tension. Water in plants can therefore flow upward against gravity, bringing life-giving water and nutrients to the top of even the tallest trees. Water freezes from the top down and floats, so fish can live in the winter. Ninety-seven percent of the Earth's water is in the oceans. But on our Earth, there is a system designed which removes salt from the water and then distributes that water throughout the globe. Evaporation takes the ocean waters, leaving the salt, and forms clouds which are easily moved by the wind to disperse water over the land, for vegetation, animals and people. It is a system of purification and supply that sustains life on this planet, a system of recycled and reused water.

The human brain simultaneously processes an amazing amount of information. Your brain takes in all the colors and objects you see, the temperature around you, the pressure of your feet against the floor, the sounds around you, the dryness of your mouth, even the texture of your keyboard. Your brain holds and processes all your emotions, thoughts and memories. At the same time your brain keeps track of the ongoing functions of your body like your breathing pattern, eyelid movement,

hunger and movement of the muscles in your hands. The human brain processes more than a million messages a second. Your brain weighs the importance of all this data, filtering out the relatively unimportant. This screening function is what allows you to focus and operate effectively in your world. The brain functions differently than other organs. There is an intelligence to it, the ability to reason, to produce feelings, to dream and plan, to take action, and relate to other people.

The eye can distinguish among seven million colors. It has automatic focusing and handles an astounding 1.5 million messages – simultaneously. The false theory of evolution focuses on mutations and changes from and within existing organisms. Yet evolution alone does not explain the initial source of the eye or the brain – the start of living organisms from nonliving matter.

The universe had a start. Scientists are convinced that our universe began with one enormous explosion of energy and light, which we now call the Big Bang. This was the singular start to everything that exists: the beginning of the universe, the start of space, and even the initial start of time itself. Astrophysicist Robert Jastrow, a self-described agnostic, stated, "The seed of everything that has happened in the Universe was planted in that first instant; every star, every planet and every living creature in the Universe came into being as a result of events that were set in motion in the moment of the cosmic explosion...The Universe flashed into being, and we cannot find out what caused that to happen." Steven Weinberg, a Nobel laureate in Physics, said at the moment of this explosion, "the universe was about a hundred thousand million degrees Centigrade...and the universe was filled with light." The universe has not always existed. It had a start...what caused that? Scientists have no explanation for the sudden explosion of light and matter.

The universe operates by uniform laws of nature. Much of life may seem uncertain, but look at what we can count on day after day: gravity remains consistent, a hot cup of coffee left on a counter will get cold, the earth's day is the same 24 hours every day, and the speed of light doesn't change – on earth or in galaxies far from us. How is it that we can identify laws of nature that *never* change? The universe is so orderly, and so reliable that a designer is the only reasonable explanation for it. "The greatest scientists have been struck by how strange this is. There is no logical necessity for a universe that obeys rules, let alone one that abides by the rules of mathematics. This astonishment springs from the recognition that the universe doesn't have to behave this way. It is easy to imagine a universe in which conditions change unpredictably from instant to instant, or even a universe in which things pop in and out of existence." Richard Feynman, a Nobel Prize winner for quantum

electrodynamics, said, "Why nature is mathematical is a mystery...The fact that there are rules at all is a kind of miracle."

The DNA code informs and programs a cell's behavior. All instruction, all teaching, all training comes with intent. Someone who writes an instruction manual does so with purpose. Did you know that in every cell of our bodies there exists a very detailed instruction code, much like a miniature computer program? As you may know, a computer program is made up of ones and zeros, like this:

110010101011000. The way they are arranged tell the computer program what to do. The DNA code in each of our cells is very similar. It's made up of four chemicals that scientists abbreviate as A, T, G, and C. These are arranged in the human cell like this: CGTGTGACTCGCTCCTGAT and so on. There are three billion of these letters in every human cell and there are about 100 trillion cells in a human body!

Well, just like you can program your phone to beep for specific reasons, DNA instructs the cell. DNA is a three-billion-lettered program telling the cell to act in a certain way. It is a full instruction manual and each cell has this program. Why is this so amazing? One has to ask...how did this information program wind up in each human cell? These are not just chemicals. These are chemicals that instruct, that code in a very detailed way exactly how the person's body should develop. Natural, biological causes are completely lacking as an explanation when programmed information is involved. You cannot find instruction, precise information like this, without someone intentionally constructing it.

Richard Dawkins, one of the more known atheistic authors in the 21st century actually agreed that Intelligent Design could be behind the creation of DNA. He was asked in an interview by Ben Stein: "What do you think is the possibility that intelligent design might turn out to be the answer to some issues in genetics or in evolution?" Dawkins answered: "Well, it could come about in the following way. It could be that at some earlier time, somewhere in the universe, a civilization evolved by probably some kind of Darwinian means to a very very high level of technology and designed the form of life that they seeded onto perhaps this planet. That is a possibility and an intriguing possibility. And I suppose it is possible that you might find evidence for that if you look at the details of bio-chemistry, molecular biology, you might find a signature of some sort of Designer." Ben Stein said: "Wait a second, Richard Dawkins thought intelligent design might be a legitimate pursuit?" Dawkins continued: "And that Designer could well be a higher intelligence from elsewhere in the universe. But that higher intelligence would have self had to come about by some explicable or ultimately explicable process. It couldn't just have

jumped into existence spontaneously. And that's the point." Ben Stein concludes: "So Professor Dawkins was not against intelligent design, just certain types of designers such as God."

This is a very interesting 5-minute video clip from the documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* by Ben Stein. We recommend this interesting documentary. In this short clip, we see that Richard Dawkins, the notorious atheist and promoter of evolution, admits that scientific evidence could suggest intelligent design. However, Dawkins says that the evidences of design might have come from some "evolved" alien civilization which did the designing. Okay, so the evidence might show intelligent design, according to Dawkins, as long one doesn't think that God is the designer... very interesting. This is quite an admission by the well known atheist.

Despite his learning and his pretension to intellectual sophistication, Richard Dawkins is actually a wicked fool (see Psalm 52:1). In one simple five-minute interview, his arguments against the existence of God (the Intelligent Designer) crumble as he contradicts himself. This, of course, shows how atheists knows that life is designed but that they with free will choose to lie in order to escape having to think about the laws and judgments of God. The reader should be able to see that atheists are actually arguing from a position that everyone, including themselves, are insane. Atheists claim that while everything in nature and the universe looks designed, it only looks that way without actually being designed. This is a perfect description of insanity or mental illness. Insane or mentally ill people constantly imagine that things are not as they seem, and atheists, fitting perfectly in their category, run with and take this frightful and incoherent insanity as their maxim, agreeing that their senses are plagued by insanity, playing tricks on themselves, not being able to trust their own senses, even though everything in nature points to a Creator. Thus, it is shown how atheists actually incriminate themselves, confessing themselves to be insane and their world-view, to be literal insanity. If everything in this world looks designed, the logical conclusion can only be that a Designer with Intelligence created it. To say otherwise is to be patently insane.

2. The Cosmological Argument

Everything that begins to exist has to have a cause. This is rooted in the metaphysical idea that being cannot come from non-being. Out of nothing, nothing comes. What this argument will get you to, is an uncaused eternal cause that never came into being. And that is God. The key premise here is to demonstrate that the universe began to exist, because if the universe began to exist, it follows logically

that the universe had a cause. There are other versions of The Cosmological Argument that does not depend on the universe coming into being. Why is there something rather than nothing? All have wondered about this, and think that there must be some ultimate explanation of reality. And that is a very plausible explanation that everything that exist has to have some kind of explanation until you get to an absolutely self existent being which is self existent, that is, not explained by anything outside of itself. Atheists will often state: “Who created God”, but what they fail to see is that this creates an impossible situation, for this would mean that one must continue to state: “Who created he who created God” and so on into infinity. To ask who created God is an illogical question since there must be a first mover of everything; for if everything that happens depends on another thing, there is an infinite regression, that is, an endless number of causes for every new cause, which is impossible and illogical. Something must always have existed and have been uncreated, and that is God.

1. The origin of the universe.

Have you ever asked yourself where the universe came from? Why anything at all exists? Typically, atheists have said that the universe is just eternal and uncaused. But there are good reasons, both philosophical and scientific which call that assumption into question. Philosophically, the idea of an infinite past is very problematic. If the universe never had a beginning, that means that the number of past events in the history of the universe is infinite. But the real existence of an actually infinite number of things leads to metaphysical absurdities. For example, suppose you had an infinite number of coins: number 1, 2, 3 and so on to infinity. And I took away all the odd number coins. How many coins would you have left? Well, you still would have all the even numbered coins, or an infinity of coins. So infinity, minus infinity, is infinity. But now suppose instead that I took away all of the coins numbered greater than 3. Now how many coins would you have left? Three coins of course. So infinity, minus infinity, is three. In each case I took away an identical number of coins from an identical number of coins and came up with contradictory results. In fact, you can subtract infinity from infinity and get any answer from zero to infinity. For this reason, inverse operations like subtractions and division are simply prohibited in transfinite arithmetic. But in the real world, no such convention has any sway. Obviously, you can give away whatever coins you wish. This and many other examples suggests that infinity is just an idea in your mind, not something that exists in the physical reality. But that entails that past events since they are just not ideas but are real, must be finite in number. Therefore the series of past events cannot go back forever. Rather, the universe must have

begun to exist.

This conclusion has been confirmed by remarkable discoveries in astronomy and astrophysics. We now have pretty strong evidence that the universe is not eternal in the past, but had an absolute beginning, a finite time ago. In 2003, Arvin Borde, Alan Guth and Alexander Vilenkin, were able to prove that any universe which is on average in a state of cosmic expansion throughout its history cannot be infinite in the past, but must have a past space time boundary. What makes their proof so powerful is that it holds regardless of the physical description of the very early universe. Because we don't yet have a quantum theory of gravity, we are not able to provide a physical description of the first split second of the early universe. But the Borde, Guth, Vilenkin theorem is independent of any such physical description of that moment. Their theorem implies that the quantum vacuum state of the early universe which some popularizers have misleadingly and inaccurately characterized as nothing cannot be eternal in the past but must have had an absolute beginning. Even if our universe is just a tiny part of a so called multiverse composed of many universes, their theorem requires that the multiverse itself must have a beginning. Of course, highly speculative scenarios, like loop quantum gravity models, string models, even closed time like curves have been proposed to try to avoid this absolute beginning. However, these models are fraught with problems, and the bottom line is that none of these theories even if true succeed in restoring an eternal past universe. At most, they just push the beginning back a step. But then the inevitable question arises: Why did the universe come into being? What brought the universe into existence? Some intrepid atheists have said that the universe just popped into being without a cause. But surely, that is metaphysically impossible. For such a conclusion is in the words of a philosopher of science in head on collision with the most successful ontological commitment in the history of science; namely the metaphysical principle that out of nothing, nothing comes. So, why does the universe exist instead of just nothing? Where did it come from? There must have been a transcendent cause which brought the universe into being.

We can summarize our argument as follows: 1. The universe began to exist. 2. If the universe began to exist, then the universe has a transcendent cause. 3. Therefore, the universe has a transcendent cause. Given the truth of the two premises, the conclusion necessarily follows.

Now from the very nature of the case, this cause must be an uncaused, changeless, timeless and immaterial being which created the universe. It must be uncaused because we have seen that there cannot be an infinite regress of causes. It must be

timeless and therefore changeless at least without the universe because it created time. Because it also created space, it must transcend space as well, and therefore be immaterial and not physical. Now, there are only two possible candidates that could possibly fit such a description. Either an abstract object like a number or else an unembodied mind or consciousness. But abstract objects don't stand in causal relationships. The number 7 for example can't cause anything and therefore it follows logically that the transcendent cause of the universe is an unembodied mind. And thus we are brought not merely to an uncaused cause of the universe, but to its personal Creator.

2. The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life.

In recent decades, scientists have been stunned by the discovery that the initial conditions of the Big Bang were fine-tuned for the existence of intelligent life with a delicacy and precision that literally defy human comprehension. This fine-tuning is of two sorts. First, one of the laws of nature are expressed as mathematical equations; you find in them certain constants like the gravitational constant. These constants are not determined by the laws of nature. Second, in addition to these constants, there are certain arbitrary quantities which are just put in as initial conditions on which the laws of nature operate. For example, the amount of entropy in the early universe. Now, all of these constants and quantities fall into an extraordinarily narrow range of life-permitting values. Were these constants or quantities to be altered by less than a hairs breadth, the life-permitting balance would be destroyed and life would not exist. We now know that life-prohibiting universes are incomprehensibly more probable than any life-permitting universe.

Now, there are only three possible explanations of this extraordinary fine-tuning and these three possible explanations are physical necessity, chance, or design.

It can't be due to physical necessity because as we have seen, the constants and quantities are independent of the laws of nature. So, maybe the fine-tuning is due to chance? After all, highly improbable events happen every day. But what serves to distinguish chance events from design is not simply enormous improbability but also the presence of an independently given pattern to which the event conforms. For example: In the movie "Contact", scientists are able to distinguish a signal from outer space from random noise – not just by its improbability – but by its conforming to the pattern of the prime numbers. The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life exhibits just that kind of combination of incomprehensible improbability and an independently given pattern that are the earmarks of design.

Hence, we have good reason to think that the fine-tuning is not due to either physical necessity or chance, from which we may conclude therefore it is due to design. And thus the fine-tuning of the universe implies a designer of the cosmos.

3. The moral argument

If there is no God, then there really are no objective moral values and duties in the world. By objective moral values I mean values which are valid and binding independently of whether people believe in them or not. Many theists and atheists alike agree that if God does not exist, then moral values and duties are not objective in this sense. For example, Michael Russ, an agnostic and philosopher of science explains: “Morality is a biological adaptation no less than our hands or our feet and our teeth considered as a rational set of claims of an objective something. Ethics is illusory. Morality is just an aid to survival. Reproduction and any deeper meaning is illusory.”

On a naturalistic view, unless there is a God as an anchor point for moral values, moral values and duties are just the product of biological evolution, and on this view, without God, everything is relative. Human beings are just relatively evolved primates and moral values are just something we have evolved to get along in society without killing each other. According to this view, just as a group of baboons exhibits cooperative and even altruistic behavior because natural selection has determined it to be advantageous in the struggle for survival, so their primate cousin Homo Sapiens exhibits similar behavior for the same reason. As a result of socio-biological pressures there has evolved among Homo Sapiens a sort of herd morality which functions well in the perpetuation of our species. But on the atheistic view, there does not seem to be anything that makes morality objectively binding and true. But objective moral values and duties do exist.

What this illogical world view will get you, is that if everyone on earth said that raping, murdering, and torturing people for fun was moral and good, then it was not really evil at all but actually good and moral. Thus, in this evil world view, one could actually call rape, murder and torture of others for fun moral, good and praiseworthy actions as long as all agrees with it. Evil and good are just illusory in this worldview, and every man makes up what morality is by himself. Any argument that an atheist could give for denying the objective reality of moral values, one could construct a parallel argument for being skeptical about objective reality of the external world. Just as atheists believe that the physical reality exists, so all of them

also knows that morality exists. If we trust our sensory intuition that there is a world of objects independent of us out there, we don't have any grounds for distrusting our moral intuition of the realm of objective values. The man who says that it is morally acceptable to rape little children is just as mistaken as the man who says $2+2=5$. Many things are really wrong. But then it follows logically and inescapably that God exists. Some people think that the evil in the world disproves the existence of God, but it is obvious that it is the exact opposite that is true. Real evil in the world actually serves to prove the existence of God since without God to ground objective moral values and duties, good and evil as such would not exist.

Many countries in the world have held and do hold evil and immoral views. A good example is atheistic communism who killed 100 million people during the 20th century. According to the atheistic and naturalistic worldview, they would have to agree that these communists who killed and tortured millions of people actually did no wrong at all. What atheists must claim if they hold that there is no moral law that applies to all of humanity is that rape, murder, pedophilia, torturing others for fun etc., are not really wrong, evil or immoral in itself, but that we humans have only made it wrong in order for society to continue. It is safe to say that whoever holds such a despicable worldview is obviously contradicting his God-given conscience and is a complete liar. All humans above the age of reason clearly have a conscience that tells them that some things are good and other things are evil, and so, the moral argument shows that there must be a cause of why all humans have a conscience that teaches them that there are moral and immoral actions. That cause must be God. All humans understands and knows that some things are good and evil from the golden rule, which states that a person shall not do unto another what he himself does not want suffer.

The truth is, atheists aren't atheists because the evidence for atheism is overwhelming. It's not that they have sincerely looked into it and just can't bring themselves to believe in the claims of Christianity. They don't want to listen to or consider any Christian claims because they don't want to accept Christian morality. They don't want a higher power telling them what they should and shouldn't do. They don't want to curb their sexual appetites and greed and selfishness. They don't want to feel guilty for doing wrong. How does one avoid the guilt that comes from doing wrong? One must insist that there is no such thing as absolute morality, no such thing as objective right and wrong. Atheism is simply the easiest means to that end. Consider the words of Thomas Nagel, a famous atheist philosopher.

“In speaking of the fear of religion, I don't mean to refer to the entirely reasonable

hostility toward certain established religions and religious institutions, in virtue of their objectionable moral doctrines, social policies, and political influence. Nor am I referring to the association of many religious beliefs with superstition and the acceptance of evident empirical falsehoods. I am talking about something much deeper—namely, the fear of religion itself. I speak from experience, being strongly subject to this fear myself: 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. It isn't just that I don't believe in God and, naturally, hope that I'm right in my belief. It's that I hope there is no God! I don't want there to be a God; I don't want the universe to be like that.” (“The Last Word” by Thomas Nagel, Oxford University Press: 1997)”

And one last one from Aldous Huxley.

“I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in metaphysics, he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do, or why his friends should not seize political power and govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves... For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual and political.” — Aldous Huxley in *Ends and Means*, 1937

Lack of Evidence

Atheist positions seem to fall into two main categories. The first is the lack-of-evidence category where the atheist asserts that the supporting evidence isn't good enough for him to affirm God's existence. The second is the category where the atheist believes that the idea of God's existence is illogical and contrary to the evidence at hand. To simplify, one position says there isn't enough evidence to conclude that God exists, and the other position says the evidence is contrary to God's existence. For those atheists who simply lack belief and exercise no energy in the discussion, neither category applies because they are not involved in the debate. But, some of those who claim to lack belief in God are often involved in discussions where they are arguing against God's existence.

However, in discussions with atheists, you won't hear any evidence for the validity of atheism. There are no "proofs" that God does not exist in atheist circles; at least,

none that I have heard – especially since you can't prove a negative regarding the existence of God. Of course, that isn't to say that atheists haven't attempted to offer some proofs that God does not exist. But their attempted proofs are invariably insufficient. After all, how do you prove there is no God in the universe? How do you prove that in all dimensions, places and times, there is no God? You can't. Besides, if there was proof of God's non-existence, then atheists would be continually using it. But we don't hear of any such commonly held proof supporting atheism or denying the existence of God. For the sake of argument, even if you could prove that there is no God in the physical universe, how could one prove that God is not in another dimension? It is obvious that it is impossible to prove that there is no God. Therefore, since there are no proofs for atheism's truth, and there are no proofs that there is no God, the atheist must hold his position by faith. Faith, however, is not something atheists like to claim as the basis of adhering to atheism.

So atheism cannot be proven and must be accepted by faith. However, the Bible and the natural law (our conscience) teaches that God's existence is clearly seen in the universe (Psalm 19:1-4), in nature (Romans 1:18-22), and in our own hearts (Ecclesiastes 3:11). In other words, God is clearly proven by His creation.

Death and the moment of truth: How atheists and infidels die

However much atheists and infidels want to protract their death and continue to live in defiance of God's laws, God have put a definite limit on all mankind's actions so that even those of the most despicable and lying kind of atheists and infidels should be helped by the fear of death to become honest and once again assess the evidence for God's existence. Even if God's existence was only somewhat possible, (which is not true since He is proven to exist by His creation through irrefutable mathematical evidence) atheists should do all in their power to ascertain whether there is some possibility that God exist. The frightful last word testimony below of different sorts of famous atheists and infidels who changed their mind about God's existence on their death beds should sober any mind, and help them to look at the evidence once more in true honesty and without any bias. This life is frightfully short, while eternity is frightfully long, and thus, any rational mind should seriously consider that however much they may act as if God does not exist, they shall die sooner or later. A man may live a lie, but his death bed tells the truth. The quotations before us show us how atheists and infidels (however famous or learned) willfully rejects and lies about God's existence only until they know that they must meet Him. Aristotle wrote truly that: "Death is a dreadful thing, for it is the end!" John Donne, the English author, wrote: "Death is a bloody conflict and no victory at

last; a tempestuous sea, and no harbor at last; a slippery height and no footing; a desperate fall and no bottom!" Rousseau cried, "No man dares to face death without fear."

Sir Francis Newport, the head of an English Atheist club to those gathered around his deathbed: "You need not tell me there is no God for I know there is one, and that I am in His presence! You need not tell me there is no hell. I feel myself already slipping. Wretches, cease your idle talk about there being hope for me! I know I am lost forever! Oh, that fire! Oh, the insufferable pangs of hell! ...Oh, that I could lie for a thousand years upon the fire that is never quenched, to purchase the favor of God and be united to Him again. But it is a fruitless wish. Millions and millions of years will bring me no nearer the end of my torments than one poor hour. Oh, eternity, eternity forever and forever!, Oh, the insufferable pangs of Hell!"

Voltaire, the most influential atheist of Europe in his day, who often stated that "by the time I'm buried, the Bible will be non-existent" cried out with his dying breath in horrifying desperation: "I am abandoned by God and man; I will give you half of what I am worth if you will give me six months' life." (He said this to Dr. Fochin, who told him it could not be done.) "Then I shall die and go to hell!" His nurse said: "For all the money in Europe I wouldn't want to see another unbeliever die! All night long he cried for forgiveness."

Sir Thomas Scott, Chancellor of England: "Until this moment I thought there was neither a God nor a hell. Now I know and feel that there are both, and I am doomed to perdition by the just judgment of the Almighty."

In a Newsweek interview with Svetlana Stalin, the daughter of satanic mass murderer **Josef Stalin** who is estimated to have murdered over 50 million people, she told of her father's death: "My father died a difficult and terrible death... God grants an easy death only to the just... At what seemed the very last moment he suddenly opened his eyes and cast a glance over everyone in the room. It was a terrible glance, insane or perhaps angry and full of fear of death... His left hand was raised, as though he were pointing to something above and bringing down a curse on us all. The gesture was full of menace... The next moment he was dead."

Anton LaVey, author of the Satanic Bible and high priest of the religion dedicated to the worship of Satan. Some of his famous quotes are "There is a beast in man that needs to be exercised, not exorcised". His dying words were "Oh my, oh my, what have I done, there is something very wrong...there is something very wrong...."

Thomas Hobbes, the political philosopher and skeptic who corrupted many of England's men: "If I had the whole world, I would give anything to live one day. I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at. I am about to take a fearful leap in the dark!"

M.F. Rich: "Terrible horrors hang over my soul! I have given my immortality for gold; and its weight sinks me into a hopeless, helpless Hell!"

Thomas Payne the leading infidel writer in American colonies: "Stay with me, for God's sake; I cannot bear to be left alone, O Lord, help me! O God, what have I done to suffer so much? What will become of me hereafter? "I would give worlds if I had them, that The Age of Reason had never been published. O Lord, help me! Christ, help me! ...No, don't leave; stay with me! Send even a child to stay with me; for I am on the edge of Hell here alone. If ever the Devil had an agent, I have been that one."

David Hume, atheist philosopher famous for his philosophy of empiricism and skepticism of religion, he cried loud on his death bed "I am in flames!" It is said his "desperation was a horrible scene".

David Strauss, leading representative of German rationalism, after spending a lifetime erasing belief in God from the minds of others: "My philosophy leaves me utterly forlorn! I feel like one caught in the merciless jaws of an automatic machine, not knowing at what time one of its great hammers may crush me!"

Talleyrand (called the most brilliant mind in Europe of his dupes) when asked about his condition while on his deathbed replied: "I am suffering the pangs of the damned."

Sir Julian Huxley, English evolutionist, biologist and staunch atheist, on his deathbed: "So it is true after all, so it is true after all."

Adams, the infidel said: "I'm lost, lost, lost. I am damned forever." His agony was so great that as he died, he tore the hair from his head.

Christine Hewitt, Jamaican journalist and entertainer was quoted: "The Bible was the worst book ever written." Shortly thereafter, in June 2006, she was found, burned beyond recognition in her automobile.

Deathbed conversions are extremely rare

The Bible which ranges over a period of six thousand years records but one instance of a deathbed conversion (the penitent thief that died beside Jesus on the cross).

“For what is your life? It is a vapour which appeareth for a little while, and afterwards shall vanish away.” (James 4:15)

None of us knows how much time we have left in this life or what the circumstances of our death will be. We may die in a sudden, unexpected manner that will preclude even a possibility of a deathbed conversion. The only reasonable option is to repent and believe in Jesus Christ today. Many people die without having the experience of an extended amount of time on a death bed. Many people die instantly and unexpectedly, with no opportunity to repent and ask God to forgive their sins.

Below is an interesting quote from St. Alphonsus concerning the idea of conversion to the Catholic Faith at the end of one’s life. Although these types of conversions are possible, they are extremely rare. St. Alphonsus states that these types of conversions proceed out of necessity, and that it would be very difficult for God to pardon such a person: “He that lives in sin till death shall die in sin. “You shall die in your sin.” (John 8:21.) It is true that, in whatsoever hour the sinner is converted, God promises to pardon him; but to no sinner has God promised the grace of conversion at the hour of death. “Seek the Lord while he may be found.” (Isaiah 55:6.) Then, there is for some sinners a time when they shall seek God and shall not find him. “You shall seek me, and shall not find me.” (John 7:34.) The unhappy beings will go to confession at the hour of death; they will promise and weep, and ask mercy of God, but without knowing what they do. A man who sees himself under the feet of a foe pointing a dagger to his throat, will shed tears, ask pardon, and promise to serve his enemy as a slave during the remainder of his life. But, will the enemy believe him? No; he will feel convinced that his words are not sincere—that his object is to escape from his hands, and that, should he be pardoned, he will become more hostile than ever. In like manner, how can God pardon the dying sinner, when he sees that all his acts of sorrow, and all his promises, proceed not from the heart, but from a dread of death and of approaching damnation.” (Sermon 38: On the death of the sinner, par. 8)

All knows that God exists

We know God exists because he pursues us. He is constantly initiating and seeking for us to come to him. For many atheists, the issue of people believing in God

bothers them greatly. What is it about atheists that would make them spend so much time, attention, and energy refuting something that they don't believe even exists?! What causes them to do that? Many atheists attributes their intentions as caring for those poor, delusional people...to help them realize their hope was completely ill-founded. But there also many that have other motives.

As a former atheist stated: "As I challenged those who believed in God, I was deeply curious to see if they could convince me otherwise. Part of my quest was to become free from the question of God. If I could conclusively prove to believers that they were wrong, then the issue is off the table, and I would be free to go about my life. I didn't realize that the reason the topic of God weighed so heavily on my mind was because God was pressing the issue. I have come to find out that God wants to be known. He created us with the intention that we would know him. He has surrounded us with evidence of himself and he keeps the question of his existence squarely before us. It was as if I couldn't escape thinking about the possibility of God. In fact, the day I chose to acknowledge God's existence, my prayer began with, "Ok, you win..." It might be that the underlying reason atheists are bothered by people believing in God is because God is actively pursuing them."

In truth, the underlying reason atheists are bothered by people believing in God is because God is actively pursuing them. Countless of people have endured this scourge on their consciences and thought to themselves that "I had a notion that somehow, besides questing, I was being pursued."

The ultimate of statistics is this – that one out of every one; dies. "And it is appointed unto man once to die, but after this the judgment." (Hebrews 9:27) Death is a certainty for which we must make preparation, or else suffer the consequence. As we think upon these LAST WORDS OF ATHEISTS, INFIDELS AND SINNERS, it naturally brings us all to an important question. It is a sobering and for some even a frightening thought, but one which ought to be considered thoughtfully and at length by each of us. – WHAT WILL YOUR LAST WORD BE?

THE BAD NEWS

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so DEATH PASSED UPON ALL MEN, FOR THAT ALL HAVE SINNED:" (Romans 5:12)

THE GOOD NEWS

“For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John 3:16) Jesus Christ died on the cross in our place, making the required payment for our sins. He offers salvation free to all – the price has been paid in full. In order to have Christ’s payment applied to our account, we must ‘receive Him’ by repenting of all our sins and becoming a member of His Church and by following all his Commandments. If we sincerely do so, we have His promise; “I will come in.”

Common Objections Against God's Existence Refuted

Objection 1: The Argument from Evil. "A typical argument posed by an atheist to show why God does not exist is as follows: God is supposed to be all good and all powerful. Evil and suffering exist in the world. If God is all good he would not want evil and suffering to exist. If He is all powerful then He is able to remove all evil and suffering. Since evil and suffering exist, God is either not all good (which means he is not perfect and not God), or he is not all powerful (and limited in abilities and scope). Since all these examples shows God is not all good and powerful, then He does not exist."

Answer to Objection 1: The answer to this objection is very simple and a few questions to the atheist will show the falsity and incoherence of this objection. First question to the atheist: "When you say that there is such a thing as good, aren't you assuming that there is such a thing as evil?" The atheist will answer: "That is correct." Second question to the atheist: "When you say there is such a thing as evil, aren't you assuming there is such a thing as a moral law on the basis of which to differentiate between good and evil ? The atheist will answer: "That is correct."

Based on these two answers, we can see that if a person posit such a thing as a moral law, they must also posit a moral law giver, but that's precisely whom atheists are trying to disprove. If there is no moral law giver, there's no moral law. If there's no moral law, there's no good. If there's no good, there's no evil. The atheistic objection from **The Argument from Evil** self destructs unless there is a God. One cannot explain the reality of evil without the existence of God. We have thus established that the question does not negate the existence of God. The very argument that the atheists uses proves the existence of God.

First, is the atheist arguing that God and suffering are logically incompatible with each other? If he is, then he needs to show that there is some sort of implicit

contradiction there because there is no explicit contradiction. No atheist has ever been able to sustain that burden of proof to show that there are necessarily true assumptions that would reveal some kind of a contradiction between God and the suffering and evil in the world. In fact, we can prove that God and suffering are compatible by just adding a proposition, and that would be that God has morally sufficient reasons for permitting the evil. This shows that God and the existence of evil are logically compatible.

When the logical version of the atheistic argument has been shown to be erroneous, atheists will many times resort into claiming that while it is not logical, their argument is nevertheless highly probable. They will agree that God and the existence of evil are logically compatible but state that it is highly improbable that God exists given the evil and suffering in the world. There are a multitude of reasons of why God would want to create a world where evil and suffering may exist. One would be that God wants to create a world of free creatures who can become responsible moral agents and mature persons. And that will require a world that operates according to certain natural laws. The fire that warms you can also burn you, the water that sustains you can drown you. And this world would require the ability of creatures to be able to do morally evil acts. God permits these evil things with the overall goal in mind of bringing people freely into a knowledge of himself and to eternal salvation. The goal of this life is not happiness in this life. We are not God's pets. His goal is not to create a nice zoo for us here on earth. Rather, it is to bring persons into communion with Himself forever freely. And in order to be able to do this, a world suffused with natural and moral evil would be the correlative event, since free will must exist in man in order for him to be able to love God.

In an atheistic world-view, humans are only animals and have no inherent worth at all. Atheists many times claim that humans have some kind of worth, but atheism do not since according to it, we are only matter formed by chance, and matter formed by chance cannot be proven to have any worth according to atheism. Atheists are in fact borrowing from the Christian world-view when they claim or believe that humans have an inherent worth or dignity.

Of course, the problem is that the criticism is a false dichotomy. In other words, there are more than two possibilities; namely, God might have a reason for allowing evil and suffering; man's freedom might require the allowance of evil and suffering, etc. Since all that God made is good, even those things which appear evil only appear that way because of a limited context or perspective. When viewed as a whole, that which appears to be evil ultimately contributes to the greater good.

For example, certain virtues couldn't exist without evil: courage, mercy, forgiveness, patience, the giving of comfort, heroism, perseverance, faithfulness, self-control, long-suffering, submission and obedience, to name a few. These are not virtues in the abstract, but elements of character that can only be had by moral souls. Just as evil is a result of acts of will, so is virtue. Acts of moral choice accomplish both.

What good comes out of a drive-by killing, someone might ask, or the death of a teenager through overdose, or a daughter's rape, or child abuse? The answer is that a commensurate good doesn't always come perceptibly out of those individual situations, though God is certainly capable of redeeming any tragedy. Rather, the greater good results from having a world in which there is moral freedom, and moral freedom makes moral tragedies like these possible.

This observation reveals an interesting twist in this problem. If morality freely chosen can only happen in a world where evil is possible, then heaven will be a place where there will be no moral growth, where moral choices will not be made because all the inhabitants of heaven will be immutably good. Growth of the soul is only possible and available to inhabitants of an earthly or fallen world where they can do or endure evil acts or events. Simply described, God takes the earthly wish of saved humans to be with God in heaven and secures it, making their will to be with Him steadfast and unwavering when they enter Heaven.

A deeper, more profound good results when virtue is won by free, moral souls struggling with evil, rather than simply being granted to them as an element of their constitution. Love cannot exist without free will to choose evil. We would just be robots without choice if love was an action without any choice, and thus, this proves that a person must have a choice between good and evil in order to love. After a person dies and goes to heaven, his free will has decided to reject sin and to be with God forever, and God secures that person in this intention after death if a person is saved.

There's a sound reason why God has allowed man the freedom to choose evil. It doesn't conflict with His goodness. God is neither the author of evil, nor its helpless victim. Rather, precisely because of His goodness He chooses to co-exist with evil for a time, that His goodness may be all the more manifest in those who overcome it by freely choosing to do good and avoid evil.

Romans 8:28: "And we know that to them that love God, all things work together

unto good, to such as, according to his purpose, are called to be saints."

Scriptures also indicate that God is more likely to let true believers suffer so that our faith may be built up, to not give us riches so that we will not be trapped by them, and let us be persecuted so that we can be effective light and salt to the world. He has not changed His methods in the twenty first century from what He did in the first century. We are to be set apart to Him, crucified with Him daily. We are to nail to the cross the desires and appetites of the flesh, and learn to serve Him--in health or disease, in poverty or in wealth.

It is not always God's will to heal. Both the Scriptures and experience teach that God may use physical afflictions for refining, correcting, and chastening (Hebrews 12:3-11; Job 23:10). God's Word teaches that He can heal anyone, anytime, but that He does not heal everyone, every time. St. Paul learned this truth when God explained why his thrice repeated prayer for personal healing was not granted (2 Corinthians 12:1-10); and, also, when one of Paul's faithful helpers, Trophimus, was unable to accompany him because of sickness (2 Timothy 4:20). When we pray for healing for ourselves or others, we must never forget that such healing is always God's prerogative based upon what He knows is best for each of His children.

We must also remember that the constitution of the current world is not the same as it was when God originally created it. This event is documented in the Book of Genesis. The original sin of Adam and Eve brought death and suffering on the human race, and so, while many people think that God created the world like it is now, they are wrong in this respect since God created the world without death or suffering or any of the evil things we see in this world today. Man chose to cast himself into death and suffering when he rejected and disobeyed God's laws and commandments, and so, while many atheists think that Christians or Christianity claim that God created this fallen world, the fact of the matter is that the Bible clearly states that God created the world without any evil, death or suffering at all.

Many atheists, sad to say, criticize the Christian God since the world is so evil and defective, but they do not understand that God did not create any evil in the world. A good example of how this evil arose was that humans chose to soil their own clothes with filth. Now, there was a punishment because of this defilement, but God in no way wanted this to happen, but was forced to allow this punishment since God is not only love, but also justice.

Objection 2. The Argument from Non-belief and Lack-of-evidence: "1. If

God exists, He is all-loving, all-powerful, perfectly just, and He wishes for all to know Him personally. 2. If a person has reasonable non-belief and a Lack-of-evidence of God's existence, then they are not given a fair opportunity to know God. 3. If God exists, He has both the power and motive to abolish reasonable non-belief. 4. Reasonable non-belief occurs. 5. Therefore, God does not exist.”

Answer to Objection 2: Actually, this argument closely parallels another common argument used by Christians – Personal Experiences. Personal experiences are something that can be known only to the individual who has the experience. It may be evidence for the person, but it cannot be evidence for another individual. Likewise, then, though the Argument from Non-belief and Lack-of-evidence may be claimed to be evidence for the individual who feels that they have not been provided with an opportunity to know God, it can never be considered evidence to another person. Therefore, the Argument from Non-belief is totally useless as a means to disprove the existence of God to another person. It is impossible, in principle, for me to know whether or not a person's claimed reasonable non-belief or Lack-of-evidence is actual. Therefore, premise 4 which states that reasonable non-belief occurs, is unprovable.

Continuing to refute premises 2, 3 and 5: If a person were to see that God or Hell exists with all his senses and perceptions, he would fear to offend God too much, and thus, he would cease to sin not from the motive of love of God and goodness, but from the sole motive of fear. God desires us to love Him and do good, not only because we fear Him or Hell, but because we know by our conscience that doing good is right. If the thought of God or Hell was always on our mind at every moment, no one would do good for the sake of goodness itself, but only because he feared punishments. And doing good only because of fear is not good or meritorious. In order for choice and love to be able to exist, man must be able to be free in his ability to choose either good or evil. He must not feel forced to choose either goodness or evilness, but must stand in a kind of neutral place, not being swayed by either the good or the evil side, while being totally free to choose either good or evil. However, if the perfect knowledge of God's presence and Hell was always on this person's mind, no one would have this freedom of choice. All would just comply with God because of fear so that no good deeds would be made through a love of God, but only through a fear of God. A person must love God and goodness for its own inherent value in order to be saved since this is only what is right and just. To love goodness only because of fear is unreasonable and defective. Fearing hell or punishment is not love, but fear. Even the most evil pagan or atheist understands that a person does not love another if a person only fears him. But

where there is both true love and fear, all also understands that this person loves the other person.

This is not to say that one cannot use the thought of hell or other punishments of God as an incentive to stop sinning. Far from it. Psalms 110:10 states that "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. A good understanding to all that do it: his praise continueth for ever and ever." Fear of punishment is very conducive to a person's salvation, but if this fear is alone by itself without any love, it cannot save a person. All people recognize and admit that it's good to warn another person about evil earthly occurrences like tornadoes, tsunamis and hurricanes so that they may be able to rescue themselves and their families from these disasters. This is exactly what the fear of God is, that is, a warning of what will happen with those who sin against their conscience. The Christian Church has always held that a person who only possess a fear of God or punishments cannot be saved. A person must both love and fear God in order to be saved according to God's word. This is better explained in the Christian doctrine of perfect and imperfect contrition.

It would also be totally unreasonable if another world or afterlife did not exist, since there are so much evil in this world. Both atheists and believers of God knows that evil deeds deserve a punishment. But many people who commit evil deeds in this life are never punished or are punished in a way that is not just or right for their crimes. Thus, for human existence to be moral, there must be a judgment in the afterlife.

Objection 3. The Argument from Physical Minds or the argument based on the mind-brain connection: "1. If God existed, we would have an immaterial soul that is independent of the brain. 2. The mind or soul is entirely dependent upon the brain or the body. Two versions of the argument have important implications for the philosophy of religion. The first is the *mortalistic* argument from physical minds, which runs as follows: If a nonphysical mind (rather than the brain) does our thinking, then altering the brain (say by lobotomy) should have no effect on one's ability to think. But, in fact, altering the brain does (often dramatically) affect one's ability to think. Therefore, thinking is probably not something done by a nonphysical mind, but rather something that the brain does. And since the brain is destroyed by death, thinking – or one's mind as a whole – is probably destroyed by death too."

"The second version, the *atheistic argument from physical minds*, runs as follows: Since all known mental activity has a physical basis, there are probably no disembodied minds. But God is conceived of as a disembodied mind. Therefore,

God probably does not exist."

Answer to Objection 3: The answer to the 1st premise of the above objection is that it is pure speculation. We have no way of knowing, apart from experience what sort of creatures God would create if He existed. In fact, if the atheistic argument against the possibility of mind body interaction are correct, then it is logically impossible for there to be creatures composed of mind and body. So we could hardly expect that God would do the logically impossible. And thus, if his argument for his second premise are correct, then the first premise is necessarily false. And so this argument is literally self-refuting. One premise refutes the other. Moreover, the 2nd premise that the mind or soul is entirely dependent upon the brain or the body goes far beyond the evidence. At best, the evidence shows a correlation of mental events and brain events but not dependency. Worse though is that this premise is self-defeating. For if the mind is entirely dependent upon the body, then causation between mind and body is a one way street. The body can effect the mind, but the mind cannot effect the body and that is incompatible with freedom of the will. Everything you believe is determined by the physical stimuli that you receive through your body. But then, what about the belief of atheists that their 2nd premise is true? In that case, his belief is not the result of rational reflection or choice on his part but rather, it is just physically determined for him. His believing it is no more rational than his having a headache. And so, this premise is incapable of being rationally affirmed, and so it is literally self-defeating.

The Argument from Physical Minds is illogical because the mind, soul or spirit of man cannot be perceived or seen in this life. Since the soul is not physical, it is impossible to disprove its existence. Thus, this argument is erroneous and proven to be false. The soul speaks through the vessel of the body, and uses the body as a kind of message device. If this message device is incapacitated or altered, it cannot function properly and the soul cannot communicate properly. A person who suffers from some kind of brain deformity or illness, thus suffers from a defective communication device, and this makes them unable to communicate properly. They are very much like a person that is asleep or tired. They are unconscious or semiconscious. As long as a person exist on this earth, all of their reasoning powers and thinking must go through the brain. One could say that the human brain is very much like a computer, (although infinitely more complex) and that the soul communicates with the brain just like computers communicate with each other. And this is in fact what science has proven: In an astonishing new study, scientists at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), have imaged human and monkey brains and found that the pathways in our brains — the connections between neurons —

are almost perfectly grid-like like a computer. Scientists are now creating computer chips based on the human brain, and as all should know by now, computers are not created by chance but by Intelligent Design, again showing us that the human brain and body is an amazing and complex creation of God. Not only that, scientists have also discovered that the brain is able to communicate with other objects and they predict that people in the future will be able to upload information to their brains just like a computer. This newly found scientific fact of the ability of the brain to communicate with objects have also helped amputees to gain the control of artificially made limbs through mere willpower. The brain is almost an exact replica of a computer, working both as a receiver and sender of information. Simply said, the brain receives information from the soul and transmits it to our physical body so that we can think and act.

Atheists and agnostics generally assume that personality originates from within the brain as a byproduct of the bio-electrical impulses that make this marvelous piece of circuitry function, which makes the personality nothing more than the byproduct of the cells that make up the brain and a reflection of the wider environment that brain finds itself in. If this is the case, however, then how is it possible that something which is not in and of itself intelligent or self-aware—the cells of the human brain—can collectively create that which is intelligent and self-aware? In other words, where do the individual cells that make up the brain acquire the consciousness that makes personality possible in the first place? This is a case of getting something from nothing.

Objection 4. The argument from religious confusion: "According to the argument from religious confusion, or problem of religious diversity, if God or some other supernatural being had the ability and desire to ensure that human beings understood the truth about such perennial matters, we would expect that being to reveal those truths widely and unequivocally. However, the existence of far-reaching religious confusion betrays the absence of any such revelation. Consequently, the existence of any such revelatory being—including God—is highly unlikely. (Note the related argument from reasonable non-belief.) When the focus of such an argument is widespread confusion about morality, it is occasionally called an argument from ethical confusion.

A related argument from contrariety, first developed by David Hume in his mid-18th-century *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, notes that the contrary claims of competing religions are mutually exclusive and thus cannot all be true. Moreover, the testimonial "evidence" for the truth of any one religion (whether

understood as testimony for the occurrence of public miracles or private religious experiences) is on an equal footing with the contrary testimonial evidence for any other religion (such that the clash of equally credible testimonies yields a "he said, she said" situation). Since there are a multitude of competing religions, and thus a multitude of (absent anything better than testimony) equally credible yet contrary testimonies, the probability that any given religion is true—and thus that any religion at all is true—is extraordinarily low. Consequently, it is highly probable that all religions are false. Although an argument from contrariety can be combined with an argument from religious confusion to demonstrate the probable nonexistence of God, it does not have to be; an argument from contrariety stands on its own as a strong argument for the falsity of all religions."

Answer to Objection 4: This argument holds no weight since it makes the false assumption that people deserve to know about and believe in God and his one true religion. But this assumption is not based on facts but on an unprovable assumption. There's no way to prove that people deserve to know about certain facts about God. In fact, the evidence speaks to the exact opposite. Most people are not good but commit sins daily, and that is the reason why God leaves them in a false religion.

It is obviously unreasonable and illogical to claim that a person should be allowed to enter into communion or friendship with a Being who they claim is a liar and deceiver. God is the fount of morality, and any person who will be allowed to enter the true religion must also follow those sets of rules of morality that their God-given conscience tells them about. Unless they do so, they, by their own evil action of calling God a liar and deceiver, shut down communication with God. It is only logical that a person who rejects their God-given conscience (and by this calling God a liar and deceiver) should not be able to continue to receive more information about God and how to be his friend. This is not say that all those who receive the true religion is necessarily good, but only that a person who does not receive information about the true religion during his earthly life rejected his God given conscience and was evil.

There are two moral laws that God has provided to us humans. The first is the natural law, and no one above the age of reason can be excused if they sin against or reject it. Some commonly known sins against the natural law are rape, pedophilia and murder, but there are countless more. Thus, all who commit such sins against the natural law or who claim that they are right to do are inexcusable, since these moral laws are imprinted on our hearts.

The second law is the theological law, and it explains such things which cannot be known or understood by us in this life from our natural knowledge, like how the spiritual world operates, or how the physical reality came into being. All persons who wish to enter into communion or friendship with God must first follow the natural law that their God-given conscience tells them about, and if they do so, they are then allowed by God's grace to find the true religion. A person may be innocently in error on some points of the theological law and be able to contradict it without sin if he has not been informed about it since the theological law is not automatically known by man's nature like the natural law but only by external revelation, but he can never contradict or act against the natural law without sinning and offending God. This person who unknowingly contradicts the theological law is called a material heretic in theological definitions. He errs materially, but not with knowledge of his error and that is why he can be excused. However, a person can never be a material heretic against the natural law since his conscience always tells him that certain deeds are evil. Therefore, all those who reject or sin against the natural law are always evil, guilty and inexcusable.

The relationship between God and a person who are left in unbelief can be easily summed up like this: 1. God tells a person to follow and agree with His natural law. 2. Those who refuse to do so, are calling God a liar and deceiver. 3. Those people who refuse to follow or agree with the natural law imprinted on their hearts break the communication with God by this action of calling God a liar and deceiver. 4. By their own action of rejecting the natural law, those who refuse to follow it shuts down their own ability to know about or believe in the theological law which tells about God's religion in more specificity. A person who follows the natural law will always be informed of the true religion before his death. But this is of course only common sense. If a person calls another person a deceiver and liar, he is showing hostility towards him and the relationship is not suitable to continue. To state otherwise is to be utterly illogical.

Objection 5. Complexity does not imply a Creator or Designer and the question of who created God: “The temptation to attribute the appearance of design to a designer is a false one, because the designer hypothesis immediately raises the larger problem of who designed the designer. One can only assume that God must have at least as much complexity as anything He is supposed to have designed. Given the theist’s assumption that complexity requires a designer, God’s own complexity implies that He also had a designer. Either the theist is arguing for an infinite regress of God-designers and designers of God-designers, etc., or he is

contradicting his own assumption that complexity requires design. By using God as an “explanation” the theist is doing nothing more than explaining complexity (in living things) with complexity (God’s). But this amounts to assuming what one is trying to explain, which is no explanation at all. It just moves the mystery back a step.”

Answer to Objection 5: In order to recognize that an explanation (x1) is the best, you don't need an explanation (x2) of explanation (x1). You don't need an explanation (x2) of explanation (x1) in order to realize that explanation (x1) is the best. This is an elementary point in the philosophy of science. For example, if archeologists were digging in the earth, and they came across objects that were shaped like arrowheads and pottery shards, and tomahawks and so on and so forth, can you imagine one of the archeologists saying: “Look how the processes of metamorphoses and sedimentation have formed these uncanny objects.” Of course not. They would immediately recognize that these were artifacts and products of intelligent design of some unknown people group in the past. Now, in order to recognize the best explanation of these artifacts, the archeologists don't need to be able to explain who the people group was, where they came from, what their origin was, or anything of that sort. The archeologists may have no explanation of this unknown people group who produced the artifacts, and yet it's clear that these artifacts are best explained, not by metamorphoses and sedimentation but by intelligent design.

Or again, not to claim that extraterrestrials exist, but for the sake of argument, what if astronauts were to find on the backside of the moon a pile of machinery there that had not been left by an American astronaut or a Russian cosmonaut? What would be the best explanation for that complex machinery? Well, clearly it would be some sort of extraterrestrial intelligence that had left the machinery there. And you don't have to have an explanation of who these extraterrestrials were, or where they came from, or how they got there, or anything of that sort in order to recognize that the best explanation of this machinery is intelligent design. In order to recognize an explanation as the best, you don't have to have an explanation of the explanation. In fact, when you think about it, inquiring that would immediately lead to an infinite regress of explanations. You would need an explanation of the explanation, but then in order to recognize that as best, you need an explanation of the explanation of the explanation, and then an explanation of the explanation of the explanation of the explanation, so that nothing could ever be explained because it would lead to an infinite regress of explanations. So that this principle, that in order to recognize an explanation as the best, you have to have an explanation of the explanation, would

destroy science. This is a principle that is wholly antithetical to the very project of science at whose altar of course atheists worship. So ironically, this objection of atheists have enunciated a principle or presupposed a principle here which is wholly unscientific and would destroy the entire scientific enterprise if ever taken seriously. So in the case at hand, in order to recognize that intelligent design is the best explanation of the complex order in the universe, you don't have to have an explanation of the explanation. You may not know what the explanation is of the intelligent designer that produced the cosmos, but that does not in any way count against the credibility of the hypothesis that the complex order in the universe is best explained by there being an intelligent designer.

If the best explanation always needs an explanation, we are left with an infinite regress, and that is impossible and illogical. For if you must always provide an explanation (“God's designer”) of the explanation (God) of a thing, and then continue to explain every cause behind it also (“the designer of God's designer”), it will never end. One must then go on to infinity and ask for the cause of everything, and as most intelligent beings understands, this is impossible and illogical. There must be something that has always existed and that is uncreated, and that is God. It is enough to determine that the thing was created or made by a designer by examining the thing itself. Just like no one claims that watches or houses are able to create themselves even though they do not know who their Creators are, so the complexity of the universe, DNA, or the human body proves that only an intelligent designer must be behind its formation, even though we cannot see this designer.

The statement by the atheist which states that “Either the theist is arguing for an infinite regress of God-designers and designers of God-designers, etc., or he is contradicting his own assumption that complexity requires design” is also false since God is an uncaused first mover. No theist who is not utterly stupid and illogical claims that there is an infinite regress of God-designers. It is impossible and illogical to have an infinite regress of God-designers and designers of God-designers. Something must always have existed, and that something is God. Otherwise, you will have an infinite regress of God-designers and designers of God-designers, and that is impossible.

The assumption that God is complex that the atheist makes is also not based on fact but only on an unprovable assumption. St. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, in whose system of thought the idea of divine simplicity is central, wrote in *Summa Theologica* that because God is infinitely simple, God can only appear to the finite mind as infinitely complex. The Godhead is immaterial, and a mind without a body.

God is remarkably simple, having no parts and no composition. Simple in nature. God is not composed or divisible by any physical or metaphysical means. Simplicity of God refers to the fact that he has no parts. The simplicity teaching extends to the entire nature of God. His substance, nature, and very being is that of utter simplicity. The properties usually attributed to God such as omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence do not contradict the teaching of simplicity because each property is a different way of looking at the infinite active being of God from a limited perspective. One consequence of this teaching is the fact that since God is simple, he must be a pure spirit. The dogma of simplicity follows from the teachings of the 4th Lateran Council and the first Vatican Council which stated that God is an absolutely simple substance or nature. The basis of this De Fide dogma can be found within the gospel of John, "God is a spirit" (John 4:24). Further refuting the argument that God must be more complex than His Creation is the fact that even in this life, simple machinery assemble more complex machinery, so that the premise of the atheist that states that something must be more complex than the complexity of its creation is shown to be utterly false and erroneous. Therefore, the whole premise of the objection is erroneous, based on false assumptions and thus proven to be false.

Objection 6. "1. Everything that religion claims that God can do, can be accounted for by science. So there is no need or necessity for God, because science can account for everything. 2. On the other side of the argument, is the reasons why people do believe in God. One can understand why people believe in God. It's a sense of being alone. It's a sense of bewilderment. It's a sense of wishing for power over other people. The fact that science is omnipotent and the fact that I can understand why people desperately want to believe in God, that is an argument against it."

Answer to Objection 6: It is a fallacy of trying to explain of how a belief originates, you thereby show the belief to be false. Even if it were true that belief in the existence of God were the product of fear and anxiety and so forth, which is not true and admitted, but even if it were, it is a genetic fallacy to say that because that is the way a belief originates, therefore the belief is false. The atheists' claim state that science can account for everything is also a fallacy. There are a good number of things that cannot be scientifically proven but that we are all rational to accept. Let us list five such examples. 1. Logical and mathematical truths cannot be proven by science. Science presupposes logic and math so that to try to prove them by science would be arguing in a circle. 2. Metaphysical truths like that there are other minds other than my own or that the external world is real, or that the past was not created five minutes ago with an appearance of age are rational beliefs that cannot

be scientifically proven. 3. Ethical truths about statements of value are not able to be proven by science or by a scientific method. You can't show by science whether the Nazi scientists in the camps did anything evil as supposed to the scientists in the western democracies. 4. Esthetic judgments cannot be accessed by the scientific method because the beautiful like the good cannot be scientifically proven. 5. And finally, and most remarkably, would be science itself. Science cannot be justified by the scientific method. Science is permeated with unprovable assumptions. For example, the special theory of relativity, the whole theory hinges on the assumption that the speed of light is constant in a one way direction between the points of A and B. But that strictly cannot be proven. We simply have to assume that in order to hold to the theory.

Objection 7. For morality to exist, there is no need for a God or a law-giver to exist: “There doesn't need to exist a God in order for a moral code to exist. If there's a law of non-contradiction, that is to say that it is fundamentally irrational to contradict yourself, I don't see any reason to conclude from that there must be some some cosmic logician laying down that law. The logic of the word requirement does not actually entail the existence of a Requirer. Reason itself requires that you don't contradict yourself. And that's fine as long as you understand that there does not actually have to be a person who lays down the law of non-contradiction. Similarly then, I want to say that we don't need a law-giver for there to be genuine requirements. Reason requires that we act in accordance with reason. There are various compelling reasons not to harm people and to aid them and so we can personify reason in that way if we want, but all it just means is that there is compelling, decisive, objective, categorical reasons to behave in certain ways and not behave in other ways or to reason in various ways. So I myself am skeptical of the claim that commandments requires a Commander, or requirements requires a Requirer or that law requires a law-giver. If we want to find a reason why there exist a moral code, we as a society lay down these requirements. That idea is a natural fit if we accept the theory that the rules of morality emerges from the thought process of asking ourselves about how we should behave towards one another. If we face this question in the mode of perfect rationality of what perfectly rational beings would lay down as rules, we will see that a God or law-giver is not needed for morality to exist. These are rules that we are giving to each other. We enter into these rules freely because we see that it makes sense to reach these agreements. Consequently, if somebody breaks those rules, they are not upholding their part of the social contract, and as such, the rest of us, who are indeed keeping this agreement, can appropriately and with due authority turn to the person who is acting immorally and say: You shouldn't behave that way. You are not keeping up

your end of the bargain. So if you think there must be someone who is demanding of us that we act morally, the answer could be: Well, there is. Each one of us is demanding of everybody else and indeed demanding of ourselves as well that we act morally.”

Answer to Objection 7: The question before us is if God is necessary for morality. Notice what the question is not asking. We are not asking whether belief in God is necessary for morality. No one is arguing that in order to do moral actions, you need to believe in God. Rather, the atheistic question emphasizes whether God is necessary for morality. And the answer to that question is dependent on what you mean by morality. If by morality you mean simply a certain pattern of social behavior prevalent among human beings, then obviously this sort of behavior could still go on even if it turned out that God does not exist. God is not necessary in order for humans to exhibit certain patterns of social behavior which they call acting morally. But if by morality you mean that certain things are really good or evil, that certain actions are unconditionally obligatory or impermissible, then many atheists and theists alike agree that God is indeed necessary for morality. In the absence of God, morality turns out to be just a human convention or illusion. The same patterns of social behavior might go on without God but it would be a delusion to think that such behavior has any objective moral significance, that is, it only seems wrong but it is not really wrong.

Accordingly, God is necessary for morality in at least three distinct ways. Without God, objective moral values, moral duties, and moral accountability would not exist. Let's look at the first point. If God does not exist, objective moral values do not exist. When we talk about moral values, we are talking about whether something is good or evil. To say that there are objective moral values is to say that something is good or evil independently of whether anybody believes it to be so. To say for example that the murder of the Nazis in the Holocaust in Germany or the murder of about 100 million people of the Communists in the gulags of Russia was objectively evil, is to say that it was evil even though the Nazis and Communists who carried it out thought that it was good. And it would still have been evil even if the Nazis and Communists had won World War 2 and succeeded in brainwashing or exterminating everybody who disagreed with them so that everybody believed their murder was good. If there are no God, then moral values are not objective in that sense.

Traditionally, moral values have been based in God, who is the highest good. He is the foundation of moral values. God's own holy and loving nature supplies the

absolute standard against which all actions are measured. He is by nature loving and possess all moral virtues in Himself. But if God does not exist, what basis remains for objective moral values? Why think that human beings would have moral worth? On the atheistic view, humans are just accidental by-products of nature which have evolved relatively recently on an infinitesimal speck of dust that we call the planet earth, lost somewhere in a hostile and mind-less universe in which we are doomed to perish individually and collectively in a relatively short time. On atheism, there is no reasonable argument to think that human well being is objectively good anymore than insect well being or dog well being or monkey well being. On a naturalistic view, moral values are just a by-product of biological evolution and social conditioning. For, in a naturalistic view, just as a troop of Baboons exhibits altruistic behavior because natural selection has determined it to be advantageous in the struggle for survival, so their primate cousins Homo Sapiens (Humans) have similarly evolved behavior for the same reasons. As a result of socio-biological pressure, there has evolved among Homo Sapiens a sort of herd morality which functions well in the perpetuation of our species.

However, on an atheistic worldview, there is nothing to make this morality objectively true. The position of evolutionists is that humans have an awareness of morality because such an awareness is of biological worth. Morality is a biological adaptation no less than our hands and our feet according to it. Morality is just an aid to survival and protection and any deeper meaning is illusory according to it. But if there is no mind distinct from the brain, then everything we think and do is determined by the input of our five senses and our genetic makeup. There is no personal agent who freely decides to do something. Free will does not exist according to this ludicrous theory. But without freedom, none of our choices is morally significant. They are like the jerks of a puppet's limbs, controlled by the strings of sensory input and physical constitution. And what moral value does a puppet or its movements have? None. If you take God out of the picture, you are left with an apelike creature on a tiny speck of dust who is beset with delusions of moral grandeur.

Secondly, if God does not exist, objective moral duties do not exist. Duties have to do with if something is right or wrong. You might think at first that the distinction between right and wrong is the same as the distinction between good and evil, but if you think about it, you can see that this is simply not the case. Duty has to do with moral obligation: what I should or should not do. But obviously you are not morally obligated to do something just because it would be good for you to do it. For example, it would be good for you to become a doctor, wishing to help sick people

become better. But you are not morally obligated to become a doctor. So, there's a difference between moral values and moral duties. If God does not exist, we have no objective moral duties. To say that we have objective moral duties is again to say that we have certain moral obligations regardless of whether we think that we do. Traditionally, our moral duties were thought to come from God's commandments such as the Ten Commandments. Far from being arbitrary, these commands flow necessarily from His moral nature. On this moral foundation, we can affirm the objective rightness of love, generosity, self-sacrifice and equality, and condemn as objectively wrong selfishness, hatred, abuse, racism, and oppression.

But if there is no God, there remains no basis for claiming that these things are really evil. On the atheistic view, humans are just animals and animals have no moral obligations to one another. When a lion kills a zebra, it kills the zebra, but it does not murder the zebra. When a great white shark forcibly copulates with a female, it forcibly copulates with her, but it does not rape her. For there is no moral dimension to these actions. They are neither prohibited nor obligatory. So, if God does not exist, why think that we have any moral obligation to do anything. Who or what imposes these moral duties upon us. Where do they come from? On the atheistic view certain actions such as incest, pedophilia or rape may not be biologically and socially advantageous, and so in the course of human development have become taboo. They go against the social contract that the atheists claim is the basis of morality. But that does nothing to show that incest, pedophilia or rape is really wrong. Such behavior goes on all the time in the animal kingdom. On the atheistic view, the rapist who flouts the morality or the social contract, is doing nothing more serious than acting unfashionably like the man who flouts etiquette by belching loudly at the dinner table. If there is no moral law giver, then there is no objective moral law which we must obey. It's all a matter of social convention.

Thirdly, if God does not exist, then there is no basis for moral accountability. Traditionally, it has been held that God holds all people morally accountable for their actions despite the inequities of this life. Thus, the choices that we make has an eternal significance. But if God does not exist, what basis exist for moral accountability? If life ends at the grave, then ultimately it makes no difference whether you live as a Stalin or as a Saint. As the Russian writer Dostoyevsky rightly said: "If there is no immortality, then all things are permitted." Given the finality of death, it really does not matter how you live. The state torturers in Soviet understood this all too well. The cruelty of atheism is hard to believe when man has no faith in the reward of good or the punishment of evil. There is no reason to be human. The communist torturers often said: "There is no God, no hereafter, no

punishment for evil. We can do what we wish.” A certain torturer even said: “I thank God in whom I don't believe that I have lived to this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart.” He expressed it in an unbelievable brutality and torture inflicted on prisoners and this was sanctioned by the state. So what do you say to someone who claims that we may as well live as we please out of pure self-interest? You might say that it is in your best self-interest to adopt a moral lifestyle. But clearly, that is not always true. We all know situations where self-interest runs counter to morality. Moreover, if you are sufficiently powerful, then one can ignore the dictates of conscience, and safely live in self-indulgence. In sum, without God, there are no objective moral values, moral duties, or moral accountability. God is therefore vitally necessary to morality.

Objection 7. The Anti-creation Argument: “(a) If X creates Y, then X must exist temporally prior to Y. (b) But nothing could possibly exist temporally prior to time itself (for that would involve existing at a time when there was no time, which is a contradiction). (c) Thus, it is impossible for time to have been created. (d) Time is an essential component of the universe. (e) Therefore, it is impossible for the universe to have been created. (f) It follows that God cannot exist.”

Answer to Objection 7: This argument is illogical since logic proves that something must always have existed and that time cannot have been created in all dimensions, places or things. Time can indeed have begun in many dimensions or our dimension at a specific time, but it cannot have begun in every place or thing since something must have always existed for our universe and our time to have begun at a specific point of time. The universe did not just come into being out of nothing. To state that it did, is to be patently illogical. Nothing cannot make something. That is a fundamental point in logic which cannot be denied. Thus, there must be a cause of the universe and something must have always existed in order for our universe to have come into being. The claim (b) by the atheist if he supposes that the Godhead is a part of His creation is also erroneous. Christian theism does not hold this argument but it teaches that God always existed and that our dimension was created at some point in time and that God exists independently of His Creation.

Objection 8. The Transcendent-Personal Argument: “(a) In order for God to have created the universe, he must have been transcendent, that is, he must have existed outside space and time. (b) But to be personal implies (among other things) being within space and time. (c) Therefore, it is logically impossible for God, as defined as an eternal, all-powerful, personal being who created and rules the

universe and is the deity described in the Bible as interpreted by Christianity to exist.”

Answer to Objection 8: The claim (b) that personality requires that a being is within space and time is impossible to prove and the objection is based on an unprovable assumption. It is a subjective claim without any actual evidence shown for its validity. It is thus proven to be erroneous. Humans are indeed very like God in that we understand the concept of eternity, but we differ from Him in that we were created at some point of time, while He has always existed.

Objection 9. The Incoherence-of-Omnipotence Argument: “(a) If God as defined as an eternal, all-powerful, personal being who created and rules the universe and is the deity described in the Bible as interpreted by Christianity were to exist, then he would be omnipotent (i.e., able to do anything that is logically possible). (b) But the idea of such a being is incoherent.”

Answer to Objection 9: A common mistake atheists make is to state that omnipotence includes that a being should be able to act in an illogical or evil way, and if that being is unable to act in an illogical way, he is not omnipotent. But the Christian faith has always taught that God cannot sin or do illogical things. He is the very basis for morality and purpose. Some atheists will express this in the question of whether God can create a rock that He cannot lift. While this question may seem hard to answer, it is not. God cannot make a stone or anything that has a purpose or meaning not in accordance to His goodness. God is unable to do evil or illogical things since He is pure goodness, morality and purpose. He is unable to sin or do meaningless things. The basis for the atheistic claim (b) is totally incoherent since an omnipotent Being, that is, an Almighty being does not have to be able to sin in order to be able to be omnipotent. Such a claim by the atheists is baseless and not built on logic.

Objection 10. The Argument from Human Insignificance: “(a) If the deity described in the Bible as interpreted by Christianity were to exist, then it would be expected that humans occupy some significant place in the universe. (b) But, both from the standpoint of space (the size of the universe in relation to the size of the earth) and from the standpoint of time (the length of time in which the universe has existed in relation to the length of time in which humans have existed), humans do not occupy any significant place in the universe. (c) Hence, God, as defined as deity described in the Bible as interpreted by Christianity probably does not exist.”

Answer to Objection 10: Even if we accept for a moment that the universe has existed a very long time, which is impossible to prove by the scientific method unless a time machine was invented, and that the universe is very large, which is also impossible to prove by direct scientific tests, this does not negate humanity's significance in any way. For the argument that the size of a thing or the length in time of a thing equals significance is incoherent. Even in this life, small things and short moments may make a greater effect and have a larger significance than big things and longer moments. A good example of this is an atomic bomb. It is both proportionally small, and acts in a proportionally short time, yet it effects reality in a great way and its significance and effect is proportionally greater than many other things that are much larger and that have existed a far longer time.

Furthermore, the atheistic claim that humans are insignificant does not take into account the human ability to reason and think. A human thought is able to comprehend the whole of the universe, and even more so, it is able to comprehend things above and beyond the physical universe. A human thought is also able to comprehend the concept of eternity and be able to comprehend that there was a time when the universe did not exist and that there might come a time in the future when the universe will cease to exist. Thus, humans are able to comprehend something greater than the whole universe by their reasoning and thoughts which mindless objects are not able to do so that humans can rightly be argued to be more significant than these mindless objects or even the whole universe.

At best, the atheist can claim that the world has existed from the time he was born. Before that, anyone can claim that it only looks as if the world existed so and so long. Even more, the atheist cannot claim to know for certain how long he has existed. Some person could claim that his memories was implanted in him and that they therefore are an illusion. To state that because humans occupy a small place in the universe, humans therefore are not significant, is a baseless argument since that argument is assuming to know why God does something. The atheistic assertion (b) cannot be proven and argument (c) is thus shown to be false.

Objection 11. A Disproof of God's Existence: “1. If God exists, God has not had the feelings of lust or envy. 2. If God exists, God exists as a being who knows at least everything man knows. 3. If God exists as a being who knows at least everything man knows, God knows lust and envy. 4. If God knows lust and envy, God has had the feelings of lust and envy.”

Answer to objection 11: First, we need to define what we mean with God here

and that is the Godhead, that is, the unchangeable essence or Spirit of God. Second, we need to understand what the word “knows” means that the atheistic argument uses. If “knows” means that the Godhead has experienced all of our emotions, lusts or temptations, that is an argument that is totally baseless. There's no evidence for this, and the atheistic argument falls flat on its face and is proven to be incoherent and based on a false assumption immediately. The 2nd Premise of the atheist which states that: “If God exists, God exists as a being who knows at least everything man knows” is incoherent since the Godhead does not know evil, temptation or the feelings of lust and envy by experiencing its evil effects but only by knowing about how it effects mankind. God does not “know” everything, if we by the words “know everything” mean to say that God also knows sin by doing it or experiencing it Himself or that God has had the feelings of lust and envy. God is unable to sin or to be tempted or to endure feelings of lust and envy. It is evil and defective to experience feelings of lust and envy and it is only as a direct cause of the fall of Adam and Eve and original sin that humans has to endure these evil feelings. However, it is not always sinful to endure them since being tempted or experiencing feelings of lust and envy is not the same as a willful action or giving consent to these feelings.

Therefore, the Godhead does not “know” the feelings of lust and envy by enduring them but only by knowledge about them in a similar way that a person can know about a bomb killing people without actually suffering its evil effects. Furthermore, God who is our Creator and who allows these feelings because of our sins, knows about how the effects of these feelings operates in men more perfectly than any man can know. God's knowledge can never be compared to a human's knowledge and there's no evidence that can be provided by atheists that God's knowledge is similar to a human. If we mean that “knows” means that God knows how an evil feeling like lust or envy operates and effects mankind, then the word “knows” is suitable to describe God's knowledge of the feelings of lust and envy. The Christian definition of the Godhead has always been that the divine essence is unchangeable and so God “knows” about how evil effects mankind, but He does not suffer from its effects. The very nature of an unchangeable Being implies that there is no change in Him, and thus, even though the Holy Bible speaks about God's will in human terms and appear to say that God has feelings of anger and sadness etc., that is only in order to help us to understand God's will. Although there are similarities between God and humans, and humans are made in the image of God, God's being can in no way be compared to humans since God is singularly unique and the only Being that is uncreated. Premises 3 and 4 are therefore proven to be incoherent, illogical and based on baseless and unprovable assumptions.

Objection 12. God and Moral Autonomy: “So the idea that any being could be worthy of worship is much more problematic than we might have at first imagined. In saying that a being is worthy of worship, we would be recognizing him as having an unqualified claim on our obedience. The question, then, is whether there could be such an unqualified claim. It should be noted that the description of a being as all-powerful, all-wise, and so on would not automatically settle the issue; for even while admitting the existence of such an awesome being, we might still question whether we should recognize him as having an unlimited claim on our obedience.

There is a long tradition in moral philosophy, from Plato to Kant, according to which such a recognition could never be made by a moral agent. According to this tradition, to be a moral agent is to be autonomous, or self-directed. Unlike the precepts of law or social custom, moral precepts are imposed by the agent upon himself, and the penalty for their violation is, in Kant's words, "self-contempt and inner abhorrence." The virtuous person is therefore identified with the person of integrity, the person who acts according to precepts that she can, on reflection, conscientiously approve in her own heart.

On this view, to deliver oneself over to a moral authority for directions about what to do is simply incompatible with being a moral agent. To say "I will follow so-and-so's directions no matter what they are and no matter what my own conscience would otherwise direct me to do" is to opt out of moral thinking altogether; it is to abandon one's role as a moral agent. And it does not matter whether "so-and-so" is the law, the customs of one's society, or Jehovah. This does not, of course, preclude one from seeking advice on moral matters and even on occasion following that advice blindly, trusting in the good judgment, of the adviser. But this is justified by the details of the particular case--for example, that you cannot form any reasonable judgment of your own because of ignorance or inexperience or lack of time. What is precluded is that a person should, while in possession of his wits, adopt this style of decision making (or perhaps we should say this style of abdicating decision making) as a general strategy of living, or abandon his own best judgment when he can form a judgment of which he is reasonably confident.

We have, then, a conflict between the role of worshiper, which by its very nature commits one to total subservience to God, and the role of moral agent, which necessarily involves autonomous decision making. The role of worshiper takes precedence over every other role the worshiper has; when there is any conflict, the worshiper's commitment to God has priority over everything. But the first

commitment of a moral agent is to do what in his own heart he thinks is right.

Thus the following argument might be constructed: 1. If any being is God, he must be a fitting object of worship. 2. No being could possibly be a fitting object of worship, since worship requires the abandonment of one's role as an autonomous moral agent. 3. Therefore, there cannot be any being who is God.”

Answer to objection 12: First, worshiping God does not in any way make us leave our conscience and free will. All retain both their conscience and free will while worshiping God and when choosing to give one's will and consent to God's word, one must also remain able to differentiate between the true word of God and goodness and the evil word of the devil. Thus, even while worshiping and submitting one's will to God, one must also use one's free will and conscience to ascertain that it is the true God. Secondly, God cannot command a man to commit sin or anything that is unreasonable. The assertion that “the first commitment of a moral agent is to do what in his own heart he thinks is right” is completely false, since a humble person always considers that his way of interpreting a situation might be wrong, and thus in his humility, seeks the will of an all-knowing and all-powerful God who can judge things better than himself. A person who think that his own understanding of a situation is always right is of course totally delusional and proud and he, strange to say, has dared to arrogate to himself the powers of omniscience that only God have. Even science itself shows that we as humans cannot know and understand everything. Only an unreasonable and proud person would think that anything and everything that got into his own mind was right. That is such an ignorant assertion that it is beyond words. According to this pathetic and ridiculous argument of atheists, if a man thought that rape or murder was right and moral to do, then it was right and moral to commit such evil acts. No, just like we have scientists or doctors in different fields, and common people are totally uneducated and unable to work in their fields of work, so it is with man's understanding of morality. It is defective, and the countless of examples of evil acts that men does in this world, proves that this is so. Therefore, there is a need for a doctor to heal the wound of our morality, and that doctor is God. Man is unschooled in the art of differentiating between moral and evil actions since he was born with original sin, and thus, he must seek a moral law that tells him what to do and what not to do. That law is God's law. Therefore, the 2nd premise is shown to be baseless and false.

People are sinful; their very consciences are corrupt and unreliable guides. What is taken for conscientiousness many times is nothing more than self-aggrandizement

and arrogance. Therefore, we cannot trust our own judgment; we must trust God and do what he wills. Only then can we be assured of doing what is right.

The atheist might object to this, saying: "This is a view that has always had its advocates among theologians. But this Augustinian view suffers from a fundamental inconsistency. It is said that we cannot know for ourselves what is right and what is wrong, because our judgment is corrupt. But how do we know that our judgment is corrupt? Presumably, in order to know that, we would have to know (a) that some actions are morally required of us, and (b) that our own judgment does not reveal that these actions are required. However, (a) is just the sort of thing that we cannot know, according to this view. Now, it may be suggested that while we cannot know (a) by our own judgment, we can know it as a result of God's revelation. But even setting aside the practical difficulties of distinguishing genuine from bogus revelation (a generous concession), there is still this problem: if we learn that God (some being we take to be God) requires us to do a certain action and we conclude on this account that the action is morally right, then we have still made at least one moral judgment of our own, namely, that whatever this being requires is morally right. Therefore, it is impossible to maintain the view that we have moral knowledge and that all of it comes from God's revelation."

The inherent lack of evidence for the assertions of the atheist should have been spotted by most readers at this time. We hear the atheist ask? "But how do we know that our judgment is corrupt." The answer is simple: We know that our judgment is corrupt since we see ourselves and others commit sins or immoral actions daily. All men sins or make morally repugnant actions some time in their life, and thus by this example, man knows instinctively and by heart that he is in no position to act as the final word on what is and is not morality. Just as a person who does not know anything about different sciences, yet understands that others are more learned in them, so man knows by his knowledge of and experience in acts against morality that he is not suited to act as judge in matters of morality. Nothing could be more obvious. God's word acts a kind of educator, instructing man in what is and is not moral behavior.

Conclusion

In conclusion of these atheistic objections, the reader should have been able to see the inherent lack of logic that pervades every single argument that atheists make. In every single argument, atheistic objectors make up the most incoherent and unproven premises that one almost could come to think of. No doubt, there are

countless more of these pathetic and illogical objections. The strangeness in surveying these irrational arguments brings up a thought. How is it possible for those who make such stupid arguments to be able to even speak in public? It seems bordering on the absurd and fantastical that men who otherwise may judge of other things in a reasonable manner and be functional in positions where intelligence is required, suddenly, when confronted with the matter of God, suddenly resort to the most frightful degradation in intelligence, making the most stupid and false assertions that one almost could come to think of. The answer to this conundrum is of course that they are not at all unknowing of the facts, but that they are willfully ignorant of the facts in order to please their lust and assuage their conscience that tells them that they will be judged for their acts against God.

My critique could stop here, but for the sake of completeness I will offer a few reasons why atheists reject obvious facts (such as presented in this text) which they know are irrefutable.

1. Bias

Human beings tend to be biased towards a certain viewpoint. Sometimes, this bias can get in the way of an objective analysis of the evidence. Bias can occur for a number of reasons, but whatever the case it is quite possible that those who claim that they have been provided with insufficient evidence are merely biased with regards to the evidence they have.

2. Pride

Another malady that affects a great number of humans is pride. Pride can occur because someone thinks they are superior to others. In the case of atheism, pride could occur because the nonbelievers do not like the idea of being considered sinners that have fallen short of God. Or, pride could occur because an individual does not feel like being “under” a higher power. Whatever the case, pride is a very real factor and undoubtedly affect an objective look at the evidence for God’s existence.

3. Anger

A very common factor, I think, which leads to a lack of belief in God, is anger. This anger could take many forms. Perhaps a person is unsatisfied with the way things are going in their life and they feel that, if God existed, He should do something about it. Perhaps they are upset that somebody they care for died. Anger can often consume an individual and get in the way of rational thought. This could lead to an unjustified rejection of the evidence for God’s existence.

4. Ridiculous Expectations

Many times atheists suppose God should write “Jesus Christ lives. Repent and be saved!” on the moon. They may expect God to come down and have a chat. In both situations, the expectation of evidence is much too high. The individual may unreasonably expect more evidence for God’s existence than they would require for other propositions. This is obviously unfair and is thus not reasonable nonbelief.

5. Wish to disregard theistic morality

Another common reason why atheists and agnostics choose to reject God is that nonbelievers do not wish to change their lifestyles to accommodate belief in God. They may feel that Biblical morality is too strict. For example, many nonbelievers express distress with the expectation that Christians avoid lust. Christianity's rejection of pre-marital sex is also an issue that brings up quite a bit of indignation. The wish to live one’s life in a particular manner undoubtedly lead many bad willed souls to an unfair analysis of the evidence for God’s existence.

6. Insufficient Effort

The question of whether or not God exists is possibly the most important issue humans face. However, many people (theist and non-theist alike) don’t give the issue the attention it deserves. Therefore, those atheists who give only a cursory examination of the evidence cannot be considered to have reasonable non-belief. The existence of so many potential factors, in addition to the evidence we have already seen, proves that reasonable non-belief does not actually occur in the world. To state that atheists of all people are not able to either deceive themselves or be willful liars in various ways such as the ones explained above is patently illogical and baseless. The Argument from Non-belief is already thoroughly discredited because it can never be considered evidence for anybody but the individual who has the complaint. There are probably countless more of these kinds of weak and pathetic explanations of why atheists do not accept the truth and become honest, so this small list should in no way be thought to be all of the reasons for their rejection of the obvious existence of God.

Atheists and Agnostics are Without Excuse

It is infallibly taught in Sacred Scripture that everyone above the age of reason can know with certainty that there is a God. They know this by the things that are made: the trees, the grass, the sun, the moon, the stars, etc. Anyone who is an atheist (who believes that there is no God) is without excuse. The [natural law](#) convicts him. This

is a revealed truth of Sacred Scripture.

Creation itself bears witness that there is a God, that is, a living, omnipotent and intelligent Being who created it. The apostle Paul wrote to the saints in Rome that since the creation of the world, God's invisible qualities – His eternal power and Godhead – have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made (Romans 1:20); and David said that the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows His handiwork (Psalm 19:1). Therefore, since the existence of God is so clearly witnessed by His works, those who deny His existence are without excuse. “The fool has said in his heart, ‘there is no God’” (Psalm 53:1).

God defined infallibly, based on Romans 1, that the one true God can be known with certitude by the things which have been made, and by the natural light of human reason.

Romans 1:19-21: “Because that which is known of God is manifest in them. For God hath manifested it unto them. **For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; His eternal power also, and divinity: SO THAT THEY ARE INEXCUSABLE.”**

Atheists, agnostics and unbelievers are without excuse, because they are surrounded by the works of God which attest very clearly that God exists. Undoubtedly the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, clearly prove the existence of God because they did not come into existence by chance or by their own power but by the will of the one true God. For according to the Scripture there was a time when all these things did not exist, then at a certain point of past time they came into existence by the will of God. God created them in six days (Genesis 1:1-31; 2:1-3; Exodus 20:11), and in wisdom God made them all (Psalm 104:24). Oh, what a wonderful wisdom can be seen in all the works of God! It can be seen even in the simplest forms of life. God is indeed a wise Designer and Creator! Among the things made by God, one, that is, man, was made in God's image, for the Scripture says: “So God created man in His own image” (Genesis 1:27). That's why St. Paul says that man “is the image and glory of God” (1 Corinthians 11:7). Man himself, therefore, bears witness that God exists. When one considers that man is an intelligent being, with a will, reasoning ability, emotions and a conscience, how can he deny the existence of God?

The Catholic Church has dogmatically defined the principle set forth in Romans 1 –

which directly contradicts the teaching of atheism.

Pope Pius IX, *First Vatican Council*, Session 3, On Revelation, Can. 1: “If anyone shall have said that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, **cannot be known with certitude by those things which have been made, by the natural light of human reason: let him be anathema.**”

Pope Pius IX, *First Vatican Council*, Session 3, On God the Creator, Can. 1: “If anyone shall have denied the one true God, Creator and Lord of visible and invisible things: let him be anathema.”

All the people who die in unbelief and in cultures which have never been penetrated by the Gospel go to Hell for sins against the natural law and the other grave sins which they commit – which bad will and failure to cooperate with God's grace is the reason for why they deny God or that He does not reveal the Gospel to them.

2 Corinthians 4:3: “**And if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the god of this world [Satan] hath blinded the minds of unbelievers**, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not shine unto them.”

To sum up, just as a house, computer or watch exists because someone designed them and built them, and we can't affirm that no one has made them (even though we don't know who made them!), so the universe (that is, the heavens, the earth, the sea and all that is in them) exists because someone designed it and made it, and this 'someone' is God, our Creator. In other words, the perfection, the beauty, the design and the orderliness of the universe require the existence of a Supreme Being whose intelligence and power have no limit, and this Supreme Being is God. It is absurd to think that the universe was not created by God when it is so complex and it is utterly illogical of atheists to claim that a house or a watch is made by another person even though he does not know who made it, while claiming that God didn't create the universe when the universe is infinitely more complex than a single watch. This example proves that all atheists and agnostics are willful liars who clearly understand that this world must be designed by an intelligent Being, but that they choose to reject this knowledge. Simply said, an atheist does not reject the existence of God because he has a good argument or objection against Him, but because acknowledging God's existence would mean that he would have to accept some rules. Atheists and people who is living in sin does not like to be told to stop sinning. They want to continue doing what pleases them. All atheists undoubtedly

commit sins or bad deeds since almost all people commit sins sometimes. However, since atheists do not want to feel sad of the thought of or think about that they are going to be punished for their willful sins, they choose to reject the existence of God in order to live a short life of sin. An atheist does not want to find God for the same reason that a murderer or a thief does not want to find a police officer: both of them know they are guilty and that they will be punished for their willful crimes if they find God or a police officer. And so, the atheist lies to himself in order to suppress his conscience who rebukes him when he sins and tells him that evil deeds deserve a punishment.

In truth, “Everyone can know with certainty that there is a supreme spiritual being, Who is the One True God and the Creator of the world and all that it contains. There is no one who cannot understand and believe that God exists, if he considers how the earth bears fruit and how the heavens give rain, how the trees bloom, how each and every animal exists in its own kind, how the stars serve man, and how troubles and sorrows come and often happen against the will of man. From all these things, man can see that he is mortal and that it is God who arranges and directs all these things. For if God did not exist, everything would be disorganized. Thus, all things are of God, and everything is rationally arranged for the use and knowledge of mankind. And there is not the least little thing that is created or exists in the world without reasonable cause.” (cf. [St. Bridget's Revelations, Book 1, chapter 15.](#))

Everyone knows that God is not something that they have carved out of wood or jade or stone. They know that God is not the tree that they worship or the river they worship or the rock or the snake or the sacred tree frog or nature spirits. They know that these things aren't the Creator of the universe. Every such person knows that he is worshipping a creature rather than the Creator.

Thus, “If a man cannot understand or comprehend God's virtues and powers as they are because of his weakness, he can still see them with faith and believe. But if people in the world do not want to use their reason to consider God's power, they can still use their hands to touch and sense the deeds that Jesus Christ and His saints have done. They are namely so obvious that no one can doubt them to be the deeds of God. Who raised the dead and gave sight to the blind if not God? Who cast out the evil devils from men if not God? What have God taught if not things beneficial for the prosperity of soul and body and easy to bear?” (cf. [St. Bridget's Revelations, Book 1, chapter 15.](#))

If there were truly people of sincere and of good will who had not yet attained the

faith, then God would send a preacher (even miraculously, if necessary) to bring the Catholic Faith and baptism to him.

St. Thomas Aquinas, Sent. III, 25, Q. 2, A. 2, solute. 2: **“If a man should have no one to instruct him, God will show him,** unless he culpably wishes to remain where he is.”

St. Thomas Aquinas, Sent. II, 28, Q. 1, A. 4, ad 4: **“If a man born among barbarian nations, does what he can, God Himself will show him what is necessary for salvation,** either by inspiration or sending a teacher to him.”

St. Thomas Aquinas, De Veritate, 14, A. 11, ad 1: Objection: **“It is possible that someone may be brought up in the forest, or among wolves; such a man cannot explicitly know anything about the faith.”** St. Thomas replies: “It is the characteristic of Divine Providence to provide every man with what is necessary for salvation... provided on his part there is no hindrance. In the case of a man who seeks good and shuns evil, by the leading of natural reason, **God would either reveal to him through internal inspiration what had to be believed, or would send some preacher of the faith to him...**”

“It is in accord with God's justice that entry into heaven must be gained through steadfast faith, rational hope, and fervent love. A person ponders more frequently and adores more lovingly that which the heart loves more and loves with greater fervor. So it is with the gods that are placed in temples – though they are not gods nor creators, since there is but one sole creator, I myself, God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But the owners of temples and people in general love the gods more than they love me, seeking to achieve worldly success rather than to live with me. If I were to destroy the things that people love more than me, and make the people adore me against their will, then I would certainly do them an injustice by taking away their free will and desire from them. Since they have no faith in me, and there is in their hearts something more delightful than me, I reasonably permit them to produce externally what they love and long for in their minds. Because they love creation more than me, the Creator, whom they can know by probable signs and deeds, if only they would make use of their reason, and because they are blind, accursed is their creation and accursed are their idols. They themselves shall stand in shame and be sentenced for their folly, because they refuse to understand how sweet I am, their God, who created and redeemed humankind out of fervent love.”

[\(St. Bridget's Revelations, Book 5 or The Book of Questions, Interrogation 8.\)](#)

It has already been shown from Scripture that the existence of God can be proved in various ways. However, I would like to say something else. Man can not only know that God exists, but also know Him personally. In other words, He can have a personal relationship with God. For Jesus Christ said: “All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him” (Luke 10:22). Therefore, God the Father can be known through His Son, there is no other way to know God truly except through His Son. Thus, in order to know God and be saved a man needs to know His Son. How can one know the Son of God then? By repenting of his sins and believing in His atoning sacrifice and His resurrection and being baptized and enter His Church.

Jesus was the perfect sacrifice for our sins. God offers all of us forgiveness and salvation through faith and baptism if we will simply receive His gift to us (John 1:12), believing Jesus to be the Savior who laid down His life for us – His friends. If you place your trust in Jesus as your only Savior and die in a state of grace (free from mortal sin), you will have absolute assurance of eternal bliss in Heaven. God will forgive your sins, cleanse your soul, renew your spirit, give you abundant life in this world, and eternal bliss in the next world. How can we reject such a precious gift? How can we turn our backs on God who loved us enough to sacrifice Himself for us?

If you are unsure about what you believe, we invite you to say the following prayer to God; “God, help me to know what is true. Help me to discern what is error. Help me to know what is the correct path to salvation.” God will always honor such a prayer.

If you want to receive the [true Biblical Faith](#) and Jesus as your Savior, simply speak to God, verbally or silently, receive [baptism \(how to convert to the true Biblical Faith\)](#), obey [His Church](#), [His Laws](#) and [His Word](#), and tell Him that you want to receive the free gift of salvation through Jesus, Our Lord and Savior. If you want a prayer to say, here is an example: “God, thank you for loving me. Thank you for sacrificing yourself for me. Thank you for providing for my forgiveness and salvation. I want to accept the gift of salvation through Jesus. I want to receive Jesus as my Savior. Amen!”

Beware of atheism and agnosticism and refute it, for it is a wrong belief, which is

used by that ancient serpent to keep millions of people far from the true and living God.

WWW.CATHOLIC-SAINTS.NET

Free DVDs and Books