

## Rebuttals

Readers have not misunderstood our argument. They grasp, for example, one of our key assertions as (in the words of one reader who has responded to us), “[A]theistic naturalism and other related belief systems are classified as pantheistic because they deify nature by making the natural universe responsible for the development of order and, ultimately, of life.”

But some readers of this website’s content have brought accusations and criticisms that impugn or challenge the validity of the arguments made here. These criticisms have answers, and we offer them in the hope that readers will be confident that the insight this website offers is true.

The criticisms we discuss here are the following (in no particular order):<sup>1</sup>

1. “You presume to speak authoritatively on very broad issues that fall under the heading of philosophy of religion. You charge scientists and theologians as being ill-trained to speak to this subject matter.”
2. “On what basis should readers trust you?”
3. “Your papers have a ‘we have the answer that everyone else has missed’ tone.”
4. “These papers set up a rather indefensible dichotomy, namely that all religion is reducible to two forms: One form is Christian theism, and virtually everything else is either a corruption of Christian theism or is shoved under the heading of ‘pantheism.’”
5. “Pantheism has been made a category broad enough to subsume agnosticism, atheistic naturalism, and virtually every worldview that includes belief in some form of evolution.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The source of these criticisms is unknown.

6. “You fail to explain how you discern a ‘religion’ from a ‘worldview,’ from a ‘philosophical system,’ and so on.”
7. “You do not consider metaphysical origins of different belief systems, which would require us to posit more forms of religion, and not merely two.”
8. “The papers on this website are reducible to a battle over semantics. Why devote so much effort to attempting to establish a new definition (‘pantheism’) for a belief system when that definition risks confusion with long-established conventions, conflates one belief system with other very different belief systems that already claim that definition, and does not provide a better why for challenging and/or combating that belief system irrespective of its definition?”
9. “Aside from establishing a new definition, what is the *purpose* for your main argument?”
10. “The papers here interact little with Scripture.”

Discussion of each of these follows.

1. **“You presume to speak authoritatively on very broad issues that fall under the heading of philosophy of religion. You charge scientists and theologians as being ill-trained to speak to this subject matter.”** Our critic possibly holds that in the realm of religion there can be no authoritative voice. Each religion, it is supposed, has its distinctive features that in one way or another satisfy and serve its adherents. Therefore it would be bigotry to claim that one specific religion is more true, or more profound, or more satisfying than others. If our critic implies we are bigots because we are convinced that ultimate truth is found only in Scripture, so be it, we are bigots.<sup>2</sup> Or possibly our critic is steeped in the philosophy of

---

<sup>2</sup> We might ask if those who aggressively promote evolution, convinced that their atheism is true and seeking to exterminate Christianity from Western civilization, are not also bigots?

religion and finds it difficult to accept something in his area of expertise that is novel. Whatever authority our critic perceives in our writing derives neither from our education nor from our reputation, but from the Scriptures and from thoughtful analysis of the writings and beliefs of others. We understand the implications of Romans 1:25, and we have read the writings of pantheists and of theologians. We synthesized these into the argument we promote on this website, having chosen the vehicle of a website by which to share our insight with others.

Moreover, we have been trained in the sciences. We therefore are very much aware that very few scientists understand the role that unproved (and usually unprovable) presuppositions play in their work. The philosophy of science is rarely taught to graduate students in the sciences or, if it is, in time it simply gets lost due to the pressures of teaching, securing funding, and carrying out the work of science. And the stampede by theologians to try to harmonize Scripture with science betrays a totally deficient understanding of the role in science of presuppositions. If theologians grasped what we argue on this website, they would understand that evolutionary science, with its billions of years, is merely the outworking of alien religious presuppositions, so that harmonizing the two is syncretistic.

2. **“On what basis should readers trust you?”** On what basis should anyone trust the editorials and op-ed pieces that appear in newspapers? Is the argument that’s being made reasonable? Is evidence adduced to substantiate the argument? Does the argument have explanatory value? We expect readers to evaluate the papers on this website using the same criteria. We’ve based our argument on Scripture. We’ve thought through alternative explanations and have shown them wanting. We’ve tried to use logic in our thought. We take seriously a writer’s duty not to waste his readers’ time by offering puff.

The nature of the complaint however suggests that another issue provoked this criticism. It is possible the complainant esteems highly those who have established a reputation in philosophy or theology, and would find trustworthy the ideas that such prominent figures advance. We however are nobody's. No lengthy C.V., no impressive biography, and we don't sit on endowed chairs at a famous university. We try not to write using vague concepts and we avoid wherever possible such technical jargon as intellectuals use because communicating truth is, to us, a higher priority. And we don't express our views tentatively, as do those who speculate, because we are convinced the argument we promote on this website is true. We ask our readers to trust the truthfulness of the thesis we offer, not our credentials.

3. **“Your papers have a ‘we have the answer that everyone else has missed’ tone.”** Sure. Somebody had to discover penicillin. Somebody had to invent calculus, fly an airplane for the first time, make a steam engine that works. We happened to notice Robert Brow's observation that evolutionary progress is a core feature of pantheism and then put the dots together so that the picture on this website emerged. But why should this be a criticism? Does the complainant resent the fact that another explanation of that which lies at the center of evolutionary thinking than what he holds has now surfaced and is gaining traction? We would not have had to write all the papers on this website if the insight we offer had already been known. But it's *not* known, it has not previously appeared in print, and it should be, because it fully explains what is otherwise incomprehensible, the commitment evolutionists maintain despite glaring contradictory evidence and the animosity promoters of evolution direct at Christianity. What's important is not that someone had this insight, what's important is whether it is valid and reasonable. The criticism is petty.

4. **“These papers set up a rather indefensible dichotomy, namely that all religion is reducible to two forms: One form is Christian theism, and virtually everything else is either a corruption of Christian theism or is shoved under the heading of ‘pantheism.’”**

The dichotomy this critic complains about is not of our choosing. As obedient servants of Christ, we follow His words. And He stated in Matthew 7, concluding the Sermon on the Mount, “Enter through the narrow gate. For wide is the gate and easy is the way that leads to destruction, and many enter through it. But narrow is the gate and hard is the road that leads to life, and few are those that find it.” Jesus Himself established a dichotomy: there are those who follow Christ, and there is everyone else, who do not follow Him. There’s no third path, there are no other options. Liberals may chafe at this, but this is how God has arranged things. So as we look at the religious scene in America, we find two categories: theists, those who take Christ’s words seriously and try to follow Him, and those with other ideas, who refuse to follow Christ.

In Romans 1:25, the Apostle Paul finds a similar dichotomy. There are those who worship and serve God the Creator, and those who refuse to do that and instead find something else to worship and serve, something that’s (necessarily) in the natural world. So the dichotomy our critic complains of derives directly from Scripture. Indeed, the situation cannot be otherwise for, when it comes to ultimate unseen truths, there exists no way of knowing them. They can be revealed, and Scripture is the revelation of those truths. Or, rejecting revelation, one can only substitute human ideas for what those truths might be. So speculation and imagination, guesses all, lead to religious forms other than that which is based on Scripture. Scripture itself lumps all those alternate forms together and views them as rebellion (or idolatry). As argued elsewhere on this website, in the Western world, the most appropriate tag to put on all those religious forms that reject Christ,

that worship and serve that which is created, is pantheism. The criticism is undeserved.

5. **“Pantheism has been made a category broad enough to subsume agnosticism, atheistic naturalism, and virtually every worldview that includes belief in some form of evolution.”** That is correct. That’s exactly what we argue here. This complaint is not a criticism. It’s not an accusation of muddled thinking on our part. The critic is not alleging we’re wrong, and he doesn’t or can’t demonstrate that we’re wrong. He simply refuses to accept our argument.

Robert Brow (now deceased) was a theologian who studied and worked in India for decades. He probably understood pantheism better than most. We base our understanding of pantheism mainly on his work, but the writings of other pantheists confirm the correctness of our view. The central features of pantheism are its rejection of the God of Scripture and its belief in continual progress (evolution).

Repeatedly on this website we explain why agnosticism, atheism and other –isms, because they are non-theistic and hold to evolution as the explanation of origins, are at their core pantheistic.

All non-theists who reject the biblical narrative of Creation have to be lumped into one category because of Romans 1:25. So, which category is most appropriate? In that these non-theists see nature as endowed with spontaneous, self-creating capacity, they are ascribing divine qualities to nature. Therefore pantheism is the proper category. It doesn’t matter that these non-theists don’t consciously sense deity in nature. It doesn’t matter that they don’t self-identify as pantheists.

Contemporary atheists are aggressively attacking Christianity in the name of a *religion*. They may not be able to specify their religion, but we have identified it for the Church. It’s pantheism. Our critic evidently disagrees, but offers no reasons. Rejecting a thesis without stating why is itself unreasonable.

6. **“You fail to explain how you discern a ‘religion’ from a ‘worldview,’ from a ‘philosophical system,’ and so on.”** People certainly find the many abstract terms that philosophers use confusing. Philosophers themselves have to clarify what they mean by the terms they use when communicating to other philosophers! A term that means one thing to a philosopher of one particular school of thought doesn’t necessarily mean the same to another. So obviously the terms we use need to be defined or there’s no communication. Nevertheless, we have clearly and repeatedly explained what religion is. And our thesis is that everyone is religious, even atheists, and that the religion of those who reject the God of the Bible and hold to evolution to explain origins is pantheism. Our critic is trying to bring worldview and philosophy into the discussion, but these are his terms, not ours.

Many creationists repeatedly use the term worldview as that which distinguishes Christians from non-theists.<sup>3</sup> But the core issue is not worldview. A worldview derives from one’s religion. A Christian’s religion consists of the beliefs and doctrines he holds to be ultimately true, the commands of Scripture to be obeyed, and the hopes for the future that Scripture promises. He then constructs a worldview based on those beliefs, and it’s that worldview that serves as a grid or filter by which he interprets the world and life as it plays out around him. It’s that worldview built on the foundation of his religion that guides him in his decisions, his understanding of events, and what actions should be taken. For example, a core biblical (and Christian) religious

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Summer 2015 issue of *CRSQ*, for example, in three separate places (an editorial, the lead article, and a reply to a Letter to the Editor), the term “worldview” recurs. The editor writes, “...as Christians we have a very different worldview from the rest of humanity...” That’s true, but what he means is our *religion* is different because it derives from revelation, whereas other religions are inventions. Unbelievers may live a Christian worldview – in fact many do! And in another place we read that the evolution/creation conflict is “a worldview war between Christianity and naturalism.” There’d be no “war” if it were merely a dispute over worldviews; it is a war precisely because it’s a collision of mutually contradictory *religions*.

belief is that man was given dominion over God's creation. A worldview issue that follows therefore would be our duty to care for all the animals. Another core Christian religious belief is that because of Christ's atonement, forgiveness of sin is freely available to all. Worldview issues that follow therefore would be our duty to forgive others when they offend us and the duty to evangelize others. Much New Testament admonition concerns developing a worldview based on core eternal religious truths. Non-theists likewise have a worldview, although those worldviews are more varied than that of a Christian because no particular body of doctrine informs it. They may have, for example, an Epicurean worldview, or an existential worldview, or even a type of a Christian worldview. A worldview is something that we construct based on or consequent to what we believe to be absolutely true. A Christian's worldview, based on the revelation of God as the Author of life, and His conferral of the "image of God" on man, includes treasuring life, sustaining it and promoting it. In contrast, Hitler's and Stalin's worldview, based on non-theistic religion, included murdering anyone they held in their power.

Religion is distinct from philosophy because people hold their religions with deep conviction. A philosophy, in contrast, consists of ideas usually quite abstract; it is something intellectuals toy with. A Christian, one who holds tightly to the propositions of the Bible, can discuss various types of philosophy, can even know everything about them, yet not believe them.

The above distinctions notwithstanding, we acknowledge that it is difficult to draw sharp boundaries around these concepts. Nevertheless, the conflict between evolutionary science and Christianity is not one of two different philosophical systems, nor is it a clash of worldviews. It's a war between two utterly contradictory *religions*.



7. **“You do not consider metaphysical origins of different belief systems, which would require us to posit more forms of religion, not merely two.”** We find this accusation difficult to rebut because of the fuzzy language. The lofty but vague concept the critic alludes to, “metaphysical origins of different belief systems,” appears to betray a failure (or a refusal) to see that all humanity is religious. Religion seems to have been built into our psyche. All humans are religious at their core; perhaps it’s a component of the “image of God.” Where did I come from, and how did I get here? What shall guide my behavior? How do I relate to the world? What is ultimate truth? All these are questions that *religion* answers. Whether we got here by evolution or by God’s creation is a *religious* issue. The answers to these questions are—or formulate—the presuppositions that we all use on a daily basis to get thru life. Religion is a vastly deeper and more significant component of our make-up than simply what kind of assembly we attend and what kind of hymns are sung or what rites are practiced.

It’s no “metaphysical” concept that leads us to follow Christ. It’s no philosophy that leads elite evolutionists to despise Christianity. It’s not “atheistic naturalism,” nor empiricism, nor positivism, nor secularism, nor any of the other –isms that keep a non-theist convinced that evolution is true in the face of clear evidence that falsifies it. It’s religion that does these things. Our beliefs constitute our religion; or, conversely, our religion supplies the beliefs we need to live, to make decisions, to choose what’s right and what’s wrong. We’re not involved in a war of philosophies or metaphysics. Whether we realize it or not, we’re in a war of religions, and it’s non-theistic religion (which we identify on this website as pantheism) versus Christianity. Christians should know who their enemy is. It’s not a philosophy or a metaphysic.

So how many religions are there? Matthew 7:13-14 and Romans 1:25 inform us that there are exactly two: (1) following Christ, i.e., worshiping and serving the Creator God, based on revelation; or (2) everything else, which is necessarily of human invention and in some way or another involves worship of nature. This critic evidently wants to recognize each particular form of religion on earth as being distinct. That may be in the curriculum for a philosophy of religion course, and that may be part of a modern university's focus on diversity, but it isn't biblical.

Now atheists (and liberals in general) will of course reject our assertion that all people are religious. They don't want to be tagged "religious." But religion doesn't necessarily require the conscious awareness of a deity. It means holding to a system of beliefs. Nevertheless, even atheists have in the background a view regarding deity, specifically that there is none.<sup>4</sup> To say that there is no God is a deeply religious statement! Sadly, Christian intellectuals trained in secular institutions have imbibed liberal notions that serve as a barrier to understanding (let alone accepting) our argument.

**8. "The papers on this website are reducible to a battle over semantics. Why devote so much effort to attempting to establish a new definition ("pantheism") for a belief system when that definition risks confusion with long-established conventions, conflates one belief system with other very different belief systems that already claim that definition, and does not provide a better**

---

<sup>4</sup> Atheism is wishful thinking in the extreme. Atheists prefer self-glory and autonomy, but at such risk!! If atheists were intellectually honest, they should wonder how, in a world based on cause and effect, matter could possibly come into existence from nothing? And then they'd understand that only an uncaused Cause could bring anything into existence from nothing. And they should wonder, If the Bible is God's self-revelation, isn't there evidence in it that would make it self-attesting? And looking they would find messianic prophecies that, in their precise fulfillment, make unbelief irrational. Evolution is the atheist's comforting fantasy.

**why for challenging and/or combating that belief system irrespective of its definition?”** Semantics!! Of all the accusations and criticisms directed at us, this one is the most appalling. This critic, who evidently is a creationist, fails to understand the nature of the epic conflict that’s been raging in Western Civilization these past two centuries.

The words used in debate are exceedingly important. The entire framework of a debate or a poll can easily be skewed by the words that are used. Liberals won the debate over abortion at its very outset by framing it as a matter of “choice,” and the embryo was termed “tissue.” With that, they won. The elites of science, all non-theists and evolutionists, are close to winning the debate over origins by their term “science.” As long as the issue is framed as a Science-versus-Religion contest, Christians lose. The disastrous *Kitzmiller vs Dover School Board* decision depended on this very deceit. We cannot allow this trickery to continue any longer. That’s why this website. To dismiss our thesis by calling it “semantics” is the epitome of small-mindedness.

Our critic refuses to use the word “religion.” He prefers “belief system.” What he fails (refuses?) to see is that people don’t go to war over a “belief system.” The term “belief system” appeals to intellectuals who love lofty concepts and abstractions, but modern aggressive atheists are not determined to extinguish Christianity from Earth over a “belief system.” And our critic refers to “long-established conventions,” by which he probably means such categories and terms as atheism, agnosticism and secularism, or naturalism, positivism and rationalism. We appeal to this critic and to others who harbor similar views to open their minds and see that there’s a better, more biblical, more rational, more fundamental way to understand the evolution/creation conflict. We’re not introducing confusion, we’re offering the fresh insight, albeit a radically different insight, that the

Church desperately needs to defend itself from evolution's devastating onslaught.

The complaint that we conflate atheism with pantheism is reasonable. But we have already justified doing that in many places here and elsewhere on this website. This critic simply refuses to accept our argument. The problem is, the Church can't steel itself against atheists' attacks unless it has a simple and true understanding of what the conflict is all about. Framing the enemy as a "belief system" or "atheistic naturalism" or "materialism" or whatever other philosophical abstraction there might be doesn't cut it. It's religious warfare: their religion against ours.

9. **“Aside from establishing a new definition, what is the *purpose* for your main argument?”** Wait. We are not merely coming up with a new definition. This complaint reveals a critic who, sadly, has utterly missed the argument we advance on this website. Obviously, if he doesn't understand what we're saying, he can't possibly see any purpose to it.

On this website we argue that those who refuse to believe in the Creator God of the Bible and hold instead to evolution to explain origins are pantheists. That's a religion. So the conflict tearing up Western civilization is religious warfare. Pantheists – those who hold aggressively to their religion – seek to rid the world of Christianity. Hiding behind “science,” their animosity isn't recognized and their strategies are invisible. And Christians, having no understanding of the nature of the conflict, not only are defenseless, they don't know how to respond. By exposing the true nature of the conflict, we hope to arouse Christians so that they are prepared to engage a false religion. There is no need for youth raised in the church to have to go to college and have their faith destroyed; they need to understand that it is an alien religion that is being forced down their throats. Similarly,

church leaders and theologians need to realize that the Scriptures are trustworthy from page one on, and there's no need to attempt to harmonize what the Bible reveals with what pantheists imagine. Compromise should not occur if church leaders knew that another religion was being forced onto them. Pastors are confused whether Genesis 1 should be taken literally or not, for they correctly understand that resurrection depends on a *fiat* creation, and only a *fiat* creation allows the church to account for evil and for death. Pastors should realize that the confusion was injected into Christianity by an alien religion.

Let's observe that the many articles appearing recently in creationist literature showing the role of naturalism in science have not had any visible salutary effect on the conflict. That's because no one gets stirred up over another person's philosophical ideas. But when one person tries to force his religious views on someone else . . . that's a different story. Christians invite others to believe God's Word. Pantheists in contrast are at war with Christianity.

Moreover, pantheists believe that progress occurs not only in the realm of scientific study, it controls the flow of history as well. So pantheists seek to steer society in a direction that makes Christianity a thing of the past, so that non-theistic religion can prevail. The tracks of a pantheistic march thru society can be discerned. Christians should be aware what's happening to the society their children will inherit so that its advance can be checked. The purpose of this website is to call the church to identify, engage and refute this false religion, pantheism.

10. **“The papers here interact little with Scripture.”** The argument of this website can be understood as a modern-day exposition/application of Romans 1:25, “...who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever.” Or, as the NIV says it, “...worshiped

and served created things rather than the Creator,” which is similar to how the TEV translates *ktisei*, “...what God has created instead of the Creator himself.” Worship of the Creator is biblical theism.

Pantheism, which as we argue includes atheism and agnosticism, is worshiping and serving that which was created instead of the God of the Bible.

Romans 1:25 is a verse of cosmic significance, for it classifies all people into exactly two categories, and it puts the worship of created things parallel to (and in contrast to) theism. Paul is contrasting two *religions*. So there are two religions in the Western world: (1) biblical theism, and (2) everything else that is non-theistic and that focuses on nature or things natural (physical).

Romans 1:25 is essential for understanding the evolution/creation controversy. Creationist scientists have done outstanding work in showing the many problems with evolutionary explanations of origins and in presenting evidences that confirm the Bible’s narrative of creation and the flood. But all that work needs to be grounded in Scripture. And if there’s one Scripture that should serve as the biblical basis for countering evolution, it is this verse, Romans 1:25.

Creationists worship and serve the God of Scripture whereas evolutionists (perhaps unwittingly) worship and serve that which has been created. Each then has its worldview (or framework or grid) by which to interpret the world, one that derives from the underlying religious beliefs. Each is deeply committed to certain core beliefs, which is why those beliefs are religious in nature and not mere intellectual ideas or concepts. And to the extent that non-theists, because of their convictions, seek to eliminate theism from modern society, there is inescapable conflict; so Christians need to understand the nature of the warfare and prepare for it.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> To a young person enticed by non-theistic religion (whatever its form), the question should be posed: What is the authority for this belief? And the answer has to be,

This verse lies in the background of, or serves as the foundation for, all that's on this website. The complaint that our papers interact little with Scripture totally misses this key point.

We need also to point out that Romans 1:25 was penned in the context of God's wrath against sin and godlessness. Paul, thru the Spirit, reveals that God's existence is plain to all, and God therefore is justified in holding all accountable. Unbelievers need to realize that this is a self-affirming assertion! God could not justly hold everyone accountable unless indeed the evidence was plainly there for all to see. This means that evolution is a massive illusion. It blocks people from seeing the evidence God has placed in His creation that reveal not only His existence but His goodness, His greatness and His sovereignty. This verse compels belief in the God who reveals Himself.

Needless to say, our thesis must provoke more objections and questions than we discuss above. Theologians and philosophers, for example, surely object to our label of compromiser and syncretist. If they think that a white-coated scientist puts a rock into an instrument and the digital display reads "5.4 billion years" and that's therefore what the earth's age must be, they haven't been reading the creationist

---

someone's speculation. The issue is not the kind of worldview that is attracting, but the absolute truth or falsity of the belief that that worldview is based on. Pantheism (and atheism, etc) is no more ultimate than the conjectures and personal beliefs of Spinoza and the others who followed him. Moreover pantheism's core affirmations are self-refuting. Matter cannot come into existence entirely on its own, and creating ever increasing complexity (progress) requires intelligence, which means deity must be personal. And because only an uncaused Cause can have brought anything into existence, deity also must be transcendent. In contrast to human speculation, theism is based on the authority of God, who has revealed Himself and His will for us. And His Word is self-attesting, as any text on apologetics can demonstrate. *These* therefore are the options: it's either the Christian, theistic religion, based on Scripture. Or it's some form of opposing, irrational, non-theistic religion based on no higher authority than human imagination. It certainly is not what Science tells us versus what the Bible says, as most people wrongly suppose.

literature. In books, journal articles, and on websites, creationist scientists have explained the complicated process of geochronology, the assumptions that underlie it, and the absurdly anomalous dates that are routinely (deceitfully) ignored. To suppose that dating a rock is similar to obtaining the blood glucose level on a specimen of blood is naive in the extreme. The creation literature is now so massive and so compelling, carefully exposing the flaws in evolutionary thinking, there is no longer any excuse for trying to harmonize the Bible's creation narrative with evolutionary science's explanation of origins.

Another objection calls our entire project into question. It goes like this, "the Christian doctrine of total depravity sufficiently explains the source of evolutionary science; so why postulate that another religion is involved?" And indeed we agree with the premise. Rebellion against God manifests itself in every area of human endeavor, including science. This means that whenever scientific observations or evidence are interpreted, to the extent that the matter touches on God's existence or His will, evolutionary scientists will resort to naturalistic presuppositions. Evolution and its underlying naturalistic philosophy were invented to exclude God so that scientists can pretend they are doing objective investigation of the origins of the physical world. In Romans 1:18, Paul states that wicked people "suppress the truth by their wickedness." Total depravity certainly does account for the evolutionary explanation of origins.

The problem we have with this complaint is that it lacks explanatory power. It's not adequate. The premise fails to account for the religious nature of all humans. What specifically is that religion? Paul would say it's idolatry. But that requires additional layers of explanation for modern Western culture. Another religion certainly is involved, so which is it? We answer this question. Furthermore, only another religion accounts adequately for the hostility directed at Christianity, for the irrational adherence to evolution despite a plethora of valid



creationist arguments, and for the supposed natural progression of history over time away from “supernatural” explanations of events to rational and scientific (naturalistic) ones. These must result from underlying religious convictions. Moreover, evangelical theologians are fully aware of the doctrine of total depravity, yet they are scrambling to reinterpret Genesis to comport with evolutionary science’s narrative. And youth in the church surely have been taught about the pervasiveness of sin, yet they are blown away by the forceful presentation of Godless science in their schools and colleges. So another explanation, a fresh insight is needed to steel people’s defense of biblical truth. “Who wants somebody else’s religion [pantheism] crammed down their throat?” is a powerful strategy and we encourage the Church to put it to use.

To conclude, we are glad that critics question our thesis. Criticism has forced us to re-assess how reasonably we’ve presented our argument. But we find that, so far, critics have failed to defeat what we assert on this website. Readers can be assured that the papers herein assembled validly speak to the evolution/creation conflict.