



WORLDVIEW MADE PRACTICAL
Volume 19 Number 15
April 17, 2024

YouTube Discussion with Atheists - 2
How Do Committed Atheists Think?

By Freddy Davis

Today's article is part 2 of a YouTube discussion I had with some Atheists about the truth of the Christian faith. You can see part 1 at: <http://www.marketfaith.org/2024/03/youtube-discussion-with-atheists-1>.

As a reminder, every month I post, on our ministry website (www.marketfaith.org), a short video related to some of the practical implications of worldview. The hosting location for these videos is on YouTube and Rumble. From there, I put links on several other social media platforms to expand viewership. These resource are specifically created for Christians, but occasionally non-Christians will respond to me as well, particularly on the YouTube site. Most of the time not much comes of these, but occasionally one will cause a firestorm. And when it does, I will jump in and use that as an opportunity to share my faith. That happened recently.

The video that caused this current kerfuffle was entitled Now Christians are Haters? You can view it at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FgFnMUnuMN0&lc=UgwUKe2E-JOpq_Qjf4B4AaABAq.A0emz0XzEG7A0jyM_FSviv.

The conversation continues below:

[**Note:** The names have been changed, except for my own, so that those I was interacting with cannot be personally identified. Also, these conversations are copied exactly as they were posted

without making grammatical, spelling, punctuation, or any other changes except where it was absolutely necessary to make it clear.]

SW

freddydavis, You seem to be confusing secularism and atheism. I don't propose to teach atheism in schools any more than any religion. Secularism is the neutral religious position by definition. And the principles our government was founded on, were very secular.

When you say "naturalist atheism" I am wondering if by that you are referring to issues in the scientific curriculum. Because by definition, science has to be naturalistic. I am hoping you won't be attacking science in schools.

You seem to want to make things more vague by speaking of values. Nobody at FFRF is attacking Christians on the basis of their values.

If you want some values promoted in schools, it is the values that would be evaluated, based on their qualities and consequences, not their sources.

We don't allow public teachers to require Christian prayers, and we don't allow them to require Muslim prayers.

Your contention that this nation was founded on Christian values, as contrasted by Christianity itself, is vague to the point of irrelevancy. Which values are you specifically referring to? The Golden Rule? The

Permission to Reprint

If you wish to reprint this article in your own print or electronic newsletter, please include the following text:

*Reprinted from **Worldview Made Practical**; a free e-zine produced by **MarketFaith Ministries** featuring practical teaching and life tools to help Christians become more effective in their faith life. Discover **MarketFaith Ministries** at www.marketfaith.org.*

Speaking Schedule

If you are interested in having Freddy Davis or Tal Davis present one of our **Worldview Seminars** or to share about worldview and its practical implications at your church or organization, please contact **MarketFaith Ministries** to schedule your event. All contact information is at the bottom of this e-zine.

Worldview Resources

It is one of the primary purposes of **MarketFaith Ministries** to provide resources to help Christians understand the practical implications of worldview. You can find many free resources that will help you in your quest at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

respecting of human rights? The owning of slaves?

What I was speaking of, was that our founding fathers explicitly wanted to prevent religious discrimination, and I stand by that.

Our founding fathers began this country with a number of goals, but one of the hallmarks, was enlightenment philosophy. And I have heard Christians make efforts to harmonize enlightenment and Christianity, and I'll cheer them on, as it least it would align their religion more with humanistic ideals. But pretending Christianity is fundamentally tied to ,or based on something like enlightenment philosophy, seems a huge stretch.

Concerning your claim that nobody is promoting Christian religion in government, is not true. Perhaps you don't see it since you don't seem to object to it. I will cite the recent Alabama supreme court IVF finding, that is heavily in the news. The bible was explicitly cited by the Chief Justice Tom Parker in his filed opinion. And it would be rather absurd to say that their religious convictions didn't sway their ruling. Their job, is to interpret laws. Not to insert the bible in a way that rewrites a law. This is not just "Christian values".

I don't see why I should trust your protestation of Christianity not being inserted into government, when you go so far as to say Christianity should be the default. And on top of which, you vehemently protest when explicit Christian teachings, are prohibited from public classrooms.

Which is it. Is explicit religion allowed to be pushed, or is it not?

If you are by chance considering the case of intelligent design in

biology curriculums (not sure how you feel on the subject, but it seems potentially relevant), that is an example of material that has been established to be explicitly religious, and non-scientific.

If someone wants to promote some ideology to the point of establishing law or policy, I am not going to say it is good or bad because of it's source. It needs to be defended on it's merits.

I do not say Christian ideas are all bad, nor are they all good.

Freddy Davis

SW, I have said this before and you don't seem to grasp the concept. There is no such thing as a morally neutral position. EVERY moral position has its roots in some worldview foundation. Secularism and Atheism are both expressions of a naturalistic worldview and have no objective basis for morality. For objective morality to exist, there must be an objectively real moral law giver. Lacking that, human beings must make up morality for themselves. With that, you come up against the problem that the one(s) who get to determine public morality are those who are able to accumulate the power to pull it off. It has nothing to do with actual morality, it has to do with the power to impose one's personal preferences (literally, the law of the jungle). The principles our government were explicitly based upon were biblical values. The fact that there was also some influence from the humanism of the enlightenment does not change that fact. You are arguing as if a certain amount of hybridization is not possible. Some of the more prominent Christian values that formed the foundation for America's unique society include:

Life

Liberty

Pursuit of happiness (the right to freely chase one's dreams)

Subscription Information

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE:

A subscription to **Worldview Made Practical** is complementary for anyone interested in receiving it. If you received this email as a forward from a family member or a friend and wish to subscribe for yourself, you may do so at www.marketfaith.org. If you wish to unsubscribe from this newsletter, simply follow the instructions found at the bottom of each edition.

Contact Information

If you wish to contact us directly, you may do so by the following methods:

321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312

E-mail:
info@marketfaith.org
Phone: 850-383-9756

You can order our products and examine our services at <http://www.marketfaith.org>.

This issue of **Worldview Made Practical** is a production of **MarketFaith Ministries**, © 2024. All rights reserved.

Moral purity (not just sexual) - based on biblical morality
Justice (actual justice)
Love
Emphasis on the individual
Freedom of conscience
Constitutional authority
Natural law
Free enterprise
Individual ownership of property
Freedom of religion
Federalism
Separation of powers
Rule of Law
Equality of opportunity
Impartial judges (who base judgement purely on the law)
Due process
Formal accusations

All of these values are biblical values. And while you might like and appreciate many, or even most of these, the relativistic approach to morality that emerges out of a naturalistic worldview does not allow for any of them to be classified as "right" or "true." They only get promoted from that corner IF those who control society have a preference for them. But there is no compelling reason for them to do so. In fact, the history of the world is a history where all powerful leaders were a law unto themselves, and these days, with the wane of biblical values in American society, we are trending back in that direction. Perhaps you don't realize how unique American society is in the history of the world based on the fact that biblical values formed its foundation in a way that is unprecedented in history.

You advocate for people evaluating for a morality based on "qualities and consequences," but who gets to choose the qualities and consequences if there is no objective standard? The answer is, those who are in power - and they must do so arbitrarily as there is no other possibility - they acknowledge no objective standard that it is possible to draw

upon. And when the sentiment of those in power changes, or there is a change in leadership, the moral standards are also subject to change. That is the ultimate outcome of what you are promoting.

You gave the example of the judge in Alabama, and used it as an example of people promoting the Christian religion. You don't seem to be able to make the distinction, again, between Christian values and the Christian faith. No one is trying to create a theocracy. The fact that he quoted the Bible does not constitute him trying to promote Christianity. Using a biblical example is no different than other judges using "secular" examples (which are also religious in nature) to support their naturalistic arguments. In cases where a judge actually crosses the line into judicial activism and makes rulings that do not correspond to the law, I am against that no matter where it comes from. In the American system, the law is the ruler, not any individual person - especially judges (and that is also a value that emerges out of a biblical worldview). But if you are going to push against judicial activism on the one side, you must also condemn it on the other - and there are WAY more instances of it on the left than on the right because moral relativism is part and parcel of that belief system (note *Roe v. Wade* and *Obergefell*, just to name two glaring examples). They see the law as "subject to interpretation based on modern sentiments" rather than objective based on the intent of the lawmakers.

And to your last point, while you object to Christian teachings in the classrooms, you seem to have no objection to naturalistic teachings (which is a religious point of view). Creationism is one theory of origins, but naturalistic evolution is another that has NO scientific basis. It is a theory plain and simple, with no actu-

al science to demonstrate it is even possible. Why is naturalistic religious belief permissible? If you are going to go that route, you need to be consistent.

So, you say "Christian ideas are not all bad ... nor are they all good." And my question to you is, "On what basis do you make a statement like that?" Are you now making yourself the arbiter who decides good and bad morality? What makes your personal preferences the moral beliefs everyone should adhere to? Naturalistic worldview beliefs are simply inadequate for defining morality - at any level.

SW

freddydavis, I am speaking of freedom of religion, and you for some reason want to frame this as a matter of morality?

I was hoping that we could agree on a principle, that religious persecution is bad, and our founding fathers very consciously built a system to prevent that.

The only relevant standard needed, is to keep religion out of government. The point at which some moral questions might arise, would be in whether that constitutional principle is good or not.

Much of the point of the principle, is that we don't trust any individual or group to dictate those moral standards.

On the one hand you give lip service to founding principles. Yet when I delve into this principle and your views, you seem to be disagreeing with it.

I am not at all interested in getting into a debate you over various moral systems.

If we can't see eye to eye on a fairly basic legal principle, I don't see any benefit towards arguing about morality.

I found the list of virtues you listed interesting, and I thank you for being thorough.

You do seem to have a rather flexible definition of Christianity, that seems to diverge sharply from some biblical teachings, but I guess it's up to you how you define your Christianity.

Though I think attribution all of that list generally to the relevant Christians of the period of our countries origins, is not particularly well matching.

I don't see how:

Natural law

Free enterprise

Freedom of religion

Federalism

Separation of powers

are any sort of traditional Christian values, and in fact I could easily argue them to be in tension with the bible.

Freedom of religion in particular, I have no clue how you think is taught from the bible.

Your claim that all of your list are biblical values, is a stretch that probably broke a tendon. But I am not here to gate keep Christianity. I just don't grant giving Christianity credit for new principles, that it may (possibly) have adopted, in the process of adapting to be more relevant in a modern society.

I don't want to see any religious persecution, going in any direction.

I do also thank you for clarification your opinion regarding evolution. I will again restate, that I think you have the rights to your opinions and beliefs.

I would caution you when you say "evolution has no scientific basis", that you seem to have spent a bit too much time in a creationist apologetic information bubble. Because that statement is so false, that it makes you look rather foolish.

I have spent more than a bit of time reviewing anti evolution claims, and I'd like to say the quality is lacking, but truthfully the qualities that tend to shine through, are ignorance, and dishonesty.

Intelligent design is not science, and it's been proven as such in court. And for that matter, I have heard it acknowledged as such by some of it's expert proponents, such as Michael Behe. at least when they aren't selling books.

Science definitionally requires methodological naturalism. So bemoaning that principle being taught in science classes, is very strange. If you don't like that principle, you are attacking the fundamental nature of science almost directly.

Freddy Davis

SW, You can't speak of freedom of religion, or any other moral principle without dealing with the topic of morality. Why do you think freedom of religion is a good thing? What do you base that on?

I agree that religion needs to stay out of government - which includes the beliefs of Secular Humanism (or Secularism or whatever you want to call it). However, you can't keep moral values out. It is impossible. If you throw out the founding principles that are based on biblical values, then you necessarily replace them with a different set based on a different set of religious beliefs. You don't seem to grasp that the very most basic principles are the moral values.

Once again you need to understand the distinction between Christianity and biblical values. Until you get that, you will keep on making the same error you have made several times. You are simply in error if you think the values I listed are not based on biblical concepts. They are not Christianity, but they are Christian values. These values are not new, as Christianity has been around for over 2000 years. However, they were never expressed in any societal system in the way they were expressed in America's founding until the founding.

Okay, if you think naturalistic evolution has a scientific foundation, show me the science. I am not aware of any observation or experimentation that has ever been done to show how, or even that, less complex life forms can evolve to more complex ones. Intelligent design is, indeed, not science, but it is an explanation of what exists in nature. Naturalistic evolution is also not science, but is a different explanation (a naturalistic one). The only thing is, naturalistic evolution cannot be explained using the very foundational beliefs of its own naturalistic foundation. If you are going to allow one theory to be taught, then the principles of science would insist that competing theories also be considered.

Christians fully believe in methodological naturalism - which is nothing more than empirical science. I never bemoaned that being taught in schools. You are assuming things that are not true. But naturalistic evolution is not based on that. It is based on philosophical naturalism - the belief that the natural universe, operating by natural laws, is all that exists. That is a religious point of view and should not be the basis for teaching science in schools.

SW

freddydavis, I think we'll have to agree that religious discrimination being bad, is one of the few points of common ground we've found.

You keep bringing up that moral principles are important, like it is something shocking. I don't frame these things as moral debates because that is only adding an unneeded level, with potential for muddying the waters.

If someone wants to discuss an issue that has moral repercussions, I will be looking at those repercussions, not defining morality.

Debating the merits of various morality frameworks, has it's value, but in a case like this, it is a massive tangent.

I don't care if someone thinks something is moral or not. If anything, I care about the underlying morality and what that means in their thoughts and reality. Perhaps you could call me a consequentialist, although I am not claiming some grand understanding of moral philosophy, so take that label with the grain of salt intended.

I prefer to focus on the actual principle, and potential consequences. Getting hung up on labels seems quite distracting, and a disservice to the communication of, and achievement of, some common goals.

Concerning your comments in I.D. and evolution, you have some things fundamentally wrong. Evolution is supported by vast quantities of evidence, and it does not "require" philosophical naturalism. It is quite simply the conclusions that were reached by the relevant scientists to explain what was observed. To even imply that I.D. and evolution are on a similar standing concerning relevant supporting evidence, is laughable.

I'll also make note, that most of the time these debates aren't even about whether evolution is real or not anymore. Folks at AIG [Answers in Genesis] and such organizations, are apparently moving goal posts to "macroevolution", common ancestry, or other sub definitions. Assuming they don't play worse definition games like putting abiogenesis, or worse, cosmology under the moniker of evolution.

And now, I think that accomplishing much more here, is more time and effort than I am inclined to commit, so I'll wish you a good day, and good luck.

Freddy Davis

SW, Wait! Why do you believe religious discrimination is bad? That is a moral statement that comes from somewhere. Did you just make it up? What makes your belief about that right and someone like the Ayatollah wrong (who doesn't believe in it)? Your attempt to divorce morality from an underlying set of worldview beliefs simply does not hold up. You can try to avoid labels and focus on "actual principles and potential consequences" all you want, but your evaluation of those things is still based on some set of beliefs. You can't get around that by simply avoiding the subject.

So, you just plan to now hit and run? Really, after you started all this?

And now, when it comes to your conversation about evolution, you are simply dismissing counter arguments out of hand without any proof that you are right? Seriously? The topics of macro-evolution and common ancestry are not irrelevant to this conversation. You can't just throw them out because they are uncomfortable for your argument. You have to be able to explain "why" you think they don't apply, and do it using some kind of empirical process. You are simply, by faith, accepting naturalistic beliefs and throwing aside theistic beliefs without any evidence that what you are saying is true. That's just dishonest. And you can't simply dismiss the concept of abiogenesis in the conversation, either, because if Naturalism is true (as you are arguing), then before evolutionary processes can even begin, life has to exist - and it had to have come into being based on the natural laws of the universe. How do you account for that? No, the two topics cannot be separated.

Further, you may not like separating micro and macro evolution, but one is actually backed up by science, while the other is assumed to be true by evolutionary scientists, but has no science behind it (it is assumed based purely on philosophical naturalism). The argument that it is supported by "vast quantities of evidence" (presumably actual science) is simply not true. Show me the science. No, what it is supported by is an underlying philosophy and tons of speculation about how it "might have" happened. That is not science. What

it gets down to is that you must prove Naturalism to be true before the evidence you are supporting can be considered valid. So far, I don't see where you have even attempted to do that. All you have done is to say, "I am right and you are wrong." How do you know your naturalistic beliefs are true?

As for my Christian beliefs, they are consistent. God is an objectively real person who has revealed Himself and His ways to mankind - and to every individual who will heed what He has revealed. He really exists. There are literally millions of people all over the world who will testify to that being true (and while that evidence will not wash based on naturalistic worldview beliefs, it is fully consistent with Christian Theism). I not only know about Him, but know Him in an objectively real personal relationship. You can know Him, too, if you are willing to open yourself up to Him. I pray that one day you will grasp the intellectual emptiness of Naturalism and embrace the God who exists and who loves you deeply.

This conversation continues and will pick up from this point in part 3.

Would You Consider Supporting Us?

Would you consider financial support for **Market-Faith Ministries**? I feel confident that what we are doing is consistent with your beliefs about spreading the gospel and equipping the saints for ministry. Would you let us be one element of your hands and feet in this process? **MarketFaith Ministries** is a 501 (c) (3) not for profit corporation, so your contributions are tax deductible. If you would consider this we would be very grateful. Also, if you would like to know more about the ministry, it would be my pleasure to share with you personally what we are working on and how you can plug in. I can be reached at 850-383-9756 or by e-mail at Freddy@marketfaith.org. As for any donations, they may be sent directly to **MarketFaith Ministries** at 321 Anton Dr., Tallahassee, FL 32312, or you can contribute through our secure website at www.marketfaith.org. Simply click on the "Donate" button at the bottom of the homepage. We are deeply grateful for your support of this ministry.

And, as always, if you have any thoughts, opinions or suggestions about how **MarketFaith Ministries** can help you, please feel free, at any time, to call (850-383-9756) or e-mail (info@marketfaith.org). We are here to serve you.