

RICHARD DAWKINS: ATHEIST

David C F Wright PhD

Richard Dawkins is a self-confessed atheist and, of course, he is entitled to his opinions.

His latest book is *The God Delusion*. In it, he writes that he wants religious leaders to read this book and, when they have finished it, that they become atheists.

Dawkins admits that, in this book, he is attacking God.

Professor Michael Ruse has written that reading this book made him ashamed to be an atheist.

Richard Dawkins became an atheist after he was converted to the writings of Charles Darwin.

Dawkins, who was born in Kenya in 1941, states that human beings are only animals, merely machines created by our genes. He also writes that science alone is the only way to understand beauty and the universe. Religion is superseded by science. Science is the only way to discover truth. The Bible and Christianity are lies... only science is the truth.

However, it has been rightly said by others that science is not certainty, but the search for certainty.

Science cannot explain why we are here, but Dawkins says that science has the answer to this mystery. Yet he does not tell us what it is!

Science cannot explain the origins of life, but, instead, puts forward theories. The trouble is that they present their theories as facts. Evolution is taught in schools and colleges as fact, but it is not. It is speculation and, as it denies God as the Creator, it is atheistic.

Dawkins says that original evolution is a fact and those who believe in creation are deluded to the point of perversity. He also says that the evidence for evolution is as strong as the evidence for the Holocaust.

Many scientists have said that you cannot be a scientist and a Christian. In the world of politics, Michael Foot of the Labour Party, said that you cannot be a Socialist and a Christian.

Dawkins states that we have all descended from what might have been bacteria, and further states that everyone who does not believe in evolution is ignorant, utterly stupid or insane.

By evolution, he means that the universe commenced with the Big Bang and that all life began with an amoeba in the sea. Of course, there is another meaning of evolution which is that all species develop to suit their changing environments.

But the Big Bang and amoeba theories are what we will call original evolution.

"It is true that all scientific methods and theories fail when questions of origins are involved," wrote Nobel prize winner Wolfgang Pauli.

The Big Bang theory states that the entire universe came into being some 14 billion years ago. How could a random explosion in space produce the dependable laws of nature?

The Big Bang theory means that the universe came into being by chance and not by design. It was an accident.

The American astrophysicist, Arno Penzance, said that the only reliable data is the five books of Moses and the Bible as a whole.

Another scientist, Dr F A Tatford, said that because he was a scientist he could not possibly believe in

original evolution. Many others have said the same.

Evolution and some other sciences have one aim in mind to destroy God, nullify Christ and the Bible and to ridicule those who have a Christian faith. Of course, there are some scientists who do not subscribe to this debunking of Christianity.

There are those who say that the DNA of chimpanzees and humans are similar and some say that the DNA is the same and that proves that we descended from apes. But that can be explained by the Divine Creator who created apes as well as humans. DNA contains a lot of information so surely it must have an intelligent source? More information is contained in your DNA than in all the volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica. DNA's source must have an intelligence and, as it is not made by man, who is it made by?

But there is the question of morality, of right and wrong. Dawkins says we are only animals or machines or robots and we are governed by our genes... in fact, slaves to our genes. Therefore, for us there is no right or wrong. There is no morality. You cannot take a lion to court for killing and eating a gazelle. The lion is an animal. So are human beings.

Really?

To quote Dawkins again, we are survival machines... robots blindly programmed to preserve our selfish molecules known as genes. Because of this, the murderer, the rapist, the child abuser is not responsible for these actions. It is because of his genes and the chemical make up in the body. We are slaves to our genes, merely robots and not responsible for what we do.

Science cannot answer why the universe bothers to exist? Science cannot explain what life is all about.

When asked to answer these points, Dawkins said irritably that they were silly questions.

I was heckled by some scientists at a lecture I was giving. They shouted out, Where did God come from? I replied, Where did the gases come from that made up the Big Bang?

The scientists were furious and snapped, That question is irrelevant!

Here is a madman with a gun who breaks in a maternity ward of a hospital and shoots dead all the new born babies. It was not his fault. He was programmed by his genes to do this.

Richard Dawkins... these theories are sheer madness!

But he is not alone in promoting sheer madness. David Icke says that he was at Atlantis, the legendary island that sank into the sea, that Ted Heath was a satanist and a murderer of children and that the moon is hollow. Betty Shine said she could perform surgical operations without being there, and, in fact being continents away since she had special scalpels and other surgical implements and could achieve what the best surgeons could not; the actress, Shirley MacLaine, has been prosecuted for driving without due care and attention and other offences but claims that spirits from another dimension or aliens were responsible and guiding her and, therefore, she was not guilty.

Are these people examples of Dawkins' claim that they are robots merely machines governed by their genes?

Darwinism has developed into fascism and other evils such as the concept of the survival of the fittest and some attempts to sterilise women because they cannot give birth to healthy and lovely children. Read the article on fascism.

The whole matter of morality is interesting. Science cannot explain it. It can tell you that if you put a lethal poison in a drink it will kill the person who drinks it, but science cannot tell you that it is right or wrong.

Generally, we have love and welfare for our own species and these facts do not make any sense on the theory of evolution. Science cannot explain why we are, or can be, loving and caring for our own.

Dawkins goes on to attack the God of the Bible. He calls God an appalling role model and an evil monster. He is certainly not a moral Being.

But then Dawkins says, 'I don't know what is moral. Science has no methods for deciding what is moral.'

Someone has said that religion to Dawkins is like a red rag to a bull. Dawkins says that God is the great unmentionable evil at the centre of our culture. He agrees with the concept that religion poisons everything.

It is true that religion has caused endless and unforgivable troubles and there is no defence... but this is counterfeit Christianity, although Dawkins says that this proves that the real thing cannot be trusted either.

But Christianity cannot be blamed for such counterfeits and falsehoods. If people adhered to Christ's teaching then these counterfeits would not exist. There would have been no Inquisitions instituted by Catholics, no denominations, and no Wacos as there was in Texas in 1995.

The teaching of Jesus is that of morality, goodness, love, kindness and compassion. He condemned racism, hypocrisy, hatred and all evil. If His teaching were followed, there would be no war, no broken families, no harsh parenting, no teenage rebellion, no murder, no violence, no hatred, no unrighteousness anger, no child abuse, no character assassination, no slander, no libel, no suicide, no adultery, no prostitution, no pornography, no obscenity, no stealing, no materialism and so on.

But as Dawkins says, "The ten commandments and Bible teaching is obnoxious to the modern man." Clearly Dawkins, fellow atheists and the modern man, and woman, has trouble with Biblical teaching.

Dawkins tells us that the God of the Old Testament is the most unpleasant character in all fiction. He goes on to say that if God exists He must have been created, since nothing exists that has not been created. But he produces no evidence to support this, but calls God an unknowable sky fairy.

I ask, Who created the gases that resulted in the Big Bang?

That God exists is primarily a matter of faith but also of common sense as we have shown. Man and science cannot create and sustain a universe or answer the pertinent questions which we have posed. There is some Being greater than both man and all the sciences put together, and therefore that Being is not human.

I have heard many scientists, including those who say that they are atheists or agnostics, say that the more they consider original evolution (the Big Bang and the amoeba) the more ridiculous and utterly stupid these concepts become.

Dawkins is severe about the Old Testament and deliberately avoids the evidence of its veracity such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, and that not one example of archaeology contradicts the Bible.

He says that the New Testament is ancient fiction based on the game of Chinese whispers.

Then he says that nobody knew where Jesus was born not even the writers of the Gospels. The Gospels actually state where Jesus was born. The secular Jewish and Romans records of the time record where He was born. Dawkins says that the writers of the Gospels never met Jesus let alone knew Him.

God is not a delusion. Dawkins is deluded. He contradicts himself and some of his statements are both absurd and grossly offensive particularly when, for example, he claims that the evidence for original evolution is as strong as that for the Holocaust. Neither is his argument balanced. He thunders that everyone who believes in God, the Bible or Jesus Christ is ignorant, stupid and wicked.

As Dr Tatford points out, It takes a greater faith to be an atheist than to be a Christian.

The BBC and people like David Attenborough are continually thrusting evolution upon us. They do not invite the scientists who reject evolution to provide programmes

This article was written and published in 2007. Because of the importance of this article no copyright stipulations apply in this case.

Links:

[David Icke](#)