

Unconvinced Atheists 05

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 05 December 2021

Preacher: Marvin Wiseman

[0 : 00] Geisler and Turek, on pages 162 and 163 of their book, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, provides four major reasons that Darwinists insist on keeping God out of the issue.

Their use of the term Darwinists is synonymous to our use of the word atheist. The reasons they give are as follows. First, by admitting God, Darwinists would be admitting that they are not the highest authority when it comes to truth.

Second, by admitting God, Darwinists would be admitting that they don't have absolute authority when it comes to explaining causes. Third, by admitting God, Darwinists would risk losing financial security and professional admiration.

How so? Because there's tremendous pressure in the academic community to publish something that supports evolution. Find something important and you may find yourself on the cover of *National Geographic* or the subject of a PBS special.

Find nothing and you may find yourself out of a job, out of grant money, or at least out of favor with your materialist colleagues. So there's money, job security, and prestige motives to advance the Darwinian view.

[1 : 32] Finally, and perhaps the most significantly, by admitting God, Darwinists would be admitting that they don't have the authority to define right and wrong for themselves.

By ruling out the supernatural, Darwinists can avoid the possibility that anything is morally prohibited. In fact, the late Julian Huxley, once a leader among Darwinists, admitted that sexual freedom is a popular motivation behind evolutionary dogma.

When he was asked by talk show host Merv Griffin, why do people believe in evolution? Huxley honestly answered, the reason we accepted Darwinism even without proof is because we didn't want God to interfere with our sexual mores.

Notice, he didn't cite evidence for spontaneous generation or evidence from the fossil record. The motivation he observed to be prevalent among evolutionists was based on moral preferences, not scientific evidence.

Former atheist Lee Strobel reveals that he had the same motivation when he believed in Darwinism or atheism. He writes, Author and lecturer Ron Carlson has had Darwinists admit the same to him.

[3 : 17] On one such occasion, after lecturing at a major university on the problems with Darwinism and the evidence for intelligent design, Carlson had dinner with a biology professor who had attended his presentation.

Carlson asked him, So, what did you think of my lecture? The professor began, Well, Ron, what you say is true and makes a lot of sense, but I'm going to continue to teach Darwinism anyway.

Carlson was baffled. Why would you do that? He asked. Well, to be honest with you, Ron, it's because Darwinism is morally comfortable.

Morally comfortable? What do you mean, Carlson pressed? I mean, if Darwinism is true, if there is no God and we all evolved from some slimy green algae, then I can sleep with whomever I want, observed the professor.

In Darwinism, there is no moral accountability. Now, that's a moment of complete candor. Of course, this is not to say that all Darwinists think this way or that all Darwinists are immoral because some undoubtedly have lived morally better lives than many so-called Christians.

[4 : 44] It simply reveals that some Darwinists are motivated not by the evidence, but rather by a desire to remain free from the perceived moral restraints of God.

This motivation may drive them to suppress the evidence for the Creator so they can continue to live the way they want to live. And in this sense, Darwinism is no different than many other world religions in that it provides a way to deal with the guilt that results from immoral behavior.

The difference is that some Darwinists, instead of acknowledging guilt and offering ways to atone for it or rules to avoid it, attempt to avoid any implication of guilt by asserting that there is no such thing as immoral behavior to be guilty about.

These four motivations that we've suggested should not surprise us. Sex and power are the motivators that underlie many of our most intense cultural debates, such as those about abortion and homosexuality.

Too often, people take positions in those debates that merely line up with their personal desires rather than taking the evidence into account. In the same way, belief in Darwinism is often a matter of the will rather than the mind.

[6 : 08] Sometimes, people refuse to accept what they know to be true because of the impact it will have on their personal lives. This explains why some Darwinists suggest such absurd counterintuitive explanations, explanations that are against common sense.

Despite the plain evidence for design, these Darwinists fear encroachment of God into their personal lives more than they fear being wrong about their scientific conclusions.

And this is not to say that all Darwinists have such motivations for their beliefs. Some may truly believe that the scientific evidence supports their theory.

We think they get this misconception because most Darwinists rarely study the research of those in other fields. As a result, very few get the big picture.

Thank you. Thank you.