

Answering a person who says...
“PROVE TO ME THAT GOD EXISTS!”*

FIND OUT WHAT THEIR “STANDARD OF PROOF” IS. Ask them: **“What do you consider proof?”** Skeptics often say to Christians, **“Prove to me that God exists!”** The first thing a believer should do is ask such a person, **“What do you consider proof?”** You see, *evidence* is **objective**, but *proof* is **subjective**! Some say **“I only believe what I can see. If I could see God, I’d believe!”** The statement is false on the face of it. That’s shown by the fact that all people, including people who make that statement, believe in **many things** that they can’t see! Do they believe in gravity? Love? Hate? Electricity? The atom? Have they ever seen any of those things? Of course not, but they still believe in them! Others declare that they only believe in things they can understand. Yet they believe in many things they don’t understand in the least, such as cell phones, tablets, etc.

A member of a cult once told a Christian, **“If you can prove to me that Christ is God, I’ll become a follower of Him.”** The Christian wisely asked, **“But what do you consider proof? I can keep giving you Bible verses and you can keep saying that I haven’t given you enough proof!”** The cultist responded that three verses would constitute proof. The Christian showed him three and the cultist ended up trusting Christ as his Lord & Savior! Before we can prove anything to anyone, we must find out what they consider **“proof.”** Some people have no idea what their standard of proof is.

“PROOF” NORMALLY CONSISTS OF FINDING A CAUSE SUFFICIENT TO EXPLAIN AN EFFECT. Every Effect requires a Cause. Where did the Terminal Tower in Cleveland, Ohio come from? Did the wind blow some stones and wood and glass together downtown and then some *Robins & Blue Jays* put that building together? Of course not. You would undoubtedly answer **“No, that’s insane!”** The reason you don’t believe that is because wind and birds are not **SUFFICIENT Causes** to explain the *Effect* (Terminal Tower). We only consider something **“proven”** and are only convinced, if we feel the cause is *sufficient* to explain the effect we see. So let’s apply that reasoning to the question of whether there is a God or not:

The universe is an Effect-But there is no observable Cause sufficient to produce it! Someone may say, **“Well, I think the universe is its own cause. It made itself.”** An MIT cosmologist once said when asked where the initial matter came, **“Maybe the universe is the ultimate free lunch.”**¹ That comment alone illustrates the utter bankruptcy of the atheistic position. And it goes without saying that the universe has never been observed making something out of nothing! The question that naturally comes up is, **“Then doesn’t God need a cause too?”** Answer: *No, because He’s eternal.* Something has to be eternal, and the universe clearly isn’t. It’s definitely more reasonable to believe in a God that has always existed rather than a universe that has always existed, since everything in the universe is definitely **NOT** eternal.

Furthermore, that something has to be a “Someone” (i.e. a person), not an impersonal force,

¹ Alan Guth, National Geographic,

because the universe is filled with personalities. Creation is full of personalities (i.e. people with a mind [*intellect*], *will*, and *emotions*) and **something impersonal has never been observed producing anything personal!** Even statues and paintings that merely *depict* personality come from persons!

THE DESIGN OF THE UNIVERSE REQUIRES A DESIGNER. Design is another Effect that requires a Cause. No chance happening has **EVER** produced anything comparable to a flower, a living cell, DNA, or anything else. Skeptics assert that while things don't normally go "uphill" from disorganization to organization or from simple to complex (i.e. the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics), this universal law can be overcome in an "*Open System.*" In other words, since the earth receives *energy* from the sun, such *energy* can overcome the 2nd law. Thus, they contend, evolution from simple to complex organisms could have occurred, life could have evolved spontaneously from non-living chemicals, etc. However that idea has a major obstacle: You need more than mere *energy* to overcome the 2nd law of thermodynamics and produce increasing organization. You also need a "*program*" and a "*mechanism.*"

For instance, if I put the pieces of a watch in a box and start shaking it, I am applying enormous amounts of energy to it, relatively speaking. However I could shake the box indefinitely, but the pieces will never arrange themselves together to form a working watch! That is the **second law of Thermodynamics** in action in the observable world. This law, simply stated, says that everything in the universe tends to decay, wear out, and become simpler—not more complex (unless a personality or mechanism deliberately reverses that process). It will not do to simply say that the earth is an "*open system*" which receives energy from the sun. You need more than outside *energy*. You also need a "*program*" & a "*mechanism*" (especially prior to the formation of the first cell). Atheism (& evolution) has neither.

Leading atheists such as Richard Dawkins have tried to skirt around this huge problem **by replacing God with Chance.** However, Hahn & Wiker demonstrate the fallacies of Dawkins' argument and destroy it: "...a fundamental confusion that runs throughout Dawkins [is], the confusion of improbability with impossibility: 'Coincidence,' Dawkins assures the reader, 'means multiplied improbability.' That is a fancy way of saying anything can happen...he wants his reader to assume that the impossible is really only extremely improbable.

"The first most obvious objection to this kind of reasoning is this: What *would* be impossible if *anything*—or at least any physical event of the kind described—is possible? ...The answer is quite simple. **Dawkins believes that anything *but* a miracle is possible, and that leads him to believe that the impossible, no matter how absurd, is possible.** The moon, over which the cow really could jump, truly might—just for a few moments, due to random molecular restructuring—be made of green cheese. **This leads to a second point. Quite obviously, Dawkins' presentation of the miraculous and impossible is only a manifestation of his atheism...but here is the problem.** Since he has reclassified impossible things to be only highly improbable...if God is only highly improbable [as Dawkins himself admits], could His existence be any less probable than an event of such mind-numbing improbability [i.e. life evolving from non-living chemicals] that one couldn't

write down the calculated improbability in 13 ½ billion years? ...Dawkins...is using this type of argument for a purpose. **He uses his unbounded faith in chance, as a means to establish purely materialistic explanations for events that would seem to any sane person to require a supernatural cause.**

To be more pointed, Dawkins manifests a *selective* confusion of the possible and the impossible **when it suits his purposes**, and sometimes the confusion amounts to an intellectual slight-of-hand that has fooled many of Dawkins' readers... Let's look at a particularly interesting example from his *God Delusion* about the 'miracle' of life's appearance on earth, for this is how Dawkins purports to show that a Creator God is unnecessary.

“According to Dawkins, we can safely estimate that there are, somewhere in the vast universe, a ‘billion billion’ planets that would be suitable for life [sic]. He then supposes what he takes to be long odds of one in a billion of life arising by chance (although he really doesn't mean life, but merely ‘the spontaneous arising of something equivalent to DNA.’) Well, then, concludes Dawkins, ‘even with such absurdly long odds, *life will still have arisen on a billion planets—of which Earth, of course, is one.*’ This is such a surprising conclusion, Dawkins remarks, ‘I'll say it again. If the odds of life originating spontaneously on a planet were a billion to one against, nevertheless that stupefyingly improbable event would still happen on a billion planets.’ **It is such a surprising conclusion precisely because it doesn't follow. The entire argument is faulty.**...at this point we call attention to a problem in Dawkins' reasoning that is a matter of logic. You cannot assume what you have to prove; that is called ‘begging the question’ or more elegantly, the fallacy of *petitio principii*. He falls into the fallacy *because he assumes without argument that the spontaneous assembly of DNA is like getting a perfect deal in bridge, rather than being like tossing a perfect cardhouse in a hurricane. That is what he would have to prove rather than assume.*

“**The real question, the prior question, is one of possibility and impossibility, not greater or lesser *probability*.** If tossing a perfect cardhouse in a hurricane is impossible because the cards would keep blowing away, then it wouldn't become possible by adding into the calculation a billion billion available planets, or even a trillion trillion. **If the spontaneous arising of DNA is simply impossible [and it is!-mwe], then it wouldn't matter how many billions or trillions of planets there were.** It couldn't and wouldn't happen. Thus, we have to be very wary that Dawkins is not assuming that what is impossible is just very, very unlikely.”²

A skeptic may protest: “*Ah, but scientists have measured out specific chemicals in laboratories filled with sophisticated equipment and have created amino acids (small parts of a protein, which are, in turn, a very small part of the simplest living cell), which proves that random chance can produce order and design!*” **Actually, such experiments prove the very opposite!** The amino acids didn't happen by accident. They required *intelligence* (i.e. a designer)-plus thousands of years of accumulated *knowledge*, millions of dollars worth of sophisticated *equipment*, etc. So even the creation of mere amino acids in a laboratory demonstrates that things like that **definitely do not**

² Scott Hahn & Benjamin Wiker, “*Answering the New Atheism: Dismantling Dawkins Case against God*” (Emmaus Road Publishing: Steubenville, OH, 2008), pp. 10-18, italics in the original.

happen by chance! All evidence shows that design originates from intelligent beings (i.e. designers). Surely the universe isn't the one exception to that rule!

ASK A SKEPTIC OR ATHEIST, "HOW MUCH DO YOU KNOW?" Ask him to draw a circle on a piece of paper. Tell him that the circle represents "*everything there is to know about everything.*" Now ask him to draw a circle inside that circle that depicts how much he knows about everything. If he's honest, his circle will only be the size of a dot! Then point out to him that if he knows so little, it's entirely possible (probable?) that God could be found outside of what he knows, since he doesn't know everything!

CONCLUSION: Dewitt states: "*It is therefore, not reasonable to claim we know God does not exist.*"ⁱ I believe an honest consideration of the above four main points will lead to the conclusion "*that the most reasonable decision, is that a personal God does exist.*"ⁱⁱ

THE REAL REASON WHY MANY PEOPLE CLAIM THERE IS NO GOD OR THAT THE BIBLE IS FULL OF ERRORS. I'm convinced that the reason **most** people deny the existence of God or deny that the Bible is the Word of God, is because **they have a moral problem—not an intellectual one!** If a person is living a lifestyle that they know is condemned in the Bible or which produces guilt when they ponder the thought of a future judgment before God for the behavior they have engaged in, they will usually seek to either discredit God, deny the existence of God, &/or the veracity of the Bible (cf. **Rom. 1:18-32**). After all, if the Bible tells a person that what he is doing is wrong and that one day he will answer to God for it, this can cause one to struggle with guilt, and not surprisingly, fear death or deny an afterlife.

The proper way to remove such guilt is simple: Repent of our sin and receive Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. **That removes the sin & its penalty-plus the guilt!** Unfortunately, instead of doing that, most would rather continue on in their sinful lifestyle. So they attempt to deny that the Bible is true, that God is righteous & good, or that there is even a God before whom they will one day stand for judgment. By engaging in such denials, individuals can continue in their unrighteous behavior and lifestyle without their conscience bothering them as much! **It may relieve some guilt now, it has terrible consequences in eternity!** Don't make that tragic mistake!

*Most of the format, main points, content, etc., of the above four pages is taken nearly verbatim from "Answering the Tough Ones" by David A. Dewitt, Moody Press, Chicago, IL, 1980. Compiled by Rev. Mike Edwards January 1996, Goroka, Papua New Guinea, revised October, 2009 & March 2010, St. Vincent, West Indies. Addenda added, January 2010. Explanatory note: All bolding, italicizing & underlining has been added by me, unless otherwise noted. -mwe

REFERENCES

-
- i. David A. Dewitt, "Answering the Tough Ones" (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980), p. 118; ii. Ibid, p. 121.

ADDENDA **ATHEISM: THE REAL "OPIATE OF THE PEOPLE"**

In Dinesh D'Souza's book "*What's so great about Christianity?*" he argues convincingly in support of my last point above, **i.e. the reason most people become atheists, or claim there is no God or that the Bible is full of errors, is because they have a MORAL problem-not an intellectual one!** So I'd like to quote extensively from his comments here:

"To listen to prominent atheists, you get the idea that their sole cause for rejecting God is that He does not meet the requirements of reason. Philosopher Bertrand Russell was once asked what he would say if he discovered, after death, that there is an afterlife. Russell pompously said he would tell God, '*Sir, you did not give me enough evidence.*' ...**but it should be obvious by now that...unbelief, especially when it comes in the belligerent tone of a Russell, Dawkins or Hitchens, is not merely a function of following the evidence where it leads. [Rom. 1:18-25].** Rather, unbelief of this sort requires a fuller psychological explanation...secular morality, **while marching behind the banner of autonomy and self-fulfillment, can provide a cover for selfish and irresponsible behavior...is unbelief itself driven by similar motives?**

"Atheists frequently attempt to give psychological reasons for the religious commitment of believers. In his commentary on the works of Hegel, Karl Marx famously said that religion is the '*opium of the people,*' meaning that religion is a kind of escapism or mode of wish fulfillment. Sigmund Freud saw religion as providing a cowardly refuge from the harsh realities of life and the inevitability of death...Another explanation for the popularity of religion, recently expressed by James Haught...is in terms of the wish fulfillment of its self-serving leaders. In this view, which seems quite popular today, religion persists because '*churches and holy men reap earnings and exalted status from the supernaturalism they administer to their followers.*'

"I'm not convinced by any of these explanations. I agree that there are priests and mullahs who are self-aggrandizing salesmen, **but why do people go along with their schemes?** [And] **yes, there is an element of wish fulfillment in religion, but not of the kind that the atheists presume.** Theologian R.C. Sproul makes a telling point: *why would the disciples invent a God 'whose holiness was more terrifying than the forces of nature that [allegedly] provoked them to invent a God in the first place?'* [!] The God of the three Abrahamic religions—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—is a pretty exacting fellow, demanding of us purity rather than indulgence, virtue rather than convenience, charity rather than self-gratification. There are serious penalties attached to ultimate failure: for the religious believer, death is a scary thing, but eternal damnation is scarier. **So wish fulfillment would most likely give rise to a very different God than the one described in the Bible.** **Wish fulfillment can explain heaven, but it cannot explain hell.**

"Even so, my purpose here is not to dispute the atheist explanation for the appeal of religion. [Instead] I intend to turn things around and instead pose the issue of the appeal of atheism. Who benefits from it? Why do so many influential people in the West today find it attractive...?"

“Some atheists even acknowledge that they would prefer a universe in which there were no God, no immortal soul, and no afterlife. Nietzsche writes that ‘*if one were to prove this God of the Christians to us, we should be even less able to believe in him*’ [talk about being closed-minded & biased! No wonder he spent his final years in an insane asylum!-mwe] On the possibility of life after death, H. L. Mencken wrote, ‘*My private inclination is to hope that it is not so.*’ ...Physicist Victor Stenger confesses that not only does he disbelieve in God, he doesn’t like the Christian God: ‘*If he does exist, I personally want nothing to do with him.*’ And philosopher Thomas Nagel recently confessed to a ‘*fear of religion itself.*’ As he put it, ‘*I want atheism to be true...It isn’t just that I don’t believe in God...I don’t want there to be a God; I don’t want the universe to be like that.*’

D’Souza further observes: “The aversion to religion and the embrace of atheism becomes especially baffling when you consider that, on the face of it, **atheism is a dismal ideology.** Many atheists like to portray themselves as noble figures venturing into the cold night, raging against the dying of the light, and facing the pointlessness of it all. **This strikes me as a bit of a pose, and an inauthentic and slightly comical one at that.** As Michael Novak observes, if there is no God, what is there to rage at? Is it brave to spit in the face of a volcano or tidal wave? Natural forces are neither good or evil; they just are. ***So where does heroism come in if atheists are merely taking the world as it is?***

“**Other atheist writers**—and I would place Sam Harris and Richard Dawkins in this camp—**seem serene and almost gleeful about living in a world whose defining feature seems to be nature red in tooth and claw.** This is an odd reaction, because as a number of evolutionary biologists, like George Williams, have admitted, Darwinism would seem to be a repulsive doctrine. Williams expresses open disgust at the ethical implications of a system that assigns no higher purpose to life than selfish bargains and conspiracies to propagate one’s genes into future generations. According to Williams, a moral person can respond to this only with condemnation, yet Dawkins and others embrace Darwinism without ambivalence and indeed with genuine enthusiasm. **Why are they drawn to such a philosophy and where, in its grim hallways, do they find room for such evident good cheer?**

“**Biologist Stephen Jay Gould provides a clue.** Pondering the meaning of life, Gould concludes that ‘*we may yearn for a higher answer—but none exists.*’ **Then he says something very revealing.** ‘*This explanation, though superficially troubling if not terrifying, is ultimately liberating and exhilarating.*’ In other words, the bad news is good news. Doctrines that might ordinarily seem to be horrifying—death is the end, there is no cosmic purpose or divine justice, free will is an illusion—can from another vantage point be viewed as emancipating.

“**Emancipation from what?** To listen to some atheists, they want to free themselves from the

shackles of religion in order to practice virtue. [Ha!] ‘*In a world where God is no longer present,*’ Santiago Zabala writes in *The Future of Religion*, man is now free ‘*to actively practice solidarity, charity, and irony.*’ ...**The only problem is that you don’t have to get rid of religion to be charitable in the name of human brotherhood ...charity and human kinship are two of Christianity’s central themes.**

“[So] it is time to look more honestly and critically at the real motives behind modern atheism. These are often different and more interesting than the surface motives usually given by or ascribed to atheist figures... Darwin himself says he lost his faith because he could not endure the Christian notion of eternal damnation. We also learn from his writings that Darwin suffered terribly from the loss of his ten-year-old daughter, Annie. One gets the powerful sense that he could not forgive God. Atheism, in some cases, is a form of revenge.

“These are powerful motives for unbelief, but they are not the main motive. We have to probe deeper, and one way to do it is to go back in history, all the way back to the ancient philosophers Epicurus, Democritus, and Lucretius... All three of these pre-Socratic thinkers believed that material reality is all there is. Lucretius and Democritus even suggested that man is made up wholly of atoms, an uncanny foreshadowing of modern physics. At the time that the pre-Socratics wrote, however, there was no scientific evidence to back up any of their mechanistic claims about the natural world. Why then were they so attracted to teachings that were completely without empirical basis?

“Epicurus confesses that his goal is [1] to get rid of the gods. He also wants to [2] eliminate the idea of immortal souls and to ‘*remove the longing for immortality.*’ Lucretius too writes of the heavy yoke of religion, [3] imposing on man such burdens as duty and responsibility. The problem with gods, Epicurus says, is that they seek to enforce their rules and thereby create ‘*anxiety*’ in human beings. They threaten to punish us for our misdeeds, both in this life and in the next. The problem with immortality, according to Epicurus, is that there may be suffering in the afterlife. By positing a purely material reality, he hopes to *free man from such worries and allow him to focus on the pleasures of this life.*

“Not that Epicurus was a hedonist in our modern sense. He counseled that people control their sexual impulses and subsist on barley cakes and water. He was less concerned with wild pleasure than with minimizing suffering, what he termed ‘*freedom from disturbance.*’ Even death, he said, is a kind of relief, because our atoms dissipate and there is no soul to experience the lack of life or to endure the consequences of a life to come. In sum, Epicurus advocated a philosophy and a cosmology that was purely naturalistic in order to liberate man from the tyranny of the gods. And so did Lucretius, who sought through his philosophy to ‘*unloose the soul from the tight knot of religion.*’ For these men, their physics was the ground of their ethics. As Wiker puts it, ‘a materialist cosmos must necessarily yield a materialistic morality.’

“Here is a clue to the moral attractiveness of Darwinism. Darwin himself wrote that *‘he who understands baboon would do more towards metaphysics than Locke.’* **He was implying that a better understanding of our animal nature might radically change the way we view morality.** So the appeal for many is that it eliminates the concept of a ‘higher’ human nature and places man on a continuum with the animals [*think PETA, Greenpeace, Planned Parenthood, etc.-mwe*]. **The distinctive feature of animals, of course, is that they have no developed sense of morality.** A gorilla cannot be expected to distinguish between what is and what ought to be. **Consequently Darwinism becomes a way to break free of the confines of traditional morality.** We can set aside the old restraints and simply act in the way that comes naturally.

“From Darwin’s own day, many people were drawn to his ideas not merely because they were well supported but also because they could be interpreted to undermine the traditional understanding of God. As biologist Julian Huxley, the grandson of Darwin’s friend and ally Thomas Henry Huxley [often called ‘*Darwin’s Bulldog*’], put it, *‘The sense of spiritual relief which comes from rejecting the idea of God as a supernatural being is enormous.’* And from Julian’s brother Aldous Huxley, also a noted atheist, we have this revealing admission: *‘I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently I assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption...For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was...liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom.’*

“As the statements of the two Huxleys suggest, the reason many atheists are drawn to deny God, and especially the Christian God, is to avoid having to answer in the next life for their lack of moral restraint in this one. They know that Christianity places human action under the shadow of divine scrutiny and accountability. Paul writes in his letter to the **Romans 2:6-8**, *‘For he will render to every man according to his works: to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life; but those who are factious and do not obey the truth, but obey wickedness, there will be wrath and fury.’* We read in the book of **Revelation 21:8**: *‘As for the cowardly, the faithless, the polluted, as for murderers, fornicators, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars, their lot shall be the lake that burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.’* **The implication of these passages—and there are many more like them—is that death does not bring extinction but accountability.**

“Here I must pause to note a feature of Christianity that has not escaped the attention of most atheists. Christianity is a religion of love and forgiveness, but this love and forgiveness are temporal and, in a sense, conditional. Christian forgiveness stops at the gates of hell, and hell is an essential part of the Christian scheme. While the term *gospels* means ‘good news,’ these

books also contain warning messages to prepare us for **ultimate judgment**. This is a reckoning that scripture says many people are extremely eager to avoid. As **John 3:20** puts it, *‘Everyone who does evil hates the light, and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed.’* The point here is not that atheists do more evil than others, but rather that **atheism provides a hiding place for those who do not want to acknowledge and repent of their sins.**

“In a powerful essay, *‘The Discreet Charm of Nihilism,’* Nobel laureate Czeslaw Milosz argues that in order to escape from an eternal fate in which our sins are punished, man seeks to free himself from religion. **‘A true opium of the people is a belief in nothingness after death’**—the huge solace of thinking that for our betrayals, greed, cowardice, murders, we are not going to be judged.’ **So the Marxist doctrine needs to be revised. It is not religion that is the opiate of the people, but atheism that is the opiate of the morally corrupt.**

“If you want to live a degenerate life, God is your mortal enemy. He represents a lethal danger to your selfishness, greed, lechery, and hatred. It is in your interest to despise Him and do whatever you can to rid the universe of His presence. **So there are powerful attractions to life in a God-free world.** In such a world we can model our lives on one of the junior devils in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Belial, who was *‘to vice industrious, but to nobler deeds timorous and slothful.’* If God does not exist, the seven deadly sins are not terrors to be overcome but temptations to be enjoyed. **Death, previously the justification for morality, now becomes a justification for immorality.** [!] The philosopher who best understood this *‘liberation’* was Nietzsche. Contrary to modern atheists, who assure us that the death of God need not mean an end to morality, Nietzsche insisted that it did. As God is the source of the moral law, His death means that the ground has been swept out from under us. We have become, in a sense, ethically groundless, and there is no more refuge to be taken in appeals to dignity and equality and compassion and all the rest... Yet unlike Matthew Arnold, who saw the faith of the age retreating like an ocean current and was terrified by it, Nietzsche in a sense welcomes the abyss. He is, as he puts it, an *‘immoralist.’* In his view, the abyss enables us for the first time to escape guilt... **Morality is no longer given to us from above; it now becomes something that we devise for ourselves...** The old codes of *‘thou shalt not’* are now replaced by *‘I will.’*

“Therefore, **in Nietzsche’s scheme it is not strictly accurate to say that God has died. Rather, man has killed God in order to win for himself the freedom to make his own morality.** And the morality that Nietzsche celebrates is the morality of striving and self-assertion, *‘the deification of passion,’ ‘splendid animality,’* or in Nietzsche’s famous phrase, *‘the will to power.’* Any goal, even one that imposes massive hardship or suffering on the human race, is legitimate if we pursue it with energy, resolution, and commitment.

There is a recklessness and savagery in Nietzsche’s rhetoric that thrills the heart of

many modern atheists. We see it in the French existentialists like Jean-Paul Sartre, who used Nietzsche as their foundation for a philosophy based on moral freedom. I also hear a Nietzschean strain in Christopher Hitchens when he protests against the moral supervision of God, who he portrays as a jealous tyrant.

D'Souza states: **"It is chiefly because of sex that most contemporary atheists have chosen to break with Christianity.** 'The worst feature of the Christian religion,' Bertrand Russell wrote in *"Why I Am Not a Christian,"* *'is its attitude toward sex.'* Hitchens writes that *'the divorce between the sexual life and fear...can now at last be attempted on the sole condition that we banish all religions from the discourse.'* [But] if sex is unhooked from the old moral restraints, there are going to be unwanted pregnancies. Here we get to **atheism's second sacrament, which is abortion.** The real horror of abortion is not that a woman kills an unborn child but that a woman kills her own unborn child. The guilt in doing this, for all morally healthy persons, can only be tremendous. **So it is necessary for atheism to pave the way for abortion with a clear conscience. The first step is to get rid of God,** because then there is no spirit of the dead child to disturb the conscience, no hell to pay for violating the commandment against the deliberate taking of life. **The second step is to define the fetus as not really human.** As Sam Harris puts it in *The End of Faith*, *'Many of us consider human fetuses in the first trimester to be more or less like rabbits' who do not deserve 'full status in our moral community.'*

"Bioethicist Peter Singer invokes Darwinism to make the point that there is a continuum, not a clear separation, between humans and animals. **Therefore animals should be given some of the rights that are now given only to humans.** [again think *PETA* proponents & imbecilic Hollywood actors & actresses on their crusades to save the whales, pigs, minks, chickens, etc., *ad infinitum, ad nauseam*—all the while aborting their own human babies with impunity -*mwe*] Pete Singer also argues that humans should be denied some of the protections they now have on the grounds that they are not fundamentally different from animals. [Does this sound familiar?] If man is the product of evolution rather than special creation, Singer contends, then the whole structure of Judeo-Christian morality has been discredited. Indeed we cannot continue to speak in hushed tones about the sanctity of life. **Therefore abortion, euthanasia, and infanticide all become permissible** and in some situations even desirable. In Singer's work we see echoes of both Darwin and Nietzsche; **indeed, Darwin becomes the weapon with which to strike down Christian belief and clear the ground for Nietzschean immorality.**

"In a now famous article in the New York Times, Steven Pinker invoked the logic of evolution to explain why it's really not such a big deal for mothers to kill their newborn children, even after they are out of the womb [!] ...Pinker added that many cultural practices are *'designed to distance people's emotion from a newborn' precisely so that the child may be killed without too many qualms'* ...**Pinker is right that abortion and infanticide are quite common in world history. The reason that they have been forbidden for centuries**

in the West is because Western values were shaped by Christianity. Ben Wiker makes the point that *‘the laws against abortion and infanticide in the West are only intelligible as a result of its Christianization, and the repeal of those same laws is only intelligible in light of its de-Christianization.’* If America were a purely secular society, there would be no moral debate about child killing. **So one reason that Pinker and so many others attack Christianity so bitterly is precisely to remove its moral influence and make society hospitable for abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia.**

“It may seem strange to see all this callousness toward human life in a society whose primary social value is compassion. But the paradox is resolved when you see that it is precisely because we are so awful in our private lives that we need to pretend to be virtuous in our public lives (think “virtue signaling” -*mwe*). People who do things that are morally disgusting, like cheating on their spouses and killing their offspring; cannot escape the pang of conscience. **Thus it is of the highest importance to deflect that conscience, not only to give other people the impression that we are kind and wonderful, but also to convince ourselves of the same.** For the person who has just slept with his business associate, it is morally imperative that he make a sizable contribution to the *United Way*.

“My conclusion is that contrary to popular belief, atheism is not primarily an intellectual revolt, it is a moral revolt. Atheists don’t find God *invisible* so much as *objectionable*. They aren’t adjusting *their desires to the truth*, but rather *the truth to fit their desires*. This is something we can all identify with. It is a temptation even for believers. We want to be saved as long as we are not saved from our sins. We are quite willing to be saved from a whole host of social evils, from poverty to disease to war. **But we want to leave untouched the personal evils, such as selfishness and lechery and pride. We need spiritual healing, but we do not want it. Like a supervisory parent, God gets in our way. This is the perennial appeal of atheism: it gets rid of the stern fellow with the long beard and liberates us for the pleasures of sin and depravity. The atheist seeks to get rid of moral judgment by getting rid of the judge.”**

All quotes on pages 5-11 above taken from: Dinesh D’Souza, *What’s So Great About Christianity*, Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2007, pp. 261-272