

# The Many Faces Of Unbelief

**Introduction.** One of the most mind-numbing mysteries for those who believe in God is trying to understand the unbelief of those who do not. It is difficult for us to understand why people who are obviously intelligent refuse to believe in God.

The truth of the matter is that God did not create mankind as some kind of robot to serve Him slavishly without any personal choice. When Joshua, who had led the Israelites so faithfully for so long, realized that his days were numbered, he assembled the nation and admonished his charges to employ their personal volition in a proper fashion (Joshua 24:15).

In the New Testament, the principle is the same. The Pharisees possessed the same freedom of choice as did the Israelites (John 5:39-40). While the Israelites to whom Joshua spoke chose at first to heed his plea and obey Jehovah, the Pharisees to whom Christ spoke chose to ignore His plea and to disobey God.

If a person wills, he can accept God and His teaching, but God never will force Himself on that person (John 17:16-17; Revelation 22:17). If an acknowledgment of God's existence and obedience to His word makes us free (John 8:32), then disbelief and disobedience make us captives. We can become captives to error if we abandon the one moral compass -- the existence of God -- that possesses the ability to show us the way and set us free. This lesson is going to explore the different types of unbelief.

## I. **Atheism**

- A. Chief among unbelievers would be the atheist (*a*, without; *theos*, God) -- the person who affirms that there is no God. In his book, *If There's a God, Why Are There Atheists?*, R. C. Sproul observed, "Atheism involves the rejection of any form of theism. To be an atheist is to disavow belief in any kind of god or gods." Alister McGrath, in his book, *Intellectuals Don't Need God*, noted, "In other words, the atheist recognizes the need to come off the fence and the fact that there are factors in the world of human experience and thought that suggest which side of the fence that ought to be. At present, the atheist happens to sit on the godless side of that fence."
- B. Declaring oneself to be an atheist is much easier than defending the concept of atheism. In order to defend atheism, a person would have to know every single fact there is to know, because the one fact that avoided detection might just be the fact of the existence of God. In short, a man must be omniscient and omnipresent!
- C. When they defend God's existence, theists offer evidence to back up their case. If atheists claim God does not exist, they must be prepared to explain why. When Christians state that God exists and offer evi-

dences to support this claim, atheists must prove that the Christian's evidences are erroneous.

- D. Furthermore, to disbelieve necessitates the possibility of a reasonable alternative, namely to believe. Thus, the atheist shoulders two burdens: (1) to prove the theist's evidence is invalid; and (2) to establish -- with attending evidence -- a belief system that is a "reasonable alternative" worthy of acceptance by rational, thinking people.
- E. That God did reveal Himself "in a way that left no doubt" is made clear from such evidence as: (1) the marvelous order and complexity of what we call the Universe; (2) the intricate, delicately balanced nature of life; (3) the deliberate design inherent in our genetic code; (4) the astounding historical testimony attesting to the miracle-working Son of God; and (5) an otherwise unexplained (and unexplainable) empty tomb on the morning of the resurrection almost two thousand years ago.
- F. That the atheist does not consider the evidence to be trustworthy or adequate to the task does not negate the evidence. A man's attitude toward the truth does not alter the truth. A good example of this point would be the late evolutionist and atheist, Isaac Asimov, who once admitted quite bluntly: "Emotionally, I am an atheist. I don't have the evidence to prove that God doesn't exist, but I so strongly suspect He doesn't that I don't want to waste my time."
- G. Once again, the fact remains that after everything is said and done, the atheist's second option -- providing, with attending evidence, a belief system that is a "reasonable alternative" -- is an unattainable goal. Enter "agnosticism."

## II. **Agnosticism**

- A. Perhaps the logical contradiction inherent in atheism has caused many unbelievers to affirm agnosticism instead. The agnostic (*a*, without; *gnosis*, knowledge) is the person who says it is impossible to know if God exists, due to the fact that there simply is not enough credible evidence to warrant such a conclusion. Sproul says, "The agnostic seeks to declare neutrality on the issue, desiring to make neither assertion nor denial of the theistic question.... The agnostic maintains that there is insufficient knowledge upon which to make an intellectual judgment about theism."
- B. The term "agnostic" was coined by British scientist Thomas Henry Huxley, a close personal friend of Charles Darwin's and a champion of evolution who frequently referred to himself as "Darwin's Bulldog." Huxley first introduced the word in a speech in 1869 before the Metaphysical Society.

1. Huxley worked diligently to convince those around him that agnosticism was a respectable philosophical position, and that it was quite impossible to know whether or not God existed. Yet he simultaneously advocated the position that it was quite possible to deny some theistic claims with certainty.
  2. He "knew," for example, that the Bible was not God's word, and openly ridiculed anyone who believed it to be so. He severely rebuked those who believed in what he termed "the myths of Genesis," and he stated categorically that "my sole point is to get people who persist in regarding them as statements of fact to understand that they are fools" (cf. Psalm 14:1).
- C. The agnostic is far from indifferent. He takes his agnosticism extremely seriously when he affirms that nothing outside of the material world can be known or proved. However, agnosticism is built upon a self-defeating premise. English philosopher Herbert Spencer advocated the position that no man ever has been able to penetrate with his finite mind the veil that hides the mind of the Infinite. This inability on the part of the finite (mankind), he concluded, prevented any knowledge of the Infinite (God) reaching the finite.
- D. Such a premise is flawed internally because it wrongly assumes that the Infinite is equally incapable of penetrating the veil -- a position that reduces the term "Infinite" to absurdity.
1. An Infinite Being that is unable to express Itself is less finite than mortals who forever are expressing themselves.
  2. An Infinite Being that is both capable of self-expression and aware of the perplexity and needs of mortal man, yet cannot penetrate the veil, is less mortal than mortal man.
- E. To be either correct or defensible, this proposition must work both ways. Finite man must be unable to penetrate the veil to the Infinite, but at the same time the Infinite likewise must be unable to penetrate the veil to the finite. By definition, however, the Infinite would possess the capability of breaking through any such veil.
- F. Furthermore, there is an important question that begs to be asked: Will the agnostic admit that it is at least possible for someone else to know something he does not? If he is unwilling to admit this point, is he not then attributing to himself one of the defining characteristics that theists attribute to God -- omniscience?
- G. Sir Hector Hetherington, Principal Emeritus of Glasgow University, addressed this concept when he said, "There are issues on which it is impossible to be neutral. These issues strike right down to the roots of man's existence. And while it is right that we should examine the evidence, and make sure that we have all the evidence, it is equally right that we ourselves should be accessible to the evidence." The agnostic

is perfectly capable of making himself "accessible to the evidence." The question is -- will he? Or will he choose instead to hide "behind a screen of 'can't know'"?

### III. **Skepticism**

- A. The skeptic is the person who doubts there is a God. The standard dictionary definition describes a skeptic as one who holds to "the doctrine that true knowledge or knowledge in a particular area is uncertain and who has doubts concerning basic religious principles." Notice that the skeptic does not claim knowledge of God's existence is unattainable (as in agnosticism), but only "uncertain."
- B. However, the skeptic does not stop at mere "uncertainty." In fact, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says that skepticism "... confidently challenges not merely religious or metaphysical knowledge but all knowledge claims that venture beyond immediate experience." What this all simply means that the skeptic is not prepared to accept anything that cannot be verified via the scientific method.
- C. Paul Kurtz, former editor of *The Humanist*, put it like this: "To adopt such a scientific approach unreservedly is to accept as ultimate in all matters of fact and real existence the appeal to the evidence of experience alone; a court subordinate to no higher authority, to be overridden by no prejudice however comfortable."
- D. However, in the end the skeptic does not say he cannot know that God exists. Rather, he says he doubts that God exists because He cannot be seen, felt, measured, weighed or probed by the scientific method.
  1. Yet, what about those concepts that, although non-empirical and therefore unobservable via the scientific method, nevertheless are recognized to exist, and are admitted to be of critical importance to the human race -- concepts like love, sorrow and joy?
  2. This is a fallacy called Reductionism. One commits this fallacy when one selects a portion of a complex entity and says the whole is merely that portion. One does this when he makes statements like, "Music is nothing but sound waves or art is nothing but color." When it gets down to the serious questions of life -- origin, purpose, destiny, morality -- science is silent. If science cannot handle morality, aesthetics and religion, that only proves that the scientific method was reductive in the first place.
  3. Sir Arthur Eddington once used a famous analogy to illustrate this reductionism. He told of a fisherman who concluded from his fishing experiences with a certain net that "no creature of the sea is less than two inches long." Scientific reductionism is similar to this fisherman with the special net. Since the strict empirical scientist cannot "catch" or "grasp" such concepts like freedom, morality, aes-

thetics, mind and God, he concludes that they do not exist; however, they have just slipped through his net.

- E. The skeptic has paid a high price for his scientism -- the rejection and abandonment of some of the human race's most important, valuable, worthwhile and cherished concepts. Why? In order to be able to say, "I doubt that God exists!"

#### IV. **Infidelity**

- A. The infidel is the person who not only refuses to believe in God, but also is intolerant of, and actively opposed to, those who do. There have been an abundance of men and women who made quite a name for themselves via their public display of infidelity.
1. For David Hume, one of the most famous infidels of the past, there was no evidence strong enough to prove that miracles actually had taken place.
    - a) His attack upon biblical miracles had serious consequences upon religion.
    - b) Even today, many refuse to believe in God because of David Hume's arguments.
  2. In more recent times, one of the most vicious attacks upon God, Christ and the Bible was spearheaded by Robert Ingersoll and John Dewey.
    - a) More than any other individual before or since, John Dewey's views have altered American educational processes.
    - b) Will Durant explained Dewey's influence: "What separates Dewey is the undisguised completeness with which he accepts the evolution theory. Mind as well as body is to him an organ evolved, in the struggle for existence, from lower forms. His starting point in every field is Darwinian.... Things are to be explained, then, not by supernatural causation, but by their place and function in the environment. Dewey is frankly naturalistic ..."
  3. Madalyn Murray O'Hair was the most famous atheist/infidel in America for more than thirty years.
    - a) Her public saga began in 1963 when a suit to remove prayer from public schools was heard before the U. S. Supreme Court. She would debate anyone, anywhere, anytime on the existence of God and the "atrocities" of organized religion.
    - b) It can be truly said that "the most hated woman in America" -- who had made it her life's goal to oppose God -- did not live up to anyone's expectations, but undeniably lived down to the level of her self-professed atheism. In person, she was reported to be haggard, unkempt, profane and bitter.

- B. Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist, and man is consequently pitiful, for he cannot find anything to depend upon either within or outside himself. As G. K. Chesterton once observed, "When men cease to believe in God, they do not believe in nothing; they believe in anything."

## V. **Deism**

- A. The concept of deism had its beginnings among writers in seventeenth-century England, beginning with Edward Herbert (1581-1648). In one of his books, Herbert laid out five basic principles of deism: (1) the Being of God; (2) that He is to be worshipped; (3) that piety and moral virtue are the chief parts of worship; (4) that God will pardon our faults on repentance; and (5) that there is a future state of rewards and punishment.
- B. In America, deism flourished after it had declined in England. By the end of the 18th century, deism had become a dominant religious attitude among upper-class Americans.
  - 1. The first three presidents of the United States, as is evidenced in their correspondence, held deistic convictions.
  - 2. Perhaps more than anywhere else in the United States, deistic tendencies of naturalism and Biblical criticism have lived on in modernistic or liberal Protestantism.
- C. Deism came into existence as men attempted to work around the contradictions and internal inconsistencies posed by atheism and agnosticism.
  - 1. The atheist was unable to disprove God's existence, and the agnostic was forced to admit that while he might not be able to know that God exists, someone else certainly might possess such knowledge. Enter deism.
  - 2. The best way out of the dilemmas posed by atheism and agnosticism would appear to be the following scenario. Let us say that there is a God. This God created the world. He issued to the world a moral law, a code of behavior which all of His creatures are supposed to follow. God will someday judge His creatures on how well they obeyed His commandments. In the meantime He does not interfere with His creation. He made it the way He wanted it to be, and He will not contradict His own will. For the moment, we worship God and try to live by His law, but we must not expect Him to do supernatural acts for us.
- D. The deist acknowledges that God exists, and even grants that God created the Universe and its inhabitants. Deism insists that since His initial miraculous act of creation, God has had nothing whatsoever to do with either the Universe or mankind. The basic idea behind deism

often is discussed via the analogy of a clock, the idea being that God created the clock, wound it up and then walked away to leave it operating on its own. Such a position inevitably leads to the following:

1. First, deism rejects both the threefold nature of the Godhead and the deity of Christ. Since deists believe that God never specially intervenes in the world to help mankind, Jesus was not God because that would be a miracle. There is now also no reason for them to believe that God is composed of three Beings. Deists believed in a Supreme Being, but He was only one in number.
2. Second, deism rejects the idea that God has given a special revelation of Himself in the Bible. For God to reveal Himself by speaking directly to man would be a miracle. This is something the deist is not prepared to accept. Nature itself is the only revelation God needs.
3. Third, deism advocates that human reason alone is all man needs to understand God and His laws for humankind. Without special revelation from God (a miracle), deism had no choice but to advocate that reason alone was sufficient.
4. Fourth, deism rejects the notions of a prayer-hearing/prayer-answering God and a God who works in men's lives through divine providence. If you deny revelation you must also sweep out miracle, prayer and providence. Any tampering with nature and her perfect laws would imply that nature had a defect

E. What response may be offered to deism?

1. First, deism's flawed view of God's inability to work miracles must be addressed. If God can perform the miracle of Creation, there is no good reason why He cannot do other miracles. Thus deism has an inconsistency at its core.
2. Second, if the deist believes supernatural Creation occurred, he cannot deny the only divine source of knowledge concerning that Creation -- special revelation. The deistic arguments intended to eliminate the basis for belief in a supernatural revelation apply equally as well to elimination of the deistic belief in Creation.
3. Third, since God created the laws of the Universe, and since those laws are contingent upon God for their very existence, there is no good reason why an omnipotent God could not set aside those laws for the benefit of mankind; i.e., the sending of His Son into the world for mankind's redemption.
4. Fourth, the idea that human reason alone is an adequate guide for mankind, and that the "natural world" can provide him with all that he needs to know in regard to behavior, ethics, etc., is severely flawed (cf. Proverbs 14:12; Jeremiah 10:23).

- F. Deism became the easily crossed bridge from theism to naturalism -- the view that there is no God and that "nature" is all that exists.

## VI. **Pantheism**

- A. Both theists and deists hold to a view which suggests that God is "out there." In other words, He is transcendent or beyond the world. Pantheism (*pan*, all; *theos*, God), on the other hand, teaches that God is "in here." He is not in the least transcendent, but merely in the world. Put another way, God and the world are so closely intertwined that you cannot tell them apart. The central tenet of pantheism is that all is God and God is all.
- B. While pantheism long has been associated with eastern religions such as Hinduism, Taoism and some forms of Buddhism, in recent years it has made serious inroads into western thinking, as is evident from the teachings of Christian Scientists, Scientologists and certain others. Its best known public forum today is the teachings of the New Age movement, most noticeably the writings of actress Shirley MacLaine. In addressing what she refers to as her "higher self" in her book, *Dancing in the Light*, MacLaine said, "I am God, because all energy is plugged into the same source. We are each aspects of that source. We are all part of God. We are individualized reflections of the God source. God is us and we are God."
- C. In the book he authored refuting MacLaine's views, *Out on a Broken Limb*, F. LaGard Smith stated, "The heart and soul of the New Age movement, which Ms. MacLaine embraces along with her reincarnation ideas, is nothing less than self-deification.... But it really shouldn't be all that surprising. All we had to do was put the equation together: We are One; God is One; therefore, we are God. The cosmic conjugation is: I am God, you are God, we are God.... Surely if someone tells herself repeatedly that she is God, it won't be long before she actually believes it!"
1. In trying to comprehend the thinking behind such concepts, it is essential to understand that although pantheism sounds like a theory about the cosmos, actually it is a theory about self -- the individual human being.
  2. Since each individual is a part of the Universe, since God is "in" the Universe and the Universe is "in" God, and since each individual shares the "divine nature" of the Universe, each individual is God.
- D. If pantheism is correct, then there no longer is a need for we humans to "look beyond ourselves" for solutions to whatever problems it is that plague us. Instead, we simply may "look within." We, being God, are our own source of truth. We, being God, can decide what is right and what is wrong. All the power that we need to cope with life and its va-

garies lies within the untapped reservoir of human potential we call "self."

- E. Let's carry this kind of thinking to its logical end.
1. First, if we are God, sin and its associated concepts of redemption and justification become unnecessary.
  2. Second, because God is not beyond the world but in it, there can be no miracles. While there may be supernormal events, since these are not accomplished by any power outside the Universe, but instead are the result of people realizing and employing their divine potential, then "miracles" do not and cannot occur.
  3. Third, in pantheism there is neither need of, nor allowance for, divine providence. Pantheism says that, since God is all and all is God, and since God is good, then anything evil must not, and cannot, really exist. If it existed, it would be God.
  4. Fourth, when pantheism is reduced to its basic, core concepts, it becomes clear that God does not have a personality, as depicted within scripture; thus, He is not a "person" but an "It."
  5. Fifth, pantheism advocates that there is one absolute, unchanging reality -- God -- and that humans, given time and proper teaching, can come to the realization that they, too, are God.
- F. How should Christians respond to the concept of pantheism?
1. First, we must point out that the pantheistic concept of "all is God and God is all" is wrong because it attempts to sustain itself via a contradiction. In logic, one of the fundamental laws of human thought is the basic Law of Contradiction, which says, "Nothing can both be and not be." Pantheists state that God is infinite, which includes that He is eternal, omnipotent, unchanging and so forth. However, the world is finite. It is temporal, limited and changeable. Yet pantheism tells us that this description of reality as finite world and the description of reality as infinite God are both true. Can something be both finite and infinite?
  2. Second, we need to stress that, so far as God's word is concerned, everything is not "one." The Bible clearly distinguishes between two different realms: the material and the spiritual (Ecclesiastes 12:7; Hebrews 12:9; Luke 24:39; John 4:24). Far from "all being one," nature's inhabitants actually were created by God to fulfill separate roles (1 Corinthians 15:39).
  3. Third, we need to expose the illogical and unscriptural position within pantheism which teaches that God is an "impersonal It" rather than a personal God. Religious experience is impossible in any meaningful sense of fellowship or worship because all meaningful experience involves something or someone other than oneself with whom one enters the changing experience. How is it possible

- to communicate (physically or spiritually) with an impersonal, unconscious "It"?
4. Fourth, pantheists believe that God is the one absolute, unchanging reality. Yet they also believe it is possible for humans to come to realize that they are God. If humans come to realize something, then they have changed along the way. A process has occurred that brought them from a point where they did not know they were God to a point where they now know they are God.
  5. Fifth, the concept of self-deification inherent in pantheism is in direct conflict with the Bible, where only the wicked elevate themselves to the status of deity (Ezekiel 28:2; Acts 12:21-23).
    - a) This stands in stark contrast to the reaction of Paul and Barnabas when the heathens at Lystra attempted to worship them (Acts 14:8-18). Had they been pantheists, these two preachers would have encouraged the crowds in Lystra to recognize not only the preachers' deity but their own deity as well!
    - b) The testimony of the Creation is not that man is God, but rather that God transcends both this world and its inhabitants (cf. Romans 1:18-25).
    - c) The idea of self-deification in pantheism effectively eliminates the entire scheme of redemption and negates God's interaction in men's lives. It denies the role of Jesus in Creation (John 1:1-3), the prophetic accuracy of the Old and New Testaments (1 Peter 1:10-12), the providential preservation of the Messianic seed (Galatians 3:16), the miraculous birth of Christ (Matthew 1:21-23), the significance of His resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:1-58) and the hope of His second coming (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18). When man declares his own deity, he rebels against God!
  6. Sixth, we need to help others see that pantheism is little more than "disguised atheism." Erich Sauer wrote, "Moreover, pantheism is, logically considered, only a polite form of atheism. For if one asserts that God and the world are the same, finally this comes to the same thing as saying, 'There is only one world, but there is no God.'"
- G. Like atheism, pantheism offers no moral absolutes. Since each person is "God," each person does what is right in his own eyes. Pantheism is really cruel because the evidence of a transformation whereby we will become God is sadly lacking. In the truest tradition of Satan's temptation of Eve, pantheism convinces man to set himself up as God. The results back then were tragic for the entire human race; the results in our day are equally tragic.

## VII. **Panentheism**

- A. Although the names may sound similar, pantheism and panentheism actually are quite different. Whereas pantheism teaches that God is the world, panentheism teaches that God is in the world. God is neither beyond the world nor identical with it; the world is God's body.
- B. Panentheism is a kind of compromise between theism and pantheism. It does not identify God with the material Universe (as pantheism does), but neither does it hold that an eternal God actually exists, transcendent to Creation (as theism does).
  1. Panentheists believe that the material Universe constitutes God, but that God is more than the material Universe.
    - a) They say the Universe is characterized by process and change carried out by its agents of free will. God cannot totally control any series of events or any individual, but God influences the creaturely exercise of this free will by offering possibilities. He entices the world to follow His plans; He grieves if the world strays, but He cannot make the world do anything.
    - b) To say it another way, God has a will in everything, but not everything that occurs is God's will. Because God interacts with the changing universe, God is changeable (that is to say, God is affected by the actions that take place in the universe) over the course of time. However, the abstract elements of God (goodness, wisdom, etc.) remain eternally solid.
    - c) As the world changes, He changes, too, in order to coax the world along. Whatever He wants done needs to be accomplished by the world apart from His direct help. As such God is never actually perfect; He is only striving toward perfection. He in the process of becoming all that He can be.
  2. Thus panentheism is one way of making God temporal. Another way of expressing God's temporal nature is to say that He is "finite" (as opposed to infinite). In fact, panentheism often is referred to as "finite Godism."
- C. What should be the response of Christians to panentheism?
  1. First, we should point out that a "finite" God is worthless. Winfried Corduan said, "Once we have denied that God is infinite, we do not have any reason to think that He should be any of those other wonderful things that we say He is. Then He lacks a rationale for His being all-knowing, all loving, eternal, and the other attributes that are based on His infinity. Take away the infinity, and you take away the justification for believing any of the standard attributes of God. Thus the arbitrary denial of any one attribute does not yield a finite God but yields nothing at all."

- a) Once God's infinity is removed, most of His other traits fall one by one like the proverbial row of dominoes.
  - b) Panentheism finds itself in the untenable status of positing a finite, non-omnipotent, non-omniscient God who is best described in the following illogical manner: (1) He has the entire Universe as His body; (2) He is limited (because He is finite) by the physical laws of that Universe; and (3) He cannot even know His own body because it extends over the entire Universe, yet He cannot extend Himself over the entire Universe because He is restrained by its physical laws.
2. Second, panentheism suggests that God is in the "process" of changing, yet the crucial element of change -- causality -- is missing.
- a) While it is correct to say that every change is the achieving of some potential, such change does not occur by itself.
  - b) The panentheist's dilemma is that you either have an impossible God or you have a God who is not really God. Yet, there must have been a Creator beyond the process. Panentheism boils down to practical atheism.
3. Third, panentheism is the grand example of man creating God in his image, rather than the reverse. Panentheists make the mistake of confusing God's unchanging attributes with His changing activities. Once that fatal error has been committed, God then is viewed as what He does rather than what He is.
- a) However, the Bible speaks of God engaging in temporal, changing actions on occasion. A number of different metaphors drawn from specific human analogies are used. For example, God is said to "repent" (Jonah 3:10), have "arms" (Psalm 136:12), see with "eyes" (Hebrews 4:13), and hear with His "ear" (Isaiah 59:1-2). Yet the Bible also speaks of God as a "rock" (Psalm 18:2), a "tower" (Proverbs 18:10) and as having "wings" (Psalm 91: 4).
  - b) If one wishes to use these metaphors to define God, three points first must be acknowledged: (1) the Bible uses this terminology that is intended to help humans grappling with the spiritual nature of God; (2) at times, the images used are conflicting, and one cannot take these images and literally apply them to make the Universe God's body; and (3) one cannot ignore passages which teach that God, as a Spirit (John 4:24), is both infinite and unchanging (Psalm 147:5; James 1:17).
- D. The God of panentheism can coax us, but not command us. He can fight evil, but never triumph over it. He allegedly intends to achieve a better world with human cooperation, yet most of the world is happily

oblivious to His existence. He is supposed to be able to achieve a better world, but is limited by the physical laws of that world so that He never can achieve more than those laws will allow. Who can believe it?

**Conclusion.** The economy is booming and unemployment is at an all-time low. Simply put, people do not feel the "need" for God that they did in post-war America. Great men and women of thought and achievement inevitably influence multitudes who look up to them as their leaders, and when these outstanding people in our generation are atheistic and antagonistic to the Bible, what can one expect the younger generation to be, willingly following in their steps?

Our children sit at the feet of evolutionary professors who strive daily to convince them that they have evolved from some sort of primordial slime on the primeval Earth. They view television shows intended to help rid them of their archaic "Bible-belt mentality." Then one day our son or daughter unexpectedly announces, "Mom, Dad, I don't think I believe in God any more." We stand in shocked amazement, wondering how in the world this could have happened. That is what we will consider tonight.