

A Glimpse into How Psychologically Insecure Atheists Comfort Themselves Through Word Games and Intellectual Trickery: Part 1

Abu ʿIyaad

Bismillāh wal-Ḥamdulillāh.

Welcome to the Atheist Clinic.

To the right is our first patient admission, a visibly upset atheist who is annoyed at having to “repeat himself over and over again” and make a video to explain how atheism “works”.



What is Atheism?

1.3K

👍 100

🗨️ 9

➦ SHARE

🔖 SAVE

...



Milwaukee Atheists

Published on 31 Aug 2018

SUBSCRIBE 9.1K

People seem to misunderstand the term 'atheist' and I have to keep repeating myself. So here's a quick video explaining it. It's really not that hard

[SHOW MORE](#)

The Two Types of Atheists

The first are those who make a positive claim by stating outright, “There is no God”¹, and this is a difficult stance to adopt because this claim needs proof—and the only proof that

¹ By “God” in this paper, we mean **a supreme creator** who created all intertwined systems of cause-effect through which the universe and life came to be and continue to be.

would be acceptable is one that can be demonstrated through the scientific method, since this method is claimed to be the only valid, reliable route for the acquisition of knowledge by materialists, naturalists and atheists. However, by definition, science can only deal with the “natural world” because all it does is to investigate cause-effect mechanisms—within a theoretical framework—to explain how things work and nothing more. So, by definition such a claim is unverifiable through the most reliable means of acquiring knowledge, according to them. Therefore, by making this positive claim, “There is no God”, they land themselves in contradictory position—making a positively asserted claim for which they know full well that they possess no means of providing evidence. This would render it a blind “belief” something the atheists try to pretend that they are fleeing from. For this reason, this category of atheists can be safely ignored as their stupidity is open and plain for all men, women and children to see.

Most atheists have realised this and so they are very careful in the way they choose their words. Atheism is really nothing more than agnosticism, uncertainty, doubt, confusion. Atheists are intellectually confused people. **They are driven by emotional reasons.** They don't like a universe with an authority over it, it's too uncomfortable for them psychologically. Some atheists are honest enough to admit this.² **Most of them are plain liars.**

² From them is **Thomas Nagel**, an atheist philosopher, who wrote: “I want atheism to be true and am made uneasy by the fact that some of the most

The intellectual part comes afterwards—as in, how can we justify our position from an intellectual point of view, to escape from emotional trauma, from **cosmic authority syndrome**.

So—fleeing from the positively asserted claim, “There is no God”—they have to figure out a way to provide psychological comfort to themselves from the emotional trauma caused by the terrifying idea of there being an authority over the universe. They do this through carefully thinking out their intellectual positioning and using word games so that there is no way for anyone to pop their inflated balloon and emotionally hurt them. The above characterises the second type of atheist for the most part.

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. My guess is that this cosmic authority problem is not a rare condition...” In “The Last Word” (1997) p. 130-131. Nagel is also highly critical of the Darwinian materialist philosophy. He explains that its inability to explain consciousness, intentionality, meaning, or value is a major problem that has the capacity to undermine the entire naturalistic world picture. Refer to his book, “Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature is Almost Certainly False” (Oxford University Press, 2012). And also **George Klein** who said, “I am not an agnostic. I am an atheist. My attitude is not based on science, but rather on faith... the absence of a Creator, the non-existence of God is my childhood faith, my adult belief, unshakable and holy.” In “The Atheist in the Holy City”, MIT Press, 1990, p. 203. There are others with statements that are similar and these two citations are by way of example only.

In his video, the atheist pictured, states: **“Atheism is one thing and one thing alone, it is one position on one claim, it is the answer to one question: ‘Do you believe God exists?’”**

First, regarding the use of the word “believe”. If we ask the question, “Does God exist?”, or speak of the propositions, “God exists” and “God does not exist”, then there can only be a yes or a no answer. This is a question about objective reality, outside of what any individual believes and outside of what exists in any mind. There are only two mutually exclusive answers. If you give one answer, you have rejected the other, and if you withhold from giving an answer,³ you are a falsifier, a coward, a liar, and either an affirmer or denier of two mutually exclusive statements, “God exists”, “God does not exist”. In other words, irrespective of anyone’s “belief” God either exists or does not exist. This then leads us to the discussion of the definition of “belief” and then the nature of “evidence”.

³ In reality, this is the general tactic of the atheists. They use the excuse of “insufficient evidence” to avoid committing themselves to either of the two propositions. Some of them say openly: “I am not bothered either way, whether a God exists or not, it does not affect me, so I am not interested. It does not affect how I live my life.” So its not really a matter of evidence as such, but more about emotional preference. These types of atheists are more frank and honest. But it is those **psychologically insecure atheists** that we are dealing with, those who convince themselves that they are intellectual and somehow superior and more enlightened than those “primitive”, “backward” theists and who then want to convince us that they “only accept facts” and not “beliefs”.

Regarding “Belief”

By introducing “belief” into the formulation of the question, atheists aim to portray themselves as intellectuals who do not have “beliefs” because “beliefs” are without evidence.

These are nothing more than word games. Atheists want to flee from the word “belief” from being ascribed to them. The word belief simply means to have confidence or conviction in a particular assertion or claim. That claim may or may not have evidence and it may be true or false. **But not every belief is without evidence.** However, atheists generalise and say a “belief” is what is taken on blind acceptance, without evidence. Islāmically, we use the word ‘aqīdah, which means that which is firmly tied and bound (to the heart and mind), irrespective of whether it is true or not, and whether it has evidence or not. If we look at dictionary definitions of “belief” we find three ideas:

First, definitions such as: “Mental acceptance of and conviction in the truth, actuality, or validity of something”, “Something accepted as true”—here there is no mention of the absence of sufficient grounds to support the belief. This is similar to ‘aqīdah and i’tiqād as explained above.

Second, definitions which have a further qualification such as: “A conviction of the truth of a given proposition or an alleged fact, resting upon grounds insufficient to constitute positive knowledge”, “Persuasion of the truth of a proposition, but with

the consciousness that the positive evidence for it is insufficient or wanting; especially, assurance of the truth of what rests chiefly or solely upon authority.” Here, we see the introduction of lack of positive evidence and insufficient grounds as qualifiers of “belief”. This is the definition that atheists use as their weapon, to present the idea that they do not have beliefs and that they do not operate on beliefs, only “facts”.

However, supporting what we said earlier, Merriam Webster provides a third definition: “Conviction of the truth of some statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon especially when based on examination of evidence”.⁴

The intent from the above is to make the use of the word “belief” very clear. It is not the case that “belief” simply means to accept something without evidence. That is one usage and definition of the word belief. Belief can also be based on evidence, numerous categories of evidence in fact. And belief can simply refer to any conviction, regardless of whether it is true or not, evidenced or not. Thus, **belief**, **truth**, **fact** and **reality** can overlap in their definitions and meanings.

⁴ So here, it would be claimed by materialists and naturalists that only scientific evidence can be used to justify “conviction” in anything and this is a false claim because it cannot be backed by scientific evidence. Meaning, there is no scientific evidence (as determined by the scientific method) that the only true statements are those verified by the scientific method.

It is important to make these distinctions in order to reveal the game played by psychologically insecure atheists. When it is said: Of the two mutually exclusive propositions, “God exists”, “God does not exist” which one is true, as only one can be true?—it causes emotional trauma that leads to bed-wetting and running to one’s mummy. To avoid this, some sort of barrier has to be erected in order to shield from such trauma.

The introduction of “belief”—upon their particular definition—is a tactical move to shift the attention away from objective reality and instead to what exists in the hearts and minds of people.

So here, the atheist’s answer would be: There is insufficient evidence⁵ for the proposition or claim “God exists?” However, you have to remember, that according to these people, it is not even possible to prove God exists in the first place through the only means of verification and knowledge-acquisition they accept, which is the scientific method. Thus, when they say, “insufficient evidence”, they know full well that **by definition**—according to them—God cannot be proved, by any means at all. As such, they are very dishonest when they say, “There is

⁵ This then leads on to the nature of “evidence” and the routes to acquiring “knowledge” that is factual. Because the atheist has justified his or her position through the claim of “insufficient evidence”, then we have to tackle the topic of what exactly constitutes evidence, and this will be tackled in another article in this series inshā’Allāh. The claim that “facts” about reality can be known and verified by scientific method alone is false. The method itself cannot prove this claim.

insufficient evidence”. Rather, they should say, “God cannot be proved by the scientific method as the “metaphysical” or “supernatural” is beyond the realm of the natural to which we have direct access through sense perception or indirect means of detection, and thus, I as an atheist have no means of knowing which of the two—“God exists” or “God does not exist”— is true, and thus my position is conjectural in nature, is purely a matter of personal preference and does not have any scientific basis at all.”

However, the atheist would not be honest enough to admit this, even though this is the true and actual reality.

In summary:

“Strong atheists” are those who make the positively asserted claim “God does not exist”. They are fools, as they have zero evidence for that claim and no way at all of proving it through any means of knowledge-acquisition they accept.⁶ They are referred to as “strong atheists” because they are making the stronger, bolder claim and due to the conviction with which they

⁶ Years earlier, atheists would retort by saying “You can’t prove a negative”—meaning that when they say, “God does not exist”, then they cannot be asked for proof, because a negative cannot be proved. However, in this response they have already assumed that their claim is true. So this is not a credible answer.

maintain their claim. However, they are actually in the weaker and more idiotic position.

The more shrewd atheists—many of whom may inwardly and secretly **believe** in the statement “God does not exist” whilst knowing they can’t prove this belief—realise that this is not a good position to be in as they will be seen to be following a “belief”. Thus, whilst inwardly they may have conviction in the belief, “God does not exist”, they to have engineer position statements to make it appear otherwise, in order to avoid the balloon being popped. They are referred to as “weak atheists” in the sense that they are not making an outright denial, but simply saying that there is no evidence that has satisfied them. Hence, they will say that atheism is simply “the absence of belief” in a God.

These are nothing but word games. We can simply rearrange this as, “**Belief** in the absence of a God” and this would be the factual reality of an atheist. He holds a “belief” in the “absence of a God”. However, to camouflage this reality, he or she says, “Atheism is the absence of belief in a God”.

The reality behind this is explained with the following:

I know that the statements “God exists” and “God does not exist” are two mutually exclusive statements and only one can be true. However, upon my philosophy of

knowledge-acquisition (meaning, the nature of knowledge and how it is acquired), neither of the two can be verified. I personally cannot accept “God exists” which means “God does not exist” [as the two are mutually exclusive], but this assertion would not be provable and it would appear nonsensical because my philosophy of knowledge-acquisition does not allow for this claim to be verified. As such, it would be no more than a belief and hence I am no different to the one who “believes” that “God exists”. But I can’t have this, I can’t be seen to have “beliefs”, so how can I present my view in such a way so as to escape this predicament? I know, let me be smart and play some word games: Atheism is the “lack of belief in a God”. Just by playing these word games I have camouflaged my reality. I **believe** there is no God, but let me just present it as “absence of belief in a God.” As for the issue of “evidence” and the presence or lack thereof, then this cannot even come into the picture because upon my philosophy of knowledge-acquisition, it is not possible to come up with any evidence for the claim “God exists”. So let me play a second word game on those dumb, primitive theists and say, “Atheism is lack belief in a God due to insufficient evidence”. With this trickery, I have just pulled two wools over the eyes of those “primitive, backward” theists. I can now enter my glass house, after shielding myself, and start throwing stones at them.

Another way to present this for the purposes of comprehension would be to say to the atheist: “God exists” and “God does not exist”⁷ Only one can be true. You either say, a) the first is true and second is false or b) the second is true and the first is false, or c) you can say I don’t hold any position as there is no way to verify either one, it does not bother me and I am not interested. This third position would be the most honest, and some atheists are honest enough to say that this is the reality of their position.

As for those who say “God does not exist”, they do not have any evidence for this claim, hence it is nothing but “belief”—as they define it—and is pure conjecture. There is no knowledge involved here. So these are two of the three groups.

Those not from the above two groups—the psychologically insecure ones prone to emotional trauma and bed-wetting—among them are hypocrites, those who **believe** inwardly “God does not exist”, but outwardly, they do not want to assert this, as it would be a “belief”—as they define it—because they have no evidence for it. So they play word games in the way they present their “belief” to make it appear as an “absence of belief”. Others among them are truthful, they have been taken in by the standard rhetoric of psychologically insecure atheists and think they have a sound intellectual basis for their position.

⁷ It should already be understood that we are referring to one supreme being who is the creator of the universe and life.

So the question to ask this third group—both the hypocrites among them and the genuine ones—is: Are there any methods of knowledge-acquisition available to us through which either of these propositions “God exists”, “God does not exist” can be verified or disproved? Since the only credible means of knowledge-acquisition to materialist, naturalists and atheists in general is the scientific method, and that can only tell us how things work in the natural world through cause-effect mechanisms and nothing more, then in reality, there are no means of knowledge-acquisition through which these two propositions can be verified or disproved. This would expose their answer, “there is insufficient evidence” to be nothing more than a calculated act of dishonesty on their behalf, **a red herring**.

Here, some atheists—having realised this reality—will finally say something like, “Well if God shows Himself, that would be evidence”, or they might ask to see something “miraculous” or out of the ordinary as a direct sign. The knowledge of the existence of someone, something or some entity does not have to be based upon sense-perception alone. This entire discussion leads into the topic of “evidence” and “knowledge”, as to what they are and what are the routes through which they can be attained. As Muslims we believe the routes are many and they include: *fitrah* (innate disposition), *mushāhadah* (observation or witness), *ḥiss* (sensory perception), *‘aql ṣarīḥ* (sound reason), *tajribah* (experience or experimentation) and *riwāyah*

(transmission) and others, and this is for discussion in another article. A combination of numerous routes of knowledge provide strong evidence for accepting the proposition “God exists”—making this a “belief” in the third sense that we discussed earlier: “Conviction of the truth of some statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon **especially when based on examination of evidence**”. Hence, this belief is not “blind” at all and can be rationally justified.

Once you understand all of the above, you will know exactly how to halt an atheist in his or her tracks, pin them down and force them to jump over this first hurdle about the reality of their position before they move anywhere else. The whole facade surrounding “belief” and “evidence” should be torn down and the reality made clear. The most honest position for them would be simply to say: I prefer a life in which God is not involved, not due to any science or “insufficient evidence”, but because I just feel more comfortable with it.

Finally, developments in science, especially from the late 20th century onwards, are supporting theism more so than naturalism. This is because scientific advancements continue to reveal evident signs of ...

—**knowledge** (due to the undeniable high-level abstraction involved in biological life which runs upon a digital information system),

—**will** or **intent** (due to choice-contingency evident in creation) and

—**wisdom** (end-goals, goal-steering mechanisms, intertwined cause-effect mechanisms)

... in creation and are ruling out chance-contingency⁸ as an ever increasing impossible absurdity. This trend will continue to grow and will not reverse, increasing the risk of emotional trauma for psychologically insecure atheists. We will discuss this in future parts in this series inshā'Allāh.

Abu Iyaad

@abuiyaadsp

14/04/1439 (1.25)

⁸ Chance-contingency means dependence on the randomness of physical and chemical interactions.