

To Atheist Liberals



Send him mail.

"Food for Thought" is an original column appearing every other Tuesday at Everything-Voluntary.com, by Norman Imberman. Norman is a retired podiatrist who loves playing piano, writing music, lawn bowling, bridge, reading, classical music, going to movies, plays, concerts and traveling. He is not a member of any social network, nor does he plan on becoming one. Dr. Imberman has written a fantastic Christmas song which he had professionally recorded as a demonstration record. He is looking for a publisher, or A & R man, or record producer to listen to his song. It deserves to be a permanent member of the lexicon of familiar and favorite Christmas songs. Archived columns can be found [here](#). FFT-only RSS feed available [here](#).

Faith is the acceptance of an idea based upon the absence of proof or in spite of evidence or reason to the contrary. Therefore, to hold the position that there is faith in reason is a contradiction in terms.

Atheists come from all walks of life and from all sides of the political spectrum, but what we have in common is a commitment to reason. Our atheistic belief is based upon the fact that all explanations for the belief in the existence of any god has, under careful analysis, proved to be pure sophistry. *Atheism, The Case Against God*, by George Smith, covers the false reasoning offered by scholars who have tried, but failed to prove the existence of a deity. As such, theists are left with "faith" as a substitute explanation for their belief. They claim that faith is a legitimate alternate explanation for their belief and proceed to close the book on the subject. George Smith, in his brilliant criticism of the explanations offered by theists for their beliefs, proves that there is no valid reason to accept any of the propositions for any theistic belief. In doing so, he offers much more than a justification for the atheist position. He establishes a hierarchy of reason, from the ground up, for the construction of an edifice of rational thinking in all fields of knowledge, *including the field of politics*. The same principles apply.

Let's switch the subject of rational inquiry from religion, to the subject of rational inquiry into politics and apply those same principles. As a matter of common sense, political conclusions should require the same hierarchical structure in order to come to all rational conclusions. In other words, one's political ideology must be consistent with natural law, the nature of man, and the rules of logic. Political ideology must start from the ground up

and contain no contradictions. In the absence of such a structure, there is nothing left upon which to build a political ideology, except “faith”. I have never heard a liberal defend his/her ideology based upon a rational hierarchy, or in other words, reason. With them it’s all faith in their emotions.

Of course, everyone has a right to one’s own opinion. But an opinion is just that—an opinion. Not all opinions are correct. But, when an incorrect opinion is converted to action and coerced upon an entire populace by government, it becomes a major disaster. For example, liberals and many conservatives believe that their desire to take my property by force (law) and give it to someone else, to whom it does not belong, is just as valid as my belief to want to keep my property. They are two opposing opinions. Can both of them be correct? Ask a liberal why his opinion is right and his answer is, “because that is what I believe and I am entitled to my opinion.” He may even claim that “it is the law and therefore it is right for the government to expropriate a person’s property for the good of society.” Such statements are not arguments that establish the validity of their positions. It’s like a child who uses “because” as his reason for his argument with another child. Even most conservatives are politically religious, meaning that they accept not only their religious beliefs on faith but also accept their conservative political beliefs on faith. I recently asked an intelligent staunch conservative to explain the proper function of government. The answer was that it is government’s function to “serve the people.” I asked her “what if the people want the government to serve them free medical care?” My question stopped her dead in her tracks since she has always been adamantly against socialized (government-run or regulated) medicine. It was at that moment that she realized that she too never thought about the subject and had no reason for her answer. She is religious, theologically and politically. At least she recognized her dilemma.

Since I have never heard a liberal make a structured presentation to justify his/her position, I submit that all of my atheist friends who are liberals, overlook the fact that their political Statist positions are based upon faith, even though their atheistic beliefs may be based upon reason. Of course, there are many theistic liberals. Their theistic belief is based upon faith, as are all theistic beliefs. Such liberals use the same method in arriving at their political beliefs—faith. However, I am addressing this article only to liberals who claim to be atheists because they have a starting point on which to construct their ideology. There is some hope for them. That starting point should be based upon the same intellectual tools they use to refute those arguments that claim to prove the existence of a deity.

Atheists who are liberals take notice! When you discuss political ideology with non-liberals do you present them with a step-by-step, logically built organized system for your political beliefs? Do you discuss the proper function of government from the ground up? Do you define your terms? If you do, are the definitions consistent with each other? Is there an epistemological structure to your beliefs starting with basic premises and principles of

reality? From my own experience I know you prefer to discuss the issues and statistics. You do so because that is all you have with which to deal. You become experts on the issues and statistics. Abstract ideas don't seem to matter. The entire liberal political system is infantile. Liberals defend their childlike desires, whims and hopes with such emotional zeal that they overlook the contradiction inherent in their method. They are political mystics just as much as theists are theological mystics. Liberalism, based upon dogmatic faith is just as much a religion to a liberal as dogmatic faith is to the religion of theists.

If there is a liberal who claims that there already exists a published ideological, well-structured, liberal system of government, and quotes *The Communist Manifesto* as his example, I challenge him to prove the validity of the premises and concepts in that tome. In fact, I imagine that only dyed-in-the-wool Communists would dare to even mention such a monstrous obsolete treatise in this day and age. I offer as support for my position, books such as *The Law* by Frederic Bastiat, *Restoring The American Dream* by Robert Ringer, *The Ethics of Liberty* by Murray Rothbard, *Liberty, A Path To Its Recovery* by F.A. Harper, *Libertarianism* by John Hospers, *The Road to Serfdom* by F.A. Hayek and most importantly, course V-50 by Jay S. Snelson.

Do you hear me my liberal-atheistic friends? Can you meet the challenge? Build me a system based upon reason that justifies the theft, kidnapping, extortion, corruption, coercion and fraud perpetrated by your government and supported by the liberal masses that voted for that government. Stop adding insult to injury by insisting that it is not theft, kidnapping, extortion, corruption, coercion and fraud that you are advocating. Stop conveniently finding other euphemisms to describe the criminal activities by government that you sanction and condone. Demystify your political beliefs. Abandon your faith-based political beliefs just as you have rejected the faith-based religious beliefs of theists.

Read more from "Food for Thought":