

# The Foundations – Argumentation

## Introduction

Albert Einstein once said that:

*‘Anyone who has never made a mistake has never tried anything new.’<sup>1</sup>*

It is in this truly scientific spirit to that Stuart and I started studying the recent work of Richard Dawkins. We can’t promise that everything we say here is right, or that we have the monopoly on understanding this great writer, but we wanted to make an attempt to interact with his arguments.

Our aim in these two sessions is to equip you to deal with Dawkins – to read *The God Delusion* yourself, or at least to understand how Dawkins argues and what the major planks to his platform are.

The chances are every one of you will have a colleague at work, or a family member, or a friend who has read the book, even if you yourself haven’t, and there is every likelihood that these people will accept his arguments. And this is the main reason for actually considering his work. We’re not aiming for a character assassination, for cheap shots or to make ourselves feel smug. Rather, if Dawkins is, as he seems to be, the foremost contemporary arguer for the case for atheism – the scientific branch of the triumvirate of Dawkins, Hitchens and Pullman – we want to interact with the arguments he puts forward, and determine their strengths and flaws.

In that way, we can look to expose the vulnerability of the position when subjected to the weapons that Dawkins lays so much store by – reason and evidence. If he is found wanting, then the atheist community are obliged to provide new arguments, or to consider the gospel on its own merits, without the smoke-screen of *The God Delusion* to escape behind.

During this first chapter, I’ll be looking at the first-principles of Dawkins’ arguments – the way that he argues and the techniques he uses. That way, when we come on to deal with the specific arguments, we will be slightly wiser to how he’s using his ‘evidence.’ This is good scientific technique – in the first place, establish your method and its rigour, and in the second, analyse its implications – not the other way around, as Dawkins himself so often does. So we will start with the method, and then deal with the specifics of the implications that he draws.

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright Kevin Harris 1995 <http://rescomp.stanford.edu/~cheshire/EinsteinQuotes.html>

In this section, I want to mention two broad areas to group Dawkins' style of arguing, and then follow that on with some additional comments. Firstly, however, let me define a few terms, so that the vocabulary we use is commensurate – this is often the root of disagreements when it comes to Christianity and Science, for we easily say words and misunderstand the loaded meaning they drag with them!

## Definitions

### God

Richard Dawkins' working definition of what he terms, 'The God Hypothesis,' – that is, what he sets out to disprove – is the following:

*'...there exists a super-human, supernatural intelligence who deliberately designed and created the universe and everything in it, including us.'*<sup>2</sup>

He fleshes this out a few pages later to encompass what he terms, 'The Abrahamic God':

*'He not only created the universe; he is a personal God dwelling within it, or perhaps outside it (whatever that might mean), possessing the unpleasantly human qualities to which I have alluded.'*<sup>3</sup>

It's worth noting at this stage that in truth, God is biblically super-human only in the literal sense (that is, He is *more than* human), and not super-human in the literary sense (that is a human, but maxed-out in terms of physical characteristic – he can run faster than a speeding bullet, and so on!). Dawkins flip-flops occasionally between these two understandings, as befits his arguments. We will employ the biblically correct description

Finally, we can note that Dawkins' aim is to forward an alternative viewpoint:

*'Any creative intelligence, of sufficient complexity to design anything, comes into existence only as the end product of an extended process of gradual evolution. Creative intelligences, being evolved, necessarily arrive late in the universe, and therefore cannot be responsible for designing it.'*<sup>4</sup>

This is so full of holes that I could use it to strain rice, but we will come back to this later.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dawkins, p31, 'The God Hypothesis'

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p38, 'The God Hypothesis'

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p31, 'The God Hypothesis'

## Evolution

This is the name for any process that involves gradual change over a period of time, normally heading in a more ordered direction as time progresses. Scientifically, there are broadly two types of biological evolution.

- i) **Microevolution.** This is the gradual change within a species over time. This is clearly true and evidenced by, for example, different coloured moths in polluted cities compared to the countryside, and by the rise of MRSA (antibiotic-resistant 'super-bugs') in hospitals. In other words, it describes the small-scale changes *within* a population (below species level) of the frequency of occurrence of a given genetic trait.
- ii) **Macroevolution.** This represents the gradual change between species over time – the fact that all life descends in some way from primordial sludge early in the life of the earth. It is evolution at or above species level.

It's essential to note that microevolution is an undisputed and straightforward scientific fact. Macroevolution is what is actually under scrutiny when people use the shorthand, 'evolution.' So it is wrong to discount evolution wholesale – that would be to deny the appearance of MRSA, to take but one example – but rather we ought to recognise that where the contention is in evidence, it is over macroevolution.

## Creation / creationism

This is often used as a shorthand for the fact that the universe was created in six literal days (creation) and for the movement who hold to this fact (creationism). Anti-creationists often import other meaning into the words, namely that creationism denies all scientific theories arguing for older universes (the big bang, stellar and planetary evolutionary models, geology, geophysics, evolution and so on), and is essentially anti-scientific

In reality, the words only entail the belief that the universe is *created*, and not *uncreated*. They contain no information in and of themselves as to the creation mechanism, and so if we use them at any stage, they will be prefixed with appropriate information – 'long-period creationism' (that is, a created universe, created over billions of years), 'short-period creationism' (that is, a created universe, created over less than around ten-thousand years), 'six-day creationism' and so on. Where there are no prefixes, it is assumed that the words have their bald, basic meaning.

## Natural Selection

This is the process by which evolution progresses. In one generation, there is some form of genetic mutation, which is passed onto the next generation by reproduction. When these mutations are advantageous (e.g. make the entity faster, better at avoiding predators and so on), the next generation will survive, whereas those without the mutation will be disadvantaged. Thus, in the end the majority of those who survive will have this mutation and so the population will largely exhibit this new characteristic.

This is the *mechanism* of evolution, but Dawkins describes it as a faceless *agent* – his ‘Blind Watchmaker.’

### 1) Philosophical Techniques

The first area to examine is Dawkins’ use of philosophical techniques and strategies when he is arguing. It has been commented that it is a great shame that basic logic is no longer taught to students at university. As Professor Diggory in *The Lion, The Witch and the Wardrobe* said,

*‘Why don’t they teach logic at these schools?’*

There is a lack of understanding of the logic that underlies any given argument – whether it is a logically valid one or not<sup>5</sup>. Dawkins is, at times, the epitome of this deficiency. Whilst undoubtedly a gifted communicator and scientist, his grasp of philosophy is, at times, tenuous.

In essence, all of the following arguments are used to undermine or invalidate the truth of a position or a statement. Dawkins uses each of these in different ways to attack the concept of God, with inherent deficiencies.

#### i) Argument Ad Hominum

In effect, this argument attacks the truth of a position by attacking the person who holds it – by ridicule, parody, or whatever. It’s essential to bear in mind that just proving someone to be ignorant, disagreeable or unintelligent *doesn’t* logically prove that the position that they hold to is necessarily fallacious. Let me illustrate:

A doctor researches and discovers a 100% effective cure for HIV. This particular doctor happens to be an incredibly rude and arrogant sort; he looks down on all of his colleagues because they weren’t clever enough to develop his vaccine, he is unbearable company, and an insufferable boaster. Does this mean that if you have HIV, you will refuse to take the

---

<sup>5</sup> In fact, this is symptomatic of our culture – logic plays an ever-poorer second place in debate to rhetoric. Poor logic is excusable if it makes us laugh.

vaccine, knowing full-well that it will halt the progress of the virus and nullify the symptoms? Of course not! You may investigate more fully, but crucially, the character of this man doesn't affect the inherent truth of his claim to have developed the vaccine.<sup>6</sup>

All I want to point out is that, whilst this is a regular technique by Dawkins, just showing that there are some weird people who happen to be religious (especially Christians ... we knew that already!), this by no means proves that the thing they have put their trust in is false.

## ii) The Genetic Fallacy

The technique here is similarly to attack the truth of God's existence, but this time, by undermining the way in which the person has come to hold an idea or proposition.

So, for example, when Lewis Walport, another famous 'atheist'<sup>7</sup>, says that people are religious (especially Christian) because it is a comfort to them, this in no way invalidates the truth of what the people believe, regardless of what Walport claims. Three quick responses to that:

- God is sovereign creator – why *shouldn't* he create our brains in such a way that being in relationship with him provides some measure of 'comfort?'
- OF COURSE it is a comfort to us – Christianity tells us that we are hell-bound sinners, with the possibility of the heaven-bound tractor beam of grace! Wouldn't that comfort you?
- 'Comfort' is a slippery term, and a dangerous position on which to build your atheism – in what way does a martyr have a more comfortable life, or gain some kind of personal / community advantage by dying?

Similarly, if someone has come to hold a position because they grew up in a nominally Christian country, or in 'more Christian' times, does not invalidate the truth of Christianity. In the same way, you could invalidate the atheist's position – he has come to his conclusion because he has grown up in the 21<sup>st</sup> century West; had he grown up in Pakistan, or in early Christendom, his theistic position would be markedly different, thus his position must be false. If the genetic argument is to be held true, it must hold true for atheism also, thus invalidating the position held therein.

---

<sup>6</sup> This is an adapted version of an illustration used by Prof William Lane Craig in his seminar on uniqueness of salvation in Christ

<sup>7</sup> Walport is, in reality, too intellectually neutral to be a bona fide atheist – he is more an agnostic wannabe-atheist, because it demands less intellectual rigour.

The way you come to hold a position in relation to God *does not* mean that the inherent facts are more likely true or false ... whether I determine that  $2 + 2 = 4$  because my parents tell me, or through three post-doctoral research posts, I'm still correct. We all accept some basic axioms which we are told by other authorities without feeling the need to rigorously prove them – they are seen to be empirically true, and so that is good enough!

### iii) Category Error

This seems to be a genuine error on Dawkins' part, and is one that Christians often make, too. The error means that the writer makes a statement about something, giving it some property or information that isn't possible from the evidence provided. So, for example, if I explain the smell of a rose in great detail, I haven't supplied enough information for to flatly assert that the rose is also pink.

The two categories that Dawkins mixes up could be called 'agents' and 'mechanisms'. An agent is something that *does* something – the person that turns the handle, pushes the button or throws the ball. Mechanisms, on the other hand, are the way the thing is done – that is, the turning of the handle itself, the pushing of the button, throwing of the ball. An *agent* goes through a *mechanism* to achieve a *purpose*.

When Dawkins describes the process of natural selection, he describes it as an agent<sup>8</sup>. He says that Natural Selection (for he claims it merits the capital letters) does things – that it's the one in charge. However, natural selection is more properly understood as a mechanism – the *way* something happens, rather than the *who* that makes it happen. This is perhaps the most fundamental conceptual difference when Dawkins and Christians interact on natural selection. What Christians struggle to assimilate is what they see as a mechanism, what makes Christianity unpalatable to Dawkins et al is that for them, natural selection is a sufficient agent – it has effectively replaced God as the agent.

'If I can satisfactorily describe the process of natural selection,' they will say, 'I have demonstrably proved that there is no God, for I have demonstrably proved the viability of a new agent that makes God obsolete.' On that, six day-creationists and Dawkins agree! What they think they are dealing with is an alternative agent to God.

On the whole, though, natural selection is a description of a mechanism – of the way things happen, of the way things change and develop and progress over time. To elevate it from a mechanism to an agent is to give it unwarranted position of authority and finality for which there is little to no scientific proof. We have no more evidence that natural selection is the 'necessary agent' in the universe than atheists say we have for God to be such! By all means, there is

---

<sup>8</sup> See esp. 'The Blind Watchmaker'

evidence (if not comprehensive evidence) that it is a viable scientific theory and mechanism, but *not* a necessary agent.

Thus, by analogy, what Dawkins in effect is arguing is this:

My washing machine works. I put dirty clothes in, and an hour or so later, they come out wet and clean. Thus, there was no-body who programmed the machine, and the process that produced clean wet clothes is the same blind process that turned itself on in the first place. That's the way it is. Deal with it.

Bear this in mind as you read Dawkins – this is why he argues so vociferously for natural selection, because he thinks that if he can justifiably prove natural selection, he has a natural replacement for God as the universe's necessary agent. This is idolatry at work in all its manifest ugliness – we can replace God with something else, and something that we control and fully understand, thus putting us in charge.

## 2) Rhetorical Techniques

Secondly, let's examine some of the rhetorical techniques employed by Dawkins. These are used to ridicule the character of an idea, position or statement, parody it or otherwise make it seem unfeasible, simply by cleverly using words. Of course, Dawkins is a master at this (after all, he holds his chair in the Public Understanding of Science!) – he is a thoroughly engaging speaker and writer; witty, verbose, oratorically gifted. He is generally very enjoyable to read. However, merely writing enjoyably is not tantamount to achieving his aim:

*'If this book works as I intend, religious readers who open it will be atheists when they put it down ... at the very least, I hope that nobody who reads this book will be able to say, "I didn't know I could [give up religion]."'*<sup>9</sup>

in a rigorous, scientific, objective way. In fact, he even says in the closing chapter,

*'This is a matter of taste or private judgement, which has the slightly unfortunate effect that the method of argument I must employ is rhetoric rather than logic. I've done it before, and so have many others including, to name only recent examples, Carl Sagan ... E. O. Wilson ... Michael Shermer ... and Paul Kurtz.'*<sup>10</sup>

Ironically enough, this section of the chapter is entitled 'Inspiration.' You've gotta love a trier...

---

<sup>9</sup> Dawkins, pp5-6, 'Preface'

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p360-1

i) Can-Do

The first of these is what I call the 'Can-Do' fallacy. In effect what he does is describe a scenario that illustrates some point in his argument, and do this effectively and forcibly. He then takes this relative principle or point as normative for all situations, regardless of whether they bear any resemblance to the original illustration. He has given himself carte-blanche to take individual situations and make them normative, allowing him to build seemingly strong cases from fairly flimsy initial premises.

*'If something can [in one situation], then it does [in all situations].'*

The strong version of this, which crops up now and again is the 'Can-Must' version, where he is effectively saying,

*'If something can do this, it must do it in every situation.'*

I needn't say that this is a little fast and loose! A prime example of this is in chapter 3 ('Arguments for God's Existence,' *The argument from religious 'experience'*). He describes a psychological process which can produce mild illusions of physically unlikely phenomenon with reference to one or two senses, and then extrapolates this to every flavour and volume of religious experience – if the brain *can* do this, *it must* do this in every situation. Taking the occasional and making it normative is not good argumentation, no matter how persuasive it sounds.

Nonetheless, it is easily recognisable in the biblical description of the process of idolatry. Throughout the book of Daniel, we see a totalitarian state set against God, who oppose God by first relativising the absolute (making God just 'one of a number of options, saying you *must not* worship one thing above all), and then by absolutising the relative (you *must* worship what I tell you to). This is the pattern that is true so often as sin progresses in its destructive march.

ii) Declarative Statements

This is undeniably Dawkins' oldest and favourite trick. Boiled down, it goes something like this: 'If I shout something loudly enough, that makes it true, and people will believe me.' And the crazy thing is, they do. To be honest, that's a bit reductionist, but he has a knack of saying things in a way that sounds very grandiose and authoritative, with little to back himself up.

It's a bit like the second hand car salesman who promises you amazing things with your purchase like 'fully verified road-steady polymer traction-enhancing rim covers: fifth one comes free!' It's only when you walk away and think about it that all he's really said is that you get tyres with your car and you get the spare tyre in the boot free.

When one is writing a scientific paper, any assumed knowledge needs to be referenced and backed up by generally accepted work – my Master's thesis had a cross-reference more than once in every 100 words. Now of course, a popular book is a different ball game, but Dawkins will still regularly make what adds up to his own definitions, and bald statements, without any effort to back them up.

*'Faith,' he says on page 308, 'is evil precisely because it requires no justification and brooks no argument.'*<sup>11</sup>

Elsewhere, he says,

*'Faith [is] belief without evidence'*<sup>12</sup>

This is a definition unlikely to be accepted by any theologian, and there is no justification for it, it brooks no argument.

A classic example is his attempt to use the field of memetics, falling under the umbrella of evolutionary psychology, as a proof of his position. At one stage, he backs up his point by saying:

*'Peter Richerson and Robert Boyd emphasize the point in the title of their valuable and thoughtful book Not by Genes Alone.'*<sup>13</sup>

Now, to claim the title of a book as evidence is on the whole, not sufficient. It's like saying, 'Richard Dawkins – he wrote a book that's very readable and entertaining called *The God Delusion*. That must mean that God is a Delusion. It says it in the title, after all.

I won't say more than this, but watch out for Dawkins doing this – making a statement and causing the reader to assume that because he says it and seems **convincing** and **convinced**, it therefore carries with it the weight of authority of hard science.

At least in terms of many of his statements in *The God Delusion*, we could well follow the lead of Bertrand Russell's famous statement, justify a healthy skepticism, shake our heads and say,

*'Not enough evidence, Richard, not enough evidence'*<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p308, 'What's wrong with religion.'

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, p199, 'The Roots of Religion,' *Tread softly, because you tread on my memes*

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, p196, 'The Roots of Religion'

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, p103, 'Arguments for God's Existence,' *Pascal's wager*

### iii) Appeal to Arrogance

One of the gifted rhetorician's subtle weapons is to flatter his audience; to pander to the natural pride of the human. There are two ways in particular where this is seen in *The God Delusion*.

Firstly, the repeated use of the phrase 'consciousness raiser.' This occurs time and again throughout the book, especially after p114, '*Natural Selection as a Consciousness-Raiser*' (part of Chapter 4, 'Why there almost certainly is no God.'). although it features strongly in his preface, too. Effectively what Dawkins is doing here is saying 'Have you had your eyes opened? My view is equated with understanding, intelligence, it is the PhD to my opponents' 11-plus. Their view is equated with ignorance, dumbness.'

One might almost say

*'The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it ... the true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world.'*<sup>15</sup>

And that light is Professor Richard Dawkins

Having made this strand of connection, it is easy pickings for the writer. By nature, we want to be on the clever side, the side that have made the right decision. That's what Dawkins is appealing to with this phrase. Whether it masks weak arguments or not is moot, a deeper-seated desire is activated – to want to be on the smart side. Don't let it blind you to the argument behind the words.

Secondly, he regularly talks about himself in terms that suggest his own authority is unimpeachable. He often sounds as if he is a slightly condescending grown-up talking to a naïve child.

*'We doctors,'* he says at one stage, *'call that kind of linkage linkage.'*<sup>16</sup>

Later, he says:

*'I'm inclined to suspect ... that there are very few atheists in prison ... Another good possibility [for atheism increasing morality] is correlated with some third factor, such as higher education, intelligence or reflectiveness, which might counteract criminal impulses.'*<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> John 1:5, 9 (ESV)

<sup>16</sup> Dawkins, p197, 'The Roots of Religion,' *Tread softly, because you tread on my memes*

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p229, 'The Roots of Morality: Why are we good?' *If there is no God, why be good?*

Effectively what Dawkins does is link himself continually with the intellectual elite – ‘One day, my son, all this could be yours. Trust me, I’m a doctor.’ In other words, he **arrogantly appeals** and **appeals to arrogance**.

iv) Straw man

Briefly, one other technique of Dawkins to watch out for is the construction and mauling of straw-man arguments. The clever debating technique means that all you have to do is give an argument or position the most cursory resemblance to reality, then build into it obvious weakness or fallacies, which can be easily and summarily torn down.

Often when you examine the arguments that Dawkins attacks, they bear little or no resemblance to the personal relationship with God that you yourself know of. But that is the beauty of the argument; so long as something roughly approximating to the stereotype that most people have of religion is presented, everything else can be constructed to order.

Take, for example, *The Argument from ‘Personal Experience’* (Chapter 3, ‘Arguments for God’s Existence’), pp. 87-92. By taking a few examples and making them normative, then setting them against some simple psychology, he can effectively extrapolate to the point that all religious experience is the product of some mass psychological hoodwink. The straw man looks something like this:

*‘You say you have experienced God directly? Well, some people have experienced a pink elephant, but that probably doesn’t impress you. Peter Sutcliffe, the Yorkshire Ripper, distinctly heard the voice of Jesus telling him to kill women, and he was locked up for life. George W. Bush says that God told him to invade Iraq.’<sup>18</sup>*

By making this normative of all religious experience – a chronic parody – the task of undermining it is laughably easy. Be sure you watch what Dawkins argues *against* before you are sure it is a threat to the true notion of God<sup>19</sup>.

**3) Other Comments**

At this stage, I’ll briefly mention just one or two other things before we go on to think a bit more about the specifics of the book itself.

i) Specific Scientific and Theological Arguments

Specific arguments will be dealt with in the appropriate chapters. Simply be aware of his regular misappropriation of concepts from one area and their later

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, p88, ‘Arguments for God’s existence,’ *The argument from ‘personal experience’*

<sup>19</sup> Incidentally, this section also demonstrates argument *ad hominum* and the Can-Do fallacy.

application to another area of science, with no good reason. Arguments using terms like 'infinite regress' and 'memes' often do this.

For example, in astronomy, if I take the physical processes going on in the later life of an initially 0.5 solar mass star and assume that the same process must occur in an initially 4 solar mass star is bad science (and wrong!), so assuming everything works in exactly the same way is naïve at best and downright misleading at worst.

The worst way that this is done is to take a physical processes applying to a creature, and necessarily applying it to a creator. This is so fallacious as to be laughable. It is tantamount to saying:

*'These handouts were prepared over a few days by typing keys on a laptop computer, using a Word Processing document, printed out using an inkjet printer, and photocopied beside the trainees' office. Thus, I came into being by typing into a Word Processing document on the keys of a laptop computer over a few days, and then was born via an inkjet printer and photocopied outside the trainees' office.'*

## ii) The Flip Side

It's worth mentioning in passing that Dawkins is not the only one who suffers from some of these difficulties. It's often the case, in fact, that we Christians can be guilty of just the same fallacies and shortfalls. To give two brief examples:

- **Can-Do:** We have been known to abandon all the good practices we've learned as to how to understand the bible and take what we know to be true about God, and limit His will based on that. For example, we know undoubtedly that God *can* create the universe in a particular way, or over a particular timescale – that he is all-powerful. However, we then use this to constrain how he *must* have created things – what timescale He created the universe over and what mechanism He used. He *can* create in six days, so He *does* create in Six days. He *can* allow for evolution, so He *does* allow for evolution, and so on. In reality, we have to be careful not to constrain God's will to fit in with our creation model – both sides this way have done much harm! We need to devote ourselves to careful study of God's Word to find out what He actually wants us to know, rather than assume and impose a will onto Him!
- **Category Errors:** Similarly, knowing the God who *does* something doesn't necessarily mean that we automatically know *how* He does it or even *why* He does it. Knowing that God is the **agent** of creation (which He obviously is) doesn't necessarily mean we know the **mechanism** He uses from the bible. We *may* do, but we must carefully study God's Word, rather than impose our ideas onto Scripture.

## Conclusion

So that's an overview of the First Principles of Dawkins' style of arguing. Whilst it may seem an overwhelming pool of information that I've just downloaded onto you, it'll give you a framework to fit the specifics into. Take away and think about it, and ask questions.

But before we move on, I just want to make one final comment. When you read *The God Delusion* in depth, and begin to boil down the content to the underlying axioms, in reality most reduce to this:

### **'We don't need God anymore'**

Each time this kind of thing is expressed, it will be said slightly differently, but that is the essence of what Dawkins is postulating in his book. And that, too is the essence of sin – to say in our hearts that we don't need God anymore – in some way we have dispensed with Him. As J. Budziszewski, professor of Government and Philosophy described his own pre-Christian status, so it is with Dawkins. He says:

*'The problem is that a strong mind that refuses the call to serve God has its own way of going wrong. When some people flee from God they rob and kill. When others flee from God they do a lot of drugs and have a lot of sex. When I fled from God I didn't do any of those things; my way of fleeing was to get stupid. Though it always comes as a surprise to intellectuals, there are some forms of stupidity that one must be highly intelligent and educated to commit. God keeps them in his arsenal to pull down mulish pride'*<sup>20</sup>

If nothing else, Dawkins is a case study in the all-pervading influence of sin on our lives – the rebellion sitting within all of us, waiting to shout, 'We don't need you anymore, God.' To return to the words of Albert Einstein once more,

*'The release of atom power has changed everything except our way of thinking ... the solution to this problem [that is to say, the reason that we are so destructive] lies in the heart of mankind.'*<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> 'Escape from Nihilism', J. Budziszewski

<sup>21</sup> Copyright Kevin Harris 1995 <http://rescomp.stanford.edu/~cheshire/EinsteinQuotes.html>

