

## Theophobia, Dehumanization, and Depersonalization: A Critique of Prominent Secular-Atheist Thinkers

Samuel A. Nigro, M.D.\*

Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Ohio, USA

**\*Corresponding Author:** Samuel A. Nigro, M.D., Assistant Clinical Professor Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Ohio, USA. Email: sam@docnigro.com

This was originally written Feb 2007....

The secularist/atheist (SA) junta has grown with increasing numbers of self-promoting books and articles championed by iconoclasts attacking everything except the contemporary Joseph Goebbels' orchestrated press and media (See "media influences" in *Encyclopedia of Catholic Social Thought, Social Science and Social Policy*, pages 691-693). This presentation will critically address many popular believers/perpetrators of "secularism and atheism" (SA). My comments on each will hopefully spare all the bother of reading the rest of these atheistic tomes. The basic theophobia, dehumanization and depersonalization intrinsic to SA and SA's will be described. Additionally, I will provide full reviews and critiques of all selected quietuses as Addendum I (Please read them!). Finally, a second Addendum II will be offered containing Counter-Secularization comments and articles.

1. *The God Delusion* by Richard Dawkins (2006). This book is chosen first because it is a paradigm of the dishonesty and superciliousness of SA's. To total and permanent discrediting, Dawkins refuses the technical meaning of the most important word in his entire book:

Delusion -- a fixed false belief out of keeping with the patient's cultural background...a false belief based on incorrect inference about external reality. It is firmly sustained despite what almost everyone else believes and despite what constitutes incontrovertible and obvious proof of evidence to the contrary. The belief is not ordinarily accepted by the members of the person's culture or subculture -- Concise textbook of Clinical Psychiatry,

Saddock and Saddock, 2006.

Dawkins blatantly disregards the technical definition of "delusion" and insults his readers with a meaningless definition of "delusion" as anything that has not been proven to his satisfaction. Dawkins admits, in the preface, page 5, to ignoring severe objections and criticisms from not one but three psychiatrists about his use of the word "delusion." How are we to believe anything that follows from this man after reading this fraudulent title? How true will he be when he describes the precision of St. Thomas Aquinas? Obviously, Dawkins has his own false beliefs that are not accepted by his culture. Actually, by any definition, "God" cannot be a delusion.

2. *The Selfish Gene*, by Richard Dawkins, (1976). We are survival machines -- robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes (Opening paragraph to the Preface of the 1976 1st Edition).

Suggestibly overwhelmed by evolutionary theories, Dawkins totally buys into natural selection as neo-Darwinism (Darwin with genes), and he believes in "speciesism" meaning that no species has any priority over another. Dawkins describes genes as having "conscious aims" but then he waffles so he can deny he means it. He anthropomorphizes the universe and all complicated "creatures" in it. He originates the "meme" concept and admits the propaganda of creating a monosyllable that sounds like "gene" in order to enhance the suggestibility of his own metaphor of "memes" as cultural behavioral phenomena impacting on evolution. Do not call his fabrication "meme" but "me-me" -- that is what he is foolishly talking and writing about.

3. *The extended phenotype* by Richard Dawkins, (1982). With his, no doubt, genetically based humility, Dawkins professes this book to be the best thing he has ever written or ever read.

He announces this book as “unabashed advocacy” in the first line on page 1, and consistent with that, the book barely approaches carafe wine academic scholarship; for example, he uses the female pronoun “her” instead of the correct gender neutral “him” throughout the book, which reveals his iconoclasm include the Oxford English Dictionary. The metaphor madness and obsessive/compulsiveness in this book could be called “witchcraft.” He perseverates with everything, special pleads on every page and provides good demonstrations of *non-being* research. He reminds me of Freud's psychobabble and intense fabrication without proof. The analogy holds that Dawkins is to biology what Freud erroneously claimed he was to mental functioning. Dawkins’ central thesis is:

An animal's behavior tends to maximize the survival of the gene, “for” that behavior, whether or not those genes happen to be in the body of the particular animal forming it” (Pg. 233).

He thinks he proves this by a study of beavers and lakes. Another book, *Darwin's Fairytales* (reviewed in Addendum II), raises further doubt about Richard Dawkins, his selfish genes, memes, and most everything else he writes.

4. *The End of Faith, Religion, Terror and the Future of Reason* by Sam Harris, (2004). This book won the 2004 PEN Award for Non-Fiction...as if non-belief is not fiction. Amazing! Reacting to September 11, 2001, Harris looked closely at Islam and said “Eee gads” and decided to condemn all religion. His analysis of Islam in Chapter 4 is a very accurate and succinct description of Islam, but he offers nothing to help. Generalizer Harris refuses distinction of Islam's violence promoting Quran from the traditions and Holy Scriptures of Christianity and other religions. But yet he defends the need for political, non-religious violence in the United States and Israel. Well, except for the chapter on Islam, the book is filled with anti-religious themes not necessarily fairly presented. All religious texts are dismissed because he asserts believers have not made as much progress as he thinks he has, and if Harris cannot “conceive” it, it cannot be believed. He denies the sacredness of anything, maintains the silliness of all beliefs and has a nihilistic anti-

evolutionary bias that man is the best evolution can do. Unwittingly Harris replaces religious arrogance by scientific arrogance with solipsisms.

Faith is what credulity becomes when it finally achieves escape velocity from constraints of terrestrial discourse -- constraints like reasonableness, internal coherence, civility and candor (Pg. 65).

About beautiful and salutary actions provided by religious people, he states:

But there are far better reasons for self-sacrifice than those that religion provides. The fact that faith has motivated many people to do good things does not suggest that faith is itself a necessary (or even a good) motivation for goodness (Pg. 78).

Repeatedly, Harris is incomprehensible (like the last sentence just quoted), ahistorical, unreasonable, without evidence, and fanciful if not delusional. His concept of goodness does not include justice such that there should be reparations to the Roman Catholic Church for all it has done in every country, everywhere, by her schools, social agencies, hospitals and humanity efforts over the centuries. He closes his book with the command that “faith belongs with ignorance, hatred and greed” (Pg. 226), a comment appropriate for himself as he offers pessimism, hopelessness and joyless paralysis. This is a poor man's book of Job with a loser's ending.

5. *Letter to a Christian Nation* by Sam Harris, (2006). If Richard Dawkins is the Elmer Gantry of secular/atheism then Sam Harris is the Adolph Hitler for the same.

I engage Christianity at its most divisive, injurious, and retrograde. In this liberals, moderates and non-believers can recognize a common cause (Pg. IX).

The common cause is to attack Christianity and all organized religion at straw man worst. Arrogance, prejudice, superficiality, and feigned intelligence are evident. For two examples, Harris has a superficial understanding of slavery and is totally oblivious to Natural Law as a basis for morality without Scripture.

Atheism is not a philosophy; is not even a view of the world; it is simply an admission of the obvious. Atheism is nothing more than noises reasonable people make in the presence of unjustified religious beliefs (Pg. 51).

Harris sets himself up as the intolerant closed-minded determiner of whatever is to be "justified" as worthy of belief! Then he admits to "noisemaking" about it, which is probably the most accurate statement in the whole book because noise is what the book is. Harris also revels in the "limbo controversy" concerning the eternal fate of unbaptized children:

When one considers the fact that this is the very institution that has produced and sheltered an elite army of child molesters, the whole enterprise begins to exude a truly diabolical aura of misspent human energy (Pg. 66).

What is diabolical is the follow up of the preceding statement by proclaiming "intellectual honesty" is the core of science (pg. 64). Well, Harris needs to know, in intellectual honesty, that there is no "elite army of child molesters" unless it is in the public school system with a rate of sex abuse of children at least 3 times that of the homosexual teenage boy problem in less than 2% of Catholic priests. And, if public school systems voluntarily paid its sex victimized students comparable to the Roman Catholic Church's voluntary reparations for its far fewer sex victims, there would not be an open public high school in the country, and, by the way, Protestant and Jewish organizations would be a lot fewer if they did the same.

It is time we admitted that faith is nothing more than the license religious people give one another to keep believing when reasons fail (Pg. 67).

The book offers no evidence that Harris understands much about religion except its "worst" as unfairly, unhistorically and unscientifically engaged and imagined dogmatically. Harris' remarks are the bigoted promoting of ethnic cleansing of the worst kind: i.e., clever and sinister—like Adolph Hitler creating Jewish and Christian strawmen to hate.

#### 6. *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon* Daniel C. Dennett (2006).

Dennett is an example of defeat of self. The book is filled with constricting atheistic anti-social selfish aimless "me me me" -- faithless, hopeless, grudge-filled and smugly "charitable," to all but religious people. Dennett attempts to "break the spell" of religion for all. He is enthused about Dawkin's "meme" concept and it is fair to identify Dennett's God as "memeMeme" (pronounced "me" or "Dennett" 4 times). Like Dawkins, truth is insulted by pervasive distortions and fantasies. Anti-transcendental suggestibility is promoted by one unproven suggestion after another. Dennett has a token understanding of transcendent values (Pg. 376-78) limiting them to "truth" and "justice" and maybe "good" but he does not understand religion at its best as a pro-planet, pro-nature, pro-human, pro-social belief in *being* and God. The book is well written but superficial, interesting yet unconvincing -- basically feigned erudition. The most disturbing part is Dennett's emphasizing many times over that religion provides little good and little culture (which is why I combine my review of this book in Addendum I with that of a rebutting book, *Who Really Cares*. Dennett breaks no spells but spins his own by a spiritless hyper-rationality to a level of meta-science which leads to an ersatz me x 4 faith analyzing to nothing. Dennett negates human beingness and offers a counterfeit Christianity of "making nice." Finally, if religion is "a natural phenomenon" as in the title of this book, "What is atheism?"

#### 7. *The Designer Universe* by Steven Weinberg, (2007).

SAs are often bogus scientists or, worse, real ones. This is the 1979 Physics Nobel Prize Winner:

Any possible universe could be explained as the work of some sort of designer. Even a universe that is completely chaotic, without any laws or regularities at all, could be supposed to have been designed by an idiot.

In keeping with that philosophical oversight, Weinberg offers his own design but does not address the question as to whether an idiot could ever understand a brilliant designer. Weinberg asserts that all designs, spirit, order, harmony, ascendancy and whatever of a spiritual nature can be dismissed because:

Today we understand most of these things in terms of physical forces acting under impersonal laws... I see nothing about the human mind any more than about the weather that stands out as beyond the hope of understanding as a consequence of impersonal laws acting over billions of years.

One hopes his far reaching understanding of the weather can teach him something or maybe he is just depressed. Weinberg admits that certain constants of nature have values that seem to have been mysteriously fine-tuned to adjust the values that allow for the possibility of life, but then he gives concrete examples of elementary physics maintaining that all this is just one fragment of a much larger universe in which big bangs go off all the time, each one with different values for the fundamental constants.

In scientific words: How many universes can be on the head of a pin? His just quoted words are a scientific leap at best and scientific trash at worst—there is no evidence for any such polyverse or multiverse, and I emphasize that the word is “universe” with accent on the “uni.” Consistent with the verbal nihilism of irrelevant “universes” conceived by mathematical idiots, “person” and all other immortal words can have no real meaning for SAs, because there is no meaning to anything in SA nihilism. Furthermore, Weinberg’s logic relies heavily on a lottery analogy overlooking the fact that a lottery itself must have a designer. Consistent with his peers, religious historical negatives are exaggerated and, as all SAs, he overlooks that almost all religion negatives invariably, at least from a Christian view point, are misdeeds against real Christianity rather than deriving from it.

8. *Atheist Manifesto: The Case against Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* by Michel Onfray (2007).

Popular in Europe which he helped kill, this book is his first English translation and, therefore, likely to be his best. It is a word salad about atheism. The megalomaniac author claims to be the only one who really understands atheism. Onfray presents himself as the first real atheist, all prior atheists not being atheistic enough, such that the Masons were nothing really but “christian atheists.” He offers “atheology” as the name of his personal sect for the SA religion, calling all other religions to be metaphysical, ontological diseases (Outside SA there is no

salvation). Revealing his intelligence, Onfray maintains his Marxism in spite of its obvious historical failure. He has no problem with pedophilia and almost anything else:

The hedonist contract -- nothing could be more immanent -- legitimizes all inter-subjectivity, conditions, all thought and action, dispenses utterly with God, religion, and priests...It is an ethic without transcendent obligation or sanction (Pg. 58).

Onfray offers no rational, reasonable bases to prohibit any sort of sexual activity and just about anything else. So, after declaring “anything goes” he proceeds to condemn people who pray. A few glimpses of this madman’s homilies on religion: “Monotheism’s somber vision” (Pg. 65); “Down with intelligence” (Pg. 67); “The book bias against books” (Pg. 78); “Hatred of science” (Pg. 81); “The detesting of women” (Pg. 102); “Ravings of a hysteric” (St. Paul)(Pg. 131); “In praise of slavery” (Pg. 137); “Hitler, St. John’s disciple” (Pg. 166); “The Vatican admired Adolf Hitler” (Pg. 184); and “Jesus at Hiroshima” (Pg. 191). As a psychiatrist, I believe it is more charitable to see Onfray as a mentally ill man exploiting the system as best he can (as Picasso did). Some of his verbose sections are almost incomprehensible, filled with disorganized and loose associations. His “In praise of slavery” (Pg. 137) is pure psychobabble and not about slavery. It is frightening that this sort of stuff makes it into print and will be praised, no doubt, by like memes and genes. These are semi-delusional manic-like ramblings no doubt made passable by a pseudo-sophisticated over-worked team of editors who, exhausted, still missed a lot. This book does nothing but prove how suggestible people are, and that the best definition of Original Sin is “the suggestibility to become anti-transcendental.”

9. *God is not great: How Religion Poisons Everything* by Christopher Hitchens (2007).

As Jimmy Durante said, “Everybody wants to get into da act!” Hitchens reminds me of a story which made rounds when I was in nuclear submarines in the early 1960’s. Admiral Rickover was addressing a large group of Navy officers who were applying to be part of his rapidly expanding new nuclear Navy. Rickover mentions “backgrounds” and an officer abruptly stood up and began to list his broad range of degrees, diverse experiences, and myriad accomplishments. After several minutes, the

admiral interrupted him saying, "You have done and learned a lot of different things, mastering nothing, and I want nothing to do with you. You are a real rolling stone. Get out!" Well, that rolling stone is back and it is Christopher Hitchens, master of nothing and gadfly of all.

In the very recent past, we have seen the Church of Rome befouled by its complicity with the unpardonable sin of child rape, or, as it might be phrased in Latin form, "no child's behind left" (page 4).

This quote begins to give the thinking pattern for Hitchens on every page of his book: overstated half-truths thrown twice as far (child rape-page 4); impudent unreliability (Richard Dawkins-page 5); irritable pervasive slanderous negativism (Blaise Pascal-page 6); hyperanalysis to the point of destruction (a standard scientific procedure) (C.S.Lewis-page 7); bigoted prejudging and metastatic stereotyping (Moses-page 8); massive unfair generalizations (the abolition of religion-page 9); trenchant hyperbole (himself-page 10); and a cornucopia of ipsedixitisms and logical fallacies (book cover and page 1 through page 286). In summary, the book presents a smartass jackass enlightenment about all in the index: saints, religious traditions, all scriptures, all religious organizations, the New Testament, the Old Testament, The Talmud, The Quran, religious leaders, Eastern religions, big religions, little ones, and any religious prayer or thought. And after all this drivel, he asks religious people to "leave me alone" (page 13). After my full review in the Addendum I, we should do so because rebuttal is unnecessary.

#### 10. Humanist Manifestos (HM) I (1933) and II (1973).

Claiming that "nothing human is alien," both HMs intolerantly deny and alienate the human phenomenon of theology and many other religious themes including life after death. Basically, the HM definition of "humanness" is empty. HMs, like all SAs, neither know what a human being is nor what constitutes "human beingness." Containing contradictions in simplistic pseudo-piety, HM I offers 15 commandments while HM II adds two more. The HMs' commandments are dogmatic pontifications by Moses wannabes. For a few examples, Commandment #5, "The preciousness and dignity of the individual person as a central humanist value" contrasts with Commandment #6, which includes the right to birth control, abortion and divorce. HMs diminish the idea that life has a value making it secondary to "civil

liberty." The 11th Commandment states "practicing humanists should make it their vocation to humanize personal relations," but I would argue that real human beingness, peace and togetherness would be offered more fully if one would "personalize human relations," because to "personalize" is super human and go beyond one's biological abilities -- SAs just do not understand supernature and therefore always remain at a primitive level just below pagan. What is obviously true is that the HMs have not delivered. They neither affirm life nor elicit the possibilities of life for anyone much less all. HM I gave us the Nazis and the Soviet empire. HM II gave us unnatural anti-animal kingdom (and therefore anti-planetary) sex, abortion, death promotion, genome control, never born-free, and a one world anthill filled with pretensions of freedom well described in the book *1984*. The outcome of human history for the SAs of both Humanist Manifestos is sterile, vapid, servile, prevaricating, denatured nihilism. And, SAs always tendentiously censor and suppress, if not deny, the fact that **Humanist Manifestos pronounce that they are establishing their own "religion."** Obviously, therefore, all SA pronouncements contained in these Manifestos are "religion," and, thus, all SA promotions must be precluded from government and public school promotion because of separation of church and state.

#### 11. *Climbing Mount Improbable* by Richard Dawkins (1996).

This book is reviewed to give a glimpse of the way many evolutionists think. But I was starting to tell the story of how lenses might have evolved in the first place, from a vitreous mass that filled the whole eye. The principle of how it might have happened, and the speed with which it might have been accomplished, has been beautifully demonstrated in a computer model by a pair of Swedish biologists called Dan Nilsson and Susanne Pelger. I shall lead up to explaining their elegant computer model in a slightly oblique way (pages 160-161).

Knowing of Dawkins untrustworthiness, I looked up the article. It presents "theoretical considerations" of schematic changes from a "light sensitive patch" to a focused lens eye" by 8 stages of 1,829 steps of 1% change estimating small design improvement in optical geometry, thereby changing the model from a "flat patch" to a deepened "vitreous body filled cavity" (a "camera eye"). The mathematical calculations of the changes in this cartoon estimated "only a few

hundred thousand years” for it to occur. The article itself states that the model does not introduce structures for a functional eye such as adjustable iris; structures for distance accommodation; a vascularized layer; the choroids; retinal cells for photoreception, polarization sensitivity and colour vision; a supporting capsule; the sclera; the blood supply; structural support; or external protective structures. The model is a speculative series of sketches mathematically considered by an imposed assumed rate of change. There is no “elegant computer model” and the word “computer” was not even in the article. Dawkins again: “The central message of this chapter is that eyes evolve easily and fast, at the drop of a hat” (page 190). Right. The rest of the book is the same junk science. So is most of Dawkins, Darwin and all SA in being repeatedly self-discredited by enthusiastic untruthful and irrational disciples.

#### CLOSING REMARKS

Intelligent people deserve better. All the SAs reviewed reveal common characteristics.

1. All SA believers proclaim or accept, overtly or covertly, that **secular-atheism is a religion** for them. Because it is a religion, SA must be prevented from all state acknowledgement and support. If no Ten Commandments, then no secular atheism. Regardless, the separation of church and state must exclude secularism-atheism and all specifically proposed by SA.
2. The word "delusion" technically applies to SAs more than to believers because they themselves promote unproven beliefs clearly incompatible with their history and culture (which is the definition of “delusion”). SAs are impertinent impudent comen leading the gullible rolling stones of the contemporary press and media and other jester celebrities of humanity by the nose. That the press and media do not inform the people of the delusions of Darwinians and SAs is proof of the incompetence, unreliability and traitorousness of the press and media to the First Amendment.
3. SAs do not credit believers as equal or even capable of thinking, or, in Richard Dawkins’ case, even of reading. SAs are prejudiced against and discriminate against believers. SAs present bigotry of the worst kind. They are incapable of knowing God because they do not believe what they cannot explain or understand, or so they claim. Thus, God or any spiritual being does not exist for them. But something drives them such that they cannot leave believers alone—euphemistically, I call what drives them: “anti-spirit” bigotry (or, better yet, “demons”).
4. SAs do not realize and actually deny that the human species has partially broken away from biological bonds (i.e., humans do not need to evolve wings to fly nor do we need genes to make decisions). SAs cannot understand or believe in divinity or spirituality any more than frogs and loons can understand or believe in humanity, so there is primitive precedent for their disbelief in something greater than oneself. Thus, SAs themselves have not psychologically broken free yet from biological chains as we see them mentally in a Darwinian nightmare swinging from branch to branch, and for that, I must assume that evolution would be a good idea for them; and they ought to get on with it by joining the real key to the next evolution or leap-in-nature: Roman Catholicism.
5. SAs get a bizarre pleasure out of hurting people, and they do not know anti-planet anti-animal kingdom anti-nature pollution even though they eagerly practice it. Proclaiming "better than thou" and believing "chemistry made me do it" is an excuse instead of an explanation, SAs condone whatever they can attribute to biology whether it be pedophilia, sodomy, abortion, homosexuality, Marxism and anything else which SAs claim should not be judged because it is allegedly biologically based. Then, SAs, in self-contradiction, object hostilely to people who want to act on or believe in God -- even though there is a brain center, consistent with Natural Law, identifiable as linked to God belief. Obviously, evolution missed SAs so they do not have the God brain center and, thusly, are brain belief impaired.
6. SAs are unable to relax and surprisingly unable to be comfortable in the serene Darwin science drunk and its resulting interminable hangover of depressing trivialities, nihilistic nothingness, and vacuous despair, as they follow the oldest ethic of science: “This seems right and I will make a name for myself”—a principle first defined by Darwin himself. And yet, SAs cannot "mind their own business," because, I

believe, they are terrified that there may be a God, so they must attack counterphobically seeking the never ending needed reassurance that they have not been struck by lightning yet -- all this over and above their intense fear that somewhere, someplace, someone does not agree with them and may actually be enjoying the presence of God and completion in the Lord. And, fearing conversion, SAs can only relax with explanations of religion other than those by religious people. So SAs must give common **assent** to natural seduction and Darwin gasification rendering them unable to relax in silence.

7. SAs have a hatred component too. All malevolent hatred is based on paranoid projections from, as psychoanalysts would say, "the very opposite in the unconscious." Thus, unconsciously wishing to believe in God, SAs must, in classical paranoia, see and interpret believers as bad persecutors so the SAs have reasons to reject just as paranoids reject those on whom they project their malevolence and unwitting envy.
8. SAs tend to demonstrate evil as robotile logic with diminution of the transcendentals of matter, form, truth, oneness, good and beauty resulting in an atheistic dogma of universal anti-transcendental negativism without respect, without recognizing ancient secrets, and without mystery. And they protest too much. Their mean spiritedness is truly to be hoist by one's own arrogance.
9. Genetically defective and without a God brain center and perhaps even a heart, SAs are theophobic as they project their own huge inferiority and humiliating spiritual dearth. One must also ask "What are their sins? ... which deprive them of spirit?" SAs ought to experiment: by going to a Mass and participating in it fully imitating the presiding priest throughout. They may experience genuine spirit for a change with an awakening of the synapses in their God center.
10. SAs are cruel in wanting to take away that which gives people comfort, that which offers support and understanding, and that which gives a theory of the universe which pleases and creates value. SAs do not understand that Christian spirituality solves the problem of innate love and innate hate which exist in everyone. Human and spirit life mean that every human universally needs to love or love something greater than one's self, best of all when it is the love of God and the transcendentals given by God. Also, in contradiction, but just as universally, every human will hate -- it is an excitatory component of emotional relief -- we will hate something or someone whether we want to or not ... and hopefully it will be the devil and all the demonic words flooding the universe, and not what SA's hate, i.e., other people happier than they are. To take away the super mentality of the human spirit is to deprive people of the love/hate aspect of their humanity adequately resolved. Christian spirituality solves the intrinsic love/hate component of every human being. To deprive people of the comfort and happiness of transcendental Christianity is barbarism, subhuman and against civilization.
11. SAs are not structurally different from the religions they condemn because they offer their own religion with their own clergy and priests known as journalists and publishers. SAs have their own bishops known as editors, and they have their own pope who usually is the owner of the New York Times (the leading proponent of suggestibility propagandizing since Joseph Goebbels discovered and developed the contemporary principles of manipulating the people by public "information"). During the past seventy-five years, new communications technology, flagrantly misused by contemporary press and media using Goebbel's propaganda techniques, has overwhelmed the Church which for centuries was the primary source of reliable information and education for the people. Until recent memory, there was no radio, no television, no internet, and no really efficient newspapers i.e., no megamedia flooding the world with exciting anti-transcendental suggestibility. The Church had the monopoly almost on what was to be believed by the people who had little alternatives than going to the local church. While what went on in the churches was not "entertainment," it was perhaps the easiest place to "escape" from life's stresses and learn (a transcendental life, by the way) at the same time. Until recent memory, not only was there no salvation outside the Church, but there was little education and information either. Today the Church has yet to fully recognize that a major basis for her problems are the lack of Suggestibility Training Programs at all levels of education (which is why I enclose *And*

*Satan Turned into an Angel of Light* in Addendum II). Since the current technology of the megamedia, nothing can compete well with all the Goebbelian disinformation from the New York Times to Hollywood as the contemporary press and media foist evil after evil to manipulate, dehumanize and depersonalize the people shamelessly. And SA has a field day promoting its glitzy non-being religion. Still, the fantasies of SAs have less validity in history to sustain them than any transcendental religion worthy of the name. The end result of SAs or any group without genuine Roman Catholicism or its equivalent is an epidemic of behavioral pollutions, sexually transmitted diseases, impaired family life, and a spiritless anything-goes boring dullness with nothing to look forward to except transient, pompous, "better-than-thou" pseudo-superiority. SA is a form of subhuman pollution which is basically "whatever you can get away with." Such has been the disastrous outcome wherever Roman Catholicism or Western Civilization does not flourish. SAs offer nothing but ethnic cleansing, but still unwittingly rely on the unconscious moral capital of Roman Catholicism which is always there because of Natural Law; and, just like in "The Screwtape Letters," somehow the transcendentals keep breaking through in a resurrection of one form or another. Believers are always frustrated by the continuous reappearance of original sin and succored by the continuous reappearance of resurrections. For SAs it is the opposite. Obviously, SA offers nothing, while the Church offers the best possible hope and future, a real future, for all.

12. *Ad hominem* criticisms are appropriate because SAs are a bunch of snooty stuffed-shirts and are fools (like Richard Dawkins?); Hitler wannabees (like Sam Harris?); blights (like David Dennett!); idiots (like Steven Weinberg?); psychos (like Michel Onfray?); cannibalistic rolling stones (like Christopher Hitchens); and psychopaths (like Human Manifestors). Their grandiose demands of scientific absolute certainty is pathological and subhuman and as religious as that which they condemn. Their demands are also absurd and unattainable as Godel's Theorems document. Basically, science, in their hands, remains the adolescent offspring of the Church needing to mature out of its Promethean juvenile attack on its Roman

Catholic parents. Science and religion should be hand and glove building the earth returning all to love, freedom and God (Read my review of Behe's *The Edge of Evolution* in Addendum II).

13. In contrast, SAs and Darwinians decree and declare war with life and the universe by a "survival of the fittest" (true only in an elementary individual sense) mentality and by the myths of "common descent" and "natural selection" having neither proof nor solid evidence for either, but contradictions galore. As everything looks like a nail to a hammer, so for SAs everything looks like "common descent" and "natural selection"—two Darwin invented idols and shibboleths necessary for acceptance into the high fallutin know-it-all Superscience Flatus Club. The reliance on Darwin's grandiose travels and his grandiose conclusions is an unwarranted faith-filled science-leap credible mainly because contemporary authority is challenged, but also because Darwin's mental institute deserving creed fills the believers' nihilistic psychological peer pressure needs and inflated authority hating egos. Never have two phrases ("common descent" and "natural selection") been so mindlessly repeated as dogma without philosophical or intellectual justification. SAs doth promote too much. (Read Addendum II.)

SA, as currently promoted by a glut of diatomaceous writings, is an intellectual genocide proclaiming the anti-civilization "abandon all values ye who enter here!" Some of SA is a disgrace against history as well as science itself. Indeed the promotion of science by these people has resulted in the dark age of wisdom. SA with its relativism and psychological spiritlessness results in a meaningless dated world which is to be rejected and overcome by an active embracing and creating of a joyful movement into the transcendental world as we know it can be. To this, three major points must be remembered:

Three: An absolute general disproof of all Darwinism's cruel evolution and SA with every man for himself is Western Civilization itself.

Two: Two absolute specific disproofs of SA and all Darwinism (including survival of the fittest, the absolute struggle for life, selfish genes, extended phenotypes, natural selection, and inclusive fitness) are Planned Parenthood and the homosexual movement.



One: Scientific proof positive of spirit including the existence of souls, angels, devils and saints was provided without a doubt by Oxford University scientists' recent announcement that there is no genetic difference between the Irish and the English. I submit that is proof of the irrelevance of matter and that God is not only real but has a sense of humor.

Thus joy and laughter and spirit must pervade as SAs become superiority hacks, philosophical cowards, mathematical madmen, impersonal

non-persons and unmovable. The end result of SA is an undeniable dehumanization and a depersonalization. But even spiritless scientists have to believe in something, even if it is nothing, because "nothing" keeps them from finding reasons to believe what is right in front of them (*Non-being* does that). Secular atheism and Darwinian nihilism are religions and false religions at that, filled with the continuous cycling of original sin of which they are proof thereby missing the continuous cycling of resurrections obvious to all who have spirit.

**Citation:** Samuel A. Nigro. *Theophobia, Dehumanization, and Depersonalization: A Critique of Prominent Secular-Atheist Thinkers*. *ARC Journal of Psychiatry*. 2018; 3(2): 1-9

**Copyright:** © 2018 Authors. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.