



The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens

Vox Day

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) ➔

The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens

Vox Day

The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens Vox Day

The Irrational Atheist is not a theological work nor is it a conventional religious defense of faith. It contains no arguments for the existence of God and the supernatural, nor is it concerned with evolution, creationism, the age of Earth, or intelligent design. This book contains no arguments from Scripture. In attacking the arguments, assertions, and conclusions of the New Atheists, Vox Day's only weapons are the secular tools of reason, logic, and historically documented, independently verifiable fact.

The Irrational Atheist is not a book about God, but about those who seek to replace Him. In this devastating critique of the anti-theistic arguments of Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris, Christopher Hitchens, Daniel Dennett, and Michel Onfray, Day skillfully demonstrates to even the most skeptical reader that the New Atheists are no champions of Reason, but rather abandon Reason in their arguments against religion. Drawing upon history and philosophers from Socrates to Tupac Shakur, Vox Day combines intellectual precision with a mordant wit in presenting a powerful defense of religion's rightful place in modern society that is as convincing as it is surprising.

The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens **Details**

Date : Published March 11th 2008 by BenBella Books (first published February 1st 2008)

ISBN : 9781933771366

Author : Vox Day

Format : Hardcover 305 pages

Genre : Nonfiction, Religion, Philosophy, Atheism, Theology, Christianity

 [Download The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity o ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens Vox Day

From Reader Review The Irrational Atheist: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens for online ebook

Hp says

What a load of crap.

Adam Simmons says

I am not typically in the habit of writing reviews for books, but in this case, I feel obligated to spare any potential reader the evening or week (depending on time available and reading speed) that might be wasted in reading this book.

Before beginning my review, I would like to note that I do not define myself as an atheist, theist, or agnostic because of the terrible connotations with which they are often associated. In fact, I think labels of this sort lead to unnecessary disputes and hasty condemnations of character. If I were to begrudgingly accept a title of any kind, it would be that of an empirical skeptic.

First of all, if you are looking for any arguments for or against the existence of god, this is not the book for you. If you are looking for even the most elementary of philosophical arguments or scientific disputes regarding the basis of theistic or atheistic postulations, this is not the book for you. In fact, the author says so himself in the introduction. For anyone interested in the nature of theories surrounding the question of god, this book is far from helpful and, indeed, it never claims to be.

(On another note, If you are looking for a comprehensive outline of philosophical arguments on the matter, I would recommend the following books:

1. Critique of Religion and Philosophy by Walter Kaufmann
2. The Miracle of Theism: Arguments for and Against the Existence of God by John Leslie Mackie

If you want a serious look at all of the arguments for and against god, these books are as in-depth and far-reaching as they get.)

The only thing I can honestly say this book makes any serious attempt to do is to show that the new atheist movement is extreme and the leaders of the movement: Dawkins, Dennett, Hitchens, etc. are not fit for the task.

Outside of this, the book is nothing more than one odd amalgamation of hand-picked statistics and historical references that serve to bolster the complex melange of personal attacks and random references to the author's own political and social views.

Although the truth-value of statements are not invalidated by the character of those who wrote them, it may prove useful to do a little bit of research on the author (Vox Day) before reading this book, if only to gain an idea of where he is coming from. Because I do not want to be hypocritical in the way that the author was by using personal attacks as substitute (or as supplement, at the very least) to scholarly critique, I can only encourage you to investigate some of his views for yourselves; you may find his opinions on race, gender, etc. a bit curious.

Rather than go any further with my own observations, I have provided a list of direct quotes with page numbers that outline a few of the author's "Intellectual Arguments" in *The Irrational Atheist.*

Enjoy!

(Page Numbers Correspond to Word Document Version)

1. "Richard Dawkins is wrong. Daniel C. Dennett is wrong. Christopher Hitchens is drunk, and he's wrong. Michel Onfray is French, and he's wrong. Sam Harris is so superlatively wrong that it will require the development of esoteric mathematics operating simultaneously in multiple dimensions to fully comprehend the orders of magnitude of his wrongness." - Page 10
2. "There's mediocre prose, there's bad prose, and then there's Sam Harris waxing creative. How he didn't win a Bulwer-Lytton award for that ghastly first page of The End of Faith, I'll never know. When he's not being self-consciously literate, his writing is all right, but light a candle to St. Darwin and pray that he never decides to inflict a novel on humanity." - Page 19
3. "Agnostic: "I don't believe there is a God. Because I haven't seen the evidence."
Atheist: "There is no God. Because I'm an asshole."" - Page 21
4. "High Church atheism may be little more than a mental disorder taking the form of a literal autism." - Page 21
5. "It's not difficult to falsify Christianity, however. Ergo, Christianity is science." - Page 35
6. "The supposed incompatibility between religion and science can't be all that great if it is necessary to threaten the Islamic Republic with air strikes and invasion in order to prevent its scientists from performing research in unapproved areas." - Page 45
7. "I am a global warming skeptic myself. Greenland is still colder now than it was when Norse settlers were raising crops there in the eleventh century. So I don't see why a return to those temperatures should present a problem. Of course, when you grew up waiting for the school bus in 40 below zero wind chills, global warming just doesn't sound all that ominous." - Page 50
8. One could certainly argue that the threat to humanity from science is not really all that dire, but then it would be necessary to admit that religious faith poses no threat to humanity either, thus demonstrating Harris's thesis to be entirely bankrupt. - Page 52
9. "The end of science is a much more practical goal for the benefit of humanity than the end of faith." - Page 58
10. "This poses a real danger to the credibility of science, which is particularly ill-timed in light of the very real danger that science presently poses to humanity. After all, it would be far easier to eliminate a few hundred thousand scientists, even a few million scientists, than 4.85 billion religious adherents." - Page 64
11. "History demonstrates that the ambitious atheist who seeks political power is significantly more likely to reject the moral proscription on things such as slaughtering large numbers of people who stand in the way of establishing a godless utopia.

The peg-legged crack whore, on the other hand, only wants to shift agricultural subsidies from cereal crops to coca plants and poppies and install disco balls in the White House. This is why the philosopher John Locke reached the conclusion that atheists could be tolerated in civil society, so long as they were not permitted to hold positions of political authority." - Page 67

12. "Hitchens, meanwhile, is almost completely indifferent to getting either the science or the theology straight. (He's just a journalist after all; he's not expected to.)" - Page 69

13. "The undeniable fact is that the absurdity most often believed by those who have committed Man's greatest atrocities is that there is no God." - Page 80

14. "History clearly demonstrates that religious faith is not a tool in the hands of those who practice the arts of war." - Page 95

15. "Lennon was a talented musician, but he was also the English equivalent of the kid who has to take the GED instead of the SAT. And then fails it." - Page 98

16. "Religious war is actually less lethal to Americans than their dogs, as they annually suffer 15.7 fatalities due to dog bites." - Page 101

17. "The historical evidence is conclusive. Religious faith very seldom causes war, either implicitly or explicitly. Therefore, God is not the problem." - Page 110

18. "Sam Harris is an ignorant, incompetent, and intellectually dishonest individual who attacks religious faith because it stands in the way of his dream of the ultimate destruction of America." - Page 113

19. "It's worth noting that Harris has probably caused greater human unhappiness with his books than the serial killer, Jeffrey Dahmer, ever did with his exotic diet of human flesh, so by his own reckoning, Harris is less moral than Dahmer." - Page 117

20. "At Richard Dawkins's core is a band geek who is unable to accept the reality that marching tubas and embroidered uniforms will never impress the girls. For all its passionate and detailed explanations of water droplets and entirely new variants of suns, Unweaving the Rainbow ultimately amounts to little more than an unconvincing and repetitive refrain of "This one time, at band camp . . ." - Page 138

Outi says

Couldn't even finish. POS.

Kevin Sweet says

I made it to chapter 4. I really gave it my best. I Just finished reading all of the Four Horsemen books, and I found this book lying around at my parent's house, so I thought, why not?

Vox Day (a pen name, which means "Voice of God" in Latin) is an alt-right nutjob. He writes in the preface that this book isn't in any way a defense of religion. Instead, it's a book entirely about destroying the arguments of Harris, Dawkins, Hitchens, and sometimes Dennett when it's convenient.

Basically, he takes a sentence out of context from one of these authors, misrepresents its original intention, and spends five pages condescendingly explaining why he disagrees. It reads like an angry blog post. As it turns out, "blogger" is Day's only credential, as he runs an alt-right blog. He admits in the Acknowledgements section that he has already blogged about this material and received feedback from his followers. So *that's* why it reads like a blog post.

I had to stop reading when he tried to argue that atheists should never have been able to hold political offices. I was making notes in the margins of the book (typically there wasn't enough space), but at that point, what is there to say? Oh, you think that atheists aren't capable of holding public office. Okay, I think we're done here!

Priest Apostate says

Claiming to use logic to dissect your opponents' arguments -- only to then expect the reader to accept your claim of deity as a premise is rather insulting.

Charlotte says

"Vox Day" is the absolute stupidest pseudonym I have ever heard in my life. Oh, well, whatever, I guess I can't blame a guy whose real name is "Theodore Beale" for changing his name in order to sound cool and hip. (No offense to any normal person out there named "Theodore" or "Beale".)

This book is stuffed full of stupidity. Mr. Vox Day (chuckle) fancies himself a genius (he really does), and you can clearly see this from the way he thinks his ridiculous arguments are completely correct. Sigh... oh well, at least he's in the minority.

1 star, obviously.

piranha says

If someone feels moved to go to great lengths to tell you that they're a genius -- they're probably not. A membership in Mensa does not bestow wisdom either.

I concur that Dawkins is an arrogant jerk, but so is Vox Day, and he has rather less to show for. I find Christian dominionism as attractive as the equivalent Islamic version -- thanks, but no thanks to arguments that claim some inherent superiority elevating Christians over anyone else. This book is wholly self-indulgent, and argues in bad faith (there is no actual dichotomy between strong atheism and evangelical Christianity; the world of spirituality and morality encompasses many more choices). If you only ever discuss your faith with arrogant jerks who haven't actually thought through the arguments they're regurgitating wholesale from prominent new atheists, then this will give you ammunition to engage in

flamewars with them on the internet -- if that is your life's goal, by all means, go ahead and waste your energy.

If you've long grown beyond that, pass on this book. Seriously, if you are a believer, why do you even care? No atheist will knock on your door trying to convert you, nobody's absence of faith impacts yours at all. And if you take the fight to them, you will convince nobody with these arguments -- atheists simply do not accept them as superior because you are arguing from an authority that is as unreal to them as unicorns. Read some of the great religious thinkers instead, it'll be more personally rewarding. Same goes for fellow atheists, actually. Don't go for the low-hanging fruit to hone your thinking skills.

Rod says

Now that was fun. (and a bit nasty!)

I enjoyed every second of the ridicule towards Richard Dawkins, Sam Harris, and Christopher Hitchens. I've been tolerating their (for entertainment only) abuse for a decade now - it's great to see someone throw it back in their faces. These people really are idiots and horrible scholars, and Vox Day just helped us to see exactly how.

I'm still not fully sure what exactly Vox believes as far as Biblical Christianity goes. He tends to lean in the correct direction - and he's extremely rebellious and snarky LIKE ME (I think Elijah and a few other Biblical prophets had that same problem.) But at the end of the day: truth is truth, and it must be defended and shared.

,
Mark 16:15

And he said to them, "Go into all the world and proclaim the gospel to the whole creation.

Matthew 24:14

And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come.

Psalms 96:3

Declare his glory among the nations, his marvelous works among all the peoples!

To share the truth in LOVE is not always a pleasant thing. It seems Paul, Peter and Stephen had dangerous results when speaking the truth. If everyone is glad to hear your message - it's probably the wrong message.
:D

Roswitha says

Vox Day is very specifically NOT making a case for Christianity. He is setting about to examine, dissect, and ultimately disprove claims made by prominent Atheists, using only history, logic, and reason as his tools. In this he succeeds very well; *The Irrational Atheist* is a stimulating work which provides an intellectual challenge to understand, even to the Christian.

Vox is an outspoken Christian; and although he holds some beliefs that I don't really see as biblical, he nevertheless is an extremely intelligent, shrewd individual, and TIA goes a long way to show that the so-called intellectual reasons to disdain religion are actually almost universally groundless.

Ryan says

This book is simply extraordinary: Compelling, arch but not snarky, and delightfully readable.

If one can know a man by the enemies he makes, the 1-star reviews (and how poorly they're written) sing lustily the praises of Vox.

thecryptile says

Vox Day doesn't even attempt to prove the existence of God, but he does prove that Dawkins is a total asshat. The Irrational Atheist is a thought provoking read for skeptics and believers alike.

Paul says

For the most part, Day attempts to show the factual errors in many of the claims made by the new atheists. He succeeds.

This doesn't do much for me. I'm not saying that this is wrong, in principle. But it doesn't move the discussion where it needs to go, in my opinion. Rather than looking at the statistics of, say, how many wars have been caused by religion, one can simply point out that *even if* this were true the Bible claims that men are sinners and will do evil things. So, to point out that men do evil things is *confirmation* of the biblical claims about anthropology rather than *disconfirmation*.

I'd also rather the discussion go to the philosophical presuppositions rather than ending at statistics. I know Day said this wasn't his goal...but.

He also seemed a bit too dismissive of a few theological arguments viz. the ontological argument, experiential argument, etc. These are much stronger than he leads on. Furthermore, some of them need not be taken as reasons for the *unbeliever* to believe but, rather, reasons why the *believer* believes. In other words, they can serve as reasons or evidence for the believer, thus serving a value for *him*.

One of the reviewers below commented that we do have scientific evidence that our mother exists. Well, we don't. Saying that, "You've seen your mom, you've hugged your mom, and your mom has told you she loves you," doesn't count as scientific evidence. Hugging some person who *says* she is your mom doesn't entail that she is. And, furthermore, in this objection, since the Bible is taken to be God's revelation that he exists and loves us, then I guess we do have "scientific evidence" that God exists and loves us--he told us he did! Now, if the reviewer says: "But you can't trust that the Bible is his word," then you can't trust your "mother's" word. Furthermore, why should I believe you have a mother? You could say that *you* have seen her. Okay, but then people say Jesus, who was God in human flesh. So, we could just ask them. if you are saying that everyone must personally see another's mom in order to conclude they have a mother, then I must

believe that 99% of the people I see don't have mothers!

Unfortunately, the reviewer misunderstands Day's argument. Day states that: "While it is reasonable to state that you have not seen any evidence for God's existence, it is illogical and incorrect to assert that no such evidence exists" (IA, 253).

Okay, so Day is clearly implying that he believes said evidence does exist. He says it is fine to say that you have not seen any. What would one "base" this claim on? Says Day: "Once can certainly state that no scientific evidence for God exists, based on its absence from scientific literature" (ibid, p. 253)

So, are we following? Day is saying that the person who says "there is no evidence" is justified in saying that in the sense that said person has not seen the evidence for God in the "scientific literature." That would be the published journals, books, etc.

Day then goes on to rightfully claim: "But then there is no scientific evidence that your mother exists, much less that she loves you" (ibid, 253). Here's the point: Sticking with Day's context, he is claiming that there is no scientific evidence that your mother exists "based on" the scientific journals!

Day isn't claiming that there is no scientific evidence that could be produced whatever. Just as he wasn't admitting that about God. His context is that one can't reason from the evidence that they've seen to the conclusion that there is no evidence whatever therefore we should suspend belief in God, or else the person, if consistent, would have to reason that way with respect to their own mother.

And, the broader evidentialist constraint as applied to religion is false. There are many things that we don't have propositional evidence for, such as: the existence of a past, other minds, the reliability of memory, sense perception, etc. Moreover, the evidentialist theists boils down to an infinite regress. If you must have evidence for any belief to be rationally held, then what is the evidence for *this* belief? If you give it, then do you believe that the evidence supports your first belief? If so, then to rationally believe it you must provide evidence for this *new* belief. *Ad infinitum*.

In this Day would be correct. Unfortunately he doesn't go through what I just did above. The absence of almost any philosophical analysis made this book far weaker than it could have been.

I also have no idea why the subtitle read: Dissecting the Unholy Trinity of Dawkins, Harris, and Hitchens. The book mentioned Dan Dennett just as much as Hitchens, and Michael Onfrey only slightly less.

Now, there was some funny rhetoric employed by Day, but this got old real fast. I'd say Wilson's response to Harris employed rhetoric much better.

Though I thought the book could have been more potent, it will serve useful to have in your library as a reference to some statistics in response to some statistical claims made by the New Atheists. But I doubt anything in here will convince any New Atheist of any major flaws in the arguments of Dawkins et. al. That's because she flies by the seat of her emotional pants in rejecting Christianity. Argument isn't always effective against emotional temper tantrums.

Alyssa says

This guy says things like "the Christian God, the god towards whom Dawkins directs the great majority of his attacks, makes no broad claims to omniscience". His "logic" is all very loose. A lot of the book seems to assume that people are idiots, and they must be if he's smarter than them, which he also seems to assume- he's in mensa, after all. He seems to make fun or scoff at people who never graduated high school a lot, but then he also implies that educational degrees are no more than "pieces of paper collected from paper-selling institutions". His arguments are petty and not logically sound. His chapter "occam's chainsaw" he describes atheist arguments for why god does not exist. The major argument I've heard is lack of evidence. He decides this is a good rebuttal to there being no evidence of God: "But then, there is no scientific evidence that your mother exists, either, much less that she loves you." You've seen your mom, you've hugged your mom, and your mom has told you she loves you. Those are all physically measurable things. An objective observer would come to the same conclusion. That is what scientific evidence means. Oh well, I got a good laugh out of the book.

Hind says

Video game blogger turned theology academic, enough said.

Michael Johnson says

I loved this book. Vox lays out the case that science, instead of religion, is responsible for the most destruction on this planet; all the while showing facts and statistics to back it up. He dices through Hitchens, Harris, and Dawkins with ease, sparing Dennett and his beard. Pick this book up ASAP and check his blog out also.
