

Errata

Summary

Radikálna kritika náboženstva v novoateizme z pohľadu súčasnej teológie

Radical critique of religion in new atheism from the view of today's theology

Bc. Balázs Szamaranszky

This master thesis gives insight to debates between, so-called new-atheist and contemporary Christian theologians. The time for evaluation of these discussions is proper, because the most influential books were published and debates seem to be over. On top of it one of the main new-atheist characters, Christopher Hitchens, died of cancer in 15.12.2011.

The insight is provided by giving a clear view of new-atheist arguments divided to typological groups. It summarizes new-atheist arguments, thus it can be correlated with theological arguments. Methodology is a careful analysis of new-atheist and theological works regarding to the critique of religion or new-atheism. The methodology should provide a good basis for correlating and evaluation of arguments from both sides.

New-atheist arguments were divided into two main groups: critique of religion's metaphysical claims and critique of religion as a phenomenon in the world. The first group includes critique of noetic basis of religion, the "gap" concept, evidences of God's existence, anthropic principle, ideas of infinite regress, probability of God's existence and problem of miracles. The second group reflects the new-atheist view of religion as a natural phenomenon, that can be described as a sole phenomenon. Here belongs: religion and morals, religion and fundamentalism, formation and evolution of religion, critique of the idea of "pious scientists". The critique of new-atheists relies on three basic theses: religion is not proven and can't be proved, religion is corrupted in its roots, God is an unpleasant character. From these basic claims the critique evolved. In correlation theologians based their critique on three basic theses: Christianity can be rationally well-based, religion can be misused, God is good. Theologians reacted with these basic arguments: new-atheism is ignoring contemporary rigorous theology and atheism, it simplifies and misleads, it criticizes a bad image of religion - it criticizes a caricature, it reduces faith just on fundamentalism, dogmatic and extremist thinking, it is motivated by politics and ideology.

I found out that theologians reacted on all of significant new-atheist arguments, but some of the reactions were not appropriate. Theological reaction could have been more extensive and pluralistic. This thesis shows weaknesses of the theological reactions in describing noetic base for Christian worldview, for new-atheism have not proposed a good basis for atheistic noetics. Same applies to basis for morals. Theologians have not reacted on "God's whip", terror from hell, or on

all-seeing God's eye as a camera behind your shoulder. Theologians could have mention reformed attitude to ethics, where a good deed is a result of relationship with God and not *vice versa*. Ethics are born „*sponte et hilaiter*” and not as a reaction to hell.