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Introduction

After decades of research into the subject and innumerable debates and discussions I thought it was beneficial to write these books so that others may be able to receive at a glance what has taken me decades of exploration. In the following pages, I will uncover the brittle foundations of the materialistic position and show why it fails as an argument against the existence of God, and why it fails on its own merits as a philosophy.
When I use the word materialism in this book, I use it in a colloquial sense for Metaphysical Naturalism, also known as Ontological Naturalism. I use the word Materialism as a blanket description because it's a word that is understood at the street level by most people and has been in currency for some time. The naturalistic/materialistic assertion that the universe is a closed system of cause and effect that can be explained by purely naturalistic causes and processes without reference to a Creator is the unfounded nonsense that I'm going after in these books.

Wiser men have looked into the naturalistic proposition and have found it wanting. One such man by the name of Albert Einstein had this to say, "Everyone who is seriously involved in the pursuit of science becomes convinced that a spirit is manifest in the laws of the Universe—a spirit vastly superior to that of man, and one in the face of which we with our modest powers must feel humble."—Albert Einstein

The words of theoretical physicist, Michio Kaku also lead us away from the dogma of materialistic conclusions, "I have concluded that we are in a world made by rules created by an intelligence. Believe me, everything that we call chance today won't make sense anymore. To me it is clear that we exist in a plan which is governed by rules that were created, shaped by a universal intelligence and not by chance."

To date, after researching the arguments for and against the existence of God — for what seems like forever — I can honestly say that the arguments against the existence of God are miserably and fantastically bankrupt. Moreover, the alternative to God with regard to accounting for the universe and life — is nothing more than a bogus and fraudulent enterprise that is built upon the foundation and edifice of an ideological faith-based fantastical story that has zero evidence for it.

Over the decades in my discussions and debates, I've come to realize that over 90% of all those that proudly claim to be materialist know very little about it. For them, it's merely utilized and employed as an excuse to do their own thing and justify their own rebellion against their Creator, therefore, my task in these books is easy, I simply need to point to the GIANT elephant in the materialistic room. From a young age, when
I encountered people that did not believe in God I encountered a phenomenon entirely foreign to my experience — my own world. It became quickly apparent to me that my non-believing friends were also referring to their own experiences — or the lack thereof — when it came to their own beliefs. In short, they were simply bearing witness to their experiences, to their own lack of the experience of God. Upon questioning them for the reasons and justifications for their rejection of God I began to see the shallowness that grounded their rejection of God. No persuasive arguments were put forward by them — no good arguments against the existence of God, they were merely unbelievers by virtue of the lack of the experience of God in their own lives, and I was a believer by virtue of the experience of God in mine.

The fact is that many of those who SHOUT show me God the loudest are all too often the very same ones that don't want God in their lives; they don't want God meddling with their affairs. In short, the person that wants to rule on the throne of his own sovereignty has an invested interest in rejecting God. Motive is the first in a series of seven books that I have written. Each book is designed to decimate the credibility of atheism. I make no apologies for this.

In this seven-part series of books, beginning with the first book, 'Motive: Uncovering the Primal Rebellion in Atheism', I will address the materialistic worldview that is commonplace in our contemporary society today. In the first book, I'll uncover the sinister and demonic influences behind the atheistic enterprise and reveal what is driving the movement. I'll also reveal what really motivates a person to embrace a materialistic worldview and expose the dark historical fruits of atheism and explore what the enterprise of disbelief has contributed to the advancement of civilization. In these books, I'll expose the fundamental flaws in the materialistic story and show why materialism fails. If you're game and are even remotely interested in truth then proceed, if not then I highly recommend that you don't read these books.

Paul Ross
Chapter One: Motivating Factors

There are powerful motivating factors underpinning the enterprise of disbelief, there are benefits in adopting a materialistic worldview, in fact, these benefits are so powerful that they provide a conscious and subconscious impulse to reject God. The truth be told, many that are driven by a desire for pleasure with no regard to conscience or morality develop a curious pathological animosity towards the light, so to speak. The pathological link is well established, and the evidence is not in short supply (which I provide in these books). Over two thousand years ago another wise man also pointed this out,

"And this is the condemnation, the light has come into the world, but people loved the darkness more than the light because their actions were evil and will not come to the light lest their actions are exposed." –Jesus, John 3:19-20

The truth is, many cannot find God because they're not actually looking. Seeking God and the exaltation of one's own self-will are totally incompatible pathways, no rocket science here. The person who is truly seeking God accepts his own death – death to his own pride and death to his own insincerity and duplicitous intentions. Those that are insincere will never find God because God will not honour dishonesty, nor will he entertain human pride. But those who sincerely seek will find — that is God's guarantee.

There is something working within each one of us that bears witness to who and what we are. Because we are created by God the witness and seal of God – the Sensus Divinitatis – is within us and therefore, any attempt by the materialist to exorcise him or herself from this witness will prove
ultimately futile. Of course, such an exorcism is impossible, therefore they become insane, obsessed and delusional in the attempt to eradicate this divine witness. The continual reference to a Being that apparently does not exist is manifest evidence of their illness, and the groups that they gather in – the flock of the unbelieving – is merely an extra precaution to reinforce their protection against the divine witness that continually haunts them.

James Spiegel in his book, The Making of an Atheist, points to various underlying factors that make atheism highly desirable. In researching the lives of many famous atheists, he was able to identify a pattern and thread. In a moment of realization, Spiegel wrote,

"Could it be that their opposition to religious faith has more to do with the will than with reason? What if, in the end, evidence has little to do with how atheists arrive at their anti-faith? Perhaps we should consider the possibility that skeptical objections are the atheists' façade, a scholarly veneer masking the real causes of their unbelief causes that are moral and psychological in nature." (James Spiegel, The Making of an Atheist: How Immorality Leads to Unbelief, Page: 11)

From my own research and after decades of discussions with atheists I also came to realize that atheistic arguments are — in most part — nothing more than a cover masking their moral rebellion. The apostle Paul, in the book of Romans, pointed out that the issue is not a lack of evidence but rather the suppression of conscience in the pursuit of one's self-will and desires and therefore a powerful motivating factor for the rejection of God is identified.

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them."— Romans 1:18-19

In a culture of ever-increasing debauchery, hedonism and self-gratification we should expect the Spirit of Christ to be rejected. The Spirit of Christianity is always going to be opposed in the soul that chooses self-enthronement over God. A secular materialistic society is the
reflection of that soul.

English writer, novelist and philosopher, Aldous Huxley once said that the desire to justify one's immoral sexual practices has motivated many scholars to embrace cultural relativism and religious skepticism. Moreover, historical studies by Paul Johnson and E. Michael Jones have produced tons of evidence to support Huxley's claim.

Atheist philosopher Thomas Nagel exposes his own underlying bias when he writes, "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."

French politician and historian Louis Blanc, one of the important leaders of socialism had this to say,

"When I was an infant, I rebelled against my nurse. When I was a child, I rebelled against my teachers and my parents. When I was a man, I rebelled against the government. When I die, if there is any heaven and I go there, I will rebel against God."

The psalmist David identified the underlying condition of man's rebellion against God back in antiquity when he wrote, "The fool says in his heart, 'There is no God'" — Psalm 14:1

Anyone that has ever been involved in Christian ministry, or is human knows that any type of immorality and perversion never leads one closer to God but further away. It doesn't take a genius to see that an impure heart is not conducive to true devotion and this is why Jesus said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." — Matthew 5:8

It's very rare that you'll come across an atheist that will acknowledge that his impure desires are a powerful motivating factor in his rejection of God but every single atheist that has abandoned his atheism and turned to God has acknowledged this to be the case. In fact, if you question one that has rejected the existence of God in regard to the causes of his unbelief,
and if his totally honest — which is rare — you're more likely to discover a motive more than an actual argument. In most cases, motives to reject God come long before and the person later adopts various arguments to support a choice already made.

Robert Morey in his book, New Atheism writes, "A close study of the lives of atheists who developed sophisticated attacks on religion usually reveals they had already, for personal reasons, rejected God long before becoming freethinkers."

Morey continues, "Given the many atheists, agnostics, freethinkers, and other assorted infidels I have known through the years, in every single instance where I have been able to develop a friendship, the person has always admitted that his initial reasons for rejecting God were of a personal nature." (Robert Morey, The New Atheism, page, 54).

For example, Freud's rejection of God is no surprise once we learn that he made his wife move out of his bedroom, so his sister could sleep with him. Huxley also acknowledged that adopting materialistic philosophy gave him a way to indulge in immorality without feeling guilty.

Some atheists become physically sick when they are questioned in regard to the true origin of their rejection of God. Others are neurotic in their pathological aversion to God and prayer. In fact, there are thousands of documented cases of people that suffer from a condition called 'theophobia' wherein their pathological aversion to prayer and God is a great cause of distress for them. They hate God and are morally polluted with conflicting desires and a propensity towards rebellion against the Divine. One man, notoriously infamous for his contempt for God was the atheist philosopher Frederich Nietzsche. In the book, Modern Times, the historian Paul Johnson referred to Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini as the three devils of the twentieth century. Interestingly, Nietzsche's atheistic writings influenced all three, but I'll address this topic in greater depth in Chapter Six, The Dark Night of the Godless.

If one looks into the case reports of the phenomenon of exorcisms and demonic oppression around the globe, and down throughout history, it becomes quickly apparent that those who claimed to be afflicted by
malevolent forces also manifested an aversion towards God and struggled with some secret immoral enslavement and rebellion of the heart. If one also researches into the lifestyle choices of many atheistic intellectuals it won't take too long before one uncovers a whole world of moral rebellion and defiance against the Divine.

I've come to understand God's indictment against humanity, and that's the divine charge against the suppression of conscience in the wilful pursuit of autonomous self-rule. I understand it perfectly because I'm human as well. When it comes to underlying motives, we all share a common blindness, and this is why when I hear people say to me that they do not believe in God, because they cannot see Him, I put it down to another level of blindness, and I'll explain why in the next chapter in things unseen.

From decades of discussions and debates I came to realise that the atheistic claim of enlightenment and originality are bogus. Atheists claim to be original, but there is nothing original about them. They all Polly Parrot every line that their atheist high priests say, and all share the same chronic obsession, which is their mania fixation with God. If they were really all about the absence of God then one would expect to hear very little about God from them but if you listen to their talks, read their books, look at their blogs and attend their gatherings, God is everywhere and in everything they do and say.

For an enterprise built on the absence of God, their unrelenting preoccupation, their communal obsession speaks volumes. One could be forgiven for thinking that they are infected by a God phobia, some kind of contagion that sends them crazy, however, when you begin to see that there is a cause for their obsession than compassion and empathy should prevail in regard to them. Surely, they must have moments, brief glimpses of realisation when they see that the whole thing is making them unwell, but, alas, they cannot get off the treadmill because their obsession, their unrelenting enthusiasm for God’s non-existence just never ends.

If one investigates their arguments against the existence of God, it becomes quickly apparent that such arguments almost always invariably
fail when challenged. Case in point, many atheists have asked me if I believe in Zeus. Of course, the question is a frame-up, principally designed to smuggle-in another one of their spurious fallacies. When I say that I don't believe in Zeus, they say, "See, you are an atheist too, but we just go one less god than you." The fundamental problem with most atheistic fallacies is that illogical inconsistency must be adopted for the conclusion to work. The fallacy with this particular atheistic sleight of hands is that an absolute negation is confused with a relative one. I'll explain.

Going one less anything does not automatically necessitate the absolute negation of a thing. One less cookie does not mean no cookies, one less tree does not mean no trees. Just because there exists counterfeit money this does not automatically equate to the non-existence of real money. There may be many wrong answers to a math equation but to imply that there is no correct answer is a premature and erroneous conclusion. Absolute negations are like a giant eraser that the atheist use to arrive at absolute atheism and that's the kind of illogical dogmatism that they want us to embrace.

Chapter Two: Things unseen

I've heard people say to me that they don't believe in God because they cannot see Him, we've all heard it — I've heard it a gazillion times but have never found this to be a good argument against the existence of God because God is immaterial, so the evidence for God is not going to be found in material properties such as in atoms — protons, electrons, neutrons — things, stuff, rocks, and objects. God is Spirit, God is not a
carbon-based life form. God is not made up of the 118 elements in the periodic table. God is a Spirit — a Person —a presence —and therefore, can only be experienced.

As a presence — God is more comparable to other things in our experiences that we cannot directly see, such as wavelength, frequency, radio waves, electromagnetism, and gravity. In fact, all around us and going through us are frequencies, wavelengths in various forms that cannot be seen. If you use a mobile phone, Wi-Fi, television, or radio, then you are already taking some of these unseen realities for granted.

We cannot see God's presence, but we can experience Him. We cannot see the magnetic force around a magnet, but we can see the effects of its presence if you place an iron nail near it. We cannot see moral intuitions, logical reasoning, love, hope, despair, intentions, motives or ideas. However, the fact that we cannot see any of these things does not seem to present a problem for us. The truth be told, if we struggle to accept the immaterial nature of God, then we are going to have a hard time accepting the immaterial aspect of our own existence.

What do I mean? Well, if we break our body down we discover that 99% of our body is made up of oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, calcium and phosphorus — and the other 1% consists of trace elements — that's 100% of us accounted for, but that's not us. There is nothing in any of the ingredients here that accounts for our subjective experience of the world. Our subjective experience of the World — our consciousness and self-awareness — cannot be found in oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, calcium or phosphorus. Our consciousness cannot be reduced to hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulphur — and our reasoning does not arise from impersonal iron, magnesium, and zinc.

Our experience of the world is entirely subjective, our consciousness is not a property of matter, and our subjective experiences are non-material. In my subjective state, I experience other immaterial things such as reason, logic, conscience, conviction, judgment, evaluation, intention and love, but you'll never find any of these things in oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, calcium and phosphorus.
If we judged the world around us entirely upon sight — our perception — we would almost unanimously agree that it is concrete and solid. However, according to extensive research done in quantum physics the appearance of solidity is mostly an illusion because matter is made up of 99.9% empty space — this includes metal, rocks, and diamonds — and if you break it down further you come to a world of vibratory energy patterns of activity within fields. If you base your faith in only what you can see, then you won't believe in 94% of the universe because 94% of the universe cannot be seen — it cannot be observed. Only 6% of the universe is actual material matter, the other 94% is dark energy and dark matter. Given that we were created from a reality unseen it should not surprise us too much that when matter is reduced to the subatomic level we get closer to something immaterial.

"By faith, we understand that the universe was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made from things that are visible." — Hebrews 11:3

So much of our reality is made up of things that we cannot see. Case in point, Einstein proved the existence of wormholes mathematically along with scientist Nathan Rosen, but they are hypothetical — they cannot be observed, the same can be said regarding the recent scientific theory regarding the existence of multiple universes — they have never been observed, nor can be. The truth be told, much of our knowledge of the cosmos is theoretical, rather than observational. In fact, there are many scientists that would tell us that the existence of other dimensions are more likely than not, irrespective of what we see. Of course, we don't see or feel other dimensions; nevertheless, theoretical physics would tell us that their existence is highly likely. For one thing, M-theory would tell us that there are multiple hidden dimensions, possibly 10. Here we see no argument from science regarding the unobserved — the unseen.

Sight cannot always be trusted as the final authority because things are not always as they appear to us. For example, it appears to us that the Earth is fixed and stationary, but the truth is the exact opposite. The Earth orbits the Sun at an average speed of 67,000 mph, or 18.5 miles a second. In fact, the Sun, Earth, and the entire solar system are in motion, orbiting the centre of the Milky Way at an insane 140 miles a second.
Nothing really is as it appears. Our perspective — our perception — and the way things really are in reality may seem at odds with one another but that's only because we are restrained, confined and limited in our finitude and can only see things in part, we only see through the tools that we have.

Dinesh D'Souza provides us with an analogy to help us understand this. D'Souza tells us to consider a tape recorder. A tape recorder can only capture one mode of reality: sound. Tape recorders can hear but they cannot see, touch, or smell. Our senses place absolute limits on what reality is available to us. If we are only able to detect a limited range of dimensions — limited range of frequencies — due to our sensory limitations this does not mean that other dimensions — imperceptible — do not exist. I think D'Souza hit the nail on the head and the world of theoretical physics, as I've already shown, would not disagree.

As I've already shown there is much in scientific theory that is unobservable, but if I said that science itself was an enterprise anchored in the immaterial would you believe me? True story, scientists cannot even do their science without employing the immaterial because when a scientist does his scientific research, investigation, and evaluations he always employs mathematical and logical reasoning to make sense of his empirical science with its models of interpretation but he never stops to actually prove any of these mathematical and logical concepts, ideas and conclusions, he simply assumes them to be valid and true, they are smuggled-in, and nothing more is said in regard to them. Not just mathematical and logical reasoning but the scientist also employs in his scientific investigation value judgments, things that one will not find in physics and chemistry, in protons, neutrons and electrons, yet they underpin the very foundation of the scientific enterprise.

Here we see the immaterial bleeding into empirical science – its very underpinnings and foundations raised on the edifice of things that cannot be seen. In fact, if you were to remove mathematical, logical and moral reasoning from the scientific enterprise the whole shebang would collapse into senseless incoherency. The immaterial does not just serve as the foundational underpinning of science regarding mathematical, logical and moral reasoning but it also makes up the vast majority of our
experience of reality, as I've already shown.

**Chapter Three: materialistic assumptions**

I once went to a meeting made entirely up of atheists, except of course for me. The first thing that was obvious to me was their conceited smugness regarding their claim to what they could not know. They spoke and acted with such an air of certainty about God's apparent non-existence and seemed not at all aware of their own blindness or epistemic limitations. I came to see that most of their arguments suffered from fundamental flaws, I also came to see that their reasoning had no degree of independence, they thought and spoke as one. They all shared the same posturing, the same knee-jerk reactions and the same pretension of omniscience. This pretension of omniscience was not so much confessed but rather exhibited in their arrogance.

It seemed to escape their attention that any assertion regarding God's apparent non-existence could only ever have faith as its underpinning. The atheists that I spoke to that night failed to demonstrate the omniscience that would be required to prove their extraordinary conceited claim. One thing was clear to me and that was their certainty was anchored in their faith. Any assertion that God does not exist is a purely imaginary claim to knowledge, in short, a delusion. The claim of God's nonexistence is demonstrably self-defeating insofar as
such a claim to knowledge cannot be demonstrated. Therefore, the assertion regarding God’s non-existence is groundless and bogus.

One certain fact results from not beginning with omniscience and that is we can never know what reality is. Only through omniscience could any correction be made to our present understanding and interpretation of what we think reality is, this truism also applies to our scientific understanding of the true nature of reality. All our scientific models of interpretation remain ultimately and eternally unverifiable. Outside of omniscience, the best that a scientist can ever attain in the department of ontology is infinite ignorance regarding the final picture. This means that any materialistic hubris pontificating about God’s non-existence are fraudulent. Due to our finitude, we can only ever know in part — we are forever condemned to know in part. We can never see as God sees.

All knowledge regarding ultimate causation is beyond our observation and outside of empirical science. Most of our universe is outside of our horizon, therefore the question of observing other universes apart from our own remains completely and absolutely outside of our observation, and beyond our horizon. Now, these are not my thoughts but the thoughts of some of our smartest scientists. Therefore, given our epistemic limitations, it behoves us to embrace humility as an underlying principle. The materialist has promised us that he will explain all of reality through purely materialistic causes and processes but to date has failed to explain anything at all that matters. The materialistic explanation of the universe explains nothing and makes sense of nothing, dogmas are merely asserted to keep in step with a purely godless materialistic interpretation of reality.

To date, they have no explanation for the origin of the laws of physics. No explanation for the origin of life (There is no known example that life of any kind was ever generated from a non-living source). They have no explanation for the origin of information, and they cannot even begin to explain how mindless matter and energy magically turned into thinking, rational, self-aware persons that can reason and argue about materialistic dogma.

I understand that the materialist has a particular problem with Jesus
turning water into wine, yet they have no problem with a whole Cosmos with all of its law's, appearing out of nothing and for no purpose whatsoever. The materialist will tell us that miracles are impossible because they are a violation of natural laws — but of course — the whole Cosmos, popping out of nothing for no particular purpose whatsoever is a miracle they're happy to overlook.

Their problem is not with miracles per se, but only with miracles that owe their existence to an ultimate rational mind — God. The truth is, they have their miracles — plenty of them — an absolute abundance. In rejecting the existence of God, you don't escape from the miraculous. Retreating into the realm of purely naturalistic explanations in no way escapes the need to appeal to an endless list of improbable miracles. In fact, all explanations, no matter how far-fetched or bizarre are reasonable applicants as long as impersonal mindless forces and processes are ultimately responsible. I understand that in their worldview all explanations that absolutely exclude personal agency — God — are the only ones that can ever be valid.

And I also understand that when they are given the choice between miracles that arise from non-rational, accidental, purposeless forces, and between the miracles that are the by-products of a rational mind, they must choose the former over the latter. I appreciate that they have no choice because they have, a priori — in advance restricted themselves to only purely naturalistic explanations so as to remain a materialist — it's their religion, their philosophy, their cult — I get that.

I have compassion for them because I understand that their rejection of God is an 'a priori' philosophical position — a non-negotiable materialistic dogmatic doctrine that cannot be compromised. It's materialism through and through with absolute cultish fidelity towards the foundational principles of its own improbable faith. It's not science and has nothing to do with real science but is a philosophical opinion and interpretation on what they think and BELIEVE ultimate reality really is. It's a faith position and has nothing to do with real science.

Mysteriously, they will tell us that the Cosmos has no ultimate meaning (This is another one of their foundational assumptions), and will then go
on to try to convince us that their particular explanation is meaningful — this is delusional, can they not see it? I understand that their foundational philosophical faith-based dogma cannot have the phenomena of existence arising out of purposefulness, intentionality, intelligence, and direction. These things are all equally classified as materialistic heresy — an unforgivable sin in the materialistic cult — because they put into the mind the horrific idea of personal agency which translates to God, their chief and primary phobia.

The truth is that materialism is not humble, true, or beneficial in any way. It starts with an ASSUMPTION about reality, based on personal prejudice and the lack of an experience, with the additional handicap of very poor arguments and then goes on to insist the world adopt its view as the means to open-mindedness and enlightenment.

In short, the atheist finds himself existing in a universe that didn't plan for his existence, and yet, everything that he needs for his sustenance, development, and growth is mysteriously within his immediate environment. The idea of Divine Providence never seems to cross his mind — extraordinary! We were born into a world where our bodies require essential nutrients from food and water, proteins, fats, carbohydrates, vitamins, minerals, and water are absolutely essential for our development, growth and cell repair. The water and nutrients are absorbed into our bloodstream, which is transported to where it is needed. For the materialist, this is just a haphazard, accidental fluke of undirected impersonal processes so no need to thank anybody. We are told that the gathering together of all our biological systems and functions, in just the right places, is nothing more than pure coincidence, the magical, haphazard, accidental fluke of undirected impersonal forces. This is standard materialistic doctrine.

They want us to believe that our DNA, via dumb undirected mindless processes — for no reason and purpose whatsoever — just haphazardly, so happened to underwrite the instructions to make our cardiovascular systems, digestive systems, endocrine systems, immune systems, muscular systems, nervous systems, reproductive systems, respiratory systems, skeletal systems, eyes, hearts, lungs and ears — that in turn form into reasoning self-aware beings.
It appears that the materialist has dumb mindless, accidental, undirected processes doing the most miraculous and impossible things. Who needs a Creator when mindless matter can do anything? It's the magical play-dough in the materialistic toy box. Because magic serves as the ontological foundation of the materialistic story anything is possible and no sorcery, wizardry or conjuring is excluded. Who needs a Creator, intelligence, intention or direction when mindless dumb, entirely purposeless forces can do things that Walt Disney has yet to imagine.

Materialistic explanations do not adequately make sense of the most common phenomena of human experiences, such as the phenomena of consciousness. In fact, it has never been shown — never been demonstrated — how biochemical processes can transform into conscious subjective experiences — it's simply claimed that they do, somehow, someway. Neither do materialistic explanations explain the existence of conscience, moral intuitions and the propensity towards spirituality — nor can the materialist show how mindless dumb matter writes its own informational software code, as manifested in every molecule, atom, and elementary particle. In fact, it has never been shown or demonstrated how impersonal mindless matter and energy can write its own software code. The best scientists know of no known law of nature that writes informational code and instruction in matter — and yet the universe is teeming with it.

According to the New Scientist magazine, just one single teaspoon of DNA can hold everything from Plato through the complete works of Shakespeare to Beyoncé’s latest album. Just one gram of DNA can hold up to 455 exabytes of data? If we want to store all the digital information in the world, all we will need is two grams of DNA. Perry Marshall also points out that DNA, in a most elegant and efficient way, actually builds the machines it controls, and this makes it light years ahead of any earthly software that we know of. It appears that the most amazing technological intelligence has been here for a very long time, and we had nothing to do with its existence. Something or somebody is way ahead of us when it comes to outrageous ingenuity.

As it stands, March 2018, there are 129,864,880 books in the world that
have been published, according to Google. If it was possible that mindless impersonal haphazard accidental non-rational undirected unguided purposeless forces and processes could produce information and knowledge, then at least ONE of these books should have come into existence without a mind. Now, the very fact that every single one of them is the by-product of a mind speaks volumes in regard to the phenomenon and existence of information that is present everywhere in nature, such as the information in the laws of physics, in every single processing atom, and in the mind-boggling sophisticated complexity of DNA.

There is no evidence whatsoever of any knowledge or complex information arising out from mindless, non-rational, haphazard, accidental impersonal processes and forces. The materialist has never even remotely come close to showing how life arose from dead matter. There is no shred of evidence whatsoever to support the materialistic claim that life, consciousness & information arose out of mindless, dumb matter, yet they assert their fanciful philosophical story that if you give purposeless nothingness long enough it will start to think, reason, argue and exhibit moral convictions. STUFF HAPPENS, that's the magic of materialism — you just have to believe. Such is the nonsense spouted by the materialistic magician.

Here is a recent discussion that I had with a materialist over the existence of the universe. I've included it in this book because it echoes the general position of the materialistic position.

Paul: Mr Materialist, I have a question for you?

Materialist: Sure!

Paul: You don't believe in the existence of God; therefore, you would have to say that the universe created itself.

Materialist: Yes, that's correct.

Paul: To create itself it would have had to exist prior to its own existence. This means that the universe would have had to exist and not exist simultaneously — at the same time — and that's not only illogical and
irrational but it's a self-refuting contradiction and self-refuting contradictions by definition do not exist, unless of course, yousubscribe to a philosophy of illogical absurdity.

Materialist: Well, Stephen Hawking says that the universe came from nothing. In fact, his own words are: "because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing".

Paul: You see, that's exactly my point, he is presupposing the existence of the universe to account for the universe's existence and that's incoherent and self-contradictory. Moreover, it's a double self-contradiction because he says, "Because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing." The existence of gravity is not nothing but something, so that's philosophically incoherent. Philosopher, Keith Ward points this error out when he says that it's LOGICALLY IMPOSSIBLE for a cause to bring about some effect without already being in existence. Hawking is explaining the existence of the universe by PRESUPPOSING the existence of gravity, quantum fields, fluctuations, a bubbling vacuum, variation principles and symmetry groups.

From whence this came nothing is said. Gravity, quantum fields, fluctuations, a bubbling vacuum, variation principles and symmetry groups are not nothing, they are a whole lot of something, and yet they are invoked to explain the existence of the universe but who created these things? No answer is given they are merely presupposed and this is the evasive, dishonest and equivocal language that atheists typically use.

Some atheists invoke an infinite array of universes to account for the incredible mind-boggling fine-tuning of this particular universe. But not only is this a belief that can never be observed — and therefore must be taken on faith — but it's also the greatest non-answer provided because it still does not account for the origin of a universe-making machine, so to speak, for the origin of its laws, and just merely kicks the can further down the road. If such an explanation is invoked to eliminate the need for a Creator, then it fails miserably.

If you and I were walking through a barren desert and happened to
stumble across some unusual architecture I would consider it to be a lunatic explanation if you said that this unusual architecture was not the result of intelligence but could be perfectly explained by postulating a billion trillion random universes, because when you have so many, one is bound to accidentally result with the APPEARANCE of being designed. Honestly, who reasons like this? Well, atheists invoke this kind of reasoning all the time when they need to explain the appearance of design away, to put it down to a lucky coincidence — to get rid of God but it fails. As I’ve just shown, the foundational assumptions of materialistic explanations are horrifically bankrupt, and this will explain why atheism has made no positive contributions to any civilization.

If you were to look for a library cataloguing the contributions of atheism you would find none. If you were to look for one single solitary book noting the positive contributions of atheism you would also find nothing — this is no conspiracy, there simply is nothing to find. Atheism has contributed nothing to the betterment of humanity. No Red Cross or Salvation Army, Samaritan's Purse, Compassion International, World Vision, Saint Vincent's de Paul or any of the other 84,000 Christian charitable organizations. There is nothing in or about atheism that has inspired a mass movement towards love, altruism, forgiveness or sacrifice. No hospitals or universities started by atheists. No institutions of charity or orphanages. No inventions or medical breakthroughs. No atheistic movements to end slavery or inspire humanity to greater moral heights. No Magna Carta, Constitution, Emancipation Proclamation or Handel's Messiah.

No Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Shakespeare, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Eleanor Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, Nelson Mandela, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, Oskar Schindler, Mozart, Johann Sebastian Bach, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Wright Brothers, Florence Nightingale, William Wilberforce, George Muller, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, John Newton, John Wesley or William Booth. I could go on forever but I'm sure you get my point — atheism is bankrupt and has contributed nothing to the beauty and betterment of our world, and this leads us onto the next chapter, what's atheism have to do with science.
Chapter Four: What’s Atheism Have to do With Science?

Atheists have often said to me that if it was not for science, they would not have a mobile phone, a radio, or a television, and there would be no vaccines for deadly diseases. Am I missing something? How does the materialistic faith-based assumption — this smuggled-in philosophical position that only natural things exist — have any bearing on how one does their science? If your dentist gives you a tablet for your toothache — this is science. If he extracts the tooth or takes an X-ray — this is science as well. If he tells you that the universe is NOT a Creation of God — this is NOT science, but atheistic faith-based evangelism and you need to know the difference.

For many, the word materialistic is conflated with the word scientific. In other words, the materialist assumes his faith-based philosophy to be in the domain of real science. Insofar as science is an objective process of discovery it must remain metaphysically neutral. As soon as a scientist asserts materialism to be THE TRUTH he has stepped out of the realm of science and into the realm of metaphysical philosophy.

Atheists always present themselves as true devotees of science but will forget to mention that the very term 'scientist' was first coined by an Anglican priest and leading theologian by the name of William Whewell. They pride themselves on the scientific method but will leave out the fact
that the father of the scientific method, Francis Bacon was a devout Christian. They speak of the incredible scientific contributions of Sir Isaac Newton — one of the greatest scientists of all time, and a devout Christian, but will not embrace Newton's humility wherein he made it perfectly clear that science does not encompass all of reality. They will also forget to mention that all the scientific and technological breakthroughs that we take for granted today had/have nothing whatsoever to do with atheism. Atheism contributed NOTHING.

Philosophical naturalism is not a neutral position, it's a way to view the world — it's a worldview, an ideological smuggled-in assumption. In fact, it's an assumption that some of history's smartest men of science were not shackled by. Francis Bacon, the very founder of the scientific method was a Christian and had no need of that hypothesis — materialistic assumption to do his science, nor did any of the other great giants of science. This materialistic assumption came into science much later and was nothing more than a reflection of a materialistic and Godless society. This ideological philosophical doctrine is now the reigning ideological default position of a secular and Godless culture and many scientists are suffocating under its ideological dictatorship.

How is a scientist free to follow the evidence wherever it leads, Socrates guiding principle, when they are bullied and threatened by an institutional default position that enforces a materialistic authoritarian despotism?

Of course, this kind of atheistic tyrannical coercion is nothing new. We have been down this road before with leaders such as Mao, Stalin, Pol Pot, Enver Hoxha, Fidel Castro, Nicolae Ceausescu, Kim Jong-il and many others that insisted (with the threat of beatings and executions) that we all share the same ideological materialistic worldview, I'll speak more about this in chapter six.

For now, it does us well to remember that the overwhelming majority of scientists who were instrumental in bringing humanity into a glorious age of knowledge and igniting the scientific revolution — 16th-17th century — were all passionately devoted to God and sought to give Him Glory in their pursuit of truth, such as in the case of mathematician and
astronomer, Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Rene Descartes, Isaac Newton, and Johannes Kepler, just to name a few. Some of the world's best scientists did not see it as a departure from reason to invoke a grand architect in regard to the existence of the extraordinary intricate mathematical structures and patterns in our universe. Neither did they see it as a departure from reason to invoke a lawgiver (personal agency) regarding the origin of these laws (Laws of physics) that gave rise to mechanisms and processes that materialized into a finely-tuned universe, which in turn gave rise to life.

They invoked God. But for them, it was not a departure from reason, but rather the grounding of reasoning itself — the grounding for rationality and intelligence — as opposed to appealing to haphazard, accidental, impersonal, mindless, unguided, purposeless forces and processes — via the means of unexplained laws of physics that in turn came from nothing and for no particular reason. Nicholas Copernicus did not think that invoking God was a departure from reason, nor did Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, Johannes Kepler, Galileo Galilei, Rene Descartes, Blaise Pascal, Robert Boyle, Michael Faraday, Gregor Mendel — nor did Francis Bacon, the founder of the scientific method.

Below, is a list of scientists that changed our world forever, as you read their names and the amazing contributions that each one made to the advancement of civilisation just bear in mind that none of them subscribed to a materialistic/atheistic worldview. Their devotion to God did not get in the way of their scientific research, in fact, they would tell you that their devotion to God served as the very inspiration.

Nicolaus Copernicus, astronomer, mathematician and the first astronomer to posit the idea of a heliocentric solar system.

Galileo Galilei, astronomer, physicist, engineer, philosopher, and mathematician who played a major role in the scientific revolution.

Johann Kepler, best known for his laws of planetary motion.

Isaac Newton, discoverer of gravity.
Francis Bacon, founded the scientific method.

Nicolas Steno, a pioneer in both anatomy and geology.

Nicholas of Cusa, contributions to the field of mathematics by developing the concepts of the infinitesimal and of relative motion.

William Turner, father of English botany.

Robert Boyle, he is considered one of the most important figures in the history of Chemistry.

Albrecht von Haller, the father of modern physiology.

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, German philosopher, mathematician, and logician who is probably most well known for having invented the differential and integral calculus (independently of Sir Isaac Newton).

Antoine Lavoisier, the father of modern chemistry.

Nicole Oresme, the Discovery of the curvature of light through atmospheric.

Carl Linnaeus, father of modern taxonomy.

Joseph Priestley, credited with discovering oxygen.

Georges Cuvier, father of palaeontology.

Alessandro Volta, invented the first electric battery. {The unit Volt was named after him.}

Andre Marie Ampere, one of the founders of classical electromagnetism. {The unit for electric current, Ampere, is named after him.}

John Abercrombie, the one who created the textbook about neuropathology.

Benjamin Silliman, was the very first person to distil petroleum and a founder of the American Journal of Science.
Michael Faraday, He is known for his contributions in establishing electromagnetic theory and his work in chemistry such as establishing electrolysis.

Charles Babbage, the first computer scientist who originated the idea of a programmable computer.

James Clerk Maxwell, He is known for his contributions in establishing the electromagnetic theory.

Gregor Mendel, father of modern genetics.

Heinrich Hertz, the very first who conclusively proved the existence of the electromagnetic waves.

Asa Gray, Gray's Manual remains a pivotal work in botany.

Louis Pasteur, French biologist, microbiologist and chemist renowned for his discoveries of the principles of vaccination, microbial fermentation and pasteurization.

Lord Kelvin, he did important work in the mathematical analysis of electricity and formulation of the first and second laws of thermodynamics.

Wilhelm Röntgen, produced and detected electromagnetic radiation in a wavelength range known as X-rays.

Guglielmo Marconi, known for his pioneering work on long-distance radio transmission and for his development of Marconi's law and a radio-telegraph system.

William Williams Keen, the first brain surgeon in the United States.

Max Planck, a theoretical physicist whose work on quantum theory won him the Nobel Prize in Physics.

Arthur Eddington, He is famous for his work regarding the theory of
relativity.

Alexis Carrel, French surgeon and biologist who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine.

Charles Glover Barkla, winner of the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1917 for his work in X-ray spectroscopy.

Max Born, a German physicist and mathematician who was instrumental in the development of quantum mechanics. Born won the 1954 Nobel Prize in Physics for his "fundamental research in Quantum Mechanics, especially in the statistical interpretation of the wave function.

Georges Lemaître, Roman Catholic priest who was first to propose the Big Bang theory.

Werner Heisenberg, theoretical physicist and one of the key pioneers of quantum mechanics.

Wernher von Braun, one of the most important rocket developers and champions of space exploration.

Pascual Jordan, a theoretical and mathematical physicist who made significant contributions to quantum mechanics and quantum field theory.

Mary Kenneth Keller, an American nun who was the first woman to earn a PhD in Computer Science in the US.

Frederick Rossini, noted for his work in chemical thermodynamics.

Jérôme Lejeune, geneticist known for research into chromosome abnormalities, particularly down syndrome.

Alonzo Church, He made major contributions to mathematical logic and the foundations of theoretical computer science.

Ernest Walton, won the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1951 for his work with
John Cockcroft with "atom-smashing" experiments done at Cambridge University in the early 1930s, and so became the first person in history to artificially split the atom, thus ushering the nuclear age.

Nevill Francis Mott, was a Nobel Prize-winning physicist known for explaining the effect of light on a photographic emulsion.

Carlos Chagas Filho, Neuroscientist who headed the Pontifical Academy of Sciences for 16 years.

Sir Robert Boyd, a pioneer in British space science.

C. F. von Weizsäcker, German nuclear physicist who is the co-discoverer of the Bethe-Weizsäcker formula.

Joseph Murray, Catholic surgeon who pioneered transplant surgery. He won the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 1990.

Nicola Cabibbo, discoverer of the universality of weak interactions.

Brian Kobilka, Nobel Prize winner of Chemistry in 2012, and is a professor in the departments of Molecular and Cellular Physiology.

Fabiola Gianotti, particle physicist and the Director-General of the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN).

**Chapter Five: escape from Christianity**
When I hear atheists and liberals mock and attack Christianity I always encourage them to migrate to a country where none of the influences of Christianity are present. I tell them that it would be better for them to live in a country where none of the plagues of Christianity has taken root — Better to go to North Korea, Syria, Cuba, Libya, Burma, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Sudan, Yemen, Haiti, Indonesia, Cambodia, Nigeria, Lebanon, Pakistan, Jordan, Algeria, and Angola. Better to go to a country where Christianity has not spread its influence. Better to live in a country where there is virtually no freedom of speech, no free enterprise, no representative government, no civil liberties, virtually no rights for women than live in a country where Christianity has installed and disseminated such vile values.

Better to live in a country where Christianity has no place to install its principal value of high regard for human life, high regard for women, freedom of speech, civil liberties, representative government, free enterprise, and the elevation of human sacredness. Who wants to be imposed upon by the Good Samaritan with its ethic that extends sacred value and worth to the individual? Who wants an ethical system that's responsible for ending cannibalism in nations all around the world or the predominant principle of helping the weak and destitute that has alleviated the suffering of the poor to the farthest corners of the globe with the intervention of medicine, hospitals, clean water, welfare, orphanages? In fact, Christians are single-handedly the largest providers of healthcare, charity, and education throughout the world. Christianity played almost an exclusive role in the development of the institution of the hospital. The example and teaching of Jesus inspired ministers, priests, monks, nuns, missionaries, and untold numbers of laymen to bring medical help to the poor in almost every country of the world.

Who wants to entertain a Christianity that virtually wiped out child sacrifice in the ancient world, ended the virtue of suicide, and the devaluing of women and human life? Who wants to be a part of an enterprise that virtually single-handedly is responsible for ending slavery in the west, given that over a third of those in the abolition of slavery movement were Christians? — but we should not be too surprised by this fact because the true message of Christianity when applied always
translates to freedom and liberation — in fact, it contains the very seeds of liberation. Where ever it's gone it has been a force against enslavement, oppression, injustice, abuse, and violence. It gives dignity to the devalued and condemns the abuse and corruption of power.

It's a peculiar sound in the ears when I hear a God-mocker attacking Christianity while going to a university — fascinating because of their fascinating depth of ignorance. Do they not know, have they not been told, that the very phenomenon of the university itself had its roots in the Christian endeavours? Are they even aware of the fact that the greatest universities worldwide were started by Christians? Names like: Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton — just to name a few — were all established for the glory of God. In fact, almost every one of the first one hundred-twenty-three colleges and universities in the United States had Christian origins.

No other religion, philosophy, teaching, nation, or movement—whatever—has so changed the world for the better as Christianity has done. Christian influence on values, beliefs, and practices in Western culture are abundant and well ingrained into the flourishing society of today. Biblical commandments such as "Thou shalt not kill", "Do not steal", "Do not bear false witness", and the sanctity of life underpin much of the Western legal system. In fact, common law was heavily influenced by Christian philosophy. This philosophy argues that there is a divine reason for the existence of fundamental laws.

Do you value the contributions of science? Well, you can thank an overwhelming majority of Christians for those contributions, as I've already shown in the previous chapter. It's interesting to note that some of the most famous scientists that were instrumental in bringing humanity into a glorious age of knowledge were all devoted to Christ and sought to give Him Glory in their pursuit of truth.

The fact is those that attack Christianity and seek to have it eradicated, expunged, erased and criminalized will not live in a country where that has already been done because they don't want to join the oppressed, they want to keep their civil liberties and freedom of speech. They want their hospitals, high regard for life, healthcare, representative government, free
enterprise and rights to live according to their beliefs. They want to live free from persecution, tyranny, dictatorship, despotism, totalitarianism, and harassment. And yet, paradoxically they want to destroy the very foundation that made these things possible — such is the insanity that is destroying civilization.

A Chinese professor from the Chinese Academy of Science in Beijing, 2002 confessed to an auditorium of people that he had spent years searching for the reason for why the West had succeeded in the way that it had. Success regarding its freedoms, laws, free speech and thriving free market. And this is what he concluded:

"One of the things we were asked to look into was what accounted for the success, in fact, the pre-eminence of the West all over the world," he said. "We studied everything we could from the historical, political, economic, and cultural perspective. At first, we thought it was because you had more powerful guns than we had. Then we thought it was because you had the best political system. Next, we focused on your economic system. But in the past twenty years, we have realized that the heart of your culture is your religion: Christianity. That is why the West has been so powerful. The Christian moral foundation of social and cultural life was what made possible the emergence of capitalism and then the successful transition to democratic politics. We don't have any doubt about this." {Jesus in Beijing: How Christianity is Transforming China and Changing the Global Balance of Power, David Aikman}

Now, when I speak of the blessings bequeathed to us through the dedication of Christian individuals I'm not referring to the force of political institutions or corrupt leaders but to individual people that loved and sacrificed their lives for the benefit and blessings of others. Such individuals were merely living as their book instructed them.

"But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Highest; for He Himself is kind to ungrateful and evil men."—Jesus, Luke 6:35

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness..." —Galatians: 5:22-23
"Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by this some have entertained angels without knowing it." —Hebrews 13:2

Any action/s that deviate from these central Christian principles are blatantly unchristian in nature. In fact, Jesus warned us about wolves that would come dressed in sheep's clothing. Any behaviour that does not flow from the fruits of the Holy Spirit — as listed in Galatians: 5:22-23 — are actions clearly not coming from the Spirit of Christ.

In short, the definition of what it is to be human (humane) has largely been a gift of Christian virtue, as opposed to the blind pitiless indifference of materialistic impersonal forces. The good Samaritan ethic and the Golden rule of doing unto others as you would have others do unto you — as promoted, encouraged and endorsed by Jesus — have had a tremendous and extraordinary impact upon the formation of the values of Western civilization. Of course, if Jesus was a materialist no such moral obligations would have ever been exalted to such a high platform. If Jesus had been a Vladimir Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Kim Jung-un or Karl Marx we would have never heard of the Good Samaritan ethic, nor would have we cared too much about the poor, oppressed and suffering.

In fact, most evil is caused by people who live lives in total disregard towards God's moral law. The Supreme Royal Law is the law of love that Jesus taught. If you are killing, hating, stealing or slandering your fellow-man than you are doing so in total disregard to God's law of love. In short, if we all lived according to this law of love then 90% of all evil would cease to exist in our world. Many will raise evil and suffering as an argument against the existence of God but will be suspiciously quiet regarding all that which is good in the world. The true and beautiful, the love, compassion, empathy, kindness, altruism, giving and sacrifice? It seems to me that the skeptic has tilted the scales of good and evil all to one side — but this will not do.

Paradoxically, the materialist will invoke and appeal to moral standards, values, and judgments, although their Creator — mindless matter — is absolutely indifferent to their fabrications. They talk about their Rights, but without God, there are no inalienable rights, endowed to them by their Creator. There is NO purpose to human existence. No value, no final
court of appeal. What values? What rights? What purpose? In their worldview, nothing can go wrong because there is no right way that it should go in the first place. The atheist is desperate to have a universe without God because he knows that impersonal energy, gravity and electromagnetism will not hold him accountable. He knows that atoms are not concerned about his sin, and is confident electrons are not keeping records.

Materialist, talk about morals and values but I'm curious to how non-moral energy, gravity, and electromagnetism even BEGIN to bring forth moral conviction in a purely materialistic universe? Atoms and molecules don't generate guilt, conviction, and conscience — energy does not dictate what choices we SHOULD make — gravity imparts no pain of conscience. Atoms, molecules, and quarks are neither righteous nor unrighteous, and yet we are unable to act outside of a moral framework, it's a very big part of what we are but, in their dogma, moral intuitions, conscience and personal will are just an accidental epiphenomenal illusion because such things are not the property of mindless matter and energy.

I've always found it extraordinarily odd that those who reject God are perpetually invoking God's existence to raise their arguments against Him. Paradoxically, the materialist will invoke God's existence to blame Him for all the evil and suffering in the world and will then retreat back into his atheism. The atheist invokes the existence of God to serve Him with an indictment, therefore God exists while the indictment is being served and this kind of gives the whole game away. Through one side of their mouth they will tell us that the universe has no ultimate meaning, and through the other, they will preach that we SHOULD be living, behaving and conducting ourselves in a certain way, but in their philosophy, all such moral obligations are fictional because NATURE is totally indifferent to them. Paradoxically, they will pride yourself on not being a part of a religion and will boast of having a worldview that does not tell one how to live, believe, behave, or think — but the fact is the proponents of this naturalistic worldview continually attempt to explain our existence, define our meaning, and command how we should think about reality. They have a lot to say about important events in a person's
life, particularly one's origin, life, marriage, and death.

Of course, an atheist can be a good person, show kindness and help others but atheism is neither the cause nor the inspiration for these tendencies. Impersonal mindless, non-moral atoms neither inspire the atheist to be good nor impose any moral obligations upon him to act so. If he is to be good, generous and kind it's despite his atheism — his atheism has nothing to do with it. From whence comes this inclination, this nature to be good, generous and kind? Not from impersonal atoms. We that honor God, understand that goodness, generosity, and kindness are written into our very nature — a part of us because that's the nature of reality — a reality expressing the nature of our Creator and this is why guilt, remorse, and shame are experienced because we are a moral creation, as opposed to an accidental one, and because atheists are created by God also they will exhibit God-created qualities such as goodness, generosity, and kindness. I'm reminded of a story that Richard Wurmbrand once told while spending 14 years in a communist atheist prison, his story elucidates my point.

"Florescu, a half-gypsy thief, pulled up a wooden stool and sat down to talk with Richard in the cell. "I believe in what I can see, taste, and feel," Florescu said. "We're all matter, like this bit of wood I'm sitting on, and when you're dead, that's it." Richard had to prove a point. He stood up and kicked the stool out from under Florescu. The stool shot across the floor and slammed into the wall. Florescu hit the floor with a hard thump. "What was that for?" Florescu yelled, scrambling to his feet. "But you said you were matter like the stool," Richard replied calmly. "I didn't hear the stool complain!"

So, what happens if the Godless get their way? Well, I'm glad that you asked because they did get their way in the past — in fact, quite recently and the results were disastrous as we shall now see.
Jesus promised that where two or three are gathered in His name, he would be there in the midst of them, but for Pol Pot, if three Christians gathered and prayed, they could be accused of being enemies of the regime and arrested or executed. Such is the joyous liberation that secular — atheistic enlightenment brings. Leaders such as Mao, Stalin, the Cambodian communist leader Pol Pot, the Albanian communist leader Enver Hoxha, Prime minister of Cuba Fidel Castro, Romanian president Nicolae Ceausescu and Kim Jong-il would have all fully endorsed the silence of the Christian voice, so would have Adolf Hitler, Friedrich Nietzsche, Vladimir Lenin and Karl Marx.

North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un taught his Puppet STATE that religion was an opiate of the people — and what he meant by that was a chemical sleep-inducing, dull-numbing narcotic. Of course, this was not an original thought swimming around in Kim's head — like his fellow atheist's — this notion had its roots in an ideological, savage barbarous and inhumane philosophy — a philosophy responsible for the brutal, blood-dripping murder of over 130 million people. It was the atheistic age of Godlessness, a rule of law devoted to the clinical extraction of this so-called narcotic from people by beating them to death and smashing their skulls against concrete walls. In fact, it was their attempt at killing God one person at a time.

The Chinese people would not escape this tsunami of atheistic utopia, thanks to Marx's influence over Mao's mind. Mao was bewitched by atheistic materialism which would result in the death of
between 45-70 million Chinese in the years 1958 to 1966. Mao Zedong (毛泽东), obsessed with the ideology of atheist Karl Marx was dedicated to the vision of spreading Marx's ideology throughout China. How did that work out for him? It resulted in one of the greatest catastrophes that the world has ever known. The original Marxist-Leninist worldview was notoriously known for its zero tolerance for belief in God. Mao adopted Marxism–Leninism while working at Peking University and he became quickly smitten with its global vision. In fact, he was so consumed by its philosophy that he became a founding member of the Communist Party of China. Karl Marx was a visionary, and he deemed it absolutely necessary to destroy religion because in his judgment faith in God was an opium, a drug substitute which prevents man from becoming aware of his dignity. It was Karl Marx that helped Kim, Mao, Stalin, Lenin, Enver Hoxha, Nicolae Ceausescu and Pol Pot to realize that God was the opiate of the masses, for Marx, the solution was simple — religion had to be eradicated so that the creation of the new man — and the new utopia — freed from the shackles of God and religion could shine-forth into an enlightened age of reason. So what kind of dignity did Marx's atheistic ideological vision give to humanity? The answer is easy: Blood, pain, torture, oppression, terror, and fear. The terrible cruelties that were justified in the name of atheist Karl Marx should not surprise us when Marx's closest collaborator in the foundation of modern communism, Friedrich Engels wrote in, Anti-Duhring,

"Universal love for men is an absurdity, we need hate rather than love – at least for now." –Friedrich Engels

Marx was anti-religious because, in his opinion, religion obstructs the fulfilment of the Communist ideal, which he considered the only answer to the world's problems. Marx wanted a world without God and millions would pay with their lives to build this utopian world of atheistic paradise. Bukharin, one of Marx's associates in the First International, was an anarchist and hater of God and I suspect that atheist Marx would have been inspired by Bukharin's quote below,

"Satan is the first free-thinker and saviour of the world. He frees Adam and impresses the seal of humanity and liberty on his forehead, by making him disobedient." –Bukharin
Vladimir Lenin, added his voice to this madness when he wrote, "Every religious idea, every idea of God, every flirtation with the idea of God is unutterable vileness, vileness of the most dangerous kind, 'contagion' of the most abominable kind. Millions of sins, filthy deeds, acts of violence and physical contagions are far less dangerous than the subtle, spiritual idea of a God."

Comrade Lenin went on to add, "Our program necessarily includes the propaganda of atheism."

This same sentiment is expressed in the words of Karl Marx when he wrote, "We make war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the state, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keynote of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed."

Anyway, to cut a long story short, over 130 million people were killed in state authorized purges by a long line of atheistic leaders: 72 million people killed in China, 40 million in the former USSR, Hitler 15 million, 2 million in North Korea, 2 million in Cambodia, 1.7 million in Africa, 1.5 million in Afghanistan, 1 million in Vietnam, 150 thousand in Latin America by leaders such as Mao, Stalin, Hitler, the Cambodian communist leader Pol Pot, the Albanian communist leader Enver Hoxha, Prime minister of Cuba Fidel Castro, Romanian president Nicolae Ceausescu and Kim Jong-Il.

All of these despots, dictators and God-hating tyrants were driven by a grand vision to impose an ideological package onto the whole world — and part of that package included the eradication of religion — which translated to systematic atheistic, materialistic indoctrination in all state schools as well as the closing down of all places of worship, coupled with the biggest manhunt to arrest, imprison, torture and brutally execute those that were guilty of the crime of loving God. I have read literally hundreds of biographies over a span of 30 years from men and women that have spent much time in barbaric prisons, such as, atheistic Chinese concentration camps, atheistic Cambodian concentration camps, atheistic North Vietnam concentration camps and atheistic North Korean
concentration camps — and all have testified to the fact of being indoctrinated extensively with Godless materialistic philosophy.

In fact, the camp philosophy was employed simultaneously with beatings and torture so that the one being beaten would understand at a philosophical level that there was no moral argument that could be raised to judge those doing the torturing. These guards made it clear that without God THERE IS NO final court of appeal. What is so hard to understand about this? In fact, torture, mass executions, forced labour and malnutrition were part and parcel of the new atheistic paradise. One gentleman by the name of Richard Wurmbrand — who would go on to become a major voice for the oppressed around the world — endured many beatings from his atheistic prison guards. On one particular occasion, after a terribly painful beating, Richard cried out to them and said, "Is there no human kindness or empathy in you at all?" They laughed and replied with a quote that atheist Lenin often used, "You cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs."

Richard reported that the atheistic communist torturers often said, "There is no God, no hereafter, and no punishment for evil. We can do what we wish.' I have heard one torturer even say, '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 unbelievable brutality and torture inflicted on prisoners."

Survivors, of tortures too horrible to mention, have told us that the guards and police in gulags, concentration camps, and torture chambers used godless materialistic reasoning to justify their acts of murder and genocide and invoked godless materialistic philosophy as their moral right to do so.

Materialism, as a philosophy, proved most beneficial insofar as it tranquilized and dulled the conscience to the screams of those they were beating. Why should the guards feel any feelings of guilt, shame and remorse in a blind, pitiless, mindless indifferent universe? We all know that it's always easier to kill something if you believe that the THING you're killing has no intrinsic or ultimate value.
Richard Wurmbrand in his book, Tortured for Christ tells us that his fellow prisoners under the demonic brutality of atheistic re-education programs were driven to find new and creative ways to kill themselves. Such was the insufferable cruelties that were employed to convert the prisoners to the enlightenment of an atheistic worldview. In fact, Richard tells us that the guards were absolutely intoxicated with the new levels and depths of cruelty that they discovered.

For endless hours, up to seventeen hours a day, loudspeakers would blast out atheistic propaganda coupled with tortures too horrible to mention. Those that could not take the abuse any longer leapt from tall staircases to the floor beneath. Others lacerated their throats with barbed wire or glass. If a prisoner could muster up enough energy, he could crack his skull against the cement wall of his cell. Others died from drinking cleaning fluid. An Orthodox father who couldn't manage other methods killed himself by leaping from his elevated bunk bed. It took him several falls to succeed, Richard tells us. \{Wurmbrand, Tortured for Christ, chapter 37\}

Now you have an idea how an atheistic paradise looks when humanity is stripped of every last vestige of value and sacredness in the name of superior atheistic revelation that has man as nothing more than the by-product of a long chain of pointless and meaningless materialistic processes that were entirely accidental with no purpose intended. In a purely materialistic universe, the human body is just a particular arrangement of oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, calcium, phosphorus, potassium, sulphur, sodium, chlorine, and magnesium. For these atheists, the stomping upon little children was nothing more than a chemical disorganization.

These prison camps give us a glimpse into a world where God is rejected. God is never replaced with something nobler, something more moral or beautiful. God is replaced by a man — not an ordinary man — but a man possessed by a demon. Sigmund Freud categorized people who believed in God as suffering from mental illness, and his dogma was placed in the 'Diagnostic Manual Handbook'. The wisdom of this manual was employed by the God-hating in their torture of those that prayed. Yes, Freud talked a lot through his God-hating, Christ-defying godless heart,
but unbeknownst to him, his very mouth would soon be shut forever. Freud died from a very painful mouth cancer. Mao's wife, Jiang Qing made it her sole project to destroy every last trace of Christianity from China. Jiang Qing made a promise that once she had her way Christianity would be relegated to the Museum. How did that work out for her? She ended up committing suicide by hanging herself by a rope. Madalyn Murray O'Hair was infamous for being instrumental in having Bible readings and prayer removed from public schools (1963-1964).

Madalyn was a vulgar speaking atheist that not only claimed to not believe in God but also hated Him in every expression and in every waking moment. Her son William, no longer able to live under the tyranny of her seething cantankerous atheism disappointed her with a wound that would never heal by turning to Christianity. Madalyn was brutally murdered and hacked into pieces by a fellow member of her atheistic enterprise in the pursuit of her money that she gained by shady means. It was reported that at age sixteen Lenin tore a cross from his neck, spat on it, and stomped on it in a violent statement of his hatred of God. Demonic outbursts are never rational. People possessed by the devil act in ways that defy rationality. Lenin was obsessed with the atheist Karl Marx and studied everything that Marx wrote. Marx was an extraordinarily wicked man, vile, vulgar, rude, racist and contemptuous of women. Marx, in his delusions, fancied himself a great liberator to humanity but no other philosophical doctrine to date has there yet arisen such, abuse, tyranny, oppression, corruption, malice and genocide.

As it stands, the cultural homogeneity of our society is secular, secularism is the reigning ideology but nobody stops to ask whether it's true. The fact that the whole enterprise is built upon an entirely naturalistic faith-based presupposition is never addressed. The influence of secularism is felt everywhere, in politics, our educational institutions and in the media. I want to make it perfectly clear that secularism is not some culturally friendly neutral position but is underpinned by an aggressive naturalistic — anti-God philosophy. Secularism offers us a new worldview, a new belief, and new value system.
It's a philosophical position that is fundamentally atheistic and diametrically opposed to God, whose origins can be directly traced back to the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, culminating in the French Revolution where a militant form of humanism began to arise against Christianity through the activism of Christ-hating philosophers such as Voltaire. In place of God, they proposed and championed that one should only seek a purely natural explanation for the world — hence, naturalism. This was their philosophical imposition — their alternative to God — they wanted God out and were deeply antagonistic to Christianity — it was an Antichrist movement and would come to be known as the cult of reason and was, in essence, an atheistic community that sought to replace Christianity with man as the Supreme authority. The same fruit of animosity and opposition towards Christianity is manifest everywhere today where laws are enacted to silence the Christian voice.

There was nothing innocent, pure or true about this demonic movement, in fact, Voltaire's atheism inspired the French Revolution and its Reign of Terror, 1793-1794, where 40,000 people were beheaded and 300,000 were butchered in the Vendée. The French Revolution made the guillotine infamous and gave us a bloodbath and horror story like nothing else. This period was known as 'The Reign of Terror' and great crowds from all over would gather to be entertained as heads rolled and the blood flowed down the streets. The very same ideas that inspired these proponents of pure reason would again resurface in the hearts and ideas of some of the bloodiest God-haters of modern history. Secularism — bequeathed to us through the Enlightenment — played a very big part in the emergence of 20th-century political atheism that would result in the horrendous murder of over 130 million people. In fact, many of the great atheistic leaders of modern history were directly influenced by these Enlightenment philosophers. Secularism is a particular ideology underpinned by purely naturalistic materialistic philosophy — a worldview. Moreover, it has a history soaked in blood, violence, immorality and a curious and strange bent against Christianity.

Ever since the eighteenth century following the French Revolution, a form of militant secularism began to permeate the landscape. This movement was spearheaded by certain philosophical humanists that
wanted God out of the picture and most of it could be traced back to the vile perverse Christ-hating Voltaire. Many think that secularism is a purely neutral position and therefore serves very well as the foundation for a contemporary pluralistic society — but such a notion couldn’t be any further from the truth. Hunter Baker alerts us to the fact that secularism is not a neutral position and therefore it cannot be the answer to pluralism. Secularism is invariably wedded to naturalism in the modern world – naturalism appears to be the silent default underpinning of secularism. Today in many areas of science, sociology, history and psychology naturalism — pure philosophy — is assumed a priori as the starting presupposition thanks to these men. Nobody questions the fact that it’s a philosophy without evidence — it’s simply smuggled-in without question.

However, naturalism as a philosophy fails to explain anything and is absolutely bankrupt in its attempts to account for nearly every single mystery of the natural world. When one looks at its poor explanations one can begin to see more and more with each level that naturalism is increasingly unlikely and implausible. Moreover, naturalism is a retard to honest inquiry and a hindrance to alternate explanations for the universe outside of purely naturalistic interpretations — and worst of all — it’s in total opposition to Socrates "Following the evidence wherever it leads."

There is a big difference between Voltaire and Socrates. The former has an agenda for not following the evidence wherever it leads, and the latter exalts the principle of honest inquiry after knowledge no matter what worldview it may end up supporting. Naturalism as a philosophy is baptized in moral defiance and rebellion against the rule of the Creator - the same defiance and rebellion that we see expressed in the writings of Karl Marx cited below.

"I wish to avenge myself against the One who rules above. I will wander god-like and victorious through the ruins of this world. Thus, heaven I forfeited. I know it full well. My soul once true to God, is chosen for Hell." —Karl Marx

"We make war against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the state, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keynote of a perverted
civilization. It must be destroyed." —Karl Marx

The same demonic defiance and rebellion that we find in Hitler's writings, as cited below.

"Christianity is a rebellion against natural law, a protest against nature. Taken to its logical extreme, Christianity would mean the systematic cultivation of the human failure." —Adolf Hitler

"The reason why the ancient world was so pure, light, and serene was that it knew nothing of the two great scourges: the pox and Christianity." —Adolf Hitler

"When all is said, we have no reason to wish that the Italians and Spaniards should free themselves from the drug of Christianity. Let's be the only people who are immunized against the disease." —Adolf Hitler

Unlike Marx, Hitler was not a confessed atheist, but he was definitely an Antichrist and lover of atheistic, materialistic philosophy. I would describe Hitler as a closet atheist because the evidence supports this. Hitler was absolutely obsessed with Nietzsche's superman and Nietzscheism came to be absolutely endemic in the master race. In fact, many of Nietzsche's writings were selected and employed by Hitler to justify the killings and used as a justification for the new super master race in the elimination of inferior undesirables. Atheist philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche spoke about the Superman, a new race to arise out of a Godless generation and Adolf Hitler worked his hardest to see this race — the Aryan race — come to fruition. Hitler referred to his struggle in this regard — Mein Kampf — my struggle.

Both Hitler and Nietzsche spoke about their struggle in their own writings and what many of us forget, or haven't noticed, is that the full title of Darwin's book, the Origin of Species, was actually titled, The Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection and the Preservation of FAVOURED RACES in the STRUGGLE for LIFE. Both Nietzsche and Hitler paid special attention to the part of the title, Preservation of FAVOURED RACES in the STRUGGLE for LIFE.
Hitler loved the title for it justified — scientifically and philosophically —
his contribution in helping nature in the difficult process of
Natural selection for the preservation of favoured races — namely the
Aryan race, and 6 million Jews, the disabled, and other weak, useless
food wasters were sent to the ovens in his struggle for the favoured race.
Here, Hitler was merely employing the brute morality that nature
provides; the blind pitiless indifference that Richard Dawkins speaks of.
If Hitler was alive today you could almost be certain that Dawkins books
would be in his library, dusted and clean. In fact, almost all the Nazi
leaders were infatuated with atheist literature and Darwinian ideas.
Professor of History Ian Kershaw draws our attention to this fact.

"Darwinian ideas advocated by its leading scientists rapidly replaced the
Christian worldview, beginning only a few years after Darwin published
On the Origin of Species in 1859. German society rapidly adopted a
thoroughly secular worldview, relying on science and materialistic
philosophy for its values and morals." For example, the Angel of Death,
Josef Mengele, studied under Darwinist professor Ernst Rüdin at the
University of Munich, who taught his students that some lives were not
worth living and doctors had a responsibility to destroy such lives for the
good of society.

It's also interesting to note that Goebbels lost his Catholic faith during his
university days and replaced it with his new heroes: Nietzsche, Hitler,
and Darwin. Heydrich is considered to be the mastermind of the
Holocaust. Heydrich was reared as a Catholic, and like so many other
Nazi elites, he lost his religion and replaced it with secular philosophies.
This is one big horror story in which the thread can clearly be identified.
The moral rebellion, the common revulsion against the Holy, shared by
all these men reveals a primal and demonic rebellion against the Creator.
It is no coincidence that the rebellion and revulsion against the Holy in
these men are the same rebellion and revulsion against the Holy that is
manifested in the world of the demonic. It is difficult to understand much
of the contempt, anger and vulgarity that is expressed by many
contemporary atheists unless one understands the root cause of such
irrational animosity and enmity. Like I said at the beginning of this book,
it's not so much arguments that drive them but psychological and
emotional impulses, which have their basis in the world of demonic forces. I am convinced that the manifestation of enmity against God is a symptom of a sickness that has its roots in an ancient and moral rebellion against the Sovereign Lord of Creation, and the Bible has a lot to say about this moral rebellion and how it will end.

End of Book One

Please feel free to contact me in regard to any questions, or if you would like a hard copy of this book. E: pross676@gmail.com