

Review: Prof. Alister McGrath and Joanna McGrath, *The Dawkins Delusion: Atheist Fundamentalism and the Denial of the Divine*, Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, London, England, 2007

Pages: 78

Well-Meaning but Neutered Apologetic

This book focuses on notorious atheist Richard Dawkins and his writings, particularly the *God Delusion*. While the authors rightly take him to task for his fanatical atheism and hatred of Christianity, their defence is philosophical only which is problematic.

It is obvious that they also are theistic evolutionists, believing therefore the universe to be about 13.6 billion years old, Genesis 1 and 2 are poetic, etc., etc. (e.g., Paley's design argument is flawed [p. 7], Darwin's theory is the "best explanation of the available evidence" [p. 8], and the Intelligent Design movement is founded on the 'God of the Gaps' axiom p. 12]).

This is a grave error as since the Origin of Species, scientific discoveries have only increased the awareness of intelligent design in living systems and the only scientifically rational origin of said information. For example, RNA, DNA, the epigenome, and irreducibly-complex biological nanomachines like ATP-synthase. Neo-Darwinianism can only explain such things by a question-begging "evolution-must-have-done it-because-it-exists" statement.

Another shock is regarding the nature of Jesus, where the authors intimate that He (who is the Almighty God) was not omniscient [p. 55].

While proving Dawkins is wrong (and offensive) in many areas, he is right in that there is a “total war” between Christianity and Atheism, or science-falsely-so-called and “religion”, and the only winner will be Jesus. Any Christian trying to “walk the fence” between molecules-to-man evolution and the Bible is doomed to shipwreck:

“O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vane babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:”

I Timothy 6.20, Authorized Version

Introduction (pp. vii-xiii)

I) Deluded About God (pp. 1-12)

Atheists say faith has been *hard-wired* into believers (as strange term which implies foresight and design!).

Anthony Flew (b. 1923) became a theist only in his eighties.

The authors believe Dawkin’s critique of William Paley is “accurate”, also, Darwin’s Theory of Evolution is the best explanation of the available evidence.

God is said to represent an “infinite regress” problem, but at the same time atheists are futilely searching a “Theory of Everything” which begs the question of its own infinite regress.

Intelligent Design is claimed to be a ‘God of the gaps’ argument.

Explicability *itself* requires an explanation.

II) Has Science Disproved God? (pp. 13-27)

“Doctrinaire Positivism” scorns the meaning of such questions as:

“How did everything begin?”

“What are we here for?”

“What is the point of living?”

POMA is “Partially Overlapping Magisteria”.

In 1916, atheist psychologist James Leuba surveyed 1,000 scientists and 40% claimed belief in God. In 1997, the study was replicated and 40% *still* believe in a personal God.

Dawkin’s core assumption is that “real” scientists must be atheists.

Some ‘atheists’ believe in a vague “life force” (cf Daniel 11.38).

Dawkins [rightly] views the struggle between “religion and science” as one of total war.

On 22 October, 1996, Pope John Paul II issued a statement to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences supporting evolution.

III) What Are the Origins of Religion (pp. 28-45)

In 1841, Ludwig Feuerbach said humans invented God.

Karl Marx said that when the social revolution came religion would be useless and die out.

Dawkins posits a “God-centre” in the brain, a product of evolution which is said to be accidental. This is also termed an “epiphenomenon” that somehow conferred a selective advantage.

In the 1990s, Dawkins introduced the idea of religion as a “virus of the mind” which never gained ground scientifically.

IV) Is Religion Evil? (pp. 46-65)

Dawkins is an “ivory-tower” atheist who separates all evil actions from his philosophy.

On page 55 the authors claim Jesus was not omniscient.