



## THE UNBELIEVABLE BELIEF

– *“I want atheism to be true! I don’t want there to be a God!”* – (Atheism and God, Pt 2)

We covered in the first part of this article that there are 3 main reasons why someone will reject a claim of truth: rational, emotional and volitional reasons.

Why volitional? Because belief in God has consequences. The Pharisees and chief priests knew it. After Jesus raised Lazarus, they plotted to kill Jesus, saying, “What are we to do? For this man performs many signs. If we let Him go on like this, everyone will believe in Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation.” (John 11:47–48)

Notice what’s motivating their unbelief. It’s not the evidence. In fact, they don’t deny that signs are being performed. Rather, they don’t want to lose their status—including their temple and nation. They can’t stand the idea of living in a world like that. As a result, their wicked hearts push back.

And so do many today. In a moment of honest reflection, philosopher Thomas Nagel remarked, *“I want atheism to be true and am made uneasy by the fact that some of the most intelligent and well-informed people I know are religious believers. It isn’t just that I don’t believe in God and, naturally, hope that I’m right in my belief. It’s that I hope there is no God! I don’t want there to be a God; I don’t want the universe to be like that.”*

This kind of unbelievable unbelief is still present today. In a candid discussion between atheist philosopher Peter Boghossian and evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins, Boghossian asked Dawkins what it would take for him to believe in God.

You might assume Dawkins would boldly announce, “Evidence!” After all, scientists are supposed to care about evidence. But that’s *not* what he said. He stated,

*“Well, I used to say it would be very simple. It would be a great, big, deep, booming voice saying, ‘I am God, and I created.’ But I am persuaded that even if there was this booming voice, the more probable explanation is that it’s a hallucination, or a conjuring trick or something.... A supernatural explanation for anything is incoherent.”*

So Boghossian’s next question was: *“So what would persuade you?”* Dawkins replied, *“Well, I’m starting to think nothing would.”*

Did you catch his answer? No amount of evidence would convince Dawkins of the supernatural. None! He has excluded the supernatural *before* even looking at the evidence. His presuppositions—his naturalistic worldview—have ruled out a supernatural being. In fact, even if Dawkins heard God speaking to him in a booming voice, he wouldn’t go to God! He’d go to a psychiatrist!

This is a good example of how a volitional presupposition can actually prevent someone from recognizing a miracle, even if one occurred in their own life! Again, belief in God is not only an

evidence issue; it is also a *heart issue*. The evidence exists, but some skeptics have built up walls. They don't want to hear and will not allow that evidence to speak.

But God doesn't force anyone to love Him. If God could force people to believe, then everybody would be a believer, but He gave us free will and allowed us to love Him or to reject Him. Some people just don't want God.

True, God could have written "YAHWEH" in the stars or stamped "Made by God" on every atom in the universe. But this would not guarantee that people would believe. Some hearts simply don't *want* to believe. Evidence is not the problem. *WE humans ARE.*