



# THE ABSURDITY OF LIFE WITHOUT GOD

---

*A White Paper by Ron J. Lint, Certified Apologetics Instructor*

Does life without God make sense? Does the atheistic view of Scientisimists (worshippers of the “Religion of Science”) make sense? This paper seeks to justify the Theistic View of Life by the application of logical arguments directly rebutting the atheistic position.

# THE ABSURDITY OF LIFE WITHOUT GOD

1. **Blaise Pascal's Description of the Manner in Which People Approach the Most Profound Issue of Their Lives:** *"I know not who sent me into the world, nor what the world is, nor what I myself am. I am terribly ignorant of everything. I know not what my body is, nor my senses, nor my soul and that part of me which thinks what I say, which reflects upon itself as well as upon all external things, and has no more knowledge of itself than of them. I see the terrifying immensity of the universe which surrounds me, and find myself limited to one corner of this vast expanse, without knowing why I am set down here rather than elsewhere, nor why the brief period appointed for my life is assigned to me at this moment rather than another in all the eternity that has gone before and will come after me. On all sides I behold nothing but infinity, in which I am a mere atom, a mere passing shadow that returns no more. All I know is that I must soon die, but what I understand least of all is this very death which I cannot escape. As I know not whence I come, so I know not whither I go. I only know that on leaving this world I fall forever into nothingness or into the hands of a wrathful God, without knowing to which of these two states I shall be everlastingly consigned. Such is my condition, full of weakness and uncertainty. **From all this I conclude that I ought to spend every day of my life without seeking to know my fate. I might perhaps be able to find a solution to my doubts; but I cannot be bothered to do so, I will not take one step towards its discovery.**"*

This is the state of much of humanity. Many people just don't want to think about it!! After all, tonight is my football night.

2. **Dostoyevsky (1821-81):** The great Russian writer was profoundly troubled by the Problem of Evil: *"How could a good and loving God exist when the world is filled with so much evil?"*
  - a. This is one of the main arguments used to turn from or refuse to seek God.  
This question must be answered.
3. **Francis Schaeffer (1912-84):** *"Denial of absolute truths has gradually made its way through Western culture resulting in despair, because without absolutes man's endeavors degenerate into absurdity. Unless Western man returns to the Christian world and life view, nothing will stop the trend from degenerating into population con-*

*trol and human breeding (e.g.: embryonic stem cell research; euthanasia; assisted suicide; infanticide; abortion).”*

4. **Pascal’s Wager – slide.**

5. **DEBATE:**

- a. **Atheist (“A”): THERE IS NO GOD AND NO MORAL LAW-GIVER.** It is clear to me that society develops certain social norms and standards, which then become what we call “morals.” These norms and standards then benefit society as a whole. It is by these standards that I try to live.
- b. **Christian (“C”):** So, you say that social norms and standards – “morals” as you have defined them – are created over time by social custom, is that correct?
- c. **A: Yes!**
- d. **C:** So, whatever society says is the right thing to do?
- e. **A: Yes, that’s the rule of law. We all must abide by the law and by the standards of our own particular culture or social structure.**
- f. **C:** It was the rule of law and the rule of society in Nazi Germany to harass, discriminate against, torture, and murder Jews. Was that the right thing to do?
- g. **A: Of course not, you’re twisting my words.**
- h. **C:** On the contrary, I’m using your exact words to try to understand your position more clearly.
- i. **A: Everyone knows that the Nazi’s were clearly evil as was the Nazi-controlled government.**
- j. **C:** But who are you to say that they were evil? They thought they were good. In Nazi Germany, the Jews were less than full humans and the cause of all of society’s ills. You have clearly said that there is NO GOD and NO MORAL LAW-GIVER. You stated that society and the rule of law decide good and evil, and in fact morality. How then do you justify that position in light of Stalin or Hitler? And again, how do you even know good from evil?
- k. **A: Again, you’re twisting my words and trying to confuse me. There are, of course, some things that are clearly evil to any society.**
- l. **C:** And what would those things be?

- m. **A:** Well, to begin with, the atrocities committed in WWII Germany. Others would include torturing babies, stealing, murder, rape – those kinds of things are obviously evil.
- n. **C:** Who says?
- o. **A:** Everyone just knows it. All societies have abided by those tenants of common decency for all of time.
- p. **C:** Did Nazi Germany or Stalin abide by those standards of morality?
- q. **A:** Well, no, but they were anomalies. Most cultures and societies do abide by those basic standards?
- r. **C:** Are you saying then that moral rules of behavior are based upon standards and practices of the majority of cultures?
- s. **A:** Yes, I guess so.
- t. **C:** You guess so? Is this your opinion or not?
- u. **A:** Alright, it's my opinion.
- v. **C:** Given that it is your opinion that we are all to abide by the moral values established by a majority of cultures, then isn't it true that if a majority of cultures change their various concepts of right and wrong that the very definition of right and wrong would likewise have to change?
- w. **A:** Yes, I would have to agree to that, although I sense you're backing me into a corner.
- x. **C:** Not at all, friend. I'm just trying to understand your world view. So, given what you've just said, it is possible that the torture and murder practiced by Stalin and Nazi-Germany (to include the murder of babies, by the way) could conceivably become acceptable in many or most cultures – is that a fair statement?
- y. **A:** Yes, although I don't see how that could happen. Most people know right from wrong.
- z. **C:** But, how do they know right from wrong?
- aa. **A:** Well, as I've said, by social conditioning.
- bb. **C:** We've already been there. You said that even in a culture where evil was the norm that somehow people would know right from wrong. So, I ask again, how do they know right from wrong?

- cc. **A:** Well, in those egregious cases you mentioned, people just know; it's sort of built into them. It's part of being a rational human.
- dd. **C:** So, you do agree that some moral laws are objective and not simply relative.
- ee. **A:** I guess so, some.
- ff. **C:** Who gets to determine which moral laws are relative and which are objective?
- gg. **A:** As I said, it's just sort of built into the human race. Somehow we humans just know right from wrong.
- hh. **C:** Please explain to me how right and wrong come about by the impersonal, evolutionary process of pure chance and infinite time. Further, why would nature care or know about right and wrong? Can nature think or make judgments?
- i. If so, why aren't all people in full agreement about right and wrong? Weren't they all created by the same "Nature?"
  - ii. How could "rightness or "wrongness" be built into humans who came about solely by purposeless, meaningless physical processes over eons of time?? How??
- ii. **A:** I cannot answer those questions now, but I'm confident science will one day discover the answer.
- jj. **C:** So, your answer to a deeply searching question is that science (whomever that is!) will have an answer some day! That would seem to be a handy reply to any question to which you don't have the answer, as if that validates your position.
- i. That's tantamount to saying: "I'm right because some day I'll be proven right, and upon this reasoning, with no other evidence to offer, I place my faith."
  - ii. If that is a rational response for you to offer, why then don't you accept the same from me: "One day God will prove that I'm right!"
  - iii. Would you let me get away with that? Why would my answer be any less valid than yours?
  - iv. In fact, you are answering a searching question with a Statement of Faith in the **god of science** – your god. Correct?

- kk. **A:** You make my reasoning sound illogical, but it is not. Science is the only way to know anything.
- ll. **C:** By “science” do you mean the “Scientific Method: the testing of a proposition by physical, observable, repeatable experimentation in a laboratory?”
- mm. **A:** Yes, of course. Science is the only objective way to know if a proposition is true or not.
- nn. **C:** Is it your opinion, then, that truth does not and cannot come from a trial in a court of law?
- oo. **A:** Well, yes, truth could come from a trial.
- pp. **C:** On the same line of reasoning, would you say that truth can come from historical investigation of singularities that cannot be tested by the scientific method, such as the factual existence of George Washington?
- qq. **A:** I guess so.
- rr. **C:** So, then, science is not the only progenitor of truth, right?
- ss. **A:** Well, when you put it that way, I suppose that legal truth and historical truth are also legitimate, but I still think scientific truth is superior.
- tt. **C:** Do you see the inconsistencies in your arguments?
- uu. **A:** Some inconsistencies are inevitable until science has had a chance to discover the whole truth.
- vv. **C:** How do you know that science won’t eventually prove me right? After all, the verdict, by your own admission, is not in yet.
- ww. **A:** That’s absurd and you know it.
- xx. **C:** So, if I understand your world view, it could be summarized as follows:
- i. There is no God, and there is no moral Law-Giver.
  - ii. Morals are determined by the majority of the people; therefore being totally relative and culturally inspired.
  - iii. It is possible for the majority of the people to decide that a completely different set of moral laws will apply, which could conceivably be the antithesis of those we currently know.
  - iv. Even though all moral laws are relative and culturally inspired, somehow there are those that are objective – that is, they apply across the board to all people in all times.

- v. Those non-relative, objective moral laws are somehow built into all humans, but you don't know how they got there or who or what designed them.
  - vi. Truth comes only from science; at least it produces a superior form of truth.
  - vii. And finally, to the inconsistencies of your rationale, your answer is that science will one day discover the whole truth and you will be venerated.
  - viii. Is that accurate?
- yy. **A:** Yes. I suppose you have some religious point of view.
- zz. **C:** You can call it religious if you like, I call it rational. My world view is this:
- i. From nothing comes absolutely nothing.
  - ii. Life cannot come from nothing or non-living matter. Non-life does not bring forth life.
  - iii. There is a creator of all that exists, including you and me, and he is God.
  - iv. It is God, who is omniscient, omnipotent, and omnibenevolent, who is the moral Law-Giver. He has implanted his law into the hearts of all men, women, and children. This is how all of mankind has knowledge of Objective Right and Wrong.
  - v. It is this moral law that when broken causes guilt and anguish deep within our spirits.
  - vi. Some men chose to ignore that moral law, choosing instead to practice evil. Everyone knows when this happens, because of the moral law written into the hearts of all of mankind.
  - vii. Core morality is objective, not relative. This explains why all cultures and peoples basically agree on what is right and what is wrong. God implanted it into the hearts of all humans.
  - viii. Truth can be discovered (not developed or created) by means of the scientific method, if it relates to natural repeatable, observable events. This type of naturalistic truth is revealed by God and discovered by science, and is subject to experimentation in the laboratory. Truth can also come in the form of legal truth and historical truth, as well as an

acknowledgment of Objective Truth. Finally, Truth comes from the Word of God.

ix. Moral Truth comes only from God, the Moral Law-Giver. This truth always has been and always will be Objective in nature, is never relative, and does not depend on the actions of man, but rather the design of God.

x. Can you see any inconsistencies in my worldview?

aaa. **A:** No, but you are incorrect, naïve, and obviously reject the fact that science is the only way to know the real truth of any matter. Your opinions, like all religious people who refuse to acknowledge the truth of science, are based solely on emotionalism and irrational beliefs.

bbb. **C:** I thought you agreed that there were no inconsistencies in my worldview?

ccc. **A:** Twist my words all you like; you asked and I told you my opinion.

## **WE WILL NOW ASSUME THAT THERE IS NO GOD!**

### **(The Consequences Are Dire)**

1. **Question:** Who am I? Why am I here? Where am I going? Does my existence matter? **ANSWERS:**

a. If there is NO God, you are an accidental product of nature, a result of matter plus infinite time plus chance.

b. If there is NO God, then nothing began to exist, for all that began to exist had to have a creator. Therefore:

i. All primary elements of life always existed, with NO beginning.

1. All living and non-living things had a point of beginning – except the first life.

ii. Everything but the primary elements came into existence by chance, with no purpose, no feeling, no passion, no plan. There is no plan or reason to our:

1. Brains;

2. Eyes;



3. Blood clotting;
  4. Glands or organs.
- iii. Non-living and living things always existed and never began, for they were not created, due to the non-existence of the Creator.
1. The mountains always existed.
  2. Water always existed.
  3. DNA always existed – complete with its built-store of information (equal to a set of encyclopedias), which directs every cell in the body as to its growth, purpose, and method of operation. I wonder where the “information” came from?
  4. Proteins always existed.
  5. Atoms always existed, as did the protons and neutrons and the nucleus.
  6. Time always existed, without beginning and without ending, although such has never been tested or observed, so how would this be known by the scientific method?
    - a. Further, if time is infinite, we could not exist at this point in the time continuum, where seconds and minutes are ticking off and the future has not yet occurred.
    - b. Further yet, time could not logically be infinite if it is increasing, for that in itself, proves that time is not infinite, for something infinite cannot increase.
    - c. And if something increases, then it must have had a beginning. This observation is obvious by means of reversing the process and decreasing time to its beginning point. Something that increases must have had a beginning point.
  7. Energy always existed.
  8. Magnetism and gravity always existed.
  9. Love, hate, confusion, ambition, intelligence, fear, evil, good and all emotions always existed and were not created. Somehow, they just all exist – from non-living matter.

10. Consciousness and awareness have always existed and somehow came to rest in humans – also from non-living matter – like a rock.

- iv. These proclamations made by Scientisimist (worshippers of Natural Science) are nothing more or less than a statement of faith in their religion, for none can be tested scientifically, although the Scientisimist hold tightly to these beliefs as being scientific and intelligent.
- c. If there is NO God, there is no reason for your existence – no ultimate purpose is served. Man and the entire universe are doomed to death – total annihilation, non-existence, nihilism.
- d. If there is NO God, there is no Objective immorality or morality. Life came by chance and leads only to the grave. Therefore, all our endeavors are ultimately meaningless – study; university; jobs, interests, friendships, hobbies, helping the poor, saving a life – all ultimately meaningless.
  - i. Whether we saved lives or took lives is without ultimate meaning.
  - ii. Whether we hated or loved, built-up or destroyed, gave or stole, kept our word or broke it; helped or hindered; spoke truth or lies; kept the law or broke it; worked or was slothful; cheated or was fair; were religious or sacrilegious; it is all ultimately meaningless because there is nothing after death, and all will die.
- e. If there is NO God, the universe also faces death. It is expanding and everything in it is growing further apart. As it does so, it grows colder and colder, and its energy is being used up. Eventually all the stars will burn out and all matter will collapse into black holes. There will be no light, no heat, and no life. The universe is plunging toward inevitable extinction. There is no escape.
- f. If there is NO God, there is no ultimate meaning to life. If each al passes out of existence when he dies, then what ultimate significance (continuing without end) can be given to his life?
  - i. But even if man lived forever, it would not cure the problem of meaninglessness. Man needs more than duration to have meaning. If there

were no God, and man lived eternally, he would still lack meaning and ultimate significance.

01. There was a man marooned alone on a barren chunk of rock in space with two vials of liquid. One was poison, and the other a potion that would cause him to live forever.
  - a. Realizing his situation, he chose the vial of poison, so that he could escape his meaningless existence, but mistakenly drank the vial that would cause him to live eternally.
  - b. Upon this realization, his moans and dreadful screams could be heard though out the darkness of space.
- ii. You might say that he or she contributed to society, or cured cancer, or changed the course of history, but this only shows a temporal, relative significance (for a specified time), not an ultimate significance. Ultimately, none of this matters, for all comes eventually to nothing.
- iii. This is life without God – meaningless, purposeless, without hope, without eternal significance. Simply put: Your life doesn't matter and you don't matter ultimately. Nothing matters – not good; not evil; not taking lives or saving lives; not contributing or slothfulness; not effort or a lack of effort; not studying or ignorance; not kindness to others or using others for gain; not riches, or poverty; not building orphanages or bombing them; nothing, not preaching the Word or God or practicing Witchcraft. Nothing matters but for God.
- iv. Why love or hate or strive? Why follow any but your own form of morality, whatever that might be? Why not benefit yourself while alive – take what you want?
- v. You can't say that Hitler or Stalin or Edi Amen or Pol Pot or Mao Tse-Tung (credited with killing 20M of his own countrymen) were evil, for what is evil to one is not necessarily evil to another. And further, none of us can impose our opinions on another. Right?
- vi. Does it really matter whether humanity existed at all, for all are doomed to non-being (annihilation)? Eventually all will die and will cease to exist; so will the universe.

- vii. So, what ultimate significance is the good or bad that you do, or the moral decisions that you make?
- viii. **You say** that the good moral decisions you make while existing serves your family and society well for a time. Our lives are made better.
  - 01. But if there is no God, then where did the concept of “good” or “moral” come from? That’s just your opinion.
  - 02. What right have you to say what is “good” or “moral?” For I have a different definition of good and moral, which serves to benefit me and satisfy my desires.
  - 03. And the question still stands, what ultimate significance did your brand of morality have? In the end, all ceases to exist – there is no God.
- ix. The only rational way to live is for self-gratification, for then, at a minimum, you have enjoyed life. Doing for others is a waste of time and it serves no ultimate purpose.
- x. **You say** that you get pleasure out of helping others. Why? There are two reasons:
  - 01. It makes their lives better; and
  - 02. You know you have done a selfless act.
  - 03. To the first I ask: Why does it make someone’s life better? To what end? They, too, will cease to exist so what ultimate purpose is there? Their non-existence will be infinitely longer than their existence.
  - 04. To the second I say: Where did you get the concept of “selfless?” If you say that being “selfless” is good, we are right back where we started: How can you say anything is good or evil; for all is relative? There is no God or Moral Law Giver. It is absurd for an atheist to live a selfless life – to what end? It is far better to live a selfish life; to improve your own short existence as much as possible, before death and nihilism occurs.
- g. If there is **NO God**, there is **NO OBJECTIVE TRUTH**. There is nothing to ultimately depend upon; there is no starting point for living life or making

decisions; there is no true north, no anchor, no direction, no safety. Truth is merely an opinion.

- h. If there is **NO God** and life ends at the grave, it makes no difference whether one lives as Stalin or Mother Theresa. As **Dostoyevsky** put it: *“A truly rational person would live a life of unbridled selfishness, the goal of which is personal pleasure.”*
  - i. If there is **NO GOD**, then:
    - i. There are no objective standards of right and wrong, for who’s to say what is right and wrong?
    - ii. Moral values are either:
      - 1. An expression of personal taste, or
      - 2. A by-product of socio-economic conditioning.
    - iii. It would be logically impossible to condemn the torture of babies, oppression of the sick and helpless, or crimes against persons and society as evil, for evil differs from person to person, and doesn’t exist at all for others.
2. The concept of morality without a Moral Law-Giver is unintelligible. If death and non-being waits at the end of every life, then what was the purpose, the goal, the point?
- a. **T. S. Elliot’s** haunting lines fit this picture: *“This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. This is the way the world ends. Not with a bang, but a with a whimper.”*
  - b. As **Solomon** said in Ecc. 3:19-20: *“Vanity of vanities. All is vanity.*
  - c. **Sigmund Freud** taught that our actions, motives, and thoughts were nothing more than repressed sexual urges.
  - d. **B. F. Skinner** argued that our choices are determined by conditioning and therefore freedom of choice is but an illusion.
  - e. **Francis Crick (one of two discovers of DNA)** regards man as an electro-chemical machine that can be controlled by altering its genetic code. (*Panspermia* – *life exists in the universe due to ancient-times space travelers depositing large amounts of life-giving sperm on asteroids, meteorites, and planetoids. Additionally, a planet traveling through the seed-ridden tail of one of these heavenly bodies could also have been fertilized*). *This is how life began on Earth according to Crick*). This, of

course, does not explain where the space travelers came from. Just stop and think: This explanation of the beginning of life on earth is more reasonable to Dr. Crick than a Life-Creating God. He has no proof. He has only a totally unsubstantiated and idiotic theory. But then this is **SCIENTISM!**

- f. **Nietzsche** said: *“The implication of atheism is NIHILISM. The end of Christianity means the advent of nihilism.*
- g. So, man and the universe exist for no purpose, for there can be no ultimate purpose without God, and infinite time plus chance cannot produce purpose or moral values. Time plus chance cannot conceive of or put definition to good or evil, right or wrong, consciousness, thought, or self-contemplation, to name a few.

### 3. **THE PRACTICAL IMPOSSIBILITY OF ATHEISM: It is impossible to live consistently and happily within this world view.**

- a. If one lives consistently in the atheistic world-view, he will not be happy, for all is ultimately hopeless and meaningless.
- b. If one lives happily, it is only because he is not consistent in his beliefs.
- c. The **TWO STORY WORLD VIEW HOUSE**:
  - i. **Bottom floor**: Materialism, relativism, no God, no ultimate purpose.
  - ii. **Top floor**: God, objective morals, hope, immortality.
- d. Man cannot live happily and consistently on the bottom floor – it becomes depressing, hopeless and intolerable. So, he often makes leaps to the top floor to gain meaning and purpose in his life.
  - i. But he has no rationale to do so, for he believes there is no God and no ultimate purpose to his existence.
  - ii. Further, the universe does not acquire ultimate meaning just because I give it one. For suppose I gave the universe one meaning, and you another. Who is right?
- e. The honest atheist will admit and comprehend that there is **NO OBJECTIVE MEANING TO LIFE WITHOUT GOD**.
  - i. He will then attempt to create meaning in life by choosing to follow a certain course of action or philosophy.

1. For example, one could choose to murder, control and repress people – Stalin – to the end that all would serve him.
  2. Or, one could choose to help humanity through science or medicine, or helping the poor.
  3. Or, one could choose to pursue wealth, status, control, and power to bring meaning to his life.
  4. Sadly, there is yet another possibility – the most chosen course.
    - a. One could choose to do nothing...
    - b. Don't think about or contemplate life at all.
    - c. Avoid the pain and effort required to think through a world view and accept it.
    - d. Simply choose to live in a thoughtless, meaningless vacuum of ignorance.
    - e. Just don't give it any thought; after all, there's a party to go to tonight.
    - f. Just say that you are an agnostic – sounds intelligent – right? Sounds like you've thought it through.
- ii. But, it is inconsistent and absurd to think that one can create his own purpose in life while living only on the bottom floor, for life remains ultimately without purpose. He is only fooling himself, even in the midst of taking leaps to the top floor. In the end, it matters not whether one helps the poor or commits murder. It all ends in nihilism – no punishment or reward – no conciseness – no existence.
- iii. Atheists cannot live consistently with their world view.
1. They deeply comprehend that there must be purpose to life, and they are unable to live in a purposeless manner, so they create their own purpose in the face of their own world view that clearly offers no ultimate purpose.
  2. Therefore, they do not live consistently on the bottom floor, for they would be deeply unhappy. Atheists cannot live con-

sistently and happily within the confines of their own world view.

- f. **Atheism is actually irrational** by means of its own statement that there is **NO GOD**.
  - i. That statement claims a **universal negative**, which is impossible to prove or support. It is, therefore, irrational.
  - ii. How could one know that there is no God anywhere in the universe? Has the atheist searched the entire universe? Perhaps God is on Saturn. Has the atheist searched Saturn? And if he were to travel to Saturn to search for God, who's to say that God didn't just move to Jupiter?
  - iii. Universal negatives cannot be proven and are, therefore, irrational.
- g. Even atheist **Bertrand Russell** (1872 – 1970 – *British philosopher, mathematician, logician, historian, pacifist, socialist, atheists*) admitted that he could not live as though ethical values were simply a matter of personal preference. "I do not know the solution," he lamented. I think he knew the solution, but rejected it as unacceptable.

#### 4. What about Biblical Christianity?

- a. God does exist.
- b. Transcendent moral values exist, given by a Moral Law-Giver.
- c. Man's life has meaning and does not end in death. The resurrected body will live forever in Heaven, with God, or it will live forever separated from God and all that is good.
- d. Biblical Christianity thus provides the three conditions necessary for a meaningful, purposeful life:
  - i. God,
  - ii. Immortality, and
  - iii. Objective Morality.
- e. We can live consistently and happily within this world view.
- f. Biblical Christianity, therefore, succeeds precisely where atheism fails.
- g. This argument does not prove Biblical Christianity to be true, but rather that it is more rational than the alternative.
- h. If God does not exist, then life is futile.



- i. If God does exist, then life is meaningful and ultimately purposeful.
  - j. If God exists, we then know right from wrong and are subject to an objective morality.
5. **What problem, then, do some people have with the existence of God?** Why such ardent objection to the notion of a creator?
- a. Is it because unbelievers conclude that creation from nothing by chance over eons of time and without purpose or direction is superior, more reasonable and believable than creation by God? **I don't think so!**
  - b. Is it because unbelievers reject the concept of basic morality and general principles of right and wrong? **I don't think so!**
  - c. Is it because unbelievers don't want ultimate purpose in their lives? **I don't think so!**
  - d. Is it because unbelievers don't want immortality in an unimaginably wonderful place? **I don't think so!**
  - e. Is it because unbelievers don't want to be totally forgiven for the wrongs they know they have done? **I don't think so!**
  - f. Is it because unbelievers believe only in what they can see and feel? **I don't think so!**
    - i. They also believe in the magnetic field, gravity, the emission of radiation from isotopes, none of which has been observed by the unbeliever.
  - g. It appears that unbelievers desire all that God has to offer, **so what's the problem?**
    - i. Could it be that the committed atheist does not want to be subject to God and His commands?
    - ii. Could it be that he wants to be in control of his own life and keep doing what he's doing?
    - iii. Could it be that the committed atheist totally disdains religion and religious people, not wanting to be part of such a community of radical, judgmental, and hateful people?
    - iv. Could it be that Christians send shockwaves of conviction into the souls of non-believers?

- v. Could it be that some are blinded by the anti-God proclamations of the general scientific community?
- vi. Could it be that some have not been exposed to the teachings of Christ and have no knowledge of the truth?
- vii. Could it be that some have grown to hate God for all that has happened to them – since He has rejected me, I am rejecting Him?
- viii. Could it be that some have been hurt, ridiculed, dismissed, insulted, judged, ignored and rejected by practicing Christians?
  - 1. Who needs a God who produces people like that?
- ix. Could it be that some are concerned about how they would look to their sophisticated, unbelieving colleagues?
- x. Could it be that some are shallow and ignorant – too much trouble to think?
- xi. Could it be that some don't believe in Absolute Truth?
- xii. Could it be that some reason that evil in the world proves that there is no God, for no loving God would allow such evil?
- xiii. Whatever the reason, I think you'll find a heart that is either:
  - 1. Full of pride and arrogance, or
  - 2. Full of pain and hurt and longing and shame and hopelessness and disappointment and rejection.
- xiv. Often, my brothers and sisters, the problem is US, the **IRRELEVANT CHURCH.**
  - 1. **Irrelevant through** the acceptance of relativism.
  - 2. **Irrelevant through** political correctness.
  - 3. **Irrelevant through** not wanting to offend anyone.
  - 4. **Irrelevant through** not taking a stand for Christ.
  - 5. **Irrelevant through** not really believing the Bible to be the True and Inerrant Word of God.
  - 6. **Irrelevant through** not practicing a non-preachy, non-judgmental, loving lifestyle.
  - 7. **Irrelevant through** adding the necessity of works to Christ for salvation.

8. **Irrelevant through** accepting some of the Bible, but not the entire Bible as Truth.
9. **Irrelevant through** denominational infighting.
10. **Irrelevant through** our inability to Defend the Faith with rational discussion.
11. **Irrelevant through** compromising the necessary tenants of the faith.
12. **Irrelevant through** refusing to compromise those things that are NOT necessary for salvation.
13. **Irrelevant through** compromising the Truth of God.
14. **Irrelevant through** hiding our sins and failures to feed our pride and showcase our "GOODNESS."
15. **Irrelevant through** refusing to associate with anyone but our own safe little group.

**SO, WHAT WILL IT BE: A MEANINGLESS, PURPOSELESS LIFE WITHOUT GOD, OR A MEANINGFUL, PURPOSEFUL LIFE WITH GOD??**

**IF WITH GOD, YOU BE FILLED WITH A RELEVANT & POWERFUL LIFE WITH JESUS THE CHRIST?**

***THE END OR THE BEGINNING - YOU DECIDE***