

Atheism as a foundation of extreme leftist thought.

Atheism as an ideology is very little understood; newer generations of atheists even deny that atheism is an ideology at all (in the same way Christianity or communism is), they say that "Atheism is not an ideology, but a lack of ideology. Atheism does not compels us to do anything." and while that is a rather important point I will revisit later on, the question whether God exist, at least in principle, should have consequences, both practical and theoretical. Implications of absence of any supernatural force is something that the older generations of atheists (pre-Dawkins atheists), have been exploring for quite some time now. One has to look no further than any news source to hear about their literally (and I mean literally) morally bankrupt and reason defying plans for the society, that would no doubt end our species if implemented. Indeed it has gotten to the point where some of the new atheists gave up on trying to understand the older generation. Those who didn't give up, try to explain away these crazy schemes, not by examining the thought process behind them, but by the means of evolutionary psychology- the people advocating for an obvious evil X did not pursue any line of reasoning, they are a product of societal and genetic pressures and are irrationally compelled to pursue certain goals, while being under an illusion of rationality. What apparently never occurs to people who say this, is that they themselves are a product of societal and genetic pressures too and therefore what they consider good and logical may be merely an illusion too. I am getting way ahead of myself, let me start from the beginning.

The material world we happen to inhabit is no doubt a dreadful place. At all times we and everything around us is subject to the laws of nature that, unlike us, are not concerned with questions of morality- when the sun will be set to explode, it won't hesitate on the grounds that it might erase all life on earth. The laws of nature dictate what will happen regardless of humanitarian concerns. Strangely enough this complaint applies only when we consider the relationship of nature with human beings. Distant stars may explode all they want; in the whole universe only one specific supernova would be considered a tragic event. Stones hitting the ground, is quite a different matter than Billy hitting Tommy, even if Billy had used a stone. But in what way is it all actually different? Let us analyze the nature of the situation. A stone- an object comprised of certain atoms, arranged in a certain way, followed a certain path and hit the ground- another object comprised of certain atoms that are arranged in a certain way. Billy: an object comprised of certain atoms, arranged in a certain way, hit Tommy an object comprised of certain atoms, arranged in a certain way. Is it the composition of atoms that made the difference? If two carbon sack filled with water, were to collide, would it be evil too? Does the arrangement matter? Why would it? And, more importantly, what in heaven's name do we even mean by good and bad? Is a thing good, because it has a certain heat content or moves at certain speed? If not, then 'morality' seems to be another superstition or at best a human construct.

One might feel like the last paragraph is mere sophistry. The answer is obvious: Human beings are alive and stones and grounds are not, that's what makes a certain arrangement of atoms and molecular composition special. But in order to call human beings special, one must first establish that a certain arrangement of nature is special. There is no logic in saying that humans are somehow outside, above or central to nature, if nature is all that exists especially if one happens to live on "a cosmic speck of dust, orbiting a mediocre star in the far suburbs of a common sort of galaxy, among a hundred billion galaxies in the universe." What does it mean to be "alive" anyway and what's so special about it? "Love is just a chemical reaction in your brain" is not an empty phrase, but a factual statement. And it turns out that it's true regarding all brain activity. There is nothing "alive" about chemical reactions. Humans are made out of cells. My house is made out of bricks. So what? Cells may be full of activity and are quite complex, but fundamentally they are just inanimate matter propelled by the laws of physics, we might as well call neutron stars alive if complexity is somehow the criteria. Even if we simply go along with the official definition of life- growing, reproducing etc. these are still mere chemical reactions and the relevant question remains: "so what?" Penn Jillette said that theists act against the logic of our position when we obey the traffic laws (silly enough), but why exactly is he

stopping at red lights, if the whole universe is just a meaningless dance of inanimate matter? Tragically, the nature equipped us with a sense for self-preservation, otherwise we could have ended quicker this farce called life. Faced with the reality of our situation, we might decide to have fun as well. Fun at all cost, without thinking about tomorrow, because tomorrow is as meaningless as the whole universe after all, there is no reason to hold back if one's view of reality is that we are all just clouds of chance-arranged atoms. Humanity would not survive such a way of life. Whether we like it or not, our instincts go beyond self-preservation. We can be gentle, even though the nature is merciless. Nature may be meaningless, we shall find a purpose. We can be moral in the face of cynicism. If the price we have to pay for civilization is savagery and despair, then it is not a high price to pay.

Morality is the foundation upon which societies are built. However since we live in a meaningless world (meaningless as in everything is just clouds of atoms bumping into each other), there is no reason to suppose that what we consider moral right now yields the best results, however defined. It can hardly be argued that nature provides us with a superior shelter to what humans are capable of making. Why shouldn't we improve our morality like we improved our living conditions? Once mantises are done mating, the female mantis might eat the male mantis, because that's what the nature dictates them to do. Given enough biological engineering, humans could be made to do the same; maybe they should be. If you feel averse to the prospects of either eating or being eaten by your partner, than that is just your monkey brain acting up. Once the process is done, the new humans are going to feel about it as if it was a walk in a park on a Sunday afternoon. What I mean to illustrate is that morality is a construct, a means to an end. However if morality is a mere means to an end, certain things follow- we might argue that in order to achieve X, morality A is better than morality B, but we can't make moral judgments on whether we should pursue X rather than Y, because good and evil are terms which derive their meaning from a morality. Just like it's no use in trying to persuade a Muslim that certain parts of the Quran are morally objectionable- the Quran gives the arbitrage of good and evil. Therefore moralities aren't good or bad, they are just different, they achieve different things. If we want to have an egalitarian society, we should construct a morality where any acknowledgment of group differences is bad. If we want a socialist society, we should construct a communist morality. There is nothing in physics, chemistry or biology that would support or undermine any position. Some might want to protest when I got to "biology" by saying that there are certain preferences embedded in our genetic makeup, but so what if they are. If needed, we can change our genetic makeup by eugenics or outright genetic engineering. Millions dying in the process in actuality would be as bad as burning few tons of coal as their bodies would pave a way to the brave new world. Any moral objections will disappear once the new societal norms through genetic pressures produce new humanity, because these objections only come from the current societal norms and genetic pressures. It can hardly be argued that the current world is perfect, after all it has arrived by a blind evolutionary process. The society doesn't teach men not to rape (not like a mentor teaches his pupils, mind you, but like an owner teaches his dog), therefore they rape. White people are overachievers and black people are underachievers, it can only be due to the society arbitrarily exalting white people, and oppressing black people. To think that any of these things arise from individuals making their own choices is bigoted and, more importantly, superstitious.

Here is an interesting fact about computers: they cannot 'make up' numbers. If you command the machine to add one and one, it will give you two, but the two is fully depended on the ones you gave it. Algorithms may do wonders with numbers, but the outcome will always depend on your input and whatever was put into the machine earlier by the programmers and engineers. There doesn't even need to be a logical connection between your input and the output- if you connect a light sensor to the machine and instruct it to display "1" every time a red light shines on the sensor and "2" for blue light, the machine will do it, even though there is no logic connecting the colors and numbers. The random number generator depends too on the influences from outside of the system, and unless the source is random to begin with, the number will only seem to be random. That is because the machine works

according to the laws of nature, and the laws of nature work in a fixed way. Under standard conditions, water boils at 100 degrees Celsius. If you measured something different, then either the pressure is off, the water is not in fact water or your thermometer is faulty, not because the nature rolled a dice on you. Human brains are the same- they work according to the laws of nature too, and therefore work in a fixed way- given X, they give Y, even when there is no logical connection between X and Y. A thief does what he does, because of, and here scientists may genuinely differ, either his genes or societal pressures. Change in his behavior will depend on his genes and/or societal pressures too. Either way, nothing is coming from his own volition, because the thing called “free will” is a mere superstition, by the laws of nature it cannot exist. If you want “progress”, it is no use to change “hearts and minds” of individuals, you have to fundamentally change society with propaganda, brainwashing, reeducation and/or eugenics programs. To some, contemporary far left appear evil and crazy; it may be a sobering thought that this is as compassionate and sound as they get. If rape is deemed evil, then we should either start a brainwashing propaganda to stop rape culture, a eugenics program to kill off the gene responsible for rape or become a part of the rape culture. If people differ, then we should 'breed' the superiors and marginalize the inferior, or we should insist that people do not differ at all.

In the beginning I mentioned “New Atheists” claiming that they do not derive their morals from atheism. That's the point. Working from a clean start, atheists could never reach western values and are more likely to destroy rather than to improve them. The 'supernatural' branch, deemed 'superstition' by the atheists who are eagerly chopping it off, is the only branch holding up western values. When you see civilization regressing into a jungle, remember who put us on a par with animals.