

The Absurdity of Atheism, 2 OF 3

An object that is at rest will stay at rest unless an external force acts upon it.

Newton's 1st Law of Motion

“To say that one is an unbeliever does not mean that the one believes nothing” (James D. Bales, *You Believe*, 10). Atheists do not believe in the existence of God, but there are many things they do believe, some of which are utterly unbelievable. To demonstrate this, let's talk baseball.

Imagine a baseball lying absolutely motionless on home plate, and then ask yourself: *can that baseball put itself in motion?* Newton's first law (above) says no; it can't. In order for our baseball to move, an external force (e.g., a batter, a cyclone) has to put it in motion. In the absence of any outside force, that baseball is going nowhere.

If astronomers are to be believed, our baseball, which seems to be lying absolutely still, is, in fact, sitting on a planet that is rotating on its axis at 1,000 mph, while revolving the sun at 8,677 mph, while being part of a solar system zipping along at 493,200 mph. (Now that's what I call a fastball!)

But these figures beg a question: if the universe/all matter is in motion, how did it get in motion? Since an object at rest stays at rest, and since it takes an external force to make an object move, what external force set the universe/matter in motion?

It won't do to say that matter set itself in motion; you might as well argue that a baseball can knock itself out of the park. But just as a baseball by itself cannot produce a homerun, matter by itself cannot produce motion. And no scientist or philosopher can imagine how it could be otherwise.

Richard Dawkins, an English evolutionary biologist, may currently be atheism's best-known apologist. In his book, *The God Delusion*, he talks about motion in his chapter titled “Arguments for God's Existence.” He doesn't deny that it's logical to think that at some point in the past there had to be an unmoved mover/uncaused cause; he just denies that the God of the Bible is the terminus that set everything in motion. (Dawkins thinks that omniscience and omnipotence are mutually exclusive, and that anyone who believes these qualities can coexist in the same being is delusional.) Since he rules out the supernatural as the explanation for motion, what does Dawkins posit instead? “Some other physical concept as yet unknown.” This is the rubbish atheists talk when science and reason are against them; this is how men talk when they'll believe anything before believing that a Supreme Being exists.

I maintain that atheism is irrational/contrary to reason and that its denial of Newton's first law of motion proves it. When all the forensic dust settles, atheism believes that a baseball—without any external force acting upon it—can put itself in play. You want to talk crazy? That's crazy! If baseball was played nonstop from now till infinity and beyond, that would never happen.

So, since “anything that is in motion [has been] moved by something else” (William Lane Craig, *Apologetics, An Introduction*, 63), how can matter in motion be explained? The only rational and reasonable explanation is that *Someone*—not *something*—made it move. I believe that *Someone* is *God*.

Atheism believes that a baseball, without any outside force involved, can send itself into the upper deck. Atheists don't know much about baseball.

