

The Absurdity of Life without God

Or: "Why I must Believe in God Because I am Terrified of Dying"

William Lane Craig

Why on atheism life has no ultimate meaning, value, or purpose, and why this view is unlivable.

The Necessity of God and Immortality

Man, writes Loren Eiseley, is the Cosmic Orphan. He is the **only creature in the universe** who asks, "Why?" Other animals have instincts to guide them, but man has learned to ask questions. "Who am I?" man asks. "Why am I here? Where am I going?" Since the Enlightenment, when he threw off the shackles of religion, man has tried to answer these questions **without reference to God**. But the answers that came back were not exhilarating, but dark and terrible. "You are the accidental by-product of nature, a result of matter plus time plus chance. There is no reason for your existence. All you face is death."

Modern man thought that when he had gotten rid of God, he had freed himself from all that repressed and stifled him. Instead, he discovered that in killing God, he had also killed himself. For if there is no God, then man's life becomes **absurd**.

If God does not exist, then both man and the universe are inevitably doomed to death. Man, like all biological organisms, must die. With no hope of immortality, man's life leads only to the grave. His life is but a spark in the infinite blackness, a spark that appears, flickers, and dies forever. Therefore, everyone must come face to face with what theologian Paul Tillich has called "the threat of non-being." For though I know now that I exist, that I am alive, I also know that someday I will no longer exist, that I will no longer be, that I will die. This thought is staggering and threatening: to think that the person I call "myself" will cease to exist, that **I will be no more!**

I remember vividly the first time my father told me that someday I would die. Somehow as a child the thought had just never occurred to me. When he told me, I was filled with fear and **unbearable sadness**. And though he tried repeatedly to reassure me that this was a long way off, that did not seem to matter. Whether sooner or later, the undeniable fact was that I would die and be no more, and the thought overwhelmed me. Eventually, like all of us, I grew to simply accept the fact. We all learn to live with the inevitable. But the child's insight remains true. As the French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre observed, **several hours or several years make no difference** **once you have lost eternity**.

Whether it comes sooner or later, the prospect of death and the threat of non-being is a terrible horror. But I met a student once who did not feel this threat. He said he had been raised on the farm and was used to seeing the animals being born and dying. Death was for him simply natural—a part of life, so to speak. I was puzzled by how different our two perspectives on death were and found it difficult to understand why he did not feel the threat of non-being. Years later, I think I found my answer in

Comment [JHH1]: My interpretation of what he really means.

Comment [JHH2]: *Really?* That sounds a bit obnoxious. My life has plenty of meaning and joy without having to subjugate to a petty, jealous god. It sounds like in this essay the writer is going to *impose* a worthlessness and lack of purpose for anyone who disagrees with him.

Comment [JHH3]: We don't know that. It is possible there are other sentient beings.

Comment [JHH4]: There is nothing wrong with approaching a question from a neutral perspective, nor is it disrespectful to religion. Galileo believed in God, he just saw that the Church's stated view of reality was flawed and sought to explain what he observed. Darwin believed in God, he just wanted to explain how man, plants and animals came to be the way they were. Natural philosophers never seek to "get rid of" God, they just want to understand the world. Sometimes there is a "dark" side to what they find (if natural mechanisms can be said to be "terrible"), but that does not make it untrue.

With respect to the big questions: Why/How etc. maybe these cannot be answered until the nature of the Universe is understood. There is a great deal of purpose getting to that point.

Comment [JHH5]: Who said that man set out to kill God? Some people certainly set out to disprove aspects of religion, and have been fairly successful. You can never disprove God; why bother?

Comment [JHH6]: But even in an "afterlife" your present being will be no more. Before you lived you never were. How is that painful or threatening?

Comment [JHH7]: Delightfully melodramatic. "Unbearable" surely means it killed you. But it didn't; we all deal with it. I was 8 years old when I was told the Sun would one day consume the Earth and by extension, at that point I must be dead. It was a sobering thought (as many experiences in life are)...then I went outside to play.

Comment [JHH8]: By the same token, someone believing in an afterlife should be unafraid of death to the point of recklessness. Go to the most dangerous place on Earth to help people (a noble cause, not technically suicide) and see how long you last. Yet human beings tend to have a will to survive which is presumably linked to the compulsion to reproduce and then defend your offspring. It is quite normal for many animals to want to live. But if heaven is a fact then mortal life doesn't mean anything as long as you collect enough points. Religion thrives on uncertainty.

reading Sartre. Sartre observed that death is not threatening so long as we view it as the death of the other, from a third-person standpoint, so to speak. It is only when we internalize it and look at it from the first-person perspective—"my death: I am going to die"—that the threat of non-being becomes real. As Sartre points out, many people never assume this first-person perspective in the midst of life; one can even look at one's own death from the third-person standpoint, as if it were the death of another or even of an animal, as did my friend. But the true existential significance of my death can only be appreciated from the first-person perspective, as I realize that I am going to die and forever cease to exist. **My life is just a momentary transition out of oblivion into oblivion.**

Comment [JHH9]: Probably is. Suck it up and stop bringing everyone down, man.

And the universe, too, faces death. Scientists tell us that the universe is expanding, and everything in it is growing farther and farther apart. As it does so, it grows colder and colder, and its energy is used up. Eventually all the stars will burn out and all matter will collapse into dead stars and black holes. There will be no light at all; there will be no heat; there will be no life; only the corpses of dead stars and galaxies, ever expanding into the endless darkness and the cold recesses of space—a **universe in ruins**. **So not only is the life of each individual person doomed; the entire human race is doomed. There is no escape. There is no hope.**

Comment [JHH10]: It's called entropy. Suck it up and stop bringing everyone down, man.

The Absurdity of Life without God and Immortality

If there is no God, then man and the universe are doomed. Like prisoners condemned to death, we await our unavoidable execution. There is no God, and there is no immortality. And what is the consequence of this? **It means that life itself is absurd.** It means that the life we have is without ultimate significance, value, or purpose. Let's look at each of these.

Comment [JHH11]: Life is what you make of it. Your life may or may not be absurd, but the argumentation is pointless, because there either is or isn't a God and the answer is outside your control or mine.

No Ultimate Meaning without Immortality and God

If each individual person passes out of existence when he dies, then what ultimate meaning can be given to his life? Does it really matter whether he ever existed at all? His life may be important relative to certain other events, but what is the ultimate significance of any of those events? If all the events are meaningless, then what can be the ultimate meaning of influencing any of them? Ultimately it makes no difference.

Look at it from another perspective: Scientists say that the universe originated in an explosion called the "Big Bang" about 13 billion years ago. **Suppose the Big Bang had never occurred.** Suppose the universe had never existed. What ultimate difference would it make? The universe is doomed to die anyway. In the end it makes no difference whether the universe ever existed or not. Therefore, it is without ultimate significance.

Comment [JHH12]: But it did. There is no point asking what it would be like if it didn't. Mankind exists and may continue to exist, and may supersede itself to become some kind of immortal being. In which case every person that ever lived had a purpose, which was to take us on the journey to that ultimate destination: to solve the last question, "how can entropy be reduced or reversed".

The same is true of the human race. Mankind is a doomed race in a dying universe. Because **the human race will eventually cease to exist,** it makes no ultimate difference

Comment [JHH13]: Of course it will. It will either become extinct or turn into something else, that is how evolution works... although ironically evolution has already possibly been superseded. It is theoretically possible to design our own future.

whether it ever did exist. Mankind is thus no more significant than a swarm of mosquitos or a barnyard of pigs, for their end is all the same. The same blind cosmic process that coughed them up in the first place will eventually swallow them all again.

Comment [JHH14]: Perhaps, or perhaps not. A pig cannot perform open heart surgery or fly to the Moon but humans can do both.

And the same is true of each individual person. The contributions of the scientist to the advance of human knowledge, the researches of the doctor to alleviate pain and suffering, the efforts of the diplomat to secure peace in the world, the sacrifices of good men everywhere to better the lot of the human race--all these come to nothing. This is the horror of modern man: because he ends in nothing, he is nothing.

Comment [JHH15]: Lighten up! All those scientists made the standard of living better on a global scale, extended lifespans and helped us to understand the Universe. No priest can claim the same achievement.

But it is important to see that it is not just immortality that man needs if life is to be meaningful. Mere duration of existence does not make that existence meaningful. If man and the universe could exist forever, but if there were no God, their existence would still have no ultimate significance. To illustrate: I once read a science-fiction story in which an astronaut was marooned on a barren chunk of rock lost in outer space. He had with him two vials: one containing poison and the other a potion that would make him live forever. Realizing his predicament, he gulped down the poison. But then to his horror, he discovered he had swallowed the wrong vial—he had drunk the potion for immortality. And that meant that he was cursed to exist forever—a meaningless, unending life. Now if God does not exist, our lives are just like that. They could go on and on and still be utterly without meaning. We could still ask of life, "So what?" So it is not just immortality man needs if life is to be ultimately significant; he needs God and immortality. And if God does not exist, then he has neither.

Comment [JHH16]: Why jump to that conclusion? Love between people is much more real. People cooperating, exploring. God is just a word. You better define what it is.

Twentieth-century man came to understand this. Read *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett. During this entire play two men carry on trivial conversation while waiting for a third man to arrive, who never does. Our lives are like that, Beckett is saying; we just kill time waiting—for what, we don't know. In a tragic portrayal of man, Beckett wrote another play in which the curtain opens revealing a stage littered with junk. For thirty long seconds, the audience sits and stares in silence at that junk. Then the curtain closes. That's all.

Comment [JHH17]: Bravo. Bet that one went down well.

French existentialists Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus understood this, too. Sartre portrayed life in his play *No Exit* as hell—the final line of the play are the words of resignation, "Well, let's get on with it." Hence, Sartre writes elsewhere of the "nausea" of existence. Camus, too, saw life as absurd. At the end of his brief novel *The Stranger*, Camus's hero discovers in a flash of insight that the universe has no meaning and there is no God to give it one.

Comment [JHH18]: For the time being, that is the best advice. The purpose might not be clear yet, but we are inherently compelled to survive. That is enough.

Thus, if there is no God, then life itself becomes meaningless. Man and the universe are without ultimate significance.

No Ultimate Value Without Immortality and God

If life ends at the grave, then it makes no difference whether one has lived as a Stalin or as a saint. Since one's destiny is ultimately unrelated to one's behavior, you may as well just live as you please. As Dostoyevsky put it: "If there is no immortality then all things are permitted." On this basis, a writer like Ayn Rand is absolutely correct to praise the virtues of selfishness. Live totally for self; no one holds you accountable!

Comment [JHH19]: But yet we don't, because people prosper when they cooperate. That is why tribes developed.

Comment [JHH20]: Society has developed rules with consequences if they are broken. It is simply untrue to say you are not accountable for your actions.

Indeed, it would be foolish to do anything else, for life is too short to jeopardize it by acting out of anything but pure self-interest. Sacrifice for another person would be stupid. Kai Nielsen, an atheist philosopher who attempts to defend the viability of ethics without God, in the end admits,

We have not been able to show that reason requires the moral point of view, or that all really rational persons, unhoodwinked by myth or ideology, need not be individual egoists or classical amorality. Reason doesn't decide here. The picture I have painted for you is not a pleasant one. Reflection on it depresses me Pure practical reason, even with a good knowledge of the facts, will not take you to morality.¹

Comment [JHH21]: Perhaps then some aspect of morality is an instinct. Just as belief in God is an instinct: to trust in a higher power to protect you. For a mammal this is usually your parents or a family group. From the bottom up this leads tribes to look to multiple gods and, in the end, to one god, for protection.

But the problem becomes even worse. For, regardless of immortality, if there is no God, then there can be no objective standards of right and wrong. All we are confronted with is, in Jean-Paul Sartre's words, the bare, valueless fact of existence. Moral values are either just expressions of personal taste or the by-products of socio-biological evolution and conditioning. In a world without God, who is to say which values are right and which are wrong? Who is to judge that the values of Adolf Hitler are inferior to those of a saint? The concept of morality loses all meaning in a universe without God. As one contemporary atheistic ethicist points out, "to say that something is wrong because . . . it is forbidden by God, is . . . perfectly understandable to anyone who believes in a law-giving God. But to say that something is wrong . . . even though no God exists to forbid it, is not understandable. . . ." "The concept of moral obligation [is] unintelligible apart from the idea of God. The words remain but their meaning is gone."² In a world without God, there can be no objective right and wrong, only our culturally and personally relative, subjective judgments. This means that it is impossible to condemn war, oppression, or crime as evil. Nor can one praise brotherhood, equality, and love as good. For in a universe without God, good and evil do not exist—there is only the bare valueless fact of existence, and there is no one to say you are right and I am wrong.

Comment [JHH22]: We do obviously. There never was an objective standard of right and wrong. It evolves over time. A few hundred years ago someone would be stoned to death for adultery or homosexuality; based on religious rules that were purported to come from God and people swore blind they were absolute. Some still do. The evolution of morality comes from our own choices and has nothing to do with a god.

Comment [JHH23]: Tell that to a judge.

No Ultimate Purpose Without Immortality and God

If death stands with open arms at the end of life's trail, then what is the goal of life? Is it all for nothing? Is there no reason for life? And what of the universe? Is it utterly pointless? If its destiny is a cold grave in the recesses of outer space the answer must be, yes—it is pointless. There is no goal no purpose for the universe. The litter of a dead universe will just go on expanding and expanding—forever.

Comment [JHH24]: You're just repeating yourself now. A mantra does not make truth (good line, I will use that). One possible scenario I have already mentioned is that we will ascend to our own god-like state. It at least is something to work toward.

This whole argument can be turned around by asking "What is God's purpose?" Using all the same reasoning as has been presented, there isn't one. Just to exist, be happy or... *something*. The same answer can be applied to people.

And what of man? Is there no purpose at all for the human race? Or will it simply peter out someday lost in the oblivion of an indifferent universe? The English writer H. G. Wells foresaw such a prospect. In his novel *The Time Machine* Wells's time traveler journeys far into the future to discover the destiny of man. All he finds is a dead earth, save for a few lichens and moss, orbiting a gigantic red sun. The only sounds are the rush of the wind and the gentle ripple of the sea. "Beyond these lifeless sounds," writes Wells, "the world was silent. Silent? It would be hard to convey the stillness of it. All the sounds of man, the bleating of sheep, the cries of birds, the hum of insects, the stir that makes the background of our lives—all that was over."³ And so Wells's time traveler returned. But to what?—to merely an earlier point on the purposeless rush toward oblivion. When as a non-Christian I first read Wells's book, I thought, "No, no! It can't end that way!" But if there is no God, it will end that way,

Comment [JHH25]: Earth certainly will. It's inevitable. But mankind might have left by then.

like it or not. This is reality in a universe without God: there is no hope; there is no purpose.

What is true of mankind as a whole is true of each of us individually: we are here to no purpose. If there is no God, then our life is not qualitatively different from that of a dog. As the ancient writer of Ecclesiastes put it: "The fate of the sons of men and the fate of beasts is the same. As one dies so dies the other; indeed, they all have the same breath and there is no advantage for man over beast, for all is vanity. All go to the same place. All come from the dust and all return to the dust" (Eccles 3:19-20). In this book, which reads more like a piece of modern existentialist literature than a book of the Bible, the writer shows the futility of pleasure, wealth, education, political fame, and honor in a life doomed to end in death. His verdict? "Vanity of vanities! All is vanity" (1:2). If life ends at the grave, then we have no ultimate purpose for living.

But more than that: even if it did not end in death, without God life would still be without purpose. For man and the universe would then be simple accidents of chance, thrust into existence for no reason. Without God the universe is the result of a cosmic accident, a chance explosion. There is no reason for which it exists. As for man, he is a freak of nature—a blind product of matter plus time plus chance. Man is just a lump of slime that evolved rationality. As one philosopher has put it: "Human life is mounted upon a subhuman pedestal and must shift for itself alone in the heart of a silent and mindless universe."⁴

What is true of the universe and of the human race is also true of us as individuals. If God does not exist, then you are just a miscarriage of nature, thrust into a purposeless universe to live a purposeless life.

So if God does not exist, that means that man and the universe exist to no purpose—since the end of everything is death—and that they came to be for no purpose, since they are only blind products of chance. In short, life is utterly without reason.

Do you understand the gravity of the alternatives before us? For if God exists, then there is hope for man. But if God does not exist, then all we are left with is despair. Do you understand why the question of God's existence is so vital to man? As one writer has aptly put it, "If God is dead, then man is dead, too."

Unfortunately, the mass of mankind do not realize this fact. They continue on as though nothing has changed. I'm reminded of Nietzsche's story of the madman who in the early morning hours burst into the marketplace, lantern in hand, crying, "I seek God! I seek God!" Since many of those standing about did not believe in God, he provoked much laughter. "Did God get lost?" they taunted him. "Or is he hiding? Or maybe he has gone on a voyage or emigrated!" Thus they yelled and laughed. Then, writes Nietzsche, the madman turned in their midst and pierced them with his eyes

"Whither is God?" he cried, "I shall tell you. *We have killed him*—you and I. All of us are his murderers. But how have we done this? How were we able to drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the entire horizon? What did we do when we unchained this earth from its sun? Whither is it moving now? Away from all suns? Are we not plunging continually? Backward, sideward, forward, in all directions? Is there any up or down left? Are we not straying as through an infinite nothing? Do we

Comment [JHH26]: What is more vain than a God that demands worship, with grave consequences for those that refuse? The entire bible exists to set up and justify this scenario. Your god is vanity.

Comment [JHH27]: Isn't that cool?

Comment [JHH28]: Not if God is the asshole described in the bible. I don't hope for that.

There are plenty of "what if's" being thrown around here, so let me add my own. What if God exists and the next life is just another level with its own set of new challenges, where someone theorises "oh there is a better after-afterlife after this one".

Comment [JHH29]: Only if you want to be depressed.

not feel the breath of empty space? Has it not become colder? Is not night and more night coming on all the while? Must not lanterns be lit in the morning? Do we not hear anything yet of the noise of the gravediggers who are burying God? . . . God is dead. . . . And we have killed him. How shall we, the murderers of all murderers, comfort ourselves?⁵

The crowd stared at the madman in silence and astonishment. At last he dashed his lantern to the ground. "I have come too early," he said. "This tremendous event is still on its way—it has not yet reached the ears of man." Men did not yet truly comprehend the consequences of what they had done in killing God. But Nietzsche predicted that someday people would realize the implications of their atheism; and this realization would usher in an age of nihilism—the destruction of all meaning and value in life.

Most people still do not reflect on the consequences of atheism and so, like the crowd in the marketplace, go unknowingly on their way. But when we realize, as did Nietzsche, what atheism implies, then his question presses hard upon us: how *shall* we, the murderers of all murderers, comfort ourselves?

Comment [JHH30]: That's what any conservative individual says. It's always the end of the world when any change happens. What is the alternative to rationalism, a renewed age of religion? A dimlightenment? Then everyone just argues about their interpretation of the truth. I say, stop arguing and lighten up. If God exists, give him some credit that life isn't just a cruel game.

The Practical Impossibility of Atheism

About the only solution the atheist can offer is that we face the absurdity of life and live bravely. Bertrand Russell, for example, wrote that we must build our lives upon "the firm foundation of unyielding despair."⁶ Only by recognizing that the world really is a terrible place can we successfully come to terms with life. Camus said that we should honestly recognize life's absurdity and then live in love for one another.

The fundamental problem with this solution, however, is that it is impossible to live consistently and happily within such a world view. If one lives consistently, he will not be happy; if one lives happily, it is only because he is not consistent. Francis Schaeffer has explained this point well. Modern man, says Schaeffer, resides in a two-story universe. In the lower story is the finite world without God; here life is absurd, as we have seen. In the upper story are meaning, value, and purpose. Now modern man lives in the lower story because he believes there is no God. But he cannot live happily in such an absurd world; therefore, he continually makes leaps of faith into the upper story to affirm meaning, value, and purpose, even though he has no right to, since he does not believe in God.

Comment [JHH31]: You are drawing conclusions for your reader. There has not yet been an interesting argument worth exploring because it all presupposes that there is, in fact, a God and that there are presumably grave consequences for anyone who does not believe in him. That is the threat of most religions.

Let's look again, then, at each of the three areas in which we saw life was absurd without God, to show how man cannot live consistently and happily with his atheism.

Meaning of Life

First, the area of meaning. We saw that without God, life has no meaning. Yet philosophers continue to live as though life does have meaning. For example, Sartre argued that one may create meaning for his life by freely choosing to follow a certain course of action. Sartre himself chose Marxism.

If God is not going to punish those that do not believe, what is the problem? It seems evident that people can live moral lives according to the standard of the time without referring to god every moment. If there turns out to be one – and an afterlife, then great: Bonus points.

Christopher Hitchens said in an interview shortly before he died "I'm not afraid of being dead, but I am afraid of the process of dying because it might be painful....if it turns out there is an afterlife then... I like surprises."

Now this is utterly inconsistent. It is inconsistent to say life is objectively absurd and then to say one may create meaning for his life. If life is really absurd, then man is trapped in the lower story. To try to create meaning in life represents a leap to the upper story. But Sartre has no basis for this leap. Without God, there can be no objective meaning in life. Sartre's program is actually an exercise in self-delusion. Sartre is really saying, "Let's pretend the universe has meaning." And this is just fooling ourselves.

Comment [JHH32]: And choosing a religion isn't?

Comment [JHH33]: But this argument works equally well against your own hypothesis.... "let's pretend there is a God so we have meaning."

The point is this: if God does not exist, then life is objectively meaningless; but man cannot live consistently and happily knowing that life is meaningless; so in order to be happy he pretends life has meaning. But this is, of course, entirely inconsistent—for without God, man and the universe are without any real significance.

Comment [JHH34]: Jesus. Rinse, spit, repeat. Say something new.

Value of Life

Turn now to the problem of value. Here is where the most blatant inconsistencies occur. First of all, atheistic humanists are totally inconsistent in affirming the traditional values of love and brotherhood. Camus has been rightly criticized for inconsistently holding both to the absurdity of life and the ethics of human love and brotherhood. The two are logically incompatible. Bertrand Russell, too, was inconsistent. For though he was an atheist, he was an outspoken social critic, denouncing war and restrictions on sexual freedom. Russell admitted that he could not live as though ethical values were simply a matter of personal taste, and that he therefore found his own views "incredible." "I do not know the solution," he confessed.⁷ The point is that if there is no God, then objective right and wrong cannot exist. As Dostoyevsky said, "All things are permitted."

Comment [JHH35]: But we, mankind, have created a system where this isn't so. It is not perfect but it does get iteratively better.

But Dostoyevsky also showed that man cannot live this way. He cannot live as though it is perfectly all right for soldiers to slaughter innocent children. He cannot live as though it is all right for dictators like Pol Pot to exterminate millions of their own countrymen. Everything in him cries out to say these acts are wrong—really wrong. But if there is no God, he cannot. So he makes a leap of faith and affirms values anyway. And when he does so, he reveals the inadequacy of a world without God.

Comment [JHH36]: Although it has been perfectly alright for Christian soldiers to slaughter innocent children (now they do it with drones, even better) or jihadists to blow themselves up, and told by their priest they will go to heaven.

The horror of a world devoid of value was brought home to me with new intensity a few years ago as I viewed a BBC television documentary called "The Gathering." It concerned the reunion of survivors of the Holocaust in Jerusalem, where they rediscovered lost friendships and shared their experiences. One woman prisoner, a nurse, told of how she was made the gynecologist at Auschwitz. She observed that pregnant women were grouped together by the soldiers under the direction of Dr. Mengele and housed in the same barracks. Some time passed, and she noted that she no longer saw any of these women. She made inquiries. "Where are the pregnant women who were housed in that barracks?" "Haven't you heard?" came the reply. "Dr. Mengele used them for vivisection."

Comment [JHH37]: Sorry, how is this support for the existence of God? Germany is a Christian country. These people were hardly ignorant of "thou shalt not kill", a commandment they shared with the people they were murdering.

Another woman told of how Mengele had bound up her breasts so that she could not suckle her infant. The doctor wanted to learn how long an infant could survive without nourishment. Desperately this poor woman tried to keep her baby alive by

We must learn from our mistakes because we are the only ones that can make sure they do not happen again.

giving it pieces of bread soaked in coffee, but to no avail. Each day the baby lost weight, a fact that was eagerly monitored by Dr. Mengele. A nurse then came secretly to this woman and told her, "I have arranged a way for you to get out of here, but you cannot take your baby with you. I have brought a morphine injection that you can give to your child to end its life." When the woman protested, the nurse was insistent: "Look, your baby is going to die anyway. At least save yourself." And so *this mother took the life of her own baby*. Dr. Mengele was furious when he learned of it because he had lost his experimental specimen, and he searched among the dead to find the baby's discarded corpse so that he could have one last weighing.

My heart was torn by these stories. One rabbi who survived the camp summed it up well when he said that at Auschwitz it was as though there existed a world in which all the Ten Commandments were reversed. Mankind had never seen such a hell.

And yet, if God does not exist, then in a sense, our world is Auschwitz; there is no absolute right and wrong; *all things* are permitted. But no atheist, no agnostic, can live consistently with such a view. Nietzsche himself, who proclaimed the necessity of living beyond good and evil, broke with his mentor Richard Wagner precisely over the issue of the composer's anti-Semitism and strident German nationalism. Similarly Sartre, writing in the aftermath of the Second World War, condemned anti-Semitism, declaring that a doctrine that leads to extermination is not merely an opinion or matter of personal taste, of equal value with its opposite.⁸ In his important essay "Existentialism Is a Humanism," Sartre struggles vainly to elude the contradiction between his denial of divinely pre-established values and his urgent desire to affirm the value of human persons. Like Russell, he could not live with the implications of his own denial of ethical absolutes.

A second problem is that if God does not exist and there is no immortality, then all the evil acts of men go unpunished and all the sacrifices of good men go unrewarded. But who can live with such a view? Richard Wurmbrand, who has been tortured for his faith in communist prisons, says,

The cruelty of atheism is hard to believe when man has no faith in the reward of good or the punishment of evil. There is no reason to be human. There is no restraint from the depths of evil which is in man. The communist torturers often said, 'There is no God, no Hereafter, no punishment for evil. We can do what we wish.' I have heard one torturer even say, 'I thank God, in whom I don't believe, that I have lived to this hour when I can express all the evil in my heart.' He expressed it in unbelievable brutality and torture inflicted on prisoners.⁹

And the same applies to acts of self-sacrifice. A number of years ago, a terrible mid-winter air disaster occurred in which a plane leaving the Washington, D.C., airport smashed into a bridge spanning the Potomac River, plunging its passengers into the icy waters. As the rescue helicopters came, attention was focused on one man who again and again pushed the dangling rope ladder to other passengers rather than be pulled to safety himself. Six times he passed the ladder by. When they came again, he was gone. He had freely given his life that others might live. The whole nation turned its eyes to this man in respect and admiration for the selfless and good act he had performed. And yet, if the atheist is right, that man was not noble—he did the stupidest thing possible. He should have gone for the ladder first, pushed others away

Comment [JHH38]: No it isn't but *Auschwitz* is in our world. And it is one terrible aspect of it. If God exists why did *Auschwitz* happen? It's a slippery slope when Christians start babbling about the Holocaust or any other atrocity because all prove that there is no such thing as divine intervention.

Comment [JHH39]: That is equally as stupid a statement as the concept of a "War on Terror". Humans exist on a continuum and it has nothing to do with faith or lack thereof. Some people are good and some are bad and they can find any number of justifications for their actions. Does God punish them for deeds or their devotion to his existence?

Does an atheist go to hell merely for that fact?

if necessary in order to survive. But to die for others he did not even know, to give up all the brief existence he would ever have—what for? For the atheist there can be no reason. And yet the atheist, like the rest of us, instinctively reacts with praise for this man's selfless action. Indeed, one will probably never find an atheist who lives consistently with his system. For a universe without moral accountability and devoid of value is unimaginably terrible.

Comment [JHH40]: Yes. It is the source of that accountability and value that is at issue.

Purpose of Life

Finally, let's look at the problem of purpose in life. The only way most people who deny purpose in life live happily is either by making up some purpose, which amounts to self-delusion as we saw with Sartre, or by not carrying their view to its logical conclusions. Take the problem of death, for example. According to Ernst Bloch, the only way modern man lives in the face of death is by subconsciously borrowing the belief in immortality that his forefathers held to, even though he himself has no basis for this belief, since he does not believe in God. By borrowing the remnants of a belief in immortality, writes Bloch, "modern man does not feel the chasm that unceasingly surrounds him and that will certainly engulf him at last. Through these remnants, he saves his sense of self-identity. Through them the impression arises that man is not perishing, but only that one day the world has the whim no longer to appear to him." Bloch concludes, "This quite shallow courage feasts on a borrowed credit card. It lives from earlier hopes and the support that they once had provided." ¹⁰ Modern man no longer has any right to that support, since he rejects God. But in order to live purposefully, he makes a leap of faith to affirm a reason for living.

Comment [JHH41]: Finally, something intriguing!! I understand this because its true enough that I cannot know what my attitude would be if I did not have a Christian upbringing, which is the backdrop for my life, like it or not.

We often find the same inconsistency among those who say that man and the universe came to exist for no reason or purpose, but just by chance. Unable to live in an impersonal universe in which everything is the product of blind chance, these persons begin to ascribe personality and motives to the physical processes themselves. It is a bizarre way of speaking and represents a leap from the lower to the upper story. For example, Francis Crick halfway through his book *The Origin of the Genetic Code* begins to spell nature with a capital "N" and elsewhere speaks of natural selection as being "clever" and as "thinking" of what it will do. Fred Hoyle, the English astronomer, attributes to the universe itself the qualities of God. For Carl Sagan the "Cosmos," which he always spells with a capital letter, obviously fills the role of a God-substitute. Though all these men profess not to believe in God, they smuggle in a God-substitute through the back door because they cannot bear to live in a universe in which everything is the chance result of impersonal forces.

Indeed, many atheist writers have the same affliction. The source of their motivation to write is usually a deep dislike for religion based on evidence of past performance, however, they were raised under a traditional Christian system.

So, I get it now. [why this couldn't have been explained in the first paragraph, rather than nine pages into a poorly constructed argument, I don't know].

The great danger being predicted is that if everyone turns away from God then what of our quality of life? It apparently will lead to self-destruction.

I suppose the answer is "so what?" Won't the innocent children still go to heaven in the final apocalypse? God continues to exist because he is eternal and defines all the rules. Remember, Earth and the Universe will perish one day *anyway* at which point mortal existence ceases to be possible.

And it's interesting to see many thinkers betray their views when they're pushed to their logical conclusions. For example, certain feminists have raised a storm of protest over Freudian sexual psychology because it is chauvinistic and degrading to women. And some psychologists have knuckled under and revised their theories. Now this is totally inconsistent. If Freudian psychology is really true, then it doesn't matter if it's degrading to women. You can't change the truth because you don't like what it leads to. But people cannot live consistently and happily in a world where other persons are devalued. Yet if God does not exist, then nobody has any value. Only if God exists can a person consistently support women's rights. For if God does not exist, then natural selection dictates that the male of the species is the dominant and aggressive one. Women would no more have rights than a female goat or chicken have rights. In

Comment [JHH42]: Perhaps they do but, and this is the only time I will sink to a personal attack, those guys, plus Einstein incidentally, are way smarter than you. They think about things in innovative ways and use their imagination to the absolute capacity of human thought. You are just recycling dogma.

nature whatever is, is right. But who can live with such a view? Apparently not even Freudian psychologists, who betray their theories when pushed to their logical conclusions.

Or take the sociological behaviorism of a man like B. F. Skinner. This view leads to the sort of society envisioned in George Orwell's *1984*, where the government controls and programs the thoughts of everybody. If Skinner's theories are right, then there can be no objection to treating people like the rats in Skinner's rat-box as they run through their mazes, coaxed on by food and electric shocks. According to Skinner, all our actions are determined anyway. And if God does not exist, then no moral objection can be raised against this kind of programming, for man is not qualitatively different from a rat, since both are just matter plus time plus chance. But again, who can live with such a dehumanizing view?

Or finally, take the biological determinism of a man like Francis Crick. The logical conclusion is that man is like any other laboratory specimen. The world was horrified when it learned that at camps like Dachau the Nazis had used prisoners for medical experiments on living humans. But why not? If God does not exist, there can be no objection to using people as human guinea pigs. The end of this view is population control in which the weak and unwanted are killed off to make room for the strong. But the only way we can consistently protest this view is if God exists. Only if God exists can there be purpose in life.

The dilemma of modern man is thus truly terrible. And insofar as he denies the existence of God and the objectivity of value and purpose, this dilemma remains unrelieved for "post-modern" man as well. Indeed, it is precisely the awareness that modernism issues inevitably in absurdity and despair that constitutes the anguish of post-modernism. In some respects, post-modernism just is the awareness of the bankruptcy of modernity. The atheistic world view is insufficient to maintain a happy and consistent life. Man cannot live consistently and happily as though life were ultimately without meaning, value, or purpose. If we try to live consistently within the atheistic world view, we shall find ourselves profoundly unhappy. If instead we manage to live happily, it is only by giving the lie to our world view.

Confronted with this dilemma, man flounders pathetically for some means of escape. In a remarkable address to the American Academy for the Advancement of Science in 1991, Dr. L. D. Rue, confronted with the predicament of modern man, boldly advocated that we deceive ourselves by means of some "Noble Lie" into thinking that we and the universe still have value.¹¹ Claiming that "The lesson of the past two centuries is that intellectual and moral relativism is profoundly the case," Dr. Rue muses that the consequence of such a realization is that one's quest for personal wholeness (or self-fulfillment) and the quest for social coherence become independent from one another. This is because on the view of relativism the search for self-fulfillment becomes radically privatized: each person chooses his own set of values and meaning. If we are to avoid "the madhouse option," where self-fulfillment is pursued regardless of social coherence, and "the totalitarian option," where social coherence is imposed at the expense of personal wholeness, then we have no choice but to embrace some Noble Lie that will inspire us to live beyond selfish interests and so achieve social coherence. A Noble Lie "is one that deceives us, tricks us, compels us beyond self-interest, beyond ego, beyond family, nation, [and] race." It is a lie,

Comment [JHH43]: No wait, we're back to the ramble again after the single valid point.

It seems in your view that knowledge has to be fixed. If you revise your theory, you lose all credibility. Welcome to the scientific method. Seeking a more accurate representation of reality has been keeping us busy for a really long time now, and I would almost consider that a "purpose".

Comment [JHH44]: Some religions, Islam in particular, believe in predestination; meaning God already knows the outcome of everything. Therefore, in this view, which is widely shared by those that believe in God and would agree with everything stated so far, there is no point to existence *because* there is a God. Your future is already written. There is no free will, just heaven or hell, and either way, you are a slave.

Comment [JHH45]: I don't actually know if God exists, but I object(?).

Comment [JHH46]: Maybe. But who are you looking out for here, God or man? Who's best interests need to be served, God or man? Who is more important – GOD or MAN?

Comment [JHH47]: But they do that with religion too, or any "spiritual view". There are seven billion religions on this planet.

because it tells us that the universe is infused with value (which is a great fiction), because it makes a claim to universal truth (when there is none), and because it tells me not to live for self-interest (which is evidently false). "But without such lies, we cannot live."

This is the dreadful verdict pronounced over modern man. In order to survive, he must live in self-deception. But even the Noble Lie option is in the end unworkable. In order to be happy, one must believe in objective meaning, value, and purpose. But how can one believe in those Noble Lies while at the same time believing in atheism and relativism? The more convinced you are of the necessity of a Noble Lie, the less you are able to believe in it. Like a placebo, a Noble Lie works only on those who believe it is the truth. Once we have seen through the fiction, then the Lie has lost its power over us. Thus, ironically, the Noble Lie cannot solve the human predicament for anyone who has come to see that predicament.

The Noble Lie option therefore leads at best to a society in which an elitist group of *illuminati* deceive the masses for their own good by perpetuating the Noble Lie. But then why should those of us who are enlightened follow the masses in their deception? Why should we sacrifice self-interest for a fiction? If the great lesson of the past two centuries is moral and intellectual relativism, then why (if we could) pretend that we do not know this truth and live a lie instead? If one answers, "for the sake of social coherence," one may legitimately ask why I should sacrifice my self-interest for the sake of social coherence? The only answer the relativist can give is that social coherence is in my self-interest—but the problem with this answer is that self-interest and the interest of the herd do not always coincide. Besides, if (out of self-interest) I do care about social coherence, the totalitarian option is always open to me: forget the Noble Lie and maintain social coherence (as well as my self-fulfillment) at the expense of the personal wholeness of the masses. Rue would undoubtedly regard such an option as repugnant. But therein lies the rub. Rue's dilemma is that he obviously values deeply both social coherence and personal wholeness for their own sakes; in other words, they are objective values, which according to his philosophy do not exist. He has already leapt to the upper story. The Noble Lie option thus affirms what it denies and so refutes itself.

The Success of Biblical Christianity

But if atheism fails in this regard, what about biblical Christianity? According to the Christian world view, God does exist, and man's life does not end at the grave. In the resurrection body man may enjoy eternal life and fellowship with God. Biblical Christianity therefore provides the two conditions necessary for a meaningful, valuable, and purposeful life for man: God and immortality. Because of this, we can live consistently and happily. Thus, biblical Christianity succeeds precisely where atheism breaks down.

Conclusion

Comment [JHH48]: Oh great. Break out the tin foil hats.

Comment [JHH49]: I am not sure why we have to live in this world of absolutes where everyone concludes we are all lying to ourselves in order to function. Reality is more nuanced than that. We grow and learn very slowly to build our world view. Right and wrong is partly inherent instinct and partly learned behaviour that varies according to custom.

Before humans existed as a species and did not think to ask these questions, where was God then and how much of a problem was it that the apes were not worshipping him in golden temples?

It wasn't a problem. Which is why I can generally conclude that it does not matter. Religious people sometimes assume that the godless masses simply exist for their own pleasure, like the world should be some kind of carnal playground. However, I for one exist for my own happiness. And I have found that my happiness is impeded when those around me are unhappy. They bring me down, man. So it is worthwhile being kind to people to improve my own happiness. It's a selfish approach that works for everyone.

The guy from the plane crash that passed the ladder to other people to be rescued? Maybe it brought him immeasurable happiness to do that and it was more important than being hung up on, "I'll be dead in a few minutes."

Therefore, you do the best you can and hope it rubs off on others. In effect, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." The only useful phrase in the thousands of pages of biblical nonsense you can read.

Comment [JHH50]: Is that the one where the bible is literally true? Even if I agree and embrace that God exists, I cannot support a view which is disproved by clear evidence, such as the age and origin of the Earth etc.

Now I want to make it clear that I have not yet shown biblical Christianity to be true. But what I have done is clearly spell out the alternatives. If God does not exist, then life is futile. **If the God of the Bible does exist, then life is meaningful.** Only the second of these two alternatives enables us to live happily and consistently. Therefore, it seems to me that even if the evidence for these two options were absolutely equal, a rational person **ought to choose** biblical Christianity. It seems to me positively irrational to prefer death, futility, and destruction to life, meaningfulness, and happiness. **As Pascal said, we have nothing to lose and infinity to gain.**

Notes

- [1](#) Kai Nielsen, "Why Should I Be Moral?" *American Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1984): 90.
- [2](#) Richard Taylor, *Ethics, Faith, and Reason* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1985), 90, 84.
- [3](#) H.G. Wells, *The Time Machine* (New York: Berkeley, 1957), chap. 11.
- [4](#) W.E. Hocking, *Types of Philosophy* (New York: Scribner's, 1959), 27.
- [5](#) Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Gay Science," in *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. W. Kaufmann (New York: Viking, 1954), 95.
- [6](#) Bertrand Russell, "A Free Man's Worship," in *Why I Am Not a Christian*, ed. P. Edwards (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1957), 107.
- [7](#) Bertrand Russell, Letter to the *Observer*, 6 October, 1957.
- [8](#) Jean Paul Sartre, "Portrait of the Antisemite," in *Existentialism from Dostoyevsky to Sartre*, rev. ed., ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: New Meridian Library, 1975), p. 330.
- [9](#) Richard Wurmbrand, *Tortured for Christ* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967), 34.
- [10](#) Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1959), 2:360-1.
- [11](#) Loyal D. Rue, "The Saving Grace of Noble Lies," address to the American Academy for the Advancement of Science, February, 1991.

- by [William Lane Craig](#)

Read more: <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/the-absurdity-of-life-without-god#ixzz2iZo9kubr>

Comment [JHH51]: If the God of the bible exists life is horrific, and he: a tyrant.

Comment [JHH52]: Arrrgh. It's not a choice! One or the other reality must be true.

...Unless, the human mind/soul/whatever is so powerful that we create our own reality and perpetual afterlife. This might be theoretically possible. One would live for eternity in their last breath through some kind of time wrap.

In that scenario there is no universal truth; and the jihadist goes to heaven with his 72 virgins. In that version of existence there is no right or wrong, only your opinion of yourself.

Comment [JHH53]: What about religions that exclude the salvation of all others, including those that believe in God but interpret it wrong?

There is no meaningful conclusion here, it is just the usual veiled threat "join us or else".

A long time ago I came to the important conclusion that I did not *want* the Christian God of the bible to exist. It simply isn't good enough for me.

What I think is a plausible appraisal of existence is that man evolved to document its own reality and then will (or could, God willing ha ha) ascend beyond that.

Man has the capacity to become God and, as such, become one with God. I don't think it is so offensive to say that. It is what all religious people want to happen.

Of course, it's all speculation and may come to nothing. But, logically, it *could* happen and that is purpose enough.

The assertion sounds a bit like "Without fairies, life is absurd." By why should one think that? And really, what is meant by the claim that life is absurd without God? William Lane Craig has written at length about this subject, so let's examine what he has to say. We'll examine chapter 2 of Craig's Reasonable Faith: called The Absurdity of Life Without God. Also see his shorter article of the same title that makes all the same points. Craig opens with a clarification

No Ultimate Value Without Immortality and God. If life ends at the grave, then it makes no difference whether one has lived as a Stalin or as a saint. Since one's destiny is ultimately unrelated to one's behavior, you may as well just live as you please.Â No Ultimate Purpose Without Immortality and God. If death stands with open arms at the end of life's trail, then what is the goal of life?