

THEISTIC EVOLUTION OR ATHEISM?

W. Harland Dilbeck

Honest, intelligent, good-natured people are weary of the smug superiority and hollow hypocrisy of professional “compromisers” and “reconcilers.” “Religious” and “scientific” politicians preach or write on “I believe God and in evolution,” or “evolution—God’s method of creation,” and then pretend that they have ended the conflict between the evolutionary concept of man as a beast and the biblical teaching of man created in the image of God. To question the basis of their “harmonizing” of evolution and the Bible is to convict oneself, in their lofty estimation, of being either an ignoramus or “rabble-rouser.” Does it matter that all the great evolutionists were unable to believe in both evolution and God? Does it matter that they were all either agnostics or atheists? Does it matter that the “discovery” of the evolutionary “truth” turned Darwin himself into an unbeliever? What matter these stubborn facts to the religious compromisers who assume (and then attempt to assure us) that evolution does not lead to atheism, and that everyone except fools and fanatics realizes it?

It is a proven fact that evolution has led to atheism or agnosticism in the lives of those scientists who have accepted it. Some years ago, James H. Leuba of Bryn Mawr College sent questionnaires to a representative group of accredited scientists in America and asked two questions. The first asked if the scientist believed “in a God to whom one may pray in the expectation of receiving an answer.” The second asked if the scientist believed in immortality, “in continuation of the person after death in another world.” The results revealed that a large majority of recognized scientists find it impossible to believe in **both God and evolution**. All the atheists and agnostics among them believe in evolution. That belief makes it impossible for them to believe in God. In view of these facts and figures, what can we say of the sincerity of judgment of religious evolutionists who tell us that it not only is possible, but easy and logical, to believe honestly and conscientiously in both evolution and God? What can we say of the logic of their claim that evolution somehow gives them “a larger conception of God,” a stronger faith in the Almighty”? Is it not strange that evolution has not given to scientists who understand it best this “larger conception of God,” this “stronger faith in the Almighty”? Is it not strange that these accredited scientists lost their religion completely, lost their very belief in God, when they came to understand evolution? Surely, the scientists have a better, more complete comprehension of evolu-

tion than do the religious compromisers. The verdict of the overwhelming majority of scientists, attested to by their own personal statements in answer to Dr. Leuba’s questionnaire, is that they do not and cannot believe in both evolution and God.

A leading “reconciler” of evolution and the Bible has said that “just as religion and cheating can be compassed in one man” so can man be both believer in God and believer in evolution. That is tantamount to saying that religious evolutionists are either inconsistent or hypocritical. On no other basis could piety and crime coexist in the same person. The contention that a man can believe in both evolution and God, just as he can believe in religion and robbery, points strongly to the conclusion that most religious evolutionists are either hypocrites or inconsistent and poor logicians. This conclusion must be reached on learning that most scientists who believe in evolution find it impossible to believe in God. Scientists generally are known for their intellectual honesty. They are consistent, logical thinkers. They may be mistaken in their premises and blinded by a tragic lack of “spiritual discernment,” but they are loyal to truth as they see it. They seldom compromise their convictions. The fact that the great majority of this great body of hardheaded, clear-thinking, conscientious men and women find it impossible to believe in both God and evolution would seem to indicate strongly that only a weakness of character or a weakness in one’s thinking facilitates that feat.

The first step in making atheists is to make evolutionists. Evolution supplies the principle arguments of atheism. If you doubt this, just study the technique of the atheistic crusaders in our universities. They are bent on making disbelievers of their students. Some of these anti-God agitators teach biology, some teach philosophy, some teach other subjects. In fact, they are likely to be found stationed pretty thoroughly through all departments of our educational institutions. No matter what subject they teach, the technique is largely the same. Their propaganda for atheism consists largely of an adroit appeal to, and use of, the “facts” of evolution. Apart from evolution, there is no way of explaining the universe and man without God. There is no foundation for the “theory of everything” as the result of chance. The “mechanistic” theory of evolution is the cornerstone of atheism. Disabuse yourself of the assumption that “only a few American teachers are disbelievers.” In important departments of

education, atheism is being taught by an appallingly large number of professors in leading universities. Dr. Leuba sent questionnaires only to sociologists and psychologists who teach those subjects in colleges and universities and to those engaged in research, because “the term ‘sociologist’ is used so widely and loosely that I found advisable to consider only the teachers... and those occupied in sociological research.... A similar procedure was followed for the psychologists.” The report? **Ninety percent** of the teachers of psychology in our colleges and universities are disbelievers! **Seventy-five percent** of our university instructors of sociology are atheists or agnostics!

The professors of atheism in our universities hold that a study of evolution reveals positively that the process is not intelligently directed. They teach that evolutionary progress is the result of chance. Henry Fairfield Osborn, in *The Origin and Evolution of Life*, stated: “Chance is the very essence of evolution.” If evolution is the universal principle controlling all creation, then the universe is controlled by chance! Thus, the world and man are not products of an intelligent Designer. One university professor, who contends that “the facts of evolution refute the very God idea,” stated:

If a man sets out to build himself a modest home, he does not construct an aquarium, and then remodel it into a chicken coop, and then remodel it into a pig sty, and then remodel it into a dairy, and then into a horse barn, and then into a menagerie, and finally after unnumbered decades into a home for himself. Yet the modernists tell us that God set out to make of the earth a home for a being of spiritual possibilities known as man. So His “method” of creation was to follow a procedure infinitely more asinine than I have just described. For millions of years, such impossible, pointless monstrosities as dinosaurs and saber-toothed tigers were the highest type of life on the earth. Life was forced into ten million grotesquely shaped different molds before it finally was cast in the form of an apelike creature which passed for man. That method of creation would do discredit to the most brainless idiot who ever lived; it is a madman’s method of creation if it is a method at all....

And then this professor denied God on the basis of evolution:

Let us consider the cost of evolution in blood and suffering—and see if any other than a cruel monster would purchase human life at such a price. Suppose a man set out to train fighting cocks—and his method consisted of pitting all life against all other life; suppose he did this for year after year and made his farm run red with blood, and then after many years, suppose he finally turned his attention to training fighting cocks—what would you say of that man? Would you not think him both a fool and a fiend? What would be the sense of pitting dogs against dogs—if cocks were the objective? Well, what of the evolutionary struggle for existence? If the evolution of man was the objective, then what was the purpose in the titanic struggles of the great

mastodons? If truly there is a God back of evolution and he was intent on the creative evolution of many through bloody struggle, why didn’t he get to the point? Why didn’t he minimize the bloodshed and slaughter? Why didn’t he make the struggle and the slaughter count for something? Why all the useless and cruel struggle of beasts marked for extinction? The sanguinary struggle delayed—it did not advance—evolutionary progress. The advent of the first ape-men was retarded by thousands of years through this senseless struggle of misfits and monstrosities.... If you set out to make a suit of clothes, you don’t spend years and years and years evolving masquerade costumes that don’t fit you. If an intelligent being set out to evolve a man, He would not spend millions of years evolving grotesque mistakes, animals without a chance to escape extinction. The whole history of evolution reveals and witnesses that there is no intelligence back of the process. You cannot **understand** evolution and believe in God.

This is merely a sampling of the way professional crusaders for godlessness are using evolution as a basis for atheism. If this constitutes a misuse or a mistaken use of the doctrine—let the religious evolutionists demonstrate the fact! If evolution really is an “ennobling” rather than a degrading doctrine, if it really is a pillar of support to religion rather than to atheism, let us see the proof!

Originally Published In
Firm Foundation
December 5, 1978,
95[49]:3,12

ARTICLE REPRINT

Distributed by
Apologetics Press, Inc.
230 Landmark Drive
Montgomery, AL 36117-2752
(334) 272-8558