

Monkey Business?



[Freedom In America Today](#)

Monkey Business?

How do you have an intellectual debate with someone who believes that, rather than having been created as a "Human being" ...somewhere in *their* genealogy – *their mother* was a "Monkey?" Sadly, just the fact that they actually reside in that premise, makes for a compelling point for *their* argument in favor of their belief.

"I came from a monkey; ...I came from a monkey; ...I came from a monkey!"
I must confess – after a while of hearing that – I wonder why I am making the argument for *this* guy.

I think that many of those who profess Evolution actually are only trying to suppress their *real* feelings and belief that there is a God and that they are afraid of Him - because they would rather live life with the morals of a monkey!

I can only suppose that they think that on judgment day, they will just be able to escape responsibility for living life as they do, by telling God, *"Hey, you can't judge me, I thought I was a monkey!"*

I know that those who claim to sincerely subscribe to this "Monkey Business" (pun intended) claim that *all* that the Christian has is a "Blind Faith" which comes from the Bible. In contrast, they have the solid security of "Science" as the foundation for their faith.

Well, let's think about the credence of that perception on their part. I can recall as a child, Christopher Columbus was told that he could not sail for the New World by heading west – because - he would fall off the "Edge of the World." Why would people think that in those days? Well, the "**SCIENTISTS**" told people that! Sort of ironic that the scientist of that day would have been that ignorant – when you consider that the Bible had already expressed that the world was "Round."

Also, in the early *evolving* days, those little *pranksters* in *their* lab coats thought that the Sun circled the earth! *Whoops!*

Okay, so science – throughout the years – has been proven to be wrong! I still think that as they advance in knowledge and learn more actual truths that they can still move themselves along that road of understanding.

Humbling as it is for them to acknowledge "*Intelligent Design*" – they know that they must – because all the while *they* are "*on*" that road of understanding – it can never escape them that – unto themselves "*they*" (*Science* or *man*) could never create a road of any kind – because "*they*" not only cannot make "*Matter*" – they do not know where "*Matter*" came from!

I, as a Bible-believing Christian do. No M.I.T, no Stanford University – but, non-scientist me - I know!

I believe that the God of Creation who is my Father in Heaven sent His Son, Jesus Christ to live upon this earth and subsequently that He became a sacrifice for the sins of Man. I believe that he was murdered upon a cross and was buried. I believe that he rose from that grave after three days and is now sitting at the Right hand of God in heaven!

These Truths from the Bible were written and throughout – there were many, many witnesses. "Blind Faith?" There are more documentable facts in the Bible than any lab-log!

When considering all of the physical, as well as written documentable truths of the Bible, and the utter absence of any species in any stage of "evolving" - one does truly have to wonder how those who think they came from monkeys can have the "Blind Faith" that they do!

In the following article, David Limbaugh eloquently states how far adrift that the foundation of this ignorance can take someone.

Again, I will caution the read: As you are reading the purely inflammatory and debased logic of those professing that they did indeed – come from a monkey – they way in which they present and represent themselves does give good support for the thought that they may have truly come from a monkey! ...and, like maybe even yesterday!

Robert

Who Are the Real Religious Bigots?

Tuesday, 30 Aug 2011 10:16 AM

By David Limbaugh

As the 2012 presidential race gears up, leftist Christophobes are showing some signs of hysteria — or political opportunism; it's sometimes difficult to tell.

The New York Times' executive editor, Bill Keller, in a piece in The New York Times Magazine, argues that presidential candidates should be asked tough questions about their faith.

Keller wants to know whether a candidate will place "fealty to the Bible, the Book of Mormon . . . or some other authority higher than the Constitution and laws of this country" and "whether a president respects serious science and verifiable history."

He wants to make sure "religious doctrine" does not become "an excuse to exclude my fellow citizens from the rights and protections our country promises." His colleague, New York Times columnist Paul Krugman, followed up with a hit piece on "Republicans Against Science."

Keller is insatiably curious about whether Rick Perry subscribes to beliefs of certain pastors who endorse him and about Michele Bachmann's "mentors who preach the literal 'inerrancy' of the Bible, who warn Christians to be suspicious of ideas that come from non-Christians, who believe homosexuality is an 'abomination,' who portray the pre-Civil War South as a pretty nice place for slaves and who advocate 'Dominionism,' the view that Christians and only Christians should preside over earthly institutions."

It doesn't bother me if the media vet presidential candidates on their religious beliefs and associations, provided equal scrutiny is applied to all of them, including closet secularists. One's worldview invariably informs his political views, and information about those worldviews can't hurt.

But Keller's concern isn't with the religious beliefs of all candidates, only Christians, and not all Christians, just those who take the Bible seriously.

He doesn't seem to have any problem with the religious beliefs of non-Christians or about charlatans who opportunistically pass themselves off as Christians. Wouldn't an objective reporter have as much interest in someone fraudulently proclaiming a certain faith as he does in one who sincerely professes a faith he finds repugnant?

Did President Obama, for example, subscribe to the noxious political and religious beliefs of his pastor Jeremiah Wright? If not, why did he attend church there for 20 years and have his children baptized in that church? If so, shouldn't Keller's leftist ilk have followed up on why Obama agrees with Wright?

Is it merely accidental that Keller's candidate-faith anxiety is centered on conservative Christian candidates Bachmann and Perry?

Kellerian leftists shudder at the prospect of "irrational" and "reality-challenged" conservative Christians who question leftist dogma on global warming and evolution and who, they ludicrously believe, would turn America into a Christian theocracy. They want them nowhere near the seats of governmental power.

But what's irrational is their fear that Christians are enemies of religious liberty and advocates of theocracy. Never mind the strong Christian influence on America's founding. Never mind that most of America's presidents have been professing Christians. Liberty has no greater ally than believing Christians of all stripes.

If reality is their concern, why don't these leftists, instead of focusing on fantastic fears that a certain type of Christian president might shut down religious liberty, turn their attention to a president who *is* shutting down the economy? That's reality.

Why don't they inquire into the realism of Barack Obama and his team of economic advisers, what's left of them, stubbornly clinging to an economic agenda that is manifestly destroying our economy and bankrupting our nation?

Why don't they question the stability and rationality of a president who won't take responsibility for his policies, continues to scapegoat his predecessor and is preparing yet another speech, even as we speak, to promote the very same reckless spending policies that have driven this nation into a financial ditch?

I doubt that Keller is much interested in the answers to the questions he demands be raised of Perry and Bachmann. He thinks he already knows the answers but wants to incite fear in us about them.

He seems more interested in smearing certain candidates with the slanderous innuendo of his questions, such as the preposterous ones designed to suggest that certain candidates are theocrats who believe Southern slavery was a good thing.

The reality is that throughout our history, the halls of American government have teemed with Bible-believing Christians, and they've never pushed for theocracy.

Ironically, it is leftists who are far likelier to use the power of government to selectively

suppress political and religious liberties. They are the ones behind the Fairness Doctrine, network neutrality rules, campus speech codes, and preventing certain ideas from being presented, alongside all others, in public classrooms.

Once again, our leftist friends are projecting. They are the ones showing their religious bigotry and proselytizing us to adopt their secularist worldview.

David Limbaugh is a writer, author, and attorney. His latest book, "Crimes Against Liberty," was No. 1 on the New York Times best-seller list for nonfiction for its first two weeks. Follow him on Twitter @davidlimbaugh and his website at DavidLimbaugh.com.



[Freedumb In America Today](#)