

How Religiously Neutral are the Anti-Creationist Organisations?

Two case studies

by [Don Batten](#) and [Jonathan Sarfati](#)

1) USA's so-called 'National Center for Science Education'

In *NCSE Reports* 15(2):9, 1995, the Executive director, Eugenie C. Scott, protests against [Dr John Morris](#) of the Institute for Creation Research saying the National Center for Science Education (NCSE) is 'an offshoot of the American Humanist Association'. Scott claims confusion could possibly be due to NCSE's journal, *Creation/Evolution*, being started by the American Humanist Association (AHA) and initially edited by the executive director of the AHA, Frederick Edwards (a philosopher, not a scientist). The journal 'was later sold by AHA to NCSE', says Scott.

Although [humanism is an atheistic religious belief](#), Scott claims that NCSE was intended from the start to 'be a *religiously-neutral* organization focusing on science and education'. Scott says that NCSE has members from all sorts of religious persuasions, including 'conservative evangelical Christians'. NCSE is supposedly just interested in 'science education'. However, it seems strange that the only 'science education' NCSE seems interested in is evolution; not chemistry, physics, astronomy, or even experimental biology. 'Science' seems to be a euphemism for 'evolution', certainly nothing to do with the operational science that put men on the moon, cured diseases, etc.

In *NCSE Reports* 16(1):7, 1996, readers are directed to an article 'on our web site at <http://www.csicop.org>'. This is the Skeptics' (USA) web site, the 'Science and Reason Site', as the Skeptics claim, which overtly espouses materialism (atheism) with direct links to the Council for Secular Humanism and other atheistic / anti-Christian sites. Not surprising, since the Skeptics and Council for Secular Humanism share the same headquarters, the Center for Inquiry, at Amherst, NY. There is nothing 'religiously neutral' about this web site. There are no links to Christian Answers Net, for example, or any other conservative Christian web site to give balance. And in *NCSE Reports* 17(2):25, 1997, they advertise a self-named 'Internet Infidels' site, run by a man who has edited and contributed to a book of people who have apostatised from Biblical Christianity. No, the NCSE and its bedfellows, the AHA and the Skeptics, have one agenda: materialism /secularism /atheism.

It is good tactics to recruit 'religious' people to the cause of spreading the word that 'everything made itself'. Humanists know that if they succeed with their agenda of indoctrinating young people with the foundational beliefs of atheism (everything made itself by natural processes; there is no need for God) that rejection of Biblical Christianity will logically follow. That's why the AHA started the *Creation/Evolution* journal—to promote evolution, because it is the basis of atheism. And the NCSE are carrying on the work under the guise of religious neutrality.

Atheists such as Eugenie Scott, who is the Executive Director of the NCSE, know that if a materialistic framework of thinking can be established in young people through the education system, then Christianity will not stand. No wonder the American Humanist Association recently presented Scott with a major award (see [article](#)).

Atheism has evolution (everything made itself) as its logical foundation. Christianity has creation as its logical foundation. Christianity with evolution as its foundation will collapse. Atheist Frank Zindler said,

‘The most devastating thing though that biology did to Christianity was the discovery of biological evolution. Now that we know that Adam and Eve never were real people the central myth of Christianity is destroyed. If there never was an Adam and Eve there never was an original sin. If there never was an original sin there is no need of salvation. If there is no need of salvation there is no need of a saviour. And I submit that puts Jesus, historical or otherwise, into the ranks of the unemployed. I think that evolution is absolutely the death knell of Christianity.’ (Frank Zindler, in a debate with William Lane Craig, *Atheism vs Christianity* video, Zondervan, 1996).

How then can indoctrination in evolution be ‘religiously-neutral’?

NCSE’s underlying attitude was undoubtedly summarised by Michael Shermer (himself a self-confessed apostate) of the Skeptics Society (USA):

‘It is important to note that Skeptics and scientists have no quarrel with genuinely religious people and their religious organisations who make no claims of scientific proof for their religious beliefs’ (in the preface to *25 creationists’ arguments and 25 evolutionists’ answers*, The Skeptics Society, 1994).

In other words, you can ‘believe’ whatever you like, as long as you don’t claim your beliefs have any basis in objective reality—that there is tangible evidence for what you believe that can challenge others to believe also. As long as ‘religious’ people keep it in their churches and in their heads, the Skeptics and the NCSE will leave them alone, because such a faith will die with the next generation.

If NCSE openly opposed ‘religion’ (i.e. Christian faith), it would result in a public backlash against the NCSE and would thwart its aims—hence the pretence of ‘religious neutrality’. How can materialism / naturalism (God has nothing to do with the real world; there is no tangible evidence for his existence) be religiously neutral?

How can **anything** be ‘religiously neutral’ anyway? Jesus said we are either for Him or against Him—there is no ‘neutral’ position ([Matthew 12:30](#), [Luke 11:23](#)). The NCSE is vehemently opposed to Christians who believe the Biblical account of history, from the beginning. Is that ‘religiously neutral’?

It would be interesting to know which ‘conservative evangelical Christians’ are members (and therefore financial supporters) of the NCSE, as Scott claims there are. Surely any person described as a ‘conservative evangelical Christian’ would believe that the Bible is the revealed Word of God? How could such a person be allied with atheists? The Bible itself says

Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? What does a believer have in common with an unbeliever? ([2 Cor 6:14–15](#))

The list of ‘Supporters’ of the NCSE (eg. *NCSE Reports* 16(4), back cover) almost reads like a ‘Who’s Who’ of American atheism —names such as Gould, Eldredge, Jukes, Johanson, Sagan and Dalrymple, for example. Also, a frequent contributor to the *NCSE Reports* is one Molleen Matsumara, ‘National

Program Director' of NCSE, who is a signatory to *Humanist Manifesto 2000*. This evolutionary indoctrination campaign is dear to the heart of atheists because it is proselytising for atheism! Surely any Christian would wonder about associating with these people in their passionate campaign to see people indoctrinated with evolution?

2) The Australian Skeptics

In the Australian Christian weekly newspaper *New Life*, Barry Williams of the Australian Skeptics took offence at the claim by the *New Life* columnist 'O Nesimus' that his organisation is anti-God. Like Scott, Williams claimed that there were many members who were Christians, so O Nesimus could not be right.

However, O Nesimus' comments are understandable. The Skeptics' membership lists from around the world read like a 'Who's Who' of atheists and humanists. The original American organisation was founded by the aggressively atheistic philosopher Paul Kurtz. The link of the American Skeptics (or 'Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal'—CSICOP) with the Council for Secular Humanism is so strong that they actually share headquarters, as shown above.

Ironically, a common false charge against the Australian-founded *Creation Ministries International* is that it is 'American based', yet the Australian Skeptics [*sic*] have adopted the American spelling, although the usual Australian spelling is 'sceptic'.

The Australian Skeptics even overtly deny being anti-Christian, yet they have been at the forefront of promoting Richard Dawkins, who openly proclaims his evolutionism as an apologetic for atheism—see refutations of Dawkins' books: [The Blind Watchmaker](#), [River out of Eden](#) and [Climbing Mount Improbable](#).

They also ardently promote the scurrilous and demonstrably false accusations against Bible-believing creationists by [Ian Plimer](#), Australian Humanist of the Year (1995)—see [Refutation by Independent Committee](#). His book lampooned Scripture, and claimed that belief in life after death is evidence that people have not been taught how to think. And despite the Skeptics' professed support of good science, they were unable (or unwilling) to point out the crass scientific blunders in Plimer's book—see [Plimer's Bloopers](#) for a sample.

Their journal, *The Skeptic*, often has stridently anti-Christian articles. One of many examples is 'Religion as a Health Hazard', singling out Christianity for derision (Vol. **17**, no. 3, 1997, p. 60) by one John Stear. Stear is well-known for stridently anti-Christian articles and spirited defenses of humanism, and is now the webmaster of a skeptical site named *No Answers in Genesis*, which again feigns neutrality towards religion. Or in the same issue of *The Skeptic*, 'Biblical Cosmography' (pp. 28–32) regurgitating the discredited canard that the Bible and most church fathers taught a flat earth—see [Flat earth myth revisited](#) for a refutation. In vol. **15** no. 4, 1995, pp. 16–21, H.L. Mencken's diatribe against Christianity is cited at length, and with relish.

Williams himself points out that they are sceptical of paranormal claims, and if creation by God and the Resurrection of Christ are not paranormal, I don't know what to call them! No, Williams has made it abundantly clear in his writings that he doesn't mind Christians, as long as they don't claim their belief has something to do with the *real world*. He doesn't mind faith, as long as the faithful don't claim it's supported by any hard evidence.

Conclusion

The agenda of the NCSE and the Australian Skeptics is to see everyone taught that 'evolution' explains the origins of everything, so 'God' is unnecessary in this 'scientific' view. This totally contradicts the clear teaching of the Bible that God is *clearly* revealed in what He has created. The Bible says:

For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are **clearly seen**, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse ([Rom 1:20](#)).

God is made invisible by the teaching of evolution. That's why atheists are so enthusiastic about evolution!

If there are any real (i.e. Bible-believing) Christians supporting the NCSE or Australian Skeptics, they should heed the command of God:

'Therefore come out from them and be separate', says the Lord ([2 Cor 6:17](#)).

Finally, the best antidote against occultism, superstition and charlatanism is not godless skepticism, but Biblical Christianity. A survey published in the *Skeptical Enquirer* (Summer 1980, pp. 18–31) showed that Bible believers were the ones:

'who appear most virtuous according to scientific standards when we examine the cults and pseudo-sciences proliferating in our society today.'

See [Antidote to Superstition](#) for more details.

This PDF is from: <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/2466/>

© *Creation Ministries International*

[Home](#) | [Store specials](#) | [Privacy policy](#) | [Site map](#) | [Support CMI](#) | [About us](#)