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**Romans 1:18-20**

Last Week: **Part One: To believe or not to believe… that is the question.**

Dr. Paul Vitz- the real reason people become atheist.

**Part Two: Why I am not an atheist** First three reasons

**Part Three: Why I Am Not an Atheist**

1. **Logical inconsistency** ~ After days of reading atheist writings and blogs I have yet to find honest logical consistency.
2. David Hume – “The most important philosopher ever to write in English, David Hume (1711-1776) — the last of the great triumvirate of “British empiricists”[[1]](#footnote-1)
3. “Charles Darwin counted Hume as a central influence, as did “Darwin's bulldog,” Thomas Henry Huxley.”[[2]](#footnote-2)
4. “In light of these considerations, we may conclude that with respect to thick theism Hume is a hard skeptic who defends a non-dogmatic form of atheism.”[[3]](#footnote-3)
5. “If we take in our hand any volume: of divinity or school of metaphysics, for instance; let us ask, *does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity of number?* No*. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence?* No. Commit it then to the flames; For it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion.”[[4]](#footnote-4)
6. Note: His statement contains no mathematical (quantity of number) or scientific basis (experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence) and therefore his own test fails his own test and according to his own statement what he says “ contains nothing but sophistry and illusion” and should be burned!
7. Logical inconsistency of those believing there is no such thing as a being of all knowledge presupposes having all knowledge.
8. Failure of proof from atheists demanding proof.
9. They point out seeming contradictions in the Bible… but contextual study obliterates their claims as logically inconsistent.
10. William Lane Craig and Christopher Hitchens example.[[5]](#footnote-5)
11. **Learning to be the light or ~ The Voice oF culture 12-2-12**
12. **Morality.**
13. I appreciate intellectual honesty about atheism. Unfortunately, it is seldom found. Bertrand Russell came close “Russell admitted that he could not live as though ethical values were simply a matter of personal taste, and that he therefore found his own views “incredible.” “I do not know the solution,” he confessed. “[[6]](#footnote-6)The point is that if there is no God, then objective right and wrong cannot exist.”
14. Dostoyevsky said if there is no God “All things are permitted.”
15. Nietzsche was honest about this but it cost him his sanity.
16. True motives – Aldous Huxley – “For myself, as, no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom;”[[7]](#footnote-7)
17. The Moral Law Giver… (Based on Ravi Zacharias).
18. With all the evil in the world, how can there be a God?
19. Forward logic…
20. In order to say there is evil one must also believe in good.
21. In order to differentiate between good and evil there must be a supreme or objective moral law - Always objectively true – not based on human opinion.
22. The existence of a moral law assumes the existence of a supreme moral lawgiver- God.
23. Reverse logic.
24. If there is no God- there is no supreme moral lawgiver.
25. If there is no moral lawgiver there can be no supreme moral law and therefore no way to objectively or consistently differentiate between good and evil.
26. If you cannot differentiate between good and evil you cannot say evil exists to negate the existence of God.
27. New Atheists are now going against the teachings of Nietzsche, Huxley and others and say “We don’t need God to be good” and profess an “objective moral law.”
28. The reason for their change is that they were obliterated in debates by simple moral questions like is it acceptable to torture babies for fun or treat a person as sub-human because of the color of their skin?
29. Craig Hazen[[8]](#footnote-8) replies… “The primary technique the new atheists have adopted for dealing with the issue of the origin or grounding of the moral law is obfuscation. The new atheists are very fond of saying, “We don’t need God to be good.” Indeed, they often say that atheists, agnostics and skeptics often lead more wholesome lives than lifelong professing Christians. Now, theists should not be fooled by this. Our response should be, “Of course you don’t need God to be good — we’ve never claimed that you do.” You see, it is not knowledge (epistemology) of the moral law that is a problem — after all, the Bible teaches that this law is written on every human heart. Rather, the daunting problem for the new atheist is the nature and source (ontology) of the moral law.”
30. Where did the moral law come from if there is no moral law giver?[[9]](#footnote-9)
	1. If everything ultimately must be explained by the laws of physics and chemistry, help me understand what a moral value is (does it have mass, occupy space, hold a charge, have wavelength)?
	2. How did matter, energy, time and chance result in a set of objective moral values? Did the big bang really spew forth “love your enemy?” If so, you have to help me understand that.
	3. Watch them obfuscate and quickly deflect the argument as they can’t answer it in a logically consistent or rational manner.

 **Additional Reasons I am Not an Atheist**

4. The logical inconsistencies prevalent in atheism are glaring; such as Hume’s statement which fails its own tests, and to declare you have all knowledge that there is no being of all knowledge. Because I insist on logical consistency I cannot be an atheist.

5. Classic atheists denied objective Moral Law because they knew it logically leads to a Moral Law Giver. The new atheists after losing this point in debates now claim there is objective moral law but can’t answer where it comes from. Because I believe in objective moral law and honest logical consistency I cannot be an atheist.

**Romans 1:18-20** 18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, 19 because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown *it* to them. 20 For since the creation of the world His invisible *attributes* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,”

1. The wrath of God is not against the men themselves, but against their unrighteousness and suppression of truth.
2. Their very claim to objective moral law is evidence of God… because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown *it* to them.
3. The invisible is clearly seen.
4. Understood by looking at creation you see God’s power and authority. (Design or Time and Chance).
5. Leaves people without excuse.

**Discussion Items and Questions for Home and Small Group**

1. Reread Hume’s statement and in your own words explain how it fails its own test.
2. Discuss Aldous Huxley’s motive.
3. Role-play a dialog about morality with the information you learned here.
4. Pray to be used by God to speak truth with love.
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