

“Atheism” = *a*, negative + *theos*, God. No God. Deny omnip., eternal Creator - “God.”

Atheism glorified:

- “**Wisdom**” - **Rom 1:22** - PhD, “scientist,” etc.
- **Self-fulfillment** - **Rom 1:24** (“lusts of their hearts” - do what want to do)
- **Liberty Rom 1:28** - not “acknow. God” - no Divine moral law

Another picture (TRUTH) of Atheism - Destroys belief in ...

Note: Tho’ you may not be personally bothered by atheism, you *are* impacted by it... observe...

STANDARD OF RIGHT & WRONG- MORAL VALUES

Gen 2:16-17; 3:1f...13f; Ex. 20:1f; Rom 1:28f

Hitler... Rape... Murder... Kidnapping... homosexuality¹

WORTH & DIGNITY OF MAN

Gen 1:26,27; 9:6

Cannibalism...Euthanasia...Breeding...Human testing (China)^{2 3 4}

PURPOSE OF LIFE

Ecc 1:2-3; Lk 12:15f; Rom 11:36; 1 Co 8:6; 2Co 5:15

Death ends all... Terminates all association... This is all there is...

Suicide vs. character

STEWARDSHIP & RESPONSIBILITY

2Co 4:16; 5:10-11; Mt 25

No reward or punishment; Might makes right⁵

REDEMPTION, FORGIVENESS

Jn 3:16; Eph 2:12...13f

No relief of guilt; no love of God; no mercy and grace of the gospel

CONC

- Be aware... **1Pt 5:8**
- Teach children. grandchildren... **Ps 78:3-6**
- Invite open disc. from children... **1Th 5:17; Jn 10:37-38**
- Equip self, others... **Eph 4:13**
- Support preaching, teaching... **3Jn 8**
- Pray that faith not be undermined... **Eph 6:18**
- Build faith through considering evidence
 - Creation - **Psa 19**
 - Revelation - **Jn 20:30-31**

¹ On February 12, 1998 William Provine, a professor in the Department of ecology and evolutionary biology at Cornell University, On the campus of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, said, “**Naturalistic evolution has clear consequences** that Charles Darwin understood perfectly. **1) no gods worth having exist; 2) no life after death exists; 3) no ultimate foundation for ethics exist; 4) no ultimate meaning in life exists; and 5) human free will is nonexistent**” (bold mine, srf) (This and the following quotes are from an article by Kyle Butt, *Reason & Revelation*, 7/2008, “The Bitter Fruits of Atheism,” Part I)

Charles Darwin wrote: “A man who has no assured and ever present believed in the existence of a personal God or of a future existence with retribution and reward, can have for his rule of life, as far as I can see, only to follow those impulses and instincts which are the strongest or which seemed to him the best ones.” *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf)

² “We can no longer base our ethics on the idea that human beings are a special form of creation... Our better understanding of our own nature has bridged the gulf that was once thought to lie between ourselves and other species, so **why should we believe that the mere fact that a being is a member of the species *Homo sapiens* endows life with some unique, almost infinite, value?**... If we compare a severely defective human infant with a nonhuman animal, a dog or a pig, for example, we will often find the nonhuman to have superior capacities, both actual and potential, for rationality, self-consciousness, communication, and anything else that can plausibly be considered morally significant. **Only the fact that the defective infant is a member of the species *Homo sapiens* leads it to be treated differently from the dog or pig. Species membership alone, however, is not morally relevant...** If we can put aside the obsolete and erroneous notion of the sanctity of all human life, we may start to look at human life as it really is: at the quality of life that each human being has or can achieve” Peter Singer, magazine: *Pediatrics*, article: “Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life?” 1983. *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf)

³ Richard Dawkins, in his book, *The God Delusion*, wrote: “The granting of uniquely special rights to cells of the species *Homo sapiens* is hard to reconcile with the fact of evolution... **the humanness of an embryo cells cannot confer upon it any absolute discontinuous moral status**” 2006., *Ibid* (bold mine, srf)

Darwinian James Rachels stated that when a true moral implications of evolution are understood, the

“human alive when no longer be regarded with the kind of superstitious awe which it is accorded in traditional fault, and the lives of non-humans would longer be a matter of indifference. This means that human life will, in a sense be devalued, while the value granted the non-human life will be increased. **A revised view of such matters as suicide and euthanasia as well as a revised** view of how we should treat animals, will result.” *Ibid*. (bold mine, srf)

Rachels said:

“An infant with severe brain damage, even if it survives for many years, may never learn to speak, and its mental powers may never rise above a primitive level. In fact, its psychological capacities may be markedly inferior to those of a typical rhesus monkey. **In that case, moral individualism** [of which Rachels is a proponent --- KB] **would see no reason to prefer its life over the monkey’s.**” *Ibid* (bold mine, srf)

“Some unfortunate humans --- perhaps because they have suffered brain damage --- are not rational agent. What are we to say about them? The natural conclusion, according to the doctrine we are considering, would be that their status is that of mere animals. And perhaps we should go on to conclude that they may be used as non-human animals are used --- **perhaps his laboratory subjects, or as food.**” *Ibid*. (bold mine, srf)

⁴ In March, 2006, Forrest Mims III, chairman of the Environmental Science Section of the Texas Academy of Science, attended a meeting of the Texas Academy of Science at Lamar University in Beaumont, Texas. He reported on a speech given by Dr. Eric R. Pianka, a University of Texas evolutionary ecologist, in which Pianka advocated reducing the human population by 90%, and suggested using a highly lethal airborne toxin. Nearly every scientist, professor and college student applauded Pianka and endorsed his recommendation. While Mims was later accused of misrepresentation, his report was supported by Dr. Kenneth R. Summy, the Vice-Chairman of the Environmental Science Section of the Texas Academy of Science, who said he heard the statement himself, and by the blogs of students who were there. *Ibid.*

Concerning aborting a human embryo, Dawkins wrote, “Secular moralists are more likely to ask, ‘Never mind whether it is *human* (what does that even *mean* for a little cluster of cells?); at what ages does a developing embryo, of any specie become capable of *suffering*? ... A consequentialist or utilitarian is likely to approach the abortion question in a very different way, by trying to **weigh up suffering. Does the embryos suffer?** (Presumably not if it is aborted before it has a nervous system; and even if it is old enough to have a nervous system **it surely suffered less than, say, an adult cow in a slaughterhouse.**)” *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf). This reasoning would make it as morally viable to kill adults as to kill counts in a slaughterhouse if there were no suffering.

Peter Singer, in a chapter entitled, “Justifying Infanticide,” Says that if a mother has decided she will have two children and the second child is born with hemophilia, the data input can be disposed and replaced by another child without violating any moral code of ethics. Singer concluded, “Nevertheless the main point is clear: **killing a disabled infant is not morally equivalent to killing a person. Very often it is not wrong at all.**” *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf)

⁵ Rachels writes, “**Animal behavior is routinely studied with an eye to acquiring information that can then be applied to humans.**” *Ibid.* See 2Pt 2:12.

Dawkins argues that atheist may do evil things but that they do not do evil things in the name of atheism. However in April 1999, the young man murdered a number of schoolmates in Columbine massacre. **One wore a white T-shirt with the words, “natural selection” emblazoned on it.** In a document found in his room, he had written that he would “**kick natural selection of a few notches.**” His diary said, “I will kill **whoever I deem unfit** for, anything at all, especially life.” *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf)

Jeffrey Dahmer Murdered 17 men and boys, dismembered them, stored human body parts in his apartment, and practiced homosexual acts on his victims and cannibalized his victims. Why did he do it? He said, “**Because I always believed the lie that evolution is truth,** the theory of evolution is truth. And we all just came from the slime, and when we died, you know, that was it.” He also said, “If a person doesn’t think that there is a God to be accountable to, then what’s the point of trying to modify your behavior to keep it within acceptable ranges? That’s how I thought, anyway.” *Ibid.* (bold mine, srf)