

Inconsistencies Of Atheism

I have asked atheists why it is more immoral to kill a man than to kill a rat or a snake. I have never received an answer that came close to being logical. And these are the people who boast that they decide things logically. One such fellow answered that the reason for the difference here is that man is more intelligent. This, of course, would make it more “immoral” to kill an elephant or a horse than to kill a porcupine or a dodo bird. But this still leaves the atheist with a problem: what about people who are insane, or children who are born mentally handicapped, or people who are old and senile? Should they be destroyed like snakes and rats? They don't have this superior intelligence, and they can serve no worthwhile end in the world. Should the law make an exception and hold one guiltless who murders such unfortunate persons? As bad as atheism is, it has not come to that, not in this country anyway.

Methodists think the atheist would protest mightily if his child should be taken from him and destroyed simply because it happens to be mentally challenged. Like everything else peculiar to atheism, his argument is as full of holes as Swiss cheese, and inconsistent to the point of stupidity.

If I lost you back there at the start, here is the point: the atheist denies the existence of God. That is what the word “atheist” means — a (against) theos (God). If there is no God, there is no right or wrong. Man has no moral standard. Man has no soul. There is no God to make him a soul, you see. Man is the highest thing, if there is no God, and since a stream cannot rise higher than its source, there is no place from which an immortal soul can come. Man cannot make himself immortal, so you see, man is the same as a rat or a snake, only bigger and (he thinks) smatter! Men and snakes are both just so much flesh and blood and bones — no soul. And since there is no God, there is no standard except the standard that man himself makes. There is no higher tribunal, no judge, no one above man to whom he owes allegiance or responsibility.

James Bales, in debate with an atheist by the name of Teller, asked him what objection he could register if a group of citizens should decide to lynch him. Mr. Teller said it would be unpleasant. I should think so! But suppose it was pleasant to those who hanged him — suppose it made them happy? If it would make 20 men happy to hang one atheist, he should offer no protest, because that is real democracy at work: 20 to 1 — those are pretty big odds. And there is no God, so there is no immorality or wrong involved, except as men decide it. And what better way for men to decide than on the basis of majority rule?

On this platform, who can say that Hitler was wrong in his effort to purge out the weaklings and by selective breeding raise a nation of super men? This is the way we do our horses and hogs, and horses and hogs are just as “spiritual” as men in the atheist viewpoint. Neither have souls. On this platform who can say that it would be wrong to take old atheists (and others) when they are bent with age, toothless and senile, herd them together, and ship them off to be shot and their bodies processed for the calcium, iron, potassium, etc. that are to be found in the human body?

If this country should pass laws consistent with the theories of atheism, the atheist would move to Russia if they could. It is safe enough for the atheist to spew his atheistic theory in a nation where people ignore his conclusions when they pass their laws, but if the people, and especially the lawmakers, ever start acting like they think the atheist is right, look out!

Luther Blackmon