

Uncovering the Roots of Atheism

Discovering God in Creation – Pt. 1

by Gary H. Patterson

July 29, 2014

grace4u@gmx.com

(Please pass this on without altering any content.)

Is Truth and Morality Relative?

Introduction

My intent in this article is not to answer every question the reader may have concerning the origins of the universe and mankind. As you will see later, most of our questions will be answered by having the proper foundation in our thinking. If the foundation of anything is off, so is the structure. I will begin by responding to a question asked me by a college student: "Could God have created the process of evolution as it has been defined by modern science to explain the origins of biological life forms." The whole idea behind this context of evolution supposedly proves that we came about without the influence of a supremely intelligent designer. The idea of a Creator excludes the idea of evolution and vice versa. The answer is obviously "no." Charles Darwin, the father of trans-species evolution, was a self-professed agnostic (was not certain of a Creator).

The Self-evident Truth

Apart from the claims of any religions, there are self-evident truths that either prove or disprove the existence of a Creator God. The idea of the existence of a Creator (God) implies that the integrity of those things created depends on the laws used to create them and the order to which they were subjected. In other words, all things created would disclose evidence of the Creator's fingerprints. By simple common sense, a

person, without indoctrination and bias, can conclude that law and order can only come from intelligent design. It never occurs by random chance. Only by intelligent intervention can law be formed in the midst of lawlessness and order out of chaos. How much more is supreme intelligence needed to form such things out of nothing – more accurately, out of the resources of the creator? It is absolutely impossible for law and order to randomly, without intelligent influence, occur from an explosion of any kind. It has never happened and cannot happen even if given billions of years to randomly occur. Again, this is common sense to all those who understand that much of modern science largely bases its beliefs and theories, not on scientific fact, but on a religious atheistic bias. Unbiased common sense can safely and accurately conclude that if there is no Creator, then there would be no absolute law or order within creation – there would be no evidence of supreme intelligent influence. It is quite clear that creation would not even exist.

The roots of modern amoral or atheistic philosophies concerning human behavior can be traced largely back to a society's rejection of the reality of a Creator. Are there *absolute* truths or moral standards that set boundaries for human behavior? Is truth and morality relative – based on what we individually think is right or wrong? The only problem with such relativism is that it is always about the individual's "rights" and not how the individual's behavior affects other people, good or bad. Even atheists believe in the ideas of justice and injustice. If you ask any of them what should be done to someone who kidnaps, sexually molests, and then buries alive a ten year old child, the ideas of justice and injustice suddenly come alive within their consciences. Such relativism does not work in nature, a science lab, and, much less, in human behavior. Absolute law and order exist all throughout creation whether or not we acknowledge them.

Inanimate objects and living creatures both exist because of absolute law and order and not of ambiguous contingencies or eventualities. Such nonsense only exists in the minds of very intelligent but naïve people who have allowed themselves to be seduced by the charms of an atheistic cult parading as pure modern science. So, in this, we can see how hypocrisy is intricately interwoven into atheistic modern thinking. Law and order only applies as long as it does not contradict their personal anti-God agendas. To admit there is a Creator would mean that man cannot be his own self-ruling god. Humility toward and worship of the Creator would then have to displace the pride and arrogance that fuels his cravings for the knowledge of the origin of the universe.

The existence of a Creator would mean questions concerning the origin of the universe are already answered.

The same laws and order that presently exist in the universe would also apply to the primordial origins from which much of modern science claims we evolved. DNA coding is the biological data necessary for the formation of every aspect of our bodies down to the sub-cellular levels. It distinguishes all the kinds and species of creation from one another. Such vast data does not and cannot under any circumstances just magically occur by some random explosion, star dust, or by combining certain chemicals. Allowing the evolutionary process a very large amount of time (billions of years) will not change the facts nor the laws and order by which all things exist and mutate (in some cases). All of modern science chuckles at the notions of spontaneous regeneration and alchemy, but parades something just as ridiculous – the theory that primordial DNA coding occurred by random (evolutionary) chance and progressed over million years from a single cell organism unto modern mankind.

There is one thing that would compel a person to obsessively refuse self-evident commonsense.
(We will get to that later.)

Creating (anything) entails the implementation of absolute rules and order unto a finished product. To create music, a person must use their skill and stay within the boundaries of strict rules while composing. Otherwise, the music will benefit no one. The finished product would be nothing more than annoying and chaotic noise. When G. Marconi invented the radio, he discovered the existence of certain laws that govern radio transmission (aka Marconi's law). While the modern radio is a significant improvement over its early twentieth century counterpart, the same rules still apply concerning radio dynamics, frequencies, and transmissions. Did Marconi create the law of radio transmission? No, he discovered a law already in existence, set into place by an obviously greater source of intelligence. Truthfully, myriads of books could be and have been written portraying how certain rules, laws, and principles govern all the things of nature, human invention, and outer space. Such laws are integral to the very existence of all things that have or have not been discovered, evented, or built by mankind.

Think of it this way. If the earth deviated only slightly from its present orbit around the sun, it could become uninhabitable. Human existence depends on what seems to be a very delicate order. One asteroid or comet could change the fate of mankind. What would happen if the law of gravity ceased to function on earth?

Does the fate of humanity rest in the hands of fallible and very limited scientists or in the hands of a benevolent Creator? I would certainly prefer the later because, if indeed, there is a Creator then our fate rests in the hands of someone who has complete control

over everything *except for the everyday choices of the human will* (more on this in part two). “Modern science” is obsessed with solving the “mysteries” of the origins of the universe, always looking for more knowledge to quench their craving for self-rule and control, otherwise known as stubbornness and rebellion. That my dear friend is the bottom-line that that sets two opposing world views against one another. *This is the compelling force that would cause a person to absolutely refuse the self-evident and commonsense reality of a Creator.*

Evolutionary atheism champions the right of mankind to rule himself by ever advancing in knowledge. Creationism purports the idea that man cannot be self-ruling unto any good end because he is not all-powerful, all-knowing, and neither can he be everywhere at the same time. He has little knowledge, much less control, of those laws and order that hold the universe together. Failure to admit one’s fallibility and limitations is often the first step toward delusions of grandeur.

Not just the advancement but the very existence of all of creation depends on a definite order. This order establishes, fixes, ensures durability and integrity to all creation even down to the subatomic levels. These facts are commonly believed and heralded by modern atheistic, evolutionary science. How then can modern thinking hypocritically attribute absolute law to everything but human behavior? That would be as absurd as insisting that there are no laws governing radio transmission. Someone might respond, “Well, radio transmissions and people are not in the same category. That does not apply.” Okay, here’s another one to think about. Suppose your neighbor believes there is nothing wrong with having sex with someone else’s spouse and begins to hit on yours. Your relaxed attitude about “adultery” would suddenly change. What may have been a nice little tolerant way of thinking is now a not-so-desirable because the “immoral” behavior of another is now encroaching on your happiness. Adultery was not necessarily considered immoral by you until it became relative to your experience. This also is a type of moral relativism.

In this, we see the need for justice to avenge injustices committed by one person against another. Why do human governments of all kinds have justice systems? They were formed out of the commonsense and self-evident knowledge within a society of the need for absolute law and order for governing human behavior. Often, the objective of such law and order is to provide safety, justice, and freedom equally for all the people.

Are there consequences when natural laws are violated? Not-so-ancient proverb: he who jumps out of airplane at ten thousand feet without parachute will die. When moral law is violated there are also consequences that affect not only the victims but also the

offender. One immoral act is often the first step to worsening behavior. Even modern atheistic psychology would agree with this assessment although such behavior may not be referred to as immoral or sinful.

Only after admitting the self-evident reality of a Creator God, can any person begin to understand God's written record of creation (Genesis). Debating whether the formation of sedimentary layers, for instance, in the Grand Canyon (Arizona, USA) occurred over millions of years or happened quickly is all but futile if the self-evident reality of a Creator and His written record (the Holy Bible) are originally rejected. Nonetheless, fossils are not as intricately preserved in such scenarios if the sediments were not deposited quickly by a great flood (possibly Noah's flood). Modern fossilization examples prove the point. Deceased animal, insect, or plant life that are subjected to the elements without being immediately covered, deliberately buried, frozen, or preserved somehow are never intricately preserved by long-term hardened sedimentary layering.

Fossils in hardened sedimentary layers *are the records of the deaths of animal and plant life* and cannot credibly serve as a source of determining the age of the earth or the progress of atheistic evolution. None of us were there to see it and there are too many variables that affect sedimentary layering and fossilization. For instance, there exist modern examples of how large amounts of rain can cut large and deep ravines through limestone and other types in just the span of a few days. Catastrophic events such as floods, volcanic eruptions, and earthquakes have proven to accomplish hard sedimentary layering and erosion in a very short period of time (research the erosion caused by the eruption of the Mount St Helens volcano). Such commonsense only escapes those who are already deeply indoctrinated and, therefore, biased. Much of modern "science" already assumes what it's trying to prove (aka, begs the question).

The greater complexity of human biology and potential intelligence compared to that of a computer, for instance further proves the existence of a supremely intelligent Creator. This legitimizes the logical argument that no one would ever question that a computer had an intelligent designer. The notion that our very DNA coding is proof of a supremely intelligent designer escapes only those who arrogantly attribute DNA coding to some mystical, ambiguous, delusional process of random evolution. Only spiritually blind and naïve people would buy into such cultic insanity.

By the way, do you know what the main characteristics of a religious cult are? 1) Obsession with a lie, while parading it as the truth, 2) A obstinate departure from and rejection of commonsense and truth, 3) A refusal to listen to anything but their own outrageous claims, 4) Consistent falsification, misapplication, and twisting of self-

evident facts or truth to fit preconceived ideas, 5) Ever learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth and, 6) The leaders have a bewitching influence over their naïve followers to the point they cannot hear the truth and scoff at anything contrary to their delusion.

The verdict: evolution is their god and they boast in their knowledge. Evolutionary atheism *is* a religious cult with one of the largest followings in the history of this planet.

Absolute law and order rule the universe and the behavior of mankind whether or not we acknowledge or like it. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all things were...created (period) and are governed by a supremely intelligent Creator.

Now read part two: [*What is the Creator Like?*](#)

~~~~~\0/~~~~~

Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotes are from the New King James Version of the Holy Bible.

© Copyrighted, Gary H. Patterson. Permission granted to duplicate this article without omitting or altering any of the content.