

Chapter 1

Secular and Atheistic Religions: Overview

Bodie Hodge and Roger Patterson

Secular religions (e.g., atheism, agnosticism, secular humanism, naturalism, etc.) possess a unique status in our Western world. Having a past that has typically been uneventful, the 1800s saw an explosion of these religious variants.

Fueled by the likes of Charles Lyell in the 1830s (geological evolution or “millions of years”) and Charles Darwin beginning in 1859 (biological evolution from a common ancestor), the secular takeover of the West continued. We still see the fruit of these religious views in our day and age.

Secular religions now dominate areas like the media, education, law, museums, sexual expression, and, sadly, the minds of the next generation, according to recent statistics.¹ This makes sense since secular religious views flow freely in the education system due to secular laws imposed upon state schools. Young minds are molded into secular form, and few realize it until it is too late.

In the Western world (United States, United Kingdom, Germany, etc.), these secular religions are the biggest stumbling block for the next generation of Christians and Christian missionaries seeking to proclaim the gospel.

1. See Ken Ham, Britt Beemer with Todd Hillard, *Already Gone* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009); Ken Ham with Jeff Kinsley, *Ready to Return* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2015).

The once great West, whose churches sent missionaries out to the whole world, is now crumbling at a foundational level due in part to the influence of secularism. Secular religious doctrines are even infiltrating the Church!

Essentially, the West needs missionaries to rise up and “rebuild the wall,” so to speak, of the Church in the West. But to do so, we need to deal decisively with the religion of the day — the secularism that stands like Goliath in our culture. So how do we, as a Church, deal with it?

Immunizing the New Missionaries

Consider this hypothetical situation with which missionaries have to deal. Missionaries are sent to minister with the gospel to a place that has deadly diseases. The missionaries contract a disease and the missionaries die. You send more missionaries; they contract the same disease and die.

Now, if you were a sending church, what would you do? Do you simply send more missionaries to their potential doom? Or do you take the time to prepare your missionaries with the proper protection for what they are about to encounter — medicine or inoculation from the disease? Obviously, you want to protect your missionaries and give them what they need to be effective for the gospel work for which they are sent.

Now consider this same problem, but from a spiritual angle in our Western world. The United States and the United Kingdom were once nations greatly influenced by Christians, and churches could be found in abundance, particularly in cities. But now, churches have closed their doors *en masse* in many places in England. The same trend is happening to the United States, albeit at a delayed pace.

Today, cities have precious few churches, and those that are there are typically shallow with little doctrine (there are exceptions) and compromise the authority of God’s Word. In other words, they are struggling and dying themselves. Many Christians recognize that there is a need for churches in cities. The cities like Cincinnati, New York, Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, Chicago, London, and Bristol are ripe for church plants.

Interestingly, few of these church plants are as effective as hoped. Some church plants grow slowly, others plateau, some merely take people from other churches, and others struggle and die. A lot of excuses are given — wrong church model, not enough funding, wrong music, too traditional, etc. But the main problem is that they were not dealing with the false religion that has entwined the people of the mission field.

When a missionary goes to Africa or the Amazon or Papua New Guinea, they train themselves to know what religions are in the area (e.g., Animism, Islam, Spiritism, etc.), and they learn how to refute those false beliefs so they can be an effective witness in presenting the truth of the Bible and the gospel. They don't go with the intent of just telling people to be moral and to add Jesus to what they believe.

How many church planters in cities in the UK and the USA have trained their missionaries to refute secular humanism, Darwinism, atheism, etc.? How many pastors in church plants in New York are trained to refute secular attacks on Christianity like radiometric dating, alleged missing links, big bang, and so on? The even bigger problem is that many of the church planters may have *agreed* with the secularists and believe the big bang is true, embrace millions of years, or even prefer evolution over the Bible's origins account. Imagine if we sent a missionary to Muslims who had bought into many tenets of Islam!

While we must certainly affirm that the message of the gospel is the power of God to salvation, apologetics is an important aspect of evangelism. While we proclaim the truth of Jesus as Lord and Savior, we must also help others see how their own religious views are insufficient to deal with their sin. We might also need to answer questions that explain the foundational elements of how sin entered the world and why they need a Savior.

If a missionary is not refuting the false religion prevalent in their mission field (i.e., secularism in much of the Western world), then why would we expect that missionary to be effective? Dealing with secularism and refuting it is a key to mission work in the “new” Western world. But refuting it is only part of the step. Secular refutations should not be divorced from the preaching of the gospel and teaching disciples to obey all Jesus commanded, embracing the authority of the Bible in all areas — starting in Genesis.

What Are Secular Religions?

There are a lot of forms of secularism. They are religions that are humanistic (i.e., man is the supreme authority). Here is a list of some of the forms or aspects of secular/humanistic religions:

- Atheism and New Atheism
- Agnosticism
- Existentialism

14 — World Religions and Cults • Volume 3

- Extraterrestrial Humanism
- “Nonreligious” Religious Humanism
- Naturalism
- Stoicism
- Materialism
- Relativism
- Nazism
- Hedonism (including perverted sexual expression)
- Communism
- Nature Worship
- Idealism/Dualism
- Satanism (Church of Satan)
- Epicureanism (Evolutionism)
- Modernism
- Scientism
- Post-modernism
- Secular Humanism

As you can see, there is a wide variety of secular/humanistic religious views. Those who profess a humanistic religion often blend these aspects in various ways. For example, a person might identify generally as an atheist and hold to a materialistic view of the universe and a relativistic understanding of morality. Professor Richard Dawkins is a new atheist but also believes in aliens/extraterrestrial life as a possible explanation for the origin of life on earth. Bill Nye professes to be an agnostic (he can't know for certain if God exists), but then proceeds to argue from an atheistic perspective (no God exists, cf., Psalm 14:1).

Sometimes these religions have great variations while sharing many commonalities. For example, Hedonism promotes sexual perversions like homosexuality (e.g., LGBT) and Nazism absolutely opposes them. Yet both share the same view that man is the supreme authority, and both share an evolutionary view of origins, opposing the Bible, looking to bring human prosperity, etc.

Some of these are philosophical aspects that are utilized by each variant — like naturalism, materialism, and relativism. Even *within* the various flavors of humanistic religions you can have variations. For example, within hedonism (cf., Ecclesiastes 9:7–10) there are two very different forms:

Quantitative Hedonism (get as much as you can for your enjoyment before you die)

Qualitative Hedonism (enjoy the highest quality of things in life before you die)

There are even variations within atheism. One view presents itself from *classical atheism* — says there is no God(s) but refrains from caring what others believe, also known as soft atheism. Then there is *new atheism*, which doesn't believe God(s) exists but tries to force this view on others, also known as hard atheism.

You may also notice that some of these religious flavors sometimes cross over with the moralistic religions described in *World Religions and Cults Volume 2*. Why such great variation and yet such similar commonalities based on the authority of man?

Consider what the Bible says:

In those days there was no king in Israel; everyone did what was right in his own eyes (Judges 17:6).

That we should no longer be children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of deceitful plotting (Ephesians 4:14).

It should not surprise us that a religious view that sets man as the authority has as many variations as there are people — since each person considers themselves the captain of their own soul. Man can invent all sorts of evil (Romans 1:30) and diversity of evil and deceptive doctrine (2 Timothy 3:12–13). These things should be tested against the absolute standard of God's Word (1 Thessalonians 5:21).

How Secular Religions Took Over the West — and the Failure of the Church to Properly Respond

About 200 years ago, the United States and England were strongly influenced by Christianity. England, at least in a legal sense, is a Protestant nation headed by a Protestant monarch. The queen or king is the supreme governor of the Anglican Church. They cannot take the throne without being of the Protestant faith — there is a long history to this establishment.

This influence extended to the British colonies and the nations that developed from those colonies.

But when we see the culture today, the USA, UK, and many other Western nations are highly secular. The ubiquity and brazen display of lies, immorality, murder, greed, hatred of Christians, child sacrifice, idolatry, the love of money, and many other evils are a daily reminder that our culture has changed. So how did it get this way?

One part of the answer is the failure of the Church to seriously engage these issues. And, *Deo volente* (God willing), they will be in a better position to address the trend. But the Church has failed in two areas:

1. Instead of combatting the slow secularization that began to unfold in the West in the early 1800s, many in the Church and their leaders embraced various aspects of secularization.
2. The Church gave most teaching of children over to a third party (that became secular), so subsequent generations within the Church were not equipped and fell to the secular onslaught.

In America in the 1800s, for example, Christians began giving their children over to state schools to educate them. At the time, it seemed like a good idea, as state schools used the Bible in the classroom. They used it to teach history, logic, philosophy, literature, science, and so forth.

So the Church, by and large, didn't have to focus on those subjects. Instead, they began concentrating on teaching the gospel, theology, and morality. As man's ideas about long ages, millions of years, astronomical evolution, and biological evolution began taking over school systems, most Christians either didn't notice or fell victim themselves.

By 1925, geological evolution (millions of years) and animal evolution were being taught in schools with full backing by the state. As human evolution began to be taught, the battle lines finally erupted with the famous Scopes Trial.

Even so, as the humanistic religion began to permeate the state schools under the influence of men like John Dewey, the Bible was removed, creation was taken out, prayer was silenced, the Ten Commandments banished, and so on. Now entire generations of kids have been raised up being taught the religion of secular humanism.

But what did the Church do to specifically counter this false religious teaching? By and large — nothing! Many churches still teach morality, the gospel, and theology (not that these are bad things), but then most parents (90 percent by the latest stats)² still send their children to state schools to be taught a different religion. So for about 40 hours a week, kids from Christian homes are taught the religious tenets of secular humanism, and the Church (who scarcely teaches the kids 2–3 hours per week) wonders why the kids are walking away from the faith and following after humanistic religions. Those that remain in the Church have often brought secular baggage with them. They often hold to evolution and millions of years, secular morality, secular views of sexuality, marriage, race, and so on.

What does this do to a local church? It causes it to be stagnant, impotent, or die as members are actually mixing secular religions with their Christianity. It is no different from the former godly Israelites in the Old Testament mixing true worship of God with worship of Baal. The mere difference is with *which religion* the modern Christians mix their Christianity — secularism rather than Baal.

With this in mind, we as Christians have to “pull the plank out of our own eye” in the Church before we “reach for the speck of sawdust” in the culture’s eye. The Church needs to get back on the right track first. Thus, the Church has a big job to re-educate their congregations in the truth of the Bible in all areas like history, science, logic, and so forth.

“But We Don’t Have a Religion!”

The secularists are the first to cry, “We are not part of a religion!” Why is this the case? There are a couple of reasons.

First, they don’t want to be kicked out of the place of influence in the government school classrooms. Second, the secularist can more easily deceive kids into thinking that it is okay to believe what they teach and that it should have no conflicts with their respective religious beliefs.

Secular and humanistic religions like evolution, atheism, and agnosticism are part and parcel of the same pie. They have free reign under tax-supported dollars in the UK, USA, Australia, Germany, and so many other places. It is strange that Christianity was kicked out of the classroom and yet another religion is taught in its place.

2. Ken Ham, “Yes, We Are Losing the Millennials,” Answers in Genesis, May 13, 2015, <https://answersingenesis.org/christianity/church/yes-we-are-losing-millennials>.

Tax dollars are spent on the secular religions through schools, state-funded museums, science journals, and so on. All the while, there is a false claim that “secularists aren’t religious.”

There is a simple way to test this claim. If something isn’t religious, then it cannot oppose religious claims. Does the secular origins view (big bang, millions of years, and evolution) oppose the religious claim of special creation by God in six days and subsequently a young earth? Yes. Thus, secular views are religious. Anyone who claims that they are not religious and then makes judgments about religious topics (e.g., the deity of Christ, the existence of God, the morality of adultery, the truthfulness of the Bible, etc.) has made a religious statement. Though they may claim to be irreligious, they show that they are religious when they try to refute another religious view.

Does atheism, which says there is no God, oppose the religious claim that God exists (as found in the pages of the Bible)? Again, yes. Thus, atheism is religious. It is easy to prove that humanistic religions are religious.

Even many secularists openly admit to their faith. One instance is John Dunphy while writing for a secular magazine:

I am convinced that the battle for humankind’s future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing a classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level — preschool day care or large state university. The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new — the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of humanism.³

The U.S. Supreme Court, in *Torcaso v. Watkins*, 81 S.Ct. 1681 (1961), stated the following: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God, are

3. J. Dunphy, “A Religion for a New Age,” *The Humanist*, Jan.–Feb. 1983, p. 23.

Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and others.” Additionally, these groups are eligible for the same tax benefits as other religious groups, and secular and atheist chaplains even function within the military. You can’t have your cake and eat it too. Humanists are religious and they act in religious ways.

Is Science Secular?

Many people today insist that science can only be done by people who have a secular worldview — or at least by those who are willing to leave their religious views at the door as they enter the science lab. Several popular atheists and evolutionists have contended that people who reject the big bang and the evolution of living things are so backward that they cannot even be involved in developing new technologies.⁴

But is this really the case? Or are these opponents of a biblical worldview simply making assertions that cannot be supported with facts and substantial arguments, having an incorrect understanding of true science?

A friend of Answers in Genesis was challenged by the comment that science can only be done through a purely secular, evolutionary framework. Such statements are blatantly absurd and are a type of arbitrary fallacy called an “ignorant conjecture.” In other words, these people simply do not know the past, nor are they familiar with what science really is.

Examples of Scientists Operating from a Christian Worldview

If science is a strictly secular endeavor without any need for a biblical worldview, then why were most fields of science developed by Bible-believing Christians? For example, consider Isaac Newton, Gregor Mendel, Louis Pasteur, Johannes Kepler, Galileo Galilei, Robert Boyle, Blaise Pascal, Michael Faraday, James Joule, Joseph Lister, and James Clerk Maxwell. Were these “greats” of science not doing science? Francis Bacon developed the scientific method, and he was a young-earth creationist and devout Christian.

Even in modern times, the inventor of the MRI scanning machine, Dr. Raymond Damadian, is a Christian working with Christian principles. The founder of catastrophic plate tectonics, Dr. John Baumgardner, is also a devout Christian. And those who recently founded the scientific field of

4. As an example of this dismissive attitude, Eugenie Scott (formerly) of the National Center for Science Education (NCSE), a leading religious humanist, says, “Like other pseudosciences, ‘creation science’ seeks support and adherents by claiming the mantle of science.” <http://ncse.com/rncse/23/1/my-favorite-pseudoscience>.

baraminology are also Christians. Also, I (Bodie Hodge) developed a new method for production of submicron titanium diboride for the materials science and ceramics industry. Professor Stuart Burgess developed a new mechanism for the two-billion-dollar European (ESA) satellite *Envisat*. Dr. John Sanford developed the gene gun. And let's not forget Werner von Braun, the young-earth Christian who was the founder of rocket science and led the United States to the moon. These are but a few examples of people who held to a biblical worldview and were quite capable as scientists and inventors of new technologies.

The Foundation for Science Is Biblical Christianity

Furthermore, science comes out of a *Christian* worldview. Only the God described in the Bible can account for a logical and orderly universe. God upholds the universe in a particular way, such that we can study it by observational and repeatable experimentation (see Genesis 8:22). Because God upholds the universe in a consistent manner, we have a valid reason to expect that we can study the world we live in and describe the laws that God uses to sustain the universe (Colossians 1:17).

In the secular view, where all matter originated by chance from nothing, there is no ultimate cause or reason for anything that happens, and explanations are constantly changing, so there is no *basis* for science. Though many non-Christians do science, like inventing new technologies or improving medical science, they are doing it in a manner that is inconsistent with their professed worldview. On what basis should we expect a universe that came from nothing and for no reason to act in a predictable and consistent manner? When non-Christians do real science by observable and repeatable experimentation, they are actually assuming a biblical worldview, even if they do not realize it.

It makes sense why “science” in the United States is losing out to other nations since our science education system now limits science in the classroom exclusively to the religion of secular humanism (and its subtle variations).

It Is Not “Science vs. Religion”

So the debate is not “science versus religion.” It is really “religion versus religion.” Sadly, science is caught up in the middle.

The battle is between the religion of *secular humanism* (with its variant forms like agnosticism, atheism, and the like), which is usually called

secularism or *humanism* for short, and *Christianity*. They both have religious documents (e.g., the Humanist Manifestos I, II, and III for humanists, and the Bible for Christians); both are recognized religions by the Supreme Court;⁵ and both receive the same 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status. Both have different views of origins.

Humanism has astronomical evolution (big bang), geological evolution (millions of years of slow gradual changes), chemical evolution (life came from non-life), and biological evolution (original, single-celled life evolved into all life forms we have today over billions of years) in its view of origins. In other words, evolution (as a whole) is a tenet of the dogma of the religion of humanism in the same way as biblical creation (as a whole, with six-day creation, the Fall, global Flood, and the Tower of Babel) is a tenet of the dogma of Christianity. It is a battle between two different religions.

In recent times, the state and federal governments kicked Christianity out of the classroom, thinking they kicked religion out; but instead, they just replaced Christianity with a godless religion of humanism. This was done as an attack designed by humanists.

An Evolutionary Worldview Equals Science?

There is a misconception that this evolutionary subset of humanism *is* science. Science means knowledge and scientific methodology that is based on the scientific method (observable and repeatable experimentation). However, evolution (whether chemical, biological, astronomical, or geological) is far from scientific. Consider the following facts:

1. No one has been able to observe or repeat the making of life from non-life (matter giving rise to life or chemical evolution).
2. No one has been able to observe or repeat the changing of a single-celled life-form like an amoeba into a cow or goat over billions of years (biological evolution).
3. No one has been able to observe or repeat the big bang (astronomical evolution).
4. No one has observed millions of years of time progressing in geological layers (geological evolution).

5. U.S. Supreme Court, *Torcaso v. Watkins*.

The reason some people are confused about the religion of humanism — and specifically its subset of evolution — as being science is a bait-and-switch fallacy. Let me explain. One of the key components of humanism is naturalism. Basically, it assumes *a priori* there is nothing supernatural and no God. In other words, nature (i.e., matter) is all that exists in their religion (only the physical world).

As a clarifying note, Christians also believe in the natural realm; but unlike the naturalist or humanist, we believe in the supernatural realm, too (i.e., the spiritual, abstract, conceptual, and immaterial realm). Logic, truth, integrity, concepts, thought, God, etc., are not *material* and have no mass. So those holding to naturalism as a worldview *must* reject logic, truth, and all immaterial concepts if they wish to be consistent, since these are *not* material or physical parts of nature.

This is very important because naturalism or natural science has been added as one of the dictionary definitions of science. For example, it was not found in the 1828 Webster's dictionary, but it was added in one form in the 1913 edition. And, interestingly, they removed the definition that “the science of God must be perfect” in the 1913 edition.

So, although many appeal to observable and repeatable science through methodology to understand how the universe operates, another definition has been added to muddle this.⁶ Science is now defined as “knowledge or a system of knowledge covering general truths or the operation of general laws especially as obtained and tested through scientific method.”⁷

For example, evolutionists have continued to popularize Darwin's scientific observation of the changes in beaks of Galapagos finches as proof for the evolution of one animal kind into another. This is a great example of the bait-and-switch fallacy where scientists present real scientific evidence (the difference in finch beaks) but stretch the truth to say it gives validity to the mythology of microbes-to-man evolution (the “switch” part of the fallacy). This trick leads many to believe that evolution is real science. The only real science in this example is the observation of the difference in finch beaks.

People are baited with this good methodology of observational science (again developed by a Christian named Francis Bacon), and then they are

6. There is also the issue of operational science versus historical science. For more, see: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/ee/what-is-science>.

7. Merriam-Webster Online, s.v. “science,” accessed March 8, 2013, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/science>.

told that evolution is science while subtly appealing to another added definition: that of “natural science” or “naturalism.” This is like saying another definition of science is “Nazism.” Then Nazis could say they are “scientists” and get into a classroom! This is what has happened with humanism. The religion of humanism (with its founding principle of naturalism) has been disguised as *science* by adding another definition to the word *science*. But it is not the good science we think of that makes computers, space shuttles, and cars. It is a religion. To call evolution science is a bait-and-switch tactic.

So, Is Science Strictly Secular?

No. In summary, science can never be strictly secular for these reasons:

1. Real science is observable and repeatable experimentation that only makes sense in a biblical worldview where God’s power keeps the laws of nature consistent. In other words, science proceeds from a biblical worldview.
2. Secular humanism, with its subset of evolution, is in reality a religion and not science.
3. Many of the greatest scientists were Bible-believing Christians whose biblical worldview motivated their scientific studies, showing that a strictly secular view is not necessary for performing science.

Where Humanism Leads

Christians will continue to conduct scientific inquiry and invent things, processes, and science fields as we always have. If the United States and other places neglect our accomplishments and inventions and continue to push the religion of humanism on unsuspecting kids in the classroom (usually unbeknownst to most) by limiting its definition of science to the humanistic worldview, then my humble suggestion is that they will continue down the same road humanism leads. That is, people who are consistent in their naturalistic worldview shouldn’t care about true science or the world, since nothing ultimately matters in that worldview.

Refutations

Secular worldviews like atheism (and the like) have serious problems. When refuting false worldviews, there are three ways that are typically used to prove them false. They are:

24 – World Religions and Cults • Volume 3

1. Arbitrariness
2. Inconsistency
3. Borrowing from the Bible (preconditions of intelligibility)

Arbitrariness includes things like mere opinions, relativism, conjectures (prejudicial), and unargued biases.

Inconsistencies include logical fallacies, “actions speak louder than words” in behavior and attitudes, presupposition issues that are irrational, and views that are *reduced to absurdity*, based on where the argument is heading.

Borrowing from the Bible is couched in philosophical terminology like preconditions of intelligibility. In brief, it is when a worldview cannot account for something that is foundational. For example, in a materialistic worldview, why would love exist? Love is not material. You don’t drink some love to increase your daily dose of love.

So when a secular materialist claims they love something or someone, then it is highlighting a problem with their preconditions. In other words, the materialist in this case believes love exists, but his religious convictions say otherwise. Some of the problems with secular viewpoints will be analyzed using these criteria (arbitrariness, inconsistencies, etc.) without being exhaustive, of course.

Arbitrariness

In the case of God and His Word, they are not arbitrary. This is because there is no greater authority than God (cf. Hebrews 6:13). There is no greater authority that can be appealed to than God — and by extension His Word.

However, all secular views fail to appeal to God as their final authority, instead appealing to man. Man is a lesser authority and not absolute. Thus, any authority of man is a mere opinion to the absolute and supreme authority of God and His Word. All secular religions are based on the ideas of fallible man and thus arbitrary next to God.

The fact that many secular religions deviate from one another in their belief systems shows how relative they are regarding man’s opinions. Thus, relativism reigns supreme among them. But relativism is fallacious, being arbitrary. So from two fronts, secular religions fail to pass the test.

In response, some secularists have touted that there is variation among Christians and the outworkings of the Bible, thus the Bible is arbitrary, too.

However, this misses the point — it is not about what Christians believe, but about what God says. Christian outworkings (e.g., denominations, church splits, doctrinal misinterpretations) are based on man’s (less than perfect) understanding of the Scripture. But this has nothing to do with God being the absolute authority. Just because an authority is misinterpreted or misunderstood does not undermine its authority.

Inconsistent

Have you noticed that many secularists want to be good and want to do the moral thing? Herein lies the problem. If there is no God who sets what is right and wrong or defines good and bad, then why be moral and how can “good” be defined? It is utterly inconsistent to try to do good or be moral when your religion, *at its very base*, says there is no need or compulsion to do so.

We’ve seen atheists, agnostics, hedonists, and others get upset with brutality, people lying and deceiving, and terrorist activities, and yet they hold to positions that encourage abortion (murdering babies in the womb). Note the inconsistency.

Christians are commonly attacked for believing God’s authority regarding the truth of the Bible, but they turn around and hold to a position based on trusting man’s authority! Think of it like this:

Secular claim: You Christians blindly take the Bible as an authority because the Bible tells you to.

Christian response: By what authority do you reject God’s Word?

Secular response: I read a book (or heard someone) that told me to believe the Bible is wrong, and I trust them.

Again, note the inconsistency. The difference is that man’s authority is meaningless when compared to the absolute authority that is God’s Word. If God *is* God, then what authority would supersede God’s? There is none. God must reveal Himself as the final and superior authority.

Another secular claim, particularly from empiricists, is that “seeing is believing.” They argue that truth claims can only be known through the senses. But there is an inconsistency here. How does the secularist know that

26 — World Religions and Cults • Volume 3

alleged truth claim is true? Their senses are not involved in that alleged truth claim (that all truth claims can only be known through the senses).

To further elaborate, they claim that all truth claims are known by senses, but how do they know that? Did they see or sense that truth? Sadly, they usually hold such a position because someone told them to — like a book or teacher.

Secular religions are largely materialistic and naturalistic. Matter (including energy and space-time) is all that exists — nature is all that exists . . . thus, the term *naturalism*. This stands in direct opposition to the Christian worldview based on the Bible where the supernatural also exists. God is God of both the natural and supernatural (i.e., spiritual realm). This is why Christians are not as limited as secularists on many issues.

But a materialistic/naturalistic worldview causes undeniable problems for secular views. If matter is all that exists, then nonmaterial (immaterial) things cannot exist. There are many things that cannot exist if materialism is correct. They include:

- Logic
- Truth
- Abstractions
- Propositions
- Concepts
- Rights
- Shame
- Reason
- Knowledge
- Dignity
- Honor
- Love
- Sadness

It would be inconsistent (i.e., a behavioral inconsistency) for a secularist to appeal to logic, reason, truth, etc., to argue for a secular worldview that says immaterial things cannot exist!

Another absurd inconsistency reveals itself during discussions of God's Word being the authority. Some secularists go so far as to proclaim that they don't believe the Bible, as though that settles the debate. But it doesn't. When

a secularist (or anyone else) professes that they disagree with the Bible, then they are claiming to be God. To disagree with God is to view oneself as God. This is fallacious reasoning.

Allow me to explain this further. When one claims to disagree with God, then they are elevating their own thoughts to be greater than an omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent God. Therefore, one is (usually inadvertently) elevating themselves to *be that* God! This is clearly absurd.

Borrow from Bible

Many secularists live their lives borrowing from God's Word, though they fail to realize it. If people are merely evolved animals and there is no God who sets right and wrong, then why wear clothes? Why get married? Why get an education? Squirrels don't set up universities to discuss philosophical methodology.

Why celebrate the popular Christian holidays called weekends, which is based on the Sabbath Day and the Lord's Day? Why have holidays anyway? A holiday is a holy day, yet there exists nothing holy in a secular worldview.

Why heal sick people (medicine) when survival of the fittest should take its course as it has in the past without our interference? Why have laws? God may set laws, but if we are our own authority, then law is meaningless.

Why waste time on science? In fact, how can the secularist know the laws of nature won't change tomorrow? (From a Christian perspective, God has promised to uphold nature as it is in the future.) From a secular viewpoint, they can't know the future will be uniform. If they argue that it has always been like that, then it begs the very question at hand! Thus it is a fallacious circular argument. Yes, even the possibility of observable and repeatable science is based on God's Word being true.

Conclusion

When it comes down to it, secular views fail on a number of aspects. Even more discussion and refutation is found in the various chapters in this volume. Sadly, many have been deceived into believing that secular worldviews are the truth, when in fact truth cannot exist if secular worldviews are correct (as truth is not material).

Our hope is that those caught up in secular religions, whether they knew it or not, will repent. Our hope is to see them realize the truth of the Scripture by the power of the Holy Spirit. Secular religions ultimately say

28 — World Religions and Cults • Volume 3

things came from nothing, are going to nothing, and nothing matters. But with Christianity, there is the power of hope based on a truthful God who made a way to save us for all eternity. See chapter 15 in this volume for more on this precious subject.