

Is atheism against the law?

Atheism is a lack of belief mentality which rejects the existence of anything supernatural. By default, atheists are also **naturalists** and **evolutionists**. They believe there is a natural explanation for all circumstances and nothing has ever occurred that has a supernatural answer. While atheism does not break any state or federal laws, it does break several scientific laws. A **scientific law** is defined as the observance and recognition of a repeatable process in nature. It is widely accepted as a statement of fact and a universal truth. Scientific laws do not need complex external proofs. They are accepted at face value because they have always been observed to be true. A **miracle** is an event which is inexplicable by the laws of nature. A miracle contradicts natural, scientific laws and atheists typically scoff at the suggestion that miracles have ever occurred. What scientific laws does atheism break?

The Laws of Conservation

The **laws of conservation** are basic laws in physics that state which processes can or cannot occur in nature. Each law maintains the total value of the quantity governed by that law (e.g. matter and energy) remains unchanged during physical processes. Conservation laws have the broadest possible application of all laws in physics and are considered to be the most fundamental laws in nature. In 1905, the **theory of relativity** showed mass was a form of energy and the two laws governing these quantities were combined into a single law conserving the total amount of mass and energy. This law says neither matter nor energy can be created or destroyed. This fact leads to an inescapable question.

If matter and energy cannot be created, how did they originate?
Where did the entire physical universe come from?

Again, it is impossible to create matter and energy through natural methods. However, they do exist, so we find ourselves in a quandary. It would seem to the unbiased either matter and energy made themselves from nothing or a supernatural creator made them. Both answers violate the law of conservation. The fact that matter and energy cannot be created is consistent with the claim in **Genesis** which

says God rested from his work and all he created. This law of science contradicts the notion that matter came from nothing through natural means. Bible believing theists understand the universe was framed by the Word of God and what is seen did not come from things that are visible. God is the one who calls those things that do not exist as though they did.

Why couldn't the universe have always existed?

Because nothing that has a beginning and an end could have always existed.

Today, virtually all scientists accept the **Big Bang** theory which says the entire universe came into existence at a particular point in time when all of the galaxies, stars and planets were formed. The **Law of Entropy** says closed systems go from a state of high energy to low energy and from order to disorder. All closed systems, including our universe, disintegrate over time as they decay to a lower order of available energy and organization. Entropy always increases and never decreases in a closed system. All scientific observations confirm everything continues to move towards a greater state of decay and disorder. Because the available energy is being used up and there is no source of new energy, the universe could not have always existed. If the universe has always existed, it would now be uniform in temperature, suffering what is known as heat death. **Heat Death** occurs when the universe has reached a state of maximum entropy. It is a fact that one day our sun and all stars in the universe will burn out. Electromagnetic radiation will disappear and all matter will lose its vibrational energy. Because the stars cannot burn forever and because they are still currently burning, they could not have always existed

because they would have already burned out by now.

Some believe the law of entropy cannot be applied to the universe because they feel the universe is an open system and not a closed one. A **closed system** is defined as a system in which neither matter nor energy can be exchanged with its surroundings. Matter and energy cannot enter or escape from a closed system. It has boundaries that cannot be crossed. The definition of the word **universe** is all matter and energy, including the earth, the galaxies and the contents of intergalactic space, regarded as a whole.

If the universe is "all matter and energy", how could it be an open system?

If the universe is everything, how can there be something else out there to provide more matter and energy?

The skeptic asks, "If God created the universe, then who created God?" God is the uncreated creator of the universe, so the question, "Who created God?" is illogical. A better question would be, "If the universe needs a cause, then why doesn't God need a cause? And if God doesn't need a cause, why should the universe need a cause?" Everything which **has a beginning** has a cause. The universe has a beginning; therefore, the universe has a cause. It is important to stress the words "which has a beginning". The universe requires a cause because it had a beginning. God, unlike the universe, had no beginning, so he does not need a cause. Einstein's general relativity shows that time is linked to matter and space. Time itself would have begun along with matter and space at the beginning of the universe. Since God is the creator of the whole universe, he is the creator of time and is independent and outside of time. He is not limited by the time dimension he created, so he has no beginning in time.

There is not even one generally accepted scientific theory on the origin of matter and energy.

The Law of Biogenesis

This law is composed of two parts. The first part states that living things only come from other living things and not from non-living matter. Life only comes from life. The second part of this law states that when living things procreate, their offspring are the same type of organism they are. This is consistent with the account revealed in **Genesis** which says all living things reproduce **after their own kind**. Sharks only come from other sharks, snakes from other snakes, owls from other owls, orange trees from other orange trees, etc. Every living organism alive today is a product of and evidence for biogenesis. Some people feel biogenesis is not a scientific law, but biogenesis is a law because no one has ever documented a single case of non-living matter coming to life in **self-replicating form**. It is as true today as it has ever been. On the other hand, **abiogenesis** has been debunked many times over. When someone observes the first example of spontaneous generation which includes self-replicating machinery (DNA and RNA), biogenesis will no longer be a law. Until that time, it remains one.

If one stretched out a strand of DNA from the oldest and most basic organism

known to man, a **bacterium**, it would be almost **1,000 times longer** than the diameter of the bacterium itself. Its DNA pattern is about **4 million blocks** long. Where did all of this exquisite information come from? The components of a bacterium are far more complex than any machine mankind has ever made. There is absolutely **zero scientific evidence** of the existence of any organisms between the supposed event of abiogenesis and bacteria. This is the biggest **missing link** of all. There is absolutely no evidence any such organism is alive today or was ever alive in the past. Some feel it makes total sense no such fossils exist because the creature would have been made up of parts which do not fossilize well. If this argument was valid, there would not be any fossils of bacteria but there are.

Replication requires the **complex machinery of DNA and RNA** which are collectively known as the **genome**. According to evolution, something like the genome could only achieve its utter complexity through replication, cumulative selection and mutation.

How could DNA and RNA evolve from something very rudimentary into their present day intricacy when the organism containing the basic genome would require the more complex, present day DNA and RNA to replicate?

The **Gene Emergence Project** has sponsored an event called **The Origin of Life Prize**. They are currently offering 1.35 million dollars to anyone who can offer a credible, verifiable and reproducible explanation of the origin of life. They are by no means a creation science group. Their advisors include biochemists, molecular biologists, biophysicists, information theorists, artificial life and intelligence experts, exo/astrobiologists, mathematicians and origin-of-life researchers in many related fields. The Foundation's main purpose is to encourage interdisciplinary, multi-institutional research projects by theoretical biophysicists and origin-of-life researchers with special focus on the origin of genetic information/instructions/message/recipe in living organisms. They want to know by what mechanism initial genetic code arose in nature. They are requiring full reign be given to the exploration of spontaneously forming complexity and to inanimate systems of self-organization and replication.

There is not even one generally accepted scientific theory on the origin of life.

Scientific Method

The scientific method is held in high esteem by most atheists and it is composed of the following parts...

- 1) Careful observation of a phenomenon.
- 2) Formulation of a hypothesis concerning the phenomenon.
- 3) Experimentation to demonstrate whether the hypothesis is true or false.
- 4) A conclusion that validates or modifies the hypothesis.

Nobody has ever observed the creation of matter or energy.

Nobody has ever observed a molecular cloud collapse or any planet form.

Nobody has ever observed abiogenesis.

Nobody has ever observed the evolution of any genome.

Nobody has ever observed any phylum, class, order or family change.

Evolutionists are excellent at **Step 2** - Hypothesizing.

The only problem comes on **Steps 1, 3 and 4** - Observation, Experimentation and Validation.

We read about their theories and the conclusions of the failed experiments they performed in an effort to validate their opinions about a phenomenon that has not only never been proven scientifically but has never even been observed.

The definition of a **miracle** is an event which is inexplicable by the laws of nature. The fact is there are zero generally accepted scientific explanations on these issues. If you want to believe in naturalism it is fine with me but please don't make the erroneous claim that "science" is on your side.

What term is used to describe something you believe to be true but has no empirical evidence?

Faith.

The bottom line is we live in a universe which completely frustrates any attempt to explain its origin and content by natural processes alone. The best evidence for the possible existence of a supernatural creator lies in the total lack of any scientific evidence in these key areas. Can God be scientifically proven? No, it would be nice but his existence cannot be proven scientifically. The reason is God is **supernatural**; he exists outside the **natural**, scientific world. While our scientific tools cannot prove God exists, they do provide us with evidence we can use to determine if there is a better explanation for what has taken place besides the existence of a supernatural creator.

It is interesting how atheists reject any notion of the supernatural because of what they perceive to be a lack of evidence when they could use that same objectivity to reject their naturalistic world view. Most atheists are not even honest enough to apply the same burden of proof for naturalism that they demand of supernaturalism.

The laws of science falsify the notion that this physical, living world came to be through natural means. These laws provide very credible evidence for the possible existence of a supernatural being. Atheism violates these basic laws of science. Atheism requires not only a tremendous amount of faith but also a belief in miracles. And not only miracles but natural miracles, an oxymoron. Both naturalism and supernaturalism require faith and which one you place your faith in is one of the two most important choices you will ever make.

Borrowed from internet website – author unknown.