

REASON & REVELATION

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES

January 2007
Vol. 27, No. 1

MILITANT ATHEISM

Eric Lyons, M.Min. and Kyle Butt, M.A.

The stereotypical scientist in a white lab coat who follows the facts wherever they may lead, and reports those data without prejudice, often does not correspond to reality these days. In fact, a large majority of scientists now believe that God does not exist. These scientists feel that they should militantly spread their ideas of atheism and evolution as far and wide as possible. They abhor the idea of a supernatural Creator and believe it should be eradicated from human consciousness. Just how determined are some of the leading atheistic evolutionists to expunge theism from the world? A recent issue of the journal *New Scientist*, which just celebrated its 50th anniversary, sheds some light on the subject. In an article titled, "In Place of God: Can Secular Science Ever Oust Religious Belief—and Should It Even Try?," Michael Brooks recounted a recent meeting of "some of the leading practitioners of modern science" in La Jolla, California (2006, 192[2578]:8). They had gathered to discuss, among other questions, "Should science do away with religion?" Their answers are alarming. [NOTE: The following quotations are extracted from Brooks' report.]

Cosmologist Steven Weinburg was first to address the question, "Should science do away with religion?" He responded with an unequivocal "yes," saying: "The world needs to wake up from the

long nightmare of religion.... **Anything** we scientists can do to weaken the hold of religion should be done, and may in fact be our **greatest contribution to civilization**" (p. 9, emp. added). Since scientists at the symposium used the terms "religion" and "God" interchangeably, Weinburg in essence was saying that ridding **God** from the world would be one of science's greatest achievements. He seemed so certain that scientists could achieve this goal that he actually admitted he would "miss it once it was gone" (p. 9). How were Weinberg's comments received, you might ask? According to attendee Michael Brooks, he received "a rapturous response" (p. 9), before being heavily criticized by some, such as Richard Dawkins, surprisingly enough, "for not being tough enough on religion" (p. 9).

Dawkins, who is perhaps the most celebrated evolutionist alive today, was one of the most militant atheists at the conference. He stated: "I am utterly fed up with the respect we have been brainwashed into bestowing upon religion," i.e., God (p. 9; cf. Ecclesiastes 12:12-13). Passive atheism apparently should not be tolerated. Dawkins is "ready to mobilize" his "big...enthusiastic choir" of evolutionary colleagues (p. 11). He said: "There's a certain sort of negativity you get from people who say 'I don't like religion but you can't do anything about it.' That's a real counsel of defeatism. **We should roll our**

sleeves up and get on with it" (p. 11, emp. added). Dawkins even compared evolutionary scientists' position in the 21st century to that of homosexuals in the late 1960s: everyone needs to be "willing to stand up and be counted," so that "they could change things" (p. 11).

Dawkins likely called for such drastic action because he has seen atheism lose some of its battles. In his book, *The Blind Watchmaker*, he admitted that modern creationists have been "disturbingly successful" in their attempts to combat evolution in "American education and text-

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Militant Atheism

Eric Lyons and Kyle Butt 1

America and Atheistic Evolutionists

Dave Miller 6

DEPARTMENTS

Speaking Schedules 5

Note from the Editor

A.P. Bound Volumes for a New Year 8

RESOURCES

A.P. in the Thick of It 1-R

The Internet, A.P., and You 4-R

Will You Help? 4-R

www.ApologeticsPress.org

book publishing” (1996, p. 241). He also wrote: “There are still those who seek to deny the truth of evolution, and there are disturbing signs that their influence is even growing, at least in local areas of the United States” (p. x). The influence of anti-evolutionists disturbs Dawkins greatly—so much so that he and his colleagues feel compelled to advance evolution, while doing “away with religion” (Brooks, 192[2578]:9).

Evolutionist Neil deGrasse Tyson of the Hayden Planetarium in New York “spoke with an evangelist’s zeal” (p. 10, emp. added). He referred to a recent poll taken of members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences which revealed that 15 percent did not indicate they were atheists, and asked: “How come the number isn’t zero?... That should be the subject of everybody’s investigation. That’s something that we can’t just sweep under the rug” (p. 10). To Tyson, theistic members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences represent “a problem that needs to be addressed” (p. 10). One wonders what Tyson would suggest if Louis Pasteur, Isaac Newton, Carolus Linnaeus, and other brilliant **theistic** scientists from the past were members of this group? Kick them out for not being atheists, even though

their contributions to science likely far exceed any efforts put forth by most current members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences? Even the staunch evolutionist Niles Eldredge admitted that “all the great biologists and geologists prior to Darwin were, in some sense at least, creationists” (2001, p. 49).

Dr. Harry Kroto of Florida State University also stepped forward at the conference declaring himself “ready to fight the good fight” (Brooks, 192[2578]:11). He proposed the launching of “a coordinated global effort at education, media outreach and campaigning on behalf of science,” using especially the Internet to take evolutionary science into every home (p. 11). If you think students in private religious schools will be untouched and invulnerable to the efforts of modern-day evolutionists, consider that Kroto has these schools in his sights as well. He declared: “We must try to work against faith schooling” (p. 11).

Michael Brooks summarized the overall attitude at the La Jolla, California symposium in the following words: “science **can** take on religion and **win**” (p. 11, emp. added). So, in the words of Richard Dawkins, “We [evolutionists—EL/

KB] should roll our sleeves up and get on with it” (p. 11).

The irony of this militant attitude toward religion is that evolutionists sometimes downplay such aggressive tactics in an attempt to lull the religious populace into thinking that no battle is taking place. Niles Eldredge, the Curator in the Department of Invertebrate Paleontology at the American Museum of Natural History, wrote a book titled *The Triumph of Evolution and the Failure of Creationism*. In that book, he said: “Creationists have spuriously convinced many citizens that huge hunks of science are antithetical to their religious beliefs” (2001, p. 174). One would not have to read past the first page of Brooks’ *New Scientist* article to understand that the evolutionists themselves openly admit that their atheistic, evolutionary beliefs are antithetical to religion. To add further irony to Eldredge’s statement, the back of his book quotes *Booklist* as saying that Eldredge’s book is “a clarion call rallying evolutionist [sic] to battle.”

IT STARTS EARLY AND STAYS LATE

In the mid-1990s, philosopher Daniel Dennett wrote a book titled *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea*. Leading evolutionists such as Richard Dawkins, Steven Pinker, Philip Kitcher, and Edward O. Wilson highly recommended the book, calling it “surpassingly brilliant” and “essential,” as it persuades readers that “evolution by natural selection is vital to the future of philosophy.” One of the most disturbing comments in Dennett’s book concerned parents who teach their children (among other things) “that ‘Man’ is **not** a product of evolution” (1995, p. 519, emp. added). Dennett wrote: “[T]hose of us who have freedom of speech will feel free to describe your teachings as the spreading of falsehoods, and will attempt to demonstrate this to your children at our earliest opportunity” (p. 519). Notice the jab at religious parents—accusing them of lying and not “freely” telling the truth about man’s origins. More im-

Reason & Revelation is published monthly by Apologetics Press, Inc. Periodicals postage paid at Montgomery, AL. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Reason & Revelation, 230 Landmark Dr., Montgomery, AL 36117; ISSN:[1542-0922] USPS# 023415.

Reason & Revelation is a non-profit, tax-exempt work dedicated to the defense of New Testament Christianity. Copyright © 2006. All rights reserved.

Editor:

Dave Miller, Ph.D.*
(*Communication, Southern Illinois University)

Associate Editor:

Kyle Butt, M.A.*
(*New Testament, Freed-Hardeman University)

Annual Subscription Rates:

\$10.00 Domestic
\$ 8.00 Domestic Bulk
(5+ to same address)
\$16.00 Canada & Overseas Airmail

General inquiries, changes of address, or international callers:

Phone: (334) 272-8558
Fax: (334) 270-2002

Orders:

Phone: (800) 234-8558
Fax: (800) 234-2882

On-line Web store/catalog, subscription order/renewal form, current issues, archives, and other information (all orders processed on a secure server):

URL: www.ApologeticsPress.org
E-mail: mail@ApologeticsPress.org

Discovery—Scripture & Science for Kids is a sister publication for children. For more information, please contact our offices or visit the *Discovery* Web site at:

URL: www.DiscoveryMagazine.com

portant, observe how he then proceeded to testify that evolutionists like himself will endeavor to convince the children of theists that evolution is not fiction, but a fact that will be communicated “**at our earliest opportunity.**” How early? Consider one example.

The toddler pop-up “history” book titled *Life on Earth* was published in 2002 by Barron’s Educational Series. It is 21 pages of colorful illustrations, captivating pop-ups, and evolutionary dogma. It tells the story of evolution with less than 10 words per page. Beginning with “the first living things” in the seas, it proceeds with fish crawling out onto land and becoming amphibians. It then tells of the reptiles’ appearance, followed by the mammals, and eventually the first “hairy” humans. In case a child misses the point of the book, placed strategically just above a baby in diapers sliding down the tail of a large dinosaur, the text on the back cover reinforces the main point: “Millions of years ago life on Earth started in the oceans. Then it moved onto the land and eventually led to YOU!”

Those who teach evolution target children. Niles Eldredge wrote: “I maintain my conviction that the real **battleground** is in the classroom” (2001, p. 157, emp. added). In the same book, he asserted: “The real **battle** is still being fought at school board meetings and in public school classrooms” (p. 149, emp. added). Notice the military terminology used. Mark it down. Many within the evolutionary community recognize that the ideas of a supernatural God and organic evolution are at war. Eldredge and others offer a glimpse into their battle strategy: start early in the school system.

Near the end of his book, Eldredge included a list from Eugenie Scott, Director of the National Center for Science Education, of 25 things “parents, teachers, and even scientists” can do to help evolution win its battle over creation. The number one item listed: “Donate books and videos about evolution to **school and public libraries**” (p. 178, emp. added). Number eight: “Share your

views with **school board members**, legislators, textbook commissioners, and other **educational policy makers**” (p. 179, emp. added). Number 16: “PARENTS: Make sure your child’s teacher knows s/he has your support for teaching about evolution” (p. 179). Number 22: “K-12 TEACHERS: Work with your colleagues to create a supportive atmosphere in your school and community” (p. 180). Number 23: “K-12 TEACHERS: Work with colleagues to develop or publicize workshops and in-service units about evolution; take advantage of them yourself” (p. 180). A cursory reading of the list shows exactly the primary target of evolutionists: children and educational systems.

Dr. Dennett and his band of evolutionary guerillas are serious about teaching evolution at the “**earliest opportunity.**” It can start with what parents perceive as “innocent” pop-up books, and continue into elementary school, middle school, and high school. Then, generally with more fervor than ever before, many evolutionary college professors make it their mission to verbally beat God out of their students. Sometime ago a gentleman visited one of our creation/evolution seminars. He had attended a well-known university in the southeastern United States. He recounted how he entered one of his science classes at the beginning of the semester, and heard his professor ask the class to stand up if they believed in God. Seven individuals stood up. The professor then went on to say that by the end of the semester not one of them would stand up when he asked that question. Sure enough, toward the end of the semester the professor posed the question again, “How many of you believe in God?” Only one student stood up.

WHERE WILL IT LEAD?

If militant evolutionists have their way, what ultimately will become of non-conformists and disbelievers of evolutionary theory? Let us allow the evolutionists themselves to tell us. Richard Dickerson, a molecular biologist, wrote an article ti-

tled “The Game of Science.” In that article, he insisted that science cannot tolerate a supernatural Creator Who would perform miracles or create the Universe in six, 24-hour days. He also proposed that real science never can resort to invoking miracles as a legitimate explanation for anything that happens in the real world. Dickerson said: “[I]nvolving miracles and special creation violates the rules of the game of science and inhibits progress” (as quoted in Scott, 2004, p. 254). According to Dickerson, then, what should be done with any person who does believe in a supernatural Creator and a straightforward reading of Genesis 1? He is quick to offer his opinion. He says: “People who do not understand that concept (evolution—EL/KB) can never be **real** scientists, and should not be allowed to misrepresent science to young people from whom the ranks of the next generation of scientists will be drawn” (as quoted in Scott, p. 254, emp. added). Richard Dawkins quipped: “No **serious** biologist doubts the fact that evolution has happened, nor that all living creatures are cousins of one another” (1996, p. 287, emp.).

Consider one example of intolerance toward creationism in 2002 at Texas Tech University. When undergraduate student Micah Spradling requested a letter of recommendation from a biology instructor in order to enroll in a pre-medical program, Professor Michael Dini informed him that he needed to “truthfully and forthrightly” believe in human evolution to receive a letter of recommendation” (see Kitchen, 2002). At the time, Dr. Dini’s Web site contained the following defense of why he asked students if they believed in the factuality of evolution:

Why do I ask this question? Let’s consider the situation of one wishing to enter medical school. Whereas medicine is historically rooted first in the practice of magic and later in religion, modern medicine is an endeavor that springs from the sciences, biology first among these. The central, unifying principle of biology is the theory of evolution, which includes both micro- and macro-evolution, and which

extends to all species. How can someone who does not accept the most important theory in biology expect to properly practice in a field that is so heavily based on biology? It is hard to imagine how this can be so, but it is easy to imagine how physicians who ignore or neglect the Darwinian aspects of medicine or the evolutionary origin of humans can make bad clinical decisions....

Good medicine, like good biology, is based on the collection and evaluation of physical evidence. So much physical evidence supports the evolution of humans from non-human ancestors that one can validly refer to the “fact” of human evolution, even if all of the details are not yet known. One can deny this evidence only at the risk of calling into question one’s understanding of science and of the method of science. Such an individual has committed malpractice regarding the method of science, for good scientists would never throw out data that do not conform to their expectations or beliefs. This is the situation of those who deny the evolution of humans; such a one is throwing out information because it seems to contradict his/her cherished beliefs (as quoted in Thompson and Harrub, 2002).

In the eyes of some, such as Dr. Dini, it is no longer acceptable simply to **know** about the theory of evolution and be able to discuss it intelligently. Now, if you do not profess it, even though, admittedly, it is still simply a “theory” and “all of the details are not yet known,” you may risk the opportunity to further your education—a risk that Christians must be willing to take.

In 2003, following an investigation by the U.S. Justice Department, Dr. Dini supposedly “eliminated the evolution belief requirement from his recommendation policy and replaced it with a requirement that students be able to explain the theory of evolution” (Taylor, 2003, 27[4]:6). The **wording** in Dr. Dini’s policy changed to the following: “How do you account for the scientific origin of the human species? If you will not give a **scientific** answer to this question, then you

should not seek my recommendation” (as quoted in Taylor, 27[4]:6, emp. added).

Notice that Dr. Dini simply changed his criteria to demand a “scientific” answer. Yet, when one explores the writings of these militant evolutionists, it becomes apparent that the word “scientific” is simply a synonym for “evolutionary.” For instance, Eugenie Scott wrote: “To scientists, using God to explain natural phenomena of **any kind** violates the practice of methodological naturalism, in which scientific explanations are limited only to natural causes” (2004, p. 119, emp. added). In other words, any idea that contains a hint of a supernatural, non-material Creator is, according to their definition, “unscientific.” In the National Academy of Science’s book *Science and Creationism*, the “steering committee” members, such as Stephen J. Gould, Eugenie Scott, Francisco Ayala, and others, put it like this: “[T]he teaching of evolution should be an integral part of science instruction, and creation science is in fact not science and should not be presented as such in science classes” (1999, p. 2). How convenient. Simply demand that all answers must be “scientific,” then define scientific as excluding any reference to a supernatural Creator. Needless to say, the great scientists of the past like Newton, Faraday, and Carver never would have accepted such a biased definition of science. Nor should thinking people today allow these sneaky, semantic tactics to go unchallenged and unanswered.

Ultimately, evolutionists would like to marginalize completely those who believe in a supernatural Creator. They would like to relegate all non-evolutionists to a tiny band of “know-nothings,” or as Dawkins puts it, “backwoodsmen” who do not deserve the name “scientist” (1996, p. x). If these militant evolutionists have their way, no creationist will be allowed to enroll in the prestigious institutes of higher learning to earn advanced accredited degrees, much less have the opportunity to teach on college campuses. In the introduction to his 1996 edition of *The Blind Watchmaker*, Dawkins

said as much: “I was reminded of the creationist student who, **through some accident of the selection procedure**, was admitted to the Zoology Department at Oxford University” (p. xi). To Dawkins, and others like him, a “properly” working selection procedure would have disallowed a creationist to enroll in an institute like Oxford, regardless of his or her intellectual accomplishments or abilities. Dawkins’ sentiments are clear from his statement in 1989: “It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane (or wicked, but I’d rather not consider that)” (7:34, parenthetical item in orig.). In contradistinction, the Bible says: “The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God’” (Psalm 14:1; 53:1).

The fact that these militant evolutionists want to silence the idea of creation is ironic in light of beliefs held by Darwin himself. In his book, *Origin of the Species*, Darwin wrote:

I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. **A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question...** (1956, p. 18, emp. added).

Judging from the comments by Dawkins and others, Darwin’s suggestion that both sides should be heard was far too tolerant and soft on the “unscientific” idea of creation.

ACKNOWLEDGE THE WAR! JOIN THE FIGHT!

Highly acclaimed evolutionary scientists recognize that a war is going on—a war between atheistic evolutionary science and anti-evolutionary science. Evolutionists are ready to “get on with it” (Brooks, 192[2578]:11). They are speaking “with an evangelist’s zeal” and

are “ready to fight the good fight” (pp. 10,11). Even now, they are attempting to position themselves to set evolution “in place of God” (p. 8).

Creationists must not shy away from this battle. We, too, must roll up our sleeves and heed the apostle Paul’s admonition to “fight the good fight of faith” (1 Timothy 6:10). We must strive to “speak the words of truth and reason” (Acts 26:25), and “be ready to give a defense to everyone” (1 Peter 3:15). Indeed, “the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God” (2 Corinthians 10:4-5).

What can creationists do? How can we fight against atheistic evolutionary science? If evolutionists have benefited from Eugenie Scott’s to-do list for the advancement of evolution, perhaps it is fitting to close this article with a list of suggestions for creationists in their fight against atheistic evolution.

1. **Recognize** that there is a battle over the most fundamental pillar of Christianity (the existence of God), and **resolve** to do **something**.
2. Begin teaching your children, grandchildren, nephews, nieces,

etc. the case **for** creation and the case **against** evolution before they ever enter school. Then continue this instruction as they get older.

3. Encourage your children to ask questions about God, creation, and evolution. If you don’t answer their questions, someone will—and that someone probably will be an evolutionist.
 4. Give your children (and yourself!) the tools needed to build a strong faith—one that is based on both reason and revelation.
 5. Familiarize yourself with Web sites such as ApologeticsPress.org and ChristianCourier.com, which provide immediate answers to many of your questions. They also aid students with term papers, reports, speeches, etc.
- [The final five suggestions are adapted from Eugenie Scott’s list (see Eldredge, 2001, pp. 178-180).]
6. Donate books and videos about creation to school and public libraries.
 7. Make it a point to share your views about **creation** with school board members, legislators, textbook commissioners, and other educational policy makers.
 8. Let your children’s teachers know that they have your support if they choose to teach about the

errors and weaknesses of evolutionary theory.

9. Attempt to create an open-minded atmosphere in your school and community, so that creation and evolution can both be discussed.
10. Work with parents, teachers, churches, etc. to develop or publicize workshops or seminars about the errors of evolution and the evidence for God’s existence.

REFERENCES

- Brooks, Michael (2006), “In Place of God,” *New Scientist*, 192[2578]:8-11.
- Darwin, Charles (1956 edition), *The Origin of Species* (New York: J.M. Dent & Sons).
- Dawkins, Richard (1989), “Book Review,” *The New York Times*, section 7, April 9.
- Dawkins, Richard (1996), *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton).
- Dennett, Daniel (1995), *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster).
- Eldredge, Niles (2001), *The Triumph of Evolution and the Failure of Creationism* (New York, NY: W.H. Freeman).
- Kitchen, Sebastian (2002), “Professor Rigid on Evolution,” *Lubbock Avalanche-Journal*, A-1,9, October 6.
- Life on Earth* (2002), (Hauppauge, NY: Barron’s Education Series).
- Science and Creationism* (1999), (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press), second edition.
- Scott, Eugenie (2004), *Evolution vs. Creationism: An Introduction* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press).
- Taylor, Larry (2003), “Biology Professor Alters Evolution Statement for Recommendations,” *Skeptical Inquirer*, 27[4]:6, July/August.
- Thompson, Bert and Brad Harrub (2002), “Quick, Let’s Discriminate Against the Creationists!” [On-line], URL: <http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/2504>.

SPEAKING SCHEDULES

Kyle Butt

January 20	Leeds, AL	(205) 699-2447
February 2	Pigeon Forge, TN	(256) 764-9642
February 16-18	Pigeon Forge, TN	(423) 476-8941

Eric Lyons

January 1/10	Atlanta, GA	(770) 243-2000
January 19-21	Rockwood, TN	(865) 354-0855
February 4	Clarksburg, TN	(731) 986-3130
February 6	Henderson, TN	(731) 989-6622

Dave Miller

January 7	Jacksonville, AL	(256) 435-9356
January 14	Columbiana, AL	(205) 669-0244
January 19-21	Fredricksburg, TX	(830) 997-4632
January 24	Dalton, GA	(706) 537-3143

America and Atheistic Evolutionists

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

Amid militant cries by evolutionists to ban God from science, the public school, and America, how ironic that such talk is permissible only because America was founded by theists. For some fifty years now, atheistic evolutionists have been chipping steadily away at belief in God and the Christian religion throughout the public school and university system of this country. They have successfully indoctrinated many young people with their godless theory. Virtually every department in state universities has been infiltrated by humanistic presuppositions. Study and research are conducted from an evolutionary, relativistic framework that either jettisons the notion of God altogether, or dilutes it sufficiently to exclude the biblical portrayal of deity. Many American universities are now firmly under the control of atheists, agnostics, and skeptics who forthrightly reject belief in God, embrace a materialistic view of origins, and are determined to eradicate any residue of belief in God that may linger in the minds of their victimized pupils.

But the United States was born under such drastically different circumstances. Indeed, the foundational premise for severing ties with England, and the central rationale and justification for establishing a new nation, was articulated by the Founders in their declared intention to establish their independence (*Declaration of...*, 1776). In the very first sentence of that seminal document, they insisted that “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle[d] them” to achieve “the separate and equal station” of a new nation. The “Nature’s God” to whom they referred was the God of the Bible. In the second sentence they declared that they had been “created” (not evolved) by their “Creator” who invested them with “certain unalienable Rights.” In other words, the American Republic had a right to exist on the basis of the authority of the God

of the Bible. Further, they justified their intentions by “appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world.” And they staked the entire enterprise on “a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence.” Four times in the brief literary missive that launched the United States of America, the Founders alluded to the God of the Bible; yet now, over two centuries later, evolutionists have declared war on those who believe in that God!

The architects of this country would be outraged—and thoroughly alarmed for national survival. As Benjamin Franklin declared to Thomas Paine:

For without the Belief of a Providence that takes Cognizance of, guards and guides and may favour particular Persons, there is no Motive to Worship a Deity, to fear its Displeasure, or to pray for its Protection. **If Men are so wicked as we now see them with Religion what would they be if without it?** I intend this Letter itself as a Proof of my Friendship.... (1840, 10:281-282, emp. added).

John Adams played a central role in the birth of our nation, as delegate to the Continental Congress (1774-1777) where he signed the *Declaration of Independence*, signer of the peace treaty that ended the American Revolution (1783), two-time Vice-President under George Washington (1789-1797), and second President of the United States (1797-1801). In a letter to Thomas Jefferson on April 19, 1817, John Adams insisted: “Without religion this world would be something not fit to be mentioned in polite company, I mean hell” (1856, 10:254). He declared in 1778 that atheism ought to be treated with “horror” and those who embrace it are traitors, hypocrites, and guilty of treason:

The idea of infidelity cannot be treated with too much resentment or too much horror. The man who can think of it with patience is a traitor in his heart and ought to be execrated as one

who adds the deepest hypocrisy to the blackest treason (1977-1989, 6:348).

Writing to Noah Webster on July 20, 1798, Dr. Benjamin Rush, signer of the *Declaration of Independence*, said: “I anticipate nothing but suffering to the human race while the present systems of paganism, deism, and atheism prevail in the world” (1951, 2:799). Another signer of the *Declaration*, Samuel Adams, stated in a letter written in 1772: “I have a thorough contempt for all men...who appear to be the irreclaimable enemies of religion” (1906, 2:381). Signer of the *Constitution*, Gouverneur Morris, insisted in 1816:

There must be religion. When that ligament is torn, society is disjointed and its members perish. The nation is exposed to foreign violence and domestic convulsion. Vicious rulers, chosen by vicious people, turn back the current of corruption to its source. Placed in a situation where they can exercise authority for their own emolument, they betray their trust. They take bribes. They sell statutes and decrees. They sell honor and office. They sell their conscience. They sell their country. By this vile traffic they become odious and contemptible.... But the most important of all lessons is the denunciation of ruin to every State **that rejects the precepts of religion**” (*Collections of...*, 1821, pp. 32,34, emp. added).

Speaking to the senior class at Princeton College in 1775, *Declaration* signer John Witherspoon declared: “Shun, as a contagious pestilence,...those especially whom you perceive to be infected with the principles of infidelity or [who are] enemies to the power of religion” (1802, 6:13).

With uncanny anticipation of the audacious, avowed determination by evolutionists to rid the nation of belief in God, Alexander Hamilton, another signer of the federal *Constitution*, condemned France in 1798 for a comparable aspiration: “The attempt by the rulers of a nation to destroy all religious opinion and

to pervert a whole people to atheism is a phenomenon of profligacy.... [T]o establish atheism on the ruins of Christianity [is] to deprive mankind of its best consolations and most animating hopes and to make a gloomy desert of the universe” (1979, 21:402-404). Also describing France, John Jay, first chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, explained:

During my residence there, I do not recollect to have had more than two conversations with atheists about their tenets. The first was this: I was at a large party, of which were several of that description. They spoke freely and contemptuously of religion. I took no part in the conversation. In the course of it, one of them asked me if I believed in Christ? I answered that I did, and that I thanked God that I did.... Some time afterward, one of my family being dangerously ill, I was advised to send for an English physician who had resided many years at Paris.... But, it was added, he is an atheist.... [D]uring one of his visits, [he] very abruptly remarked that there was no God and he hoped the time would come when there would be no religion in the world. I very concisely remarked that **if there was no God there could be no moral obligations, and I did not see how society could subsist without them...** (Jay, 1833, 2:346-347, emp. added).

Even Benjamin Franklin chided the French with the near absence of atheism in early America:

[B]ad examples to youth are more rare in America, which must be comfortable consideration to parents. To this may be truly added, that serious religion, under its various denominations, is not only tolerated, but respected and practiced. **Atheism is unknown there; infidelity rare and secret;** so that persons may live to a great age in that country, **without having their piety shocked by meeting with either an atheist or an infidel** (1784, p. 24, emp. added).

Even Thomas Paine, who styled himself a deist and opponent of Christianity, nevertheless repudiated the atheism being perpetrated by today’s evolutionists. In his *Age of Reason*, he claimed to believe in God and afterlife: “I believe in one

God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life” (1794). He also wrote: “Were man impressed as fully and as strongly as he ought to be with the belief of a God, his moral life would be regulated by the force of that belief; he would stand in awe of God and of himself, and would not do the thing that could not be concealed from either” (1794). Paine not only believed in “the certainty of his existence and the immutability of his power,” he asserted that “it is the fool only, and not the philosopher, or even the prudent man, that would live as if there were no God.” In fact, he stated that it is “rational to believe” that God would call all people “to account for the manner in which we have lived here” (1794). According to Paine, today’s atheistic evolutionists are imprudent, irrational fools. The psalmist articulated the same conclusion centuries ago when he wrote: “The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God’” (Psalm 14:1; 53:1).

If atheistic evolutionists have their way in this country by having God expunged from public education, according to the Founders of America, this country will become a nightmare—a “gloomy desert,” or as John Adams believed, a living “hell” on Earth. Russia went down the same road of atheistic evolution a century ago. Because of their inability to discern spiritual things (1 Corinthians 2:14), the Soviet cosmonauts looked out of their spacecraft in the 1950s and, in ridicule, asked, “Where is God?,” echoing again the words of the psalmist: “Why should the nations say, ‘Where now is their God?’ But our God is in heaven; He does whatever He pleases” (Psalm 115:2-3). Pride is a deadly pitfall that blinds one to the truth: “The wicked in his proud countenance does not seek God; all his thoughts are, ‘There is no God’” (Psalm 10:4).

The Father of our country, George Washington, would be heartsick to hear the intentions of today’s evolutionists:

I am sure there never was a people who had more reason to acknowledge a Divine interposition in their affairs than those of the United States; and **I should be pained to believe that they have forgotten** that Agency

which was so often manifested during our revolution, or that they failed to consider the omnipotence of **that God who is alone able to protect them** (1838, 10:222-223, emp. added).

Nevertheless, the physical evidence remains abundantly clear: the Universe “declares” the plain work of the Creator (Psalm 19:1). Those who see “the things that are made” and deny the very One Who made them—are “without excuse” (Romans 1:20).

REFERENCES

- Adams, John (1856), *The Works of John Adams, Second President of the United States*, ed. Charles Adams (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, & Co.).
- Adams, John (1977-1989), *The Papers of John Adams*, ed. Robert Taylor (Cambridge: Belknap Press).
- Adams, Samuel (1906), *The Writings of Samuel Adams*, ed. Harry Cushing (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons).
- Collections of the New York Historical Society for the Year 1821* (1821), (New York: E. Bliss & E. White).
- Declaration of Independence* (1776), National Archives, [On-line], URL: <http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/declaration.html>.
- Franklin, Benjamin (1784), *Two Tracts: Information to Those Who Would Remove to America and Remarks Concerning the Savages of North America* (London: John Stockdale).
- Franklin, Benjamin (1840), *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Jared Sparks (Boston, MA: Tappan, Whittemore, & Mason).
- Hamilton, Alexander (1979), *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, ed. Harold Syrett (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Jay, William (1833), *The Life of John Jay* (New York: J. & J. Harper).
- Paine, Thomas (1794), *Age of Reason*, [On-line], URL: <http://www.ushistory.org/paine/reason/singlehtml.htm>.
- Rush, Benjamin (1951), *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, ed. L.H. Butterfield (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Washington, George (1838), *The Writings of George Washington*, ed. Jared Sparks (Boston, MA: Ferdinand Andrews).
- Witherspoon, John (1802), *The Works of the Reverend John Witherspoon* (Philadelphia, PA: William Woodward).

NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

APOLOGETICS
PRESS, INC.

A.P. BOUND VOLUMES FOR A NEW YEAR

The 2006 bound volumes of our two monthly magazines are now complete and ready for shipment from our Montgomery offices. These volumes enable the articles contained therein to remain relevant far beyond the time period during which they were authored. The bound volume of *Reason & Revelation* for 2006 contains articles on such topics as: the intelligent design of the human respiratory, digestive, and muscular systems; America, Christianity, and the Culture War; Answering Christ's Critics; The Predicted Messiah; Reasoning About the Resurrection of Christ; Scientific Foreknowledge and Medical Acumen of the Bible; Tyre in Prophecy; and "The Very Works that I Do Bear Witness of Me" (proofs for the deity of Christ). As always, this beautifully bound annual collation contains all twelve issues for the year, as well as an author/title index and an attractive cover. The bound volume sells for \$10. Previous volumes from 1995-2005 are still available at \$5 each. See the advertisement in the Resources section of this issue for further details.

Additionally, the 2006 bound volume of *Discovery*, our monthly magazine on Scripture and science for children, now is available for \$12. During 2006, *Discovery* contained articles on such timely topics as: Geology; the Church—God's Kingdom; the Value of Human Life (including articles

on abortion, human cloning, and stem cell research); the Story of Job; ants; the Laws of Thermodynamics; Rocks and Gems; A Trip to Washington, D.C.; homosexuality; the National Museum of Natural History; snakes; the divine design of the five senses; and many others. Kyle Butt and Eric Lyons serve as the editor and associate editor of *Discovery*, respectively, and do a marvelous job in ensuring that the content throughout the year is varied

so that children receive well-rounded instruction. We also have in stock bound volumes for 1998-2005.

Please be aware that for both *Discovery* and *Reason & Revelation*, whenever the bound volumes go out of print, they are gone forever; we do not reprint them. So be sure to order your copies soon.

Bound volumes of *Reason & Revelation* and *Discovery* make extremely useful additions to personal, church, or school libraries. They also make valuable gifts for youngsters, men who are attending a preacher-training school, or students in college (especially those majoring in either Bible or science-related fields). Why not consider giving a single volume (or, better yet, an entire set) to someone for their future study and edification?

Dave Miller



*See the Center Spread
for Pricing & Order Details*