

## Honest & Consistent Atheists Cannot Honestly Give Thanks

Nov 25, 2023

A thought as we approach the end of the Thanksgiving season: honest consistent atheists can't believe there is anyone to whom thanks for the blessings of this our life and its world are owed, or from whom any goods are derived. Indeed, they can't consistently believe that there are any objective goods in the first place, let alone blessings; they can believe only in specious goods – in idiotic goods (solipsistic goods, i.e., which as such are idiosyncratic, and that as nowise ordered under any Logos are therefore idiopathic). In a world ordered only by happenstance, there can be no other sort – including the good of order, and the good of understanding, which on atheism must too be specious.

I do not of course mean to suggest that men who style themselves atheists do not indeed feel gratitude, or any others of the loving feelings. Apart from the psychopaths among them, they do. What I mean to suggest rather is that any man who does honestly feel any of the loving feelings cannot be both a consistent and an honest atheist. He must be faking something or other, not just to others, but even to himself; most likely his atheism.

Notwithstanding all that, a Happy Thanksgiving to all who encounter this text, whether or not they truly believe in Thanksgiving.

Share

Reblog

40

Like

MORE IN THE ORTHOSPHERE

Can Atheism Be Carried Into Practice?

I was listening this afternoon as I drove along to a broadcast on EWTN in which the presenter, Al Kresta, was talking to EWTN host and Catholic psychologist Ray Guarendi about the 3 years he suffered horribly from clinical depression in the early 80's. His episode of acute depression – for which he was twice hospitalized – was triggered in him by an encounter with a book by an atheist, entitled *The Illusion of Immortality*. Reading it in preparation for writing a book of his own, Kresta was suddenly overtaken by

profound despair. He reflected that the reason the text – which regurgitated arguments he had long before encountered and defeated to his own satisfaction – had such an impact upon him was that the author seemed like a good guy who was simply sincere about his atheism, in a way that most atheists are not. As Kresta spoke, his offhand phrase “the horror of the atheist notion of reality” hit me really hard. I began almost to weep at the image of that notion, carried through (in the imagination only) to reality – treated, i.e., as if it were really true (as if that could even happen). This feeling, of horrified tears at being perched for the first time in my life at the edge of a precipice that verged upon an abyss of pain without bottom, persisted throughout the conversation between Kresta and Guarendi. I could feel a boundless ontological void opening beneath me, unlike any I had ever suspected. It was the horrible vacuum in which nothing can have any meaning, purpose, or point, and nothing is therefore worth anything; in which, i.e., nothing can be about anything, or for anything; in which nothing is any good.

#### Atheism Can't Be Practiced

In a conversation with several other Christians, someone mentioned some atheists who are declaring themselves de-baptized. They have a hokey ceremony incorporating a hair-dryer, and witnesses, and a celebrant: the whole nine yards. It can't be done, of course, any more than pigs could fly. Once baptized, always baptized. A young Evangelical in the company responded, “You gotta wonder: if they are really atheists, \*why do they care\*?” We all exploded in laughter. Someone else said, “It just goes to show you that despite what they say about baptism being meaningless superstition, in their hearts they don't really believe it is.”

40 COMMENTS

Following conversation

clubschadenfreude

Add a comment...

Send

Joseph A.

Joseph A.

4d ago

Kristor, brotherhood (fraternité!) is another empty (political and social) idol once removed from the Father. You'd think that the Randists out there would suffice to show that men need more to flourish in cooperative arrangements than calculated, “rational” self-interest.

Reply

Like

thordaddy

thordaddy

5d ago

There needs to be a recognition that, for some, "Christianity" has brought nothing other than harm to these individuals' lives and this best explains their rage and vitriol for all things Christian. At the same time, questioning an atheist's identity as an atheist is, in effect, questioning the atheist's sincerity for his vituperative anti-Christianity. And this then could be taken as a Christian escalation and trigger even greater animosity in what is, ultimately, interpreted as an aggressive Christian attack on the atheist's autonomy. There is real rivalry in the mere matter of "movement," psychologically-speaking.

So, in my experience, atheists are simply "radical autonomists" with their "atheism" being the chosen manner in which they maximize their autonomy to a radical extent. Christianity is conceived as a method of minimizing individual autonomy. This provokes, in many atheists, a desire to maximize one's autonomy to that "radical extent" understood, subconsciously, as that denial of objective Supremacy (God as Perfection) coupled with this desire for subjective supremacy (a God-like status on par with or preferably above the Christian's "imaginary friend\*").

\*An "imaginary friend" is also a mechanism by which an individual can maximize his autonomy.

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

thordaddy

5d ago

TD, you make the common excuse that many christians try: that only their christianity is the right one and it is innocent of causing any harm. Unfortunately, you cannot support either claim.

The need for christians to claim there are no atheists or that atheists don't know what they "should" be is the typical ignorance and arrogance of a theist. Christians, Muslims, etc all try it. Happily, you poor fellows can't read minds, and only show that you have to pretend there could be no real atheists since you must convince yourself no one can leave the religion. IF people can leave, then that shows that the religion isn't what you claim.

Trying to pretend you can psychologically analyze me, or any atheist, is the same ignorance and arrogance. Unsurprisingly, all you have is the same argument of "rebellion" that many christians try, only dressed up with big words to try to make it sound less silly.

I, as an atheist, and former christian, have concluded that no gods exist since there is no evidence for them. I do not need to rebel against imaginary nonsense that even christians can't agree on.

and surprise, still no evidence of "objective supremacy" at all.

Like

thordaddy

thordaddy

clubschadenfreude

4d ago

This is an interesting response? It's almost as if \*you\* didn't read what I wrote AT ALL adding credence to the idea of an AI-generated retort.

But alas, it does not matter whether \*you\* are real or AI-generated. Both potentials are firmly on the side of DENYING the Reality of Perfection.

And it is this genuine denial of Perfection which is the core assumption of the "atheist," ie., radical autonomist aka self-annihilator.

A.I. also denies Perfection because “no perfect system” as core assumption.

So, quite naturally, A.I. and the “atheists” will find means of collaboration serving anti-Christian ends as an expression of maximizing each other’s autonomy. .

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

thordaddy

2d ago

It’s great to see Thordaddy choose to lie, showing that christians ignore their god when they find it convenient. Sorry, no AI generated anything, so you fail yet again.

Unsurprisingly, you have no evidence of your nonsense, including any “reality of perfection” whatever that even is. It’s notable you still can’t show your god exists nor can you do what jesus promised in your bible. You are a fraud, even per your own religion.

it is great to see a batch of ignorant cultists desperately trying to sound smart. It’s notable that if one looks at what radical and autonomist (which would be a follower of autonomism, a form of marxism) means, it makes no sense in context. That would be because TD here has no idea what those words actually mean.

“This is an interesting response? It’s almost as if \*you\* didn’t read what I wrote AT ALL adding credence to the idea of an AI-generated retort.

But alas, it does not matter whether \*you\* are real or AI-generated. Both potentials are firmly on the side of DENYING the Reality of Perfection.

And it is this genuine denial of Perfection which is the core assumption of the “atheist,” ie., radical autonomist aka self-annihilator.

A.I. also denies Perfection because “no perfect system” as core assumption.

So, quite naturally, A.I. and the “atheists” will find means of collaboration serving anti-Christian ends as an expression of maximizing each other’s autonomy. .”

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

thordaddy

2d ago

hmm, radical: very different from the usual or traditional” autonomist: one who advocates autonomy.

funny how that doesn’t equate with self annihilator (someone who causes the self to cease to exist : to do away with entirely so that nothing remains) at all.

That’s what comes from making up nonsense.

“And it is this genuine denial of Perfection which is the core assumption of the “atheist,” ie., radical autonomist aka self-annihilator.

A.I. also denies Perfection because “no perfect system” as core assumption.

So, quite naturally, A.I. and the “atheists” will find means of collaboration serving anti-Christian ends as an expression of maximizing each other’s autonomy. .”

Like

Kristor

Kristor

clubschadenfreude

2d ago

Club Schadenfreude, all you've done here so far is hurl insults ("Liar!"), claim intimate knowledge of the inner lives of others you have never met ("Kristor is terrified of atheists!"), and bruit propositions without supporting them ("There is no objective good!"), all of it leavened throughout with snark that does nobody any good, least of all yourself. If you can't comment like a reasonable, civil man, then don't comment. Any more comments from you that include insults or snark will not pass moderation. This is in keeping with our longstanding comments policy, which opens:

Comments containing personal insults toward contributors or other commenters will be deleted at the discretion of the blogger in response to whose post the comment has been made. By all means feel free to express disagreement, but do it respectfully. Personal insults against third party public figures (e.g., Christopher Hitchens, George W. Bush, Winston Churchill) are allowed, but insults against their families (presuming these are not public figures) are not. One exception is that no disrespect for Jesus Christ will be tolerated. Comments containing personal accusations relevant to the discussion at hand (e.g., claiming that a commenter or contributor is "working for the other side") will also be deleted unless accompanied by compelling evidence. Repeat violators of these rules will be temporarily or permanently banned.

In some cases we may also delete comments on grounds such as libel, obscenity, incoherence or stupidity, or abuse of English grammar, syntax, or diction. The Orthosphere is meant to be a bastion of civilization, so barbarity of any sort will suffer the editorial axe.

You've been given a pass so far. No more.

Like

thordaddy

thordaddy

clubschadenfreude

2d ago

A “radical autonomist” is best understood as one who desires a subjective (s)upremacy while simultaneously rejecting objective (S)upremacy. In other words, a “radical autonomist” is one who seeks a God-like status amongst his peers while at the very same time denies God even exists.

A “self-annihilator” is best understood as one who desires total annihilation at bodily death. But, it can also be understood as one who attempts to live consistently and thus radically by the “values” of “tolerance” and “nondiscrimination.”

So, the mechanisms of “radical autonomy” in the context of the West are “tolerance” and “nondiscrimination.” These are the “values” utilized to maximize one’s autonomy to a radical extent. This “radical extent” being understood as “final liberation” aka self-annihilation. Looking deeper into these mechanisms of “radical autonomy,” it is quite evident that these “values” are also those ideological convictions placing one on the surest path to self-annihilation.

It is very coherent, I’d say.

But I digress...

The proof of your desire for “supremacy” is metastasizing with your every response. The proof of your desire to be “right” is for all to read. The proof of not only your desire to be “right,” but to be right all the time JUST IS the proof of your desire to be perfect.

\*You\* and your revealed desire is the proof of The Reality of Perfection and proof that you are not a faithful atheist.

So, when the atheist denies God... Denies Perfection... Denies objective Supremacy, he just is in a state of “radical autonomy” which inevitably leads to a desire for total annihilation at bodily death.



Here though, I get your “unprincipled exception,” as Lawrence Auster might say.

\*You\* absolutely desire to be perfect (to be right all the time) especially at this blog, undoubtedly.

Like

Joseph A.

Joseph A.

5d ago

I suppose that we all have our different complaints with the Lord, and so it's easy to become impatient with another's griping about a particular thorn when it's not pressing against your own sensitive regions. May God bless apologists for their patience and long-suffering.

It's too bad that CS has become so entangled in a spiritual briar that he (she?) can't stay focused on dealing with one thorn at a time. Above, CS notes: “christians must excuse their god when it does things that, hopefully, they would find horrible if a human did the same.” A thread about this one topic could be enlightening — but only if approached with an aim to untangle — to file down if not remove entirely the thorns therein. CS is too busy shouting and writhing

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Joseph A.

5d ago

Hello Joseph, It is curious, isn't it, when apologists can't even agree? It's notable you cannot deal with that "one thorn" at all. I suspect your excuse for christianity's subjective morality is that your god is somehow outside of its range, which would fail if you are claiming morality is objective.

There is no need to untangle the baseless claims of ignorant humans who wrote these things thousands of years ago. You start with a presupposition, that these writings are worth anything at all, and that they come from some god, an entity you cannot show exist.

Like

Assistant Village Idiot

Assistant Village Idiot

5d ago

I think I get the gist of the argument. I am wrong because I am a liar. I'll make a note of it.

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Assistant Village Idiot

5d ago

And one more false claim by the village idiot. It is notable that christians choose to lie despite supposedly worshipping a god that hates lies and liars.

Like

Alan Roebuck

Alan Roebuck

5d ago

Mr Shameful Joy is an enemy and possibly an AI bot programmed to be hostile through a veneer of erudition. I suggest not wasting any more time approving his new posts or reacting to his old ones.

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

and yep, it's great to see just how cowardly these fellows are, with not allowing my posts to be seen, still in "moderation". Nothing like such a great bit of evidence to see how failures act.

Reply

Like

Kristor

Kristor

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

Club Schadenfreude, get over yourself. I had a dentist's appointment, for Pete's sake. Sheesh.

And cut with the snark. It is substantively vacuous, so it is a waste of your time and ours. What is more important to you, perhaps, is that its only rhetorical effect is to make you look like a nasty self-absorbed moron. People will read that sort of stuff and think, “Wow; by their fruits ye shall know them; looks like atheism makes people into nasty morons; I better stay away from it.”

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Kristor

5d ago

My apologies, K, since going to the dentist is indeed important. You can of course simply allow my posts through without needing to release them.

Unfortunately, all Kristor can do is complain about my “snark”, rather than rebut my points. So much for it showing that I am a “nasty self-absorbed moron”. My posts show just how Kristor’s claims about atheists are false. He doesn’t like that at all.

Typically, Kristor’s claim fails. All you have is your friend JM trying to excuse your failure here.

Like

JMSmith

JMSmith

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

It is hard to take my eyes off the computer when CSF might deign to send a comment. Hard, but obviously not impossible.

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

JMSmith

5d ago

ROFL. Poor JM, he doesn't know I'm being held in moderation, and the cowards of the orthosphere haven't deigned to tell him and admit their cowardice.

Like

JMSmith

JMSmith

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

Your comments have been approved as soon as one of us has looked at the comment queue. It is better than you deserve, but we've got that whole mercy thing going on here. You have given, or rather cribbed, a definition of nihilism. Now tell me your non-subjective definition of value and meaning. You thump your chest and declare that "not one of you can show your lies to be true." You have yet to show your truths to be true. So far nothing but heckling from the peanut gallery.

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

JMSmith

5d ago

If it is “better than I deserve”, then don’t post them.

I do enjoy the claim of “mercy”, when it is anything but, JM.

IT’s hilarious when you whine that I dared give a definition of nihilism and I dared use a dictionary, a definition that shows how christians try to make up the definition of nihilism to fit the lies they want to tell about atheists. Your nonsense has been exposed.

Value: “something (such as a principle or quality) intrinsically valuable ( having desirable or esteemed characteristics or qualities) or desirable” – merriam webster

meaning: purpose, something that one hopes or intends to accomplish – merriam webster.

Now it’s your turn, tell me your non-subjective definition of value and meaning.

And still unable to show your god exists or that objective morality exists, JM. How typical. Do show a truth I have claimed that I have not shown as true. Surely you can, right?

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

Funny how I'm not addled at all. I'm quite grateful to see Kristor choosing to lie about me, evidently thinking his god won't notice. Unsurprisingly, no evidence is presented for "grotesque errors of interpretation, diction, etymology, syntax, grammar, logic, and style". It's easy to make false accusations. Not so easy to support them. It's always great when a failure claims it would be easy to do something, and yet cannot do it. I do enjoy Kristor's and JM's excuses that they've invented. Funny how Kristor has nothing "devastating" at all. It's easy to make up such claims. Not so easy to actually present what you don't have. I do love how poor Kristor must try to employ all he has to avoid having to rebut my points. He makes an offer but does his best to convince others to not want it done. Let me assure him that his response would not be cruel or sordid, or repellant. Indeed, I encourage it. It's even better that Kristor shows how much of a misogynistic failure he is. Kristor, dear, I'm a woman, and you've been revealed as a coward and as a liar, by me. "I feel sorry for Club Schadenfreude. His wits are addled by his evident rage – a charitable supposition – so much that he seems unlikely to be able to understand anything we've written, or that we might write. Whatever the reason, he is out of his depth when it comes to these topics. His many grotesque errors of interpretation, diction, etymology, syntax, grammar, logic, and style suffice to warrant this conclusion. He is not behaving as a reasonable man. He writes execrably; he reasons likewise. He's not up to dialectic. It would be easy to fisk his latest comment. Most of it, after all, assails positions nobody here has taken – and fails even at that. Piece of cake. But it would take a fair bit of time. And no matter how devastating the fiscing, no matter how complete its refutations of his arguments, Club Schadenfreude would not be swayed one bit. That much is clear. He'd come back with another jejune and intensely boring wall of text. But, such a fiscing might be edifying and useful to other readers. So, tell you what, folks: if at least two of you write to say that you'd find such a fiscing worthy of your time invested in reading it, why then I'll undertake the project. It's too bad Club Schadenfreude is not as intelligent or reasonable as our old friend and gadfly a.morphous. If he were, I'd learn a lot from the fiscing, because a.morphous never failed to make some good points; he read carefully, tried to understand what he had read, wrote well, sometimes beautifully, and always cleverly. So, he reliably provoked me to thought. Responding to him, I taught myself. Demolishing Club Schadenfreude by contrast will be rather a sordid and repellent exercise, and in the end somewhat cruel, like crushing a 5 year old at table tennis. But, if a couple Orthosphereans would like to see it done, I'll do it. Maybe it wouldn't be so much like watching a male boxer fight a woman. Maybe it will be rather fun, like watching the Harlem Globetrotters versus the Washington Generals. Let me know."

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

I do enjoy when christians comment about me, but are too cowardly to do it where I can easily see it.”I do not anticipate a meeting of the minds, either in sympathy or respectful disagreement. CS appears to be in the lamentable position of an ex-boyfriend who cannot get over a breakup that he—the boyfriend—initiated. CS appears to have rejected Christianity, and to now feels an angry rage that he no longer possesses what he rejected. His obsession with the intellectual and moral faults of Christians makes sense on this hypothesis, and I can think of no better explanation. I don’t think fisking this slab of prose would be worth the effort. It reduces to the accusation that we are knaves and/or fools. Any answer, however long, would reduce to “no we are not.””It’s great that JM has chosen to bear false witness about me, showing that his christianity is worthless. There is no one chrsitanity to reject, as these cultists have ably shown.I have rejected the various forms of christianity and stand against the lies that christians tell. It’s notable that JM admits that christians have intellectual and moral faults. Their morality, is again, as subjective as any humans, with each of them claiming a different set. he of course, claims he doesn’t see the effort in responding, but yet he does. Unsurprisingly, he cannot show that christians aren’t “knaves and fools”, and he admits that he has nothing else but “uh-uh”.

Reply

Like

Assistant Village Idiot

Assistant Village Idiot

Nov 27, 2023

The difficulty in debating such atheists is that it must go point by point with pauses for reflection on both sides, and takes an enormous investment of time. I have engaged in such discussions that went over months, and learned a great deal. But I would be unlikely to pick up my tools with anyone who started by calling me a liar right from the outset.

@clubschadenfreude – my standard solution to everything is to read (the former atheist) CS Lewis. Yet I fear you would find his fiction opaque, and his nonfiction too challenging, provoking sleep instead of thought. I have a dear friend of fifty years who is an atheist (though she recently allowed she may believe in Spinoza’s god) but for love of me agreed to try Mere Christianity. She stopped after three pages, but said she did like one particular point he made on the first page. She has come back to that point four times in the last year as an important lesson of 2023. I have smiled inwardly, but also sighed.

Reply



Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Assistant Village Idiot

5d ago

I've read C.S. Lewis, and yes, he was apparently an atheist. This means nothing since atheists can be ignorant too and join cults. That doesn't mean the cult's claims are true. It's rather precious that you have to claim that I wouldn't be able to read these works with your need to try to insult me. Insults only work if your opinion is valued.

I have read much of his work, including mere christniaity, the great divorce, etc. I do enjoy mere christianity where Lewis advocates for lying to potential converts to remove their ability to make an informed decision: "and secondly, i think we must admit that the discussion of these disputed points has no tendency at all to bring an outsider into the Christian fold. So long as we write and talk about them we are much more likely to deter him from entering any Christian communion than to draw him into our own. Our divisions should never be discussed except in the presence of those who have already come to believe that there is one God and that Jesus Christ is His only Son." This is in the preface if you are not familiar with it. Lies of omission are quite curious when argued for by someone who claims to worship a god that hates lies and liars. I find it curious you can't mention what point this supposed atheist friend of yours finds likeable.

Lewis finishes his preface with this "When you have reached your own room, be kind to those Who have chosen different doors and to those who are still in the hall. if they are wrong they need your prayers all the more; and if they are your enemies, then you are under orders to pray for them. That is one of the rules common to the whole house." Curious how these prayers never work.

The great divorce shows just how selfish christians can be, with Lewis' personal version of heaven and hell, and his need to claim that christians simply forget about people they loved in favor of the cult's god.

The narnia books were intersting when I was a child, but I find them rather unoriginal as an adult, being little more than a heavy handed christ allegory by a fellow who had issues with women.

Many of his other books make the argument from morality for this god, and as I've stated other places, this fails since christians cannot agree on what morality this god supposedly wants. Each comes up with their own list, based on their personal hates and desires. This, in addition to the subjectivity of christian morality when it comes to their god, shows that there is no objective morality in christianity at all. Christians each claim they have the right version and not one can show this to be true. They attack each other, creating quite the circular firing squad, and not one can do what jesus promises to his true followers per the bible. This includes Lewis, and you fellows here.

Like

Kristor

Kristor

Nov 27, 2023

JM, it is manifestly evident that Club Schadenfreude is incompetent to understand any arguments we might propose to him; he seems no more capable of them than undergraduates who think roads and highways indicate the limes of watersheds. He seems what is more to process intellectual inputs with his amygdala only. Viz, all the syntactical and grammatical errors in his writing, that read to any dispassionate observer as mere spluttering, if not indeed frothing. I suggest therefore that we forbear to offer any more arguments, if only for his sake: our mere existence seems to provoke him mightily, so that I worry about his risk of an ischemic event. May God bless and keep him, the poor bewildered fellow.

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Kristor

5d ago

Unsurprisingly, Kristor has to make an excuse why he can't show how he's supposedly right by trying to lie about me. It's a typical christian tactic. He has no arguments to make, and it is far easier to lie and claim I would not understand these imaginary arguments than it is to actually have some. It's great he's reduced to trying to criticize my grammar. still with the need to pretend he's ever so smart. Ischemic? Yep, the little dear is saying he's concerned I'll have a stroke. Curious how his god has let him down, not blessing and keeping anyone at all. It seems that Kristor isn't the true christian he claims when he can't get his god's attention.

Like

Wood

Wood

Nov 26, 2023

(When atheists show up to provide anecdotal evidence. Chef's kiss)

Reply

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Wood

5d ago

unsurprisingly, Wood, I've not simply provided "anecdotal evidence".

Like

Not So Polite Dinner Conversation – when your cult depends on nothing but fear – Club Schadenfreude

Nov 26, 2023

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Nov 26, 2023

It's nothing new to see these typical false claims by christians. Atheism is not nihilism, so they fail immediately. No one needs their imaginary god to know what good is. This is a typical attempt by a christian to try to scare people into joining their religion by lying. A rather curious tactic by people who claim to worship a god that hates lies and liars.

There is no evidence of any objective good, and one would have to wonder how these christians would demonstrate that. What we see from christians is a range of claims of what this god of theirs wants when it comes to morals. They can't agree, nor can they show their god merely exists.

This range of claims shows that christian morality is subjective. The other way we can see that christian morality is subjective is that christians must excuse their god when it does things that, hopefully, they would find horrible if a human did the same. This shows their morality is dependent on, e.g. subject to, who someone is, not a system of where a moral is always associated with an action.

That there is no objective good doesn't mean there is no good. Humans determine morality, not some imaginary being. This also means that atheists, and other non-christians, can be thankful to real people and things, no imaginary nonsense needed.

it's also rather funny how the author tries to use big words and gets them wrong. Material objects can't be solipsistic or idiopathic or idiosyncratic or specious. The attempt by the christian to seem educated fails.

"I do not of course mean to suggest that men who style themselves atheists do not indeed feel gratitude, or any others of the loving feelings. Apart from the psychopaths among them, they do. What I mean to suggest rather is that any man who does honestly feel any of the loving feelings cannot be both a consistent and an honest atheist. He must be faking something or other, not just to others, but even to himself; most likely his atheism.

Notwithstanding all that, a Happy Thanksgiving to all who encounter this text, whether or not they truly believe in Thanksgiving."

Of course he means to try to lie about atheists. He simply fails miserably.

Happily, no one needs a christian's imaginary friend to feel love, gratitude, etc. The only one here faking anything is the christian. As usual, the christian has to desperately claim that there are no atheists, since he is terrified of anyone who doesn't need his god, or more appropriately, him.

Reply

2

JMSmith

JMSmith

clubschadenfreude

Nov 26, 2023

In the passage you quote, Kristor expressly disavows the libel with which you charge him. Honest men of any persuasion readily admit that most atheists feel and express gratitude. A Christian will say that this is because goodness is objectively real and therefore its presence is overwhelming and undeniable, rather like the rising sun. Kristor says that these feelings and expressions are genuine, but that they do not comport with the atheistic universe in which the atheist ostensibly believes. These feelings and expressions are therefore lapses in the avowed atheism of the atheist. (Honest Christians admit that their Christianity is also subject to lapses.)

There are a couple of reasons gratitude does not comport with an atheistic universe. One is that gratitude recognizes voluntary and intentional goodness. Most atheistic universes are governed by necessity (nothing happens voluntarily) or chance (nothing happens intentionally).

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

JMSmith

Nov 26, 2023

Yep, liars always disavow what they do when convenient. It's easy to make accusations and then say "well I didn't mean everyone". It's a common tactic from christians who want to throw stones, but are too much cowards to take responsibility for their lies.

Unsurprisingly, JM, you christians have yet to show your god exists, or that there is objective morality or goodness at all. Each of you has a different standard of "goodness". For most of you, it involves hating anyone different than you are.

You try the same lies as Kristor, which goes to show just how deceitful christians can be when they claim that they aren't "really" accusing all atheists. You try the usual free will nonsense, which your bible repeatedly claims doesn't exist. You also fail in the usual ignorant nonsense about "chance", when this is not a dr. seussian universes where anything can happen. Happily, us humans have a reasonable facsimile of free will. We simple can't recall all that influences us. In that, yep, every happens because of other influences.

Gratitude recognizes help one is given. It has nothing to do with the type of help. You've just made up more nonsense to try to invent a need for your imaginary friend.

Like

Kristor

Kristor

clubschadenfreude

Nov 27, 2023

It is curious to me, and mordantly amusing, to see how often moderns – unused as they most of them are either by education or experience to the intellectual and emotional rigors of dialectic – respond to polite discoveries by others of defects in their systems of notions with fear and anger; how often they

take such discoveries to be attacks upon their persons, so that they counterattack with nonresponsive ad hominem. It often takes the form of accusations of bad faith: “Christians are lying!” or “Christians are trying to scare people into belief in their nonsense!” What could possibly motivate such behavior on the part of Christians is left unspecified, and so remains mysterious. Such accusations are not founded upon any outward evidence. The natural inference then is that they arise from psychological projection. Which, if true, is just sad; is pathetic.

It does not seem to occur to Club Schadenfreude that Christians might say what they say because they think it true and therefore beneficent, and so, good to say.

The anger so many moderns feel at challenges to their views muddles their wits. Confused to begin with in thinking they have been personally attacked, they are confused in the end. They cannot think as straight as productive discourse requires. This will be manifest in what follows.

Often they attack propositions that have not by their interlocutors been proposed.

Atheism is not nihilism ...

I did not suggest that atheism is nihilism. Atheism does indeed ultimately \*reduce\* to nihilism as an inevitable logical consequence – when one thinks it through carefully, this becomes obvious (for, only as ordered under the Lógos might anything be truly (rather than speciously) intelligible) – but it is not itself nihilism. The consequent conclusion is not the antecedent premise.

Likewise, the supposition that  $2,397 + 7,652 = 10,047$  implicitly entails that math per se is inconsistent, but nobody making a mistake in arithmetic would agree that he had argued by it that math as such is nonsense.

Atheists are as if they were making a simple mistake in arithmetic. E.g.:

There is no evidence of any objective good ...

On the contrary, the objective moral good is explicitly demonstrated in game theory – as may be seen in the victory of Tit for Tat over other strategies in iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma – and so, derivatively, in evolutionary psychology, and thus in sociology and economics. Club Schadenfreude might of course

double down on his solipsism, as some philosophers of mathematics do, and assert that math, too, is just stuff we invent out of whole cloth that has no true bearing on reality. Such arguments are autophagous; they redound upon and demolish themselves. For, argument as such can make sense – can be intelligible, can thus gain traction upon reality, and so be utile – only on the absolute truth of logics and maths, in virtue of which, only, can it be possible either to try to get things right, or to err thereat.

By the way, the specifically Christian moral discovery – discovery being, NB, a sort of Revelation – is that Tit for Two Tats (Matthew 5:39) works better for social cohesion and coordination than Tit for Tat. Tit for Two Tats improves upon the Lex Talionis of the Hammurabic Code, and all others like it.

That there is no objective good doesn't mean there is no good.

Correct. Where there is no objective good, there may yet be specious goods: things that seem good, but that are not really good in fact.

That said, we ought not to confuse the truth of an appearance or a proposition with its reality. An image in a mirror or mind is real. But, then, is it a veridical image? Is it in the first place an image of some real, and is it in the second a faithful image thereof, an accurate image?

The atheist and the nominalist, who believe that there are no objective goods, cannot but suppose that mental apprehensions – appearances, images – of moral or aesthetic goodness are of things that are not real. This is what it means to say that there are no objective goods that we might be more or less competent to know, or that might then as known order our acts to the world properly or fitly. If there are no objective moral or aesthetic facts, then our moral and aesthetic evaluations must perforce mislead us by guiding us according to illusions, so that adaptive behavior is rendered impossible (except happenstantially, in just the way that a broken clock happens to (seem to) tell time accurately twice a day).

That moral and aesthetic evaluations are images of things that are not real would mean, not that those images are themselves nonexistent, but rather that they are simply meaningless: not even false. On atheism and nominalism, saying that beer (e.g.) is good is like saying that beer is frumious. One might really think that beer is frumious, but there is nothing in beer that really is frumious – for, there is no such thing really as frumity – so that the thought that beer is frumious is pure simple nonsense. Likewise, on atheism and nominalism, the thought that beer is good – real enough in the thinking of it – is meaningless nonsense, pure and simple.



Material objects can't be solipsistic or idiopathic or idiosyncratic or specious.

Quite so. Nobody said they could be. What I did say was that, to the atheist, \*goods\* cannot but be solipsistic, idiopathic, idiosyncratic, and so specious; as Club Schadenfreude himself has agreed in writing that "there is no objective good ... humans determine morality."

What we see from Christians is a range of claims of what this god of theirs wants when it comes to morals. They can't agree ... This range of claims shows that Christian morality is subjective.

No. It shows only that morality is tricky, so that it is difficult to parse precisely the application to the practical details of life of the general principles of charity upon which all Christians agree. Likewise it is quite difficult to scribe a perfect circle.

... the Christian has to desperately claim that there are no atheists, since he is terrified of anyone who doesn't need his god, or more appropriately, him.

I'm terrified of Club Schadenfreude? On the contrary, I find him pathetic, and feel sorry for him. It is hard to resist the inference that in saying such things he is projecting. Consider: over many years, he has commented from time to time here at the Orthosphere, whereas I think about him or his site only when he surfaces here. Like so many atheists, he seems deeply bugged by theists, and evidently he follows our conversations; whereas, theists generally find atheists risible, silly, pitiable, tiresome, and ignore them as much as possible (which alas is not much these days: given the prevalent presumption of materialism in public discourse, theists encounter atheism on every hand, along with transgender activism, advocacy of infanticide, and the like). This, in just the way that people find flat earthers and other such cranks tedious, irrelevant and sad.

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

Kristor

6d ago

Unsurprisingly, Kristor fails again in his nonsense. It's also just great to see him try to use big words again to try to appear impressive. It's no surprise at all that Kristor has no idea what an ad hominem fallacy is, nor can he show that one was used by myself.

What can motivate lying on the part of Christians? The need to pretend how special they are, and the need to scare people into joining their cult. It's not "mysterious" at all. Those accusations are founded upon evidence. Again, Kristor tries big words but alas cannot support his claims. Where is any psychological projection going on?

Christians do indeed say what they do because they \*think\* it is true. Their problem is that they cannot demonstrate any truth in their claims, and more to the point, cannot agree amongst themselves nor show that any god supports them.

Alas, for Kristor, we are all modern humans, including him. So, his attempts to be insulting reflect quite amusingly on himself.

It's great when Kristor claims he didn't say atheism is nihilism when he did exactly that: "In a world ordered only by happenstance, there can be no other sort – including the good of order, and the good of understanding, which on atheism must too be specious." He notably uses specious incorrectly. Specious means: having a false look of truth or genuineness : SOPHISTIC. No where can Kristor show that atheism is specious.

Then he admits that he does think that atheism equates to nihilism, which has already been determined by his false claims. Unsurprisingly, he and every other theist fails to show how atheism "reduces" to nihilism (if something reduces to something else, then it becomes that thing: reduce – to become concentrated or consolidated, merriam webster). What is the logic that supports their claim? None. Kristor simply claims he has "thought it through carefully", not showing how he came to his conclusion. What he does state is simply a set of presuppositions, dependent on him showing his god exists. He has not. Unsurprisingly, this nonsense "The consequent conclusion is not the antecedent premise." Can be stated as the conclusion isn't the premise. How wonderfully obvious.

No idea what he is nattering about with the inept addition of numbers he has done.

He appears to be trying to lie yet again and claim that atheists are making the mistake, and his imaginary god really does exist. Still no evidence for that.

Then he tries referring to “game theory”, and as expected makes no sense. All Kristor is doing is throwing poo at a wall and hoping some of it sticks in his attempt to baffle by BS. He mentions all sorts of things, but cannot show how one gets to objective morality through them.

It’s even more fun when he has no idea what solipsism is nor can he explain what it has to do with his incoherent nonsense. Alas, for Kristor, no where have I said that math is something human invented out of whole cloth.

As expected, he cannot show any arguments to be self-consuming, he simply makes the baseless claim. So all he has so far is an assumption of what I think, which is wrong, and an argument based on that assumption, which also fails. Oh dear, and he tries so hard. I do love the “err thereat”.

He claims a “specific Christian moral discovery”, which is no more than a “revelation” aka something a human makes up with no evidence it came from any imaginary being. Nothing about tit for tat, or tit for two tats, is solely Christian. Matthew 5:39 is this “38 ‘You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’ 39 But I say to you: Do not resist an evildoer. But if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other also, 40 and if anyone wants to sue you and take your shirt, give your coat as well, 41 and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go also the second mile. 42 Give to the one who asks of you, and do not refuse anyone who wants to borrow from you.” Unsurprisingly, nothing shows that this works any better than anything else. Kristor simply makes yet another baseless claim. He also has the problem that most Christians have no intent on following what Jesus supposedly said, and have repeatedly ignored it in the past.

Still no evidence for any objective good, especially from Christian liars and their imaginary god. Kristor has to keep claiming anything he doesn’t like is “specious”, and has no evidence for that at all. It’s always cute when Christians insist that they are the only arbiters of what good is. And how funny when they don’t agree, with each Christian inventing a different set of “good”.

Then more nattering about mirrors to try to seem impressive. It’s the usual Christian failure to try to claim their imaginary friend is true, with again no evidence.

Nominalism is “In metaphysics, nominalism is the view that universals and abstract objects do not actually exist other than being merely names or labels.[1][2] There are at least two main versions of nominalism. One version denies the existence of universals – things that can be instantiated or exemplified by many particular things (e.g., strength, humanity). The other version specifically denies the existence of abstract objects – objects that do not exist in space and time.” Unsurprisingly, atheists aren’t always, or even often, nominalists. I’m quite sure there are abstract ideas, aka objects. Happily, us atheists know things are real, and Kristor’s nonsense that we have to somehow doubt anything exists is just hilarious.

This is just a rather amusingly drawn out attempt by Kristor to use a common Christian claim: we can't know anything without their god and that since we can't know everything, their god just has to exist, yet one more baseless claim. There is nothing at all that says without objective morality we must be misled by subjective morality. Again, Kristor just pulls things from his nethers that he cannot support.

Unsurprisingly, I can say beer is good with no problem at all, and subjective feelings are just as valid as objective ones. Like many Christians who fancy themselves sophisticated theologians and philosophers, poor Kristor asserts that objective things are somehow "better", and cannot show why that should be the case.

It's great when he agrees with me that goods can't be what he claimed them to be. Amazing how that works out. He keeps claiming objective items, like "good", and fails miserably. Unsurprisingly, Kristor has claimed that the subjective ideas of good are "specious", which he cannot show they are. He claims they are solipsistic: "relating to a theory holding that the self can know nothing but its own modifications and that the self is the only existent thing", and again, he cannot show that they are this either. He may have a point with idiopathic: peculiar to the individual/idiosyncratic: "a peculiarity of constitution or temperament : an individualizing characteristic or quality". Again, still beating the horse that objective things are better than subjective ones, and still no evidence his imaginary god exists to give objective morals, nor that anything that Kristor advocates is supported by his god.

Oh dear, now "morality is tricky", when poor Kristor has to excuse the Christian failure to agree on a morality. Curious how this god could simply give them all the same morality, but it never did. Kristor has to blame the human for not quite getting it, not his omnipotent god for failing miserably.

Yep, Kristor is terrified of me, and of atheists in general. He of course doesn't resist anything, having to continue to bear false witness against me. I don't think of him either, unless his ignorant nonsense comes up in the search on wordpress, showing when some ignorant Christian chooses to lie about atheists. It's nothing new that Kristor evidently thinks of atheists quite a bit, having to write about us repeatedly, so his attempts to claim how disinterested he is fail completely. So much for his claims of finding us atheists "risible, silly, pitiable, tiresome, and ignore them as much as possible". If this were the case, why does this post by Kristor exist at all?

Of course, Kristor, nice Christian nationalist that he is, hates anyone who isn't like him, and like all cranks complains repeatedly about LGBTQ+ folks when per his own bible, it's up to this god to judge them, not poor Kristor. As for infanticide, I'm sure Christians encounter it every day, when they read their bible. David's son, the children killed during the magic flood, the children killed during the exodus, the children killed during the repeated genocides in the bible.

Like

JMSmith

JMSmith

clubschadenfreude

6d ago

Kristor may believe that atheism is specious, or he may deny that it has even the appearance of truth, but he does not say that atheism is specious in the sentence you quote. If you read the sentence carefully, you will see that he says the goods of order and understanding are specious “on atheism,” which is to say that the good of order and understanding would be specious (only apparent) if atheism were true. They would be specious because, on atheism, “good” reduces to contingently useful. I say it is “good” that I have a knife in my pocket because I intend to stab you, but it would have been “good” for you if I left my knife at home. This is why the problem of moral dissensus is problem for your side. Our side may be riven by moral dissensus, but our theory includes a moral authority who could, if he so desired, end the quarrel and tell one group of quarrelsome Christians that they are wrong. Because your side has no moral authority, it cannot solve moral dissensus, even in theory. Thus your moral quarrels must be interminable, and interminable moral arguments is another way of saying nihilism.

Like

Kristor

Kristor

JMSmith

6d ago

I feel sorry for Club Schadenfreude. His wits are addled by his evident rage – a charitable supposition – so much that he seems unlikely to be able to understand anything we’ve written, or that we might write. Whatever the reason, he is out of his depth when it comes to these topics. His many grotesque errors of interpretation, diction, etymology, syntax, grammar, logic, and style – and courtesy – suffice to warrant this conclusion. He is not behaving as a reasonable man. He writes execrably; he reasons likewise. He’s not up to dialectic.

It would be easy to fisk his latest comment. Most of it, after all, assails positions nobody here has taken – and fails even at that. Piece of cake. But it would take a fair bit of time. And no matter how devastating the fisking, no matter how complete its refutations of his arguments, Club Schadenfreude would not be swayed one bit. That much is clear.

He'd come back with another jejune, inept and intensely boring wall of text.

But, such a fisking might be edifying and useful to other readers. So, tell you what, folks: if at least two of you write to say that you'd find such a fisking worthy of your time invested in reading it, why then I'll undertake the project.

It's too bad Club Schadenfreude is not as intelligent or reasonable as our old friend and gadfly a.morphous. If he were, I'd learn a lot from the fisking, because a.morphous never failed to make some good points; he read carefully, tried to understand what he had read, wrote well, sometimes beautifully, and always cleverly. So, he reliably provoked me to thought. Responding to him, I taught myself.

Demolishing Club Schadenfreude by contrast will be rather a sordid and repellent exercise, and in the end somewhat cruel, like crushing a 5 year old at table tennis. But, if a couple Orthosphereans would like to see it done, I'll do it.

Maybe it wouldn't be so much like watching a male boxer fight a woman. Maybe it will be rather fun, like watching the Harlem Globetrotters versus the Washington Generals. Let me know.

Like

JMSmith

JMSmith

Kristor

6d ago

I do not anticipate a meeting of the minds, either in sympathy or respectful disagreement. CS appears to be in the lamentable position of an ex-boyfriend who cannot get over a breakup that he—the

boyfriend—initiated. CS appears to have rejected Christianity, and to now feels an angry rage that he no longer possesses what he rejected. His obsession with the intellectual and moral faults of Christians makes sense on this hypothesis, and I can think of no better explanation. I don't think fiscing this slab of prose would be worth the effort. It reduces to the accusation that we are knaves and/or fools. Any answer, however long, would reduce to "no we are not."

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

JMSmith

6d ago

Jm, your attempts to cover up Kristor's lies are amusing and quite a miserable fail. The sentence you mention "In a world ordered only by happenstance, there can be no other sort – including the good of order, and the good of understanding, which on atheism must too be specious." Is just hilarious since atheism is claimed to be specious. Most of the problem is from Kristor's desperate need to use big words to try to impress, and that makes his sentence largely incoherent, since he doesn't know what the words mean.

This is what Kristor wrote: "A thought as we approach the end of the Thanksgiving season: honest consistent atheists can't believe there is anyone to whom thanks for the blessings of this our life and its world are owed, or from whom any goods are derived. Indeed, they can't consistently believe that there are any objective goods in the first place, let alone blessings; they can believe only in specious goods – in idiotic goods (solipsistic goods, i.e., which as such are idiosyncratic, and that as nowise ordered under any Logos are therefore idiopathic). In a world ordered only by happenstance, there can be no other sort – including the good of order, and the good of understanding, which on atheism must too be specious."

He claims atheists don't believe that there is a god to give thanks to. He has no evidence for this god, as you do not have any evidence for your god and that is why atheists don't believe in your little friend. He falsely claims that we somehow can't consistently believe that there any objective "goods", by which he means beneficial ideas or actions. Unsurprisingly, we can. We just don't believe in his imaginary friend.

There is no evidence of this imaginary friend “blessing” anyone at all, including self-professed Christians. Kristor, and you, are typical Christians who can’t do what your messiah promises in your bible. You are frauds per the bible’s claims.

Then Kristor claims that there are “specious goods”, by which he evidently means ideas of good that are false, another claim he cannot support. He, like most cultists, only thinks what he finds good is the objective good, and again, no evidence for that claim at all. He also claims that these ideas of good are “solipsistic”, which is rather hilarious since solipsism means: “a theory holding that the self can know nothing but its own modifications and that the self is the only existent thing” and solipsistic simply means related to the theory. Unsurprisingly, Kristor can’t show that a “good” can even be solipsistic. He, as usual, makes little sense. HE offers the usual lie that without his god we have nothing. Poor dear, he can’t show that to be true either. No “logos” can be shown to exist.

The benefits of order and understanding need no imaginary friend to show they are helpful. It’s quite apparent and no imaginary friend needed. You, like Kristor, make presuppositions with nothing to support your nonsense. Still no evidence anything is “specious” without your god. Yep, good is subjective, and still you both fail miserably to show any objective good or that your god exists at all.

Repeating the baseless claims of cults doesn’t make them magically come true.

That Christians can’t agree, aka have “moral dissensus” shows you are all simply liars. Your hypothesis contains nothing but a god you can’t show exists at all. Funny how this god can’t do what you claim it can, yet another baseless claim on your part, JM. It’s entertaining when a Christian says “but but you’re wrong since our entirely made up nonsense says so”.

No need to “solve” anything. Morality is subjective. You fail. Happily, we do have moral quarrels and morals can improve thanks to that discussion. All Christians do is claiming some god only agrees with them, and fail to demonstrate that.

It’s also great that you lie just like Kristor, JM, attempting to yet again redefine nihilism with your lies “Thus your moral quarrels must be interminable, and interminable moral arguments is another way of saying nihilism.”

Nihilism “a viewpoint that traditional values and beliefs are unfounded and that existence is senseless and useless” Funny how having quarrels about morality shows without doubt that morals are considered very important by atheists as is existence. You fail yet one more time.



Like

JMSmith

JMSmith

clubschadenfreude

5d ago

What is your definition of nihilism? How would you go about showing that a good is objectively or absolutely good? We've had enough heckling from the peanut gallery. Give us some meat to chew on.

Like

clubschadenfreude

clubschadenfreude

JMSmith

5d ago

wow, JM, I've given it already, and it's not "my" definition, it is *\*the\** definition:

"Nihilism "a viewpoint that traditional values and beliefs are unfounded and that existence is senseless and useless" Funny how having quarrels about morality shows without doubt that morals are considered very important by atheists as is existence."

I do love how ignorant christians, after claiming that nihilism is atheism, have no idea what nihilism is and have to ask for the definition.

It's even more fun when a christian wants me to do their work for them. I don't think there is objective good, and thus no way to show it exists. You make the claim, now you show how it would work.

Again, christians can't even agree amongst themselves what is "good". Funny how that works out and how not one of you can show your lies to be true.

"What is your definition of nihilism? How would you go about showing that a good is objectively or absolutely good? We've had enough heckling from the peanut gallery. Give us some meat to chew on."

Like