

THE LOGICAL IMPASSE OF ATHEIST AND AGNOSTIC DISCOURSES

Discussions on Philosophy, Rationality and God



Emrah BOZKURT

3 May 2025

Abstract

This article argues that God-centered philosophical discussions, especially in atheist and agnostic circles, are largely irrational, lack conceptual integrity and contradict the basic principles of philosophy. The author emphasizes that the sine qua non condition for a philosophical discussion is that the concept in question, in this case God, must be assumed within its own definition, even if temporarily. Since the concept of God necessitates creativity, discussing a non-creator as God loses its meaning. Nevertheless, in atheist and agnostic discourses, God's existence is denied, but questions such as “*why did he do this?*” and “*why is there pain?*” are posed assuming that God exists, which leads to a serious logical contradiction. It is also stated that arguments such as the “*argument from evil*” essentially involve emotional and reductionist responses and an anthropocentric judgment against the absoluteness of God. Agnostics' use of atheist arguments by abandoning their epistemological position contradicts their position and goes beyond rational consistency. The main theme of the article is that interpretation, criticism and syllogism, which are the main functions of philosophy, are valid only on changeable phenomena, and that making speculative judgments on ontological constants serves not philosophy but sophistry.

Keywords: God, Philosophy, Rationality, Atheism, Agnosticism, Argument from Evil

One of the most fundamental problems in today's philosophical debates is that concepts are not discussed in a philosophical context, yet they claim to be "*philosophizing*". This problem is especially pronounced when it comes to theological issues, especially in atheist and agnostic circles, where instead of a philosophical discussion, a great deal of emotional and illogical deductions are made. The main reason for this is that the vast majority of the people involved in these discussions have no knowledge of what philosophy is, how it should be done and the rules of rational thinking. Philosophy requires discussing a concept in a meaningful, logical and coherent framework. Rational thinking, on the other hand, requires discussing a concept within its defined boundaries. It should be clearly emphasized here: When discussions on God go beyond the framework of rationality, what is being done is no longer philosophy, but sophistry.

The prerequisite for discussing a concept is to assume it, even temporarily, and to evaluate it within its own definition. The concept of God is no exception. The person who wants to discuss God must first assume the existence of God on rational grounds, independent of his conceptions of God, and attribute to this God the most fundamental principle - *creativity*. This is a logical necessity. Calling a non-creator "God" is contrary to the concept itself. What is meant by creativity is the assumption that God created the universe and everything in it, otherwise it is meaningless to speak of Him as the God of men. Any discussion without this assumption is built on an empty ground. Therefore, every individual who takes part in a philosophical discussion must assume a creator God at the outset of the discussion. Any approach that does not adhere to this principled framework inevitably leads to a shift in meaning and irrationality.

However, it is a serious philosophical contradiction for atheists and agnostics in particular to try to criticize God while ignoring God. This is clearly seen in the example of the "*argument from evil*", which is widely used by these groups. In these discourses, statements such as the following are frequently encountered: "*Why did God create such a world?*", "*If He really exists, why does He allow suffering?*", "*Wouldn't such and such a system be better?*". This approach has no rational basis. Such approaches are the product of emotional reactions, not rational discussion. Because here, alternatives to God's unlimited knowledge, power and will to create are presented from a human, limited and emotional point of view. This is giving God a reason. It is saying, "*You did this wrong, this would have been the right thing to do.*" But God has already created everything and there is a reality. We can make inferences based on this reality. We like it or we don't like it, but to reshape it as "*it would be better if it were like this*" is neither philosophy nor a rational attitude.

In the background of these statements, there is a tendency to judge and reason about God's creation. However, what is being done here is both to say that God does not exist and to make absolute comments about him, and to form an argument by judging a creator whose creation possibilities are unlimited, not on the basis of what he has created, but on the basis of all other possibilities. Naturally, this attitude is a departure from logic. Because when it comes to God, there is no limit to these possibilities, and it is pointless to try to form an argument by making inferences with human reason over infinite possibilities. Moreover, in a philosophical discussion, the priority is the status of God's existence, and after the status of God's possibility is accepted at least 50% or more of the time, it is rationality to conduct a discussion on his nature and creatures; otherwise, this is clearly an example of irrationality. A similar problem arises in the case of the burden of proof. The "*argument from evil*" and many other arguments

are defended on the grounds of God's non-existence, despite the fact that they react as "*there is no proof for non-existence, the one who claims existence must prove it*". Atheists and agnostics' departure from rationality is also evident here. Even more interestingly, in the case of agnostics, the issue has shifted from the rational ground from the very beginning. Because to use atheist arguments after claiming that metaphysical phenomena and entities cannot be known with certainty is to act in a state of contradiction in itself. There is only one argument that an agnostic can use, and that is the claim that "*God cannot be known*" in relation to the situation of "*whether God can be known with certainty or not*". This is already within the scope of the concept of belief, but God is the subject of this concept. Therefore, agnosticism is dysfunctional and meaningless except as an epistemological method.

Coherence and internal logic are essential in a philosophical discussion. If a God is assumed and this God has created everything, then the discussion should be about the meaning of this creation. In other words, the question should not be "*Why did he do that?*" but "*What meaning can we make of it?*" However, most of the time this boundary is violated and empty, illogical and even contradictory discourses are produced under the pretense of a philosophical discussion. It should not be forgotten that this universe was created in this way. Pain, goodness, evil, development, human limitations are all part of this system. Ontologically, we cannot change this structure. Philosophy is the work of grasping and making sense of what is, not imagining what is not in the context of the subject and making judgments based on it.

In philosophy, the construction of thought from what is to what ought to be can be done on changeable phenomena; it has no validity for ontological situations. Moreover, this attitude is not a syllogistic method for a deeper understanding of what is, but rather a syllogistic method of thinking better than what is and making judgments about God by drawing inferences from this. Unfortunately, many people think that philosophy is just "*questioning everything*". But questioning also has rules, limits and an internal logic. Randomly saying "*this could have happened, that could have happened*" is not philosophy, it is sophistry. Philosophy is organized thinking. Therefore, a discussion on God must first assume the concept of God correctly, and then produce coherent thought based on this assumption.

For example, an atheist's argument, "*If there is a God, why do children die?*" is merely an emotional response masquerading as a rational one. This discourse does not include a hypothetical framework for the nature of God, nor does it take into account the principle of creation. It is contrary to the nature of philosophy to first reject the concept of God and then try to pass judgment on his actions. This is not a knowledge-based analysis, but an emotional form of criticism based on prejudice. Philosophical discussions or argumentation are meaningful and inclusive when done on rational grounds; otherwise, they are nothing more than hysterical behavior and prevent drawing the right conclusions.

Similarly, the arguments of agnostics such as "*If God exists, why doesn't He show Himself?*" should be evaluated within the same framework. Here too, God's essence, absoluteness and creativity are ignored, and God is questioned from an anthropocentric, limited perception. However, philosophical coherence requires understanding a being within its own limits. One cannot seek meaning by imposing one's own limited perspective on God; this is a reductionist approach, not a rational one.

All these examples show that the discourses of atheists and agnostics claiming to "*philosophize*" are often unsystematic, lack internal coherence and are based on emotional

reactions. Such approaches are sophistry masquerading as philosophical discussion. Philosophy requires conceptual clarity, logical necessity and internal coherence. If any of these are absent, there is no philosophy, only a formal discussion and a confusion of ideas.

In conclusion, the meaningful and constructive nature of a philosophical discussion depends primarily on the correct definition of the concepts used and the logical inferences that can be drawn from these definitions. The concept of God is no exception in this context; it is a conceptual and logical necessity for everyone involved in the discussion to temporarily assume God as the creator, which is the most fundamental characteristic of God. When this principle is not adhered to, the ground for philosophical discussion shifts and is replaced by emotional, superficial and contradictory interpretations.

Questions such as the “*argument from evil*”, “*Why doesn't God show himself?*” or “*Couldn't this world be better?*”, which are often encountered in atheist and agnostic circles, fall into a serious logical error by denying the nature of God while simultaneously holding God to account. This contradictory approach is based not only on the existence of God, but also on the illusion that human beings can judge an absolute being from their own limited perspective. However, philosophy is an effort to produce meaning by evaluating a concept within its own conditions and internal consistency. This production of meaning is based on the existing reality; judging God through hypothetical alternative worlds is not philosophical, but rather an attempt at an imaginary fiction.

In the case of agnosticism, there is a different inconsistency. If an agnostic position argues that metaphysical realities cannot be known with certainty, the logical consequence of this position is to limit the discussion to the level of knowledge. However, in many cases, agnostics violate their own epistemological boundaries when they try to defend the non-existence of God by resorting to atheistic arguments. This transforms agnosticism from an epistemological method into an incoherent discourse. It is therefore philosophically dysfunctional and meaningless.

Consequently, anyone who wants to produce a meaningful discourse in philosophical discussions should ensure conceptual clarity, observe rational consistency, and avoid imposing an anthropocentric perspective on concepts such as God that claim absoluteness. Philosophy aims to understand and make sense of what exists; imagining what does not exist in the context of the subject and making judgments based on it is not philosophy but sophistry. A concept such as God, which contains absoluteness and limitlessness, can only be the subject of meaningful discussion when it can be handled with its own internal limits. Otherwise, the resulting discussions are not philosophical, but merely emotional and prejudiced reactions. A true philosophical approach requires a deep and systematic way of thinking that stays true to concepts and seeks to understand them.