

## FAQ's re Pantheism and Science

Q. What's the role of speculation in pantheism?

A. There is no way anyone can know spiritual truth except it is revealed. Rejecting the revelation that is the Bible, pantheists are merely speculating – and they necessarily can *only* speculate – as to the nature of the world we live in. Such speculation can be deeply philosophical. Spinoza, for example, assumed that an infinite and eternal God would only create that which is infinite and eternal, corresponding to His nature. So what is finite couldn't have come from an infinite God because, Spinoza assumed, like originates like. So the world always existed, he said; it had no absolute beginning. Spinoza developed pantheism from these speculative ideas. The thinking that God is not an individual, that He is not conscious, and that He does not interact with persons is simply human conjecture. The notion that divinity permeates all, and that all things are but modes of one “substance” is similarly pure speculation. Likewise, scientists who reject revelation cannot know how the world we live in came into existence. They can only speculate, which is what evolution is in essence after it's been stripped of its highly technical methodologies and scientific vocabulary.

Q. What's the role of creation in pantheism?

A. To pantheists, “creation” means bringing something new into existence from that which already existed. This type of “creation” is the essence of evolution (Darwinism). It's a series of creative acts in time and, it's supposed, every part of the cosmos “creates.” That's because, to the pantheist, Divinity is creative power. This notion that creation is on-going rather than being a completed or accomplished supernatural act is speculative, and it flatly contradicts biblical revelation.

Q. How do you connect evolution to pantheism?

A. Belief in progress is a major if not defining feature of pantheism. Evolution (Darwinism) is in essence progress. Evolution insists on on-going creation, creation entirely by means of natural processes, and the unity of all life forms (having descended from a single common ancestor). The “progress” central to pantheism is evolution, it's how pantheism explains the origin of the cosmos. But the “progress” includes not just Darwinian evolution, but such secular cosmologies such as Big Bang and stellar evolution, nucleosynthesis of the elements, etc, as well, in fact all that mainstream science has contributed regarding origins in opposition to the revelation of origins that is in the Scriptures.

Q. How are you defining religion? What's the difference between religion and philosophy?

A. Religion is a set of beliefs regarding the cause, nature and purpose of the universe. It's a search for meaning in the world we indwell. Both philosophy and religion engage in this attempt to understand ultimates, but philosophy is an intellectual exercise, whereas religion involves personal commitment.

Q. What are the “absurdities” of naturalism that you refer to?

A. God has so brilliantly designed His creation that one must use illogic to deny His handiwork. Absurd ideas therefore prevail in non-theistic explanations of origins, such as these: It's believed that matter can come from nothing! Likewise, it must be believed that the law of causation (every effect has a necessary and sufficient cause) came from nowhere, an effect without a cause gave rise to the principle that every effect has a cause!! It's supposed that natural laws alone can bring matter into existence, when matter has to be present first for natural laws to act on it. Naturalistic explanations of origins irrationally ignore the omnipresent laws of thermodynamics. Naturalists suppose that life can originate and exist mechanically, simply by the operation of natural laws, and that's nonsense; there must be an immaterial information system in place to enable life to exist. The naturalist's reductionist views cannot account for reason, logic, morality, responsibility, kindness, love, honesty, etc, to mention just a few immaterial features of life that naturalism not only can't account for, but that refute naturalism by their existence. Evolutionists must use circular reasoning to justify their belief: the evolutionary sequence of the fossils in the rock layers proves the great age of the rocks, and the great age of the rock layers proves the evolutionary sequence of the fossils. Discrepant and discordant results have to be overlooked. The faint young sun paradox has to be overlooked. Design, which is omnipresent in the world of biology, has to be termed “appearance only” for naturalism cannot tolerate design – or purpose either, for that matter – only randomness. Yet the perfect correspondence between structure and function in all life forms screams purpose to any observer. That matter can self-organize isn't observed anywhere on earth, yet it is supposedly how life evolved. Trivial adaptations that are observed are extrapolated into this grand scheme that is termed the fundamental law of nature, as if because I can jump up an 8” step, I can also jump to the moon. And the list of absurdities continues. It's very long. Clear thinking is taking the Word of God as revelation of that which we otherwise cannot know regarding both the past (our origin) and the future (our destiny).

Q. Why do you insist that atheism is really pantheism?

A. All humans are religious, including atheists. But atheism is not a religion; it's simply a repudiation of theism. So what is the atheist's religion? We maintain it's pantheism.

Q. Why do you maintain that atheists are trying to impose their *non*-religion onto us?

A. Atheists don't have a non-religion, they hold to their religion, pantheism, to which they have a deep commitment and which they believe should be universal – or at least that it should supersede theism. They are not objective, secular, and neutral regarding religion. That is a caricature. The aggressive nature of atheists in recent decades is evidence that they have an agenda, which we maintain is to overthrow Christian theism either by using pantheism as a weapon and/or so that pantheism can replace theism.

Q. Why does mainstream science hold so tenaciously to evolution?

A. If science were objective, it would say that supernatural matters are necessarily not amenable to scientific discovery, that origins by definition can only be inferred at best, and that their explanations of the distant past are entirely speculative and tentative. That's not the case. Mainstream science's intolerance of the creation view and of all matters supernatural plainly demonstrate its deep commitment to a religion, and we identify that as pantheism.

Q. Does the pantheism vs creation issue have anything to say to all the young people in the church who seem so disaffected and indifferent regarding religion?

A. Show them that there is a religious war being waged against them and encourage them to engage it.

Q. Why do pantheists suppose that the universe is eternal?

A. The universe couldn't have come into existence at a certain point and still be deity. Deity by definition is eternal, not temporal, and the pantheist deity (in some way) is identified with or encompasses all of nature.

Q. Have any other theologians sensed that pantheism is behind evolutionary science?

A. Yes. Robert Brow fifty years ago wrote, "A very common type of Modified Pantheism is the religion of those who believe in progress. The principle of evolutionary progress is discovered from science and history, and the devotee then gives himself to furthering the principle with a fervent faith in progress as the be-all and end-all of life." Also, A.J. Conyers (who's now with the Lord) about 15 years ago said that pantheism is the major feature of modern secularism. He didn't discuss pantheism in the context of science, though.

Q. How do you interpret Genesis chapter one?

A. The text means the same thing that the language that's used would mean if it were used in another context, such as in Numbers chapter seven. Genesis chapter one is straightforward historical narrative – and it has to be that because it reveals that which otherwise would be absolutely unknowable. Language conveys meaning and understanding, it's not a vehicle of confusion. This doesn't mean the text can't have artistic style, because it certainly does. The chapter is elegantly written. But that doesn't mean it should be interpreted in any other way than as literal history. The Spirit of God superintended the writing of the text so that it reveals to people throughout history how and why we got here.

Q. Isn't the issue you discuss really one of inerrancy?

A. It's inerrancy only secondarily. The primary issue is the authority of Scripture. Authority means Scripture is binding upon us for belief and for practice. When the text says that the Flood was global, we are obliged to accept that as historical fact. The text is binding because its source is God who, among His perfections, is truthful and trustworthy. If science states anything regarding origins that contradicts Scripture, God's Word takes precedence; science does not have the priority.

Q. Isn't there a lot of physical evidence for evolution?

A. Evidence that science uncovers by its methodologies doesn't "speak for itself." All data, all evidence must be analyzed and interpreted. And to interpret it, certain assumptions and presuppositions must be made. It's the evolutionists' interpretations of the evidence that are false. Creation scientists look at the same evidence and attempt to interpret it in light of Scripture.

Q. Do you hold to creation because of Creation Science?

A. No. We hold to creation, and specifically a young-earth creation, because that is what the Bible teaches. Creation science merely confirms the truth of biblical creation.

Q. In what ways can the church oppose pantheism?

A. First, reveal it for what it is: a religion. Nobody wants some other religion forced onto them. Second, teach the church that revelation is trustworthy, a bona fide source of knowledge, not something to be impugned. And third, teach the church that science is an endeavor that has intrinsic limits, is carried out by fallible and finite humans, and that when it makes pronouncements based on ungodly presuppositions, they are to be denounced, not adopted.

Q. What precisely is the role or importance of pantheism to society?

A. Pantheism's effect on American society is thru evolution and its corollary idea of continual progress. Thus Marxism and all progressive politics should be understood as pantheistic. Environmentalists and animal rights activists are almost certainly motivated by pantheism. The view that is gaining increasing currency in American society that individuals don't matter as much as populations do (for example in healthcare resource allocation) is pantheistic also. The sociological concept that people are acted on by forces beyond their control, that is, by a deterministic universe, and that they therefore have minimal personal responsibility, is certainly pantheistic. The push for America to adopt same-sex marriage, abortion, and trans-sexuality promotes pantheism inasmuch as it is anti-theistic and derives from a refusal to acknowledge absolutes regarding morality. Euthanasia of the elderly likewise stems from the evolutionary view that once people have done their duty of reproducing, they need to get out of the way and cease using up resources. The coarsening of society, that is, the increasing use of vulgarity, and the diminishing sense of duty or virtue, probably also reflects pantheistic ideas. An iron triangle appears to have established pantheism in American society: the scientists in the universities who

generate the ideas, those in the media who thoughtlessly promote or popularize it, and those in government and private foundations who facilitate and empower it. We anticipate that further investigation and thought regarding the precise mechanisms by which pantheism affects our society would be fruitful research.

Q. How is pantheism an alternative religion to theism?

A. Pantheism is a counterfeit religion, a made-up religion, a substitute for Christian theism. In theism, God is a transcendent Person, a Being who is separate from what He created. But in pantheism, the deity is wholly immanent, non-personal, and not a being; their deity is identified in some way with all that exists, their deity is united with nature. In theism, creation was by God, who brought everything that exists into existence at the beginning of time. In pantheism, however, creation is an on-going process, carried out by natural forces, and that which already exists brings forth new things. In theism, God interacts with His creation and relates to His creatures. In pantheism, their deity *is* in some way the creation and all its creatures. In theism, only God is eternal and infinite, and the universe that He created is finite and temporal. In pantheism, the universe is supposedly eternal and infinite. In theism, God created discrete creatures that are to persist throughout time in their discrete created form (though with the inherent ability to vary in adapting to different environments). In pantheism, all creatures in time transform into other creatures. In theism, God created order in nature, and He uses natural laws to govern His creation. In pantheism, the natural order and natural laws *are* deity. In theism, God expects His creatures to worship Him. In pantheism, worship is impossible because there is no “I”/“Thou” relationship, and there cannot be one. Pantheism is rebellion against the God who has graciously revealed Himself!!

Q. Why do you insist that scientists are religious?

A. First, science itself is a religious endeavor because it seeks meaning in nature. It looks for meaning in the universe, and that defines religion. Second, all people are religious on two counts: because we all need to know and want to know how we got here, why we’re here, and where we’re going when it’s all over; and also because God made us to be religious, it’s part of the “image of God.” What’s true? What’s good and what’s evil? These are religious questions, and it’s part of human existence to seek to know the answers to these questions. So scientists, like everyone else, are religious. They hold religious ideas, assumptions, and presuppositions just like everyone else does. The problem is, scientists don’t set aside their religious presuppositions when doing science any more than the committed Christian can set aside his beliefs and convictions when doing his work. Religious presuppositions at minimum are these two opposite truths: God exists, or He does not exist. We maintain that, in the Western world anyway, the person (scientist) who supposes that God does not exist will adopt pantheism as his religion.

Q. Why isn’t naturalism (or materialism) the controlling philosophy or ideology that is the basis of evolutionary science instead of, as you maintain, the religion pantheism?

A. Naturalism (and the other “-isms”) are certainly in evidence in evolutionary science, but they are the worldview, or the outworking, of that which is foundational, the pantheistic religion. It’s pantheism that underlies all the “-isms” and that issues forth as the “-isms.” If the basis of evolution were merely a philosophy, there’d not be the fierce anti-theism that we see. The only reasonable explanation for mainstream science’s aggressive stance toward Christianity is that it’s not their religion and they don’t want it around. Rebellion against God is not merely holding to a wrong philosophy (though that’s involved); it’s a problem of belief, and that’s a religious matter.

Q. Who was Robert Brow?

A. Brow was born in Karachi, Pakistan, then schooled in Brussels and various places in England, Canada and Scotland. After his conversion, he studied theology and served 11 years in India teaching theology in Allahabad Bible Seminary, then became staff for InterVarsity. After he was ordained an Episcopal priest, he served parishes in India, England, Canada, Cyprus, and Abu Dhabi. His writings are all on the Internet at [www.brow.on.ca/](http://www.brow.on.ca/).

Q. Why do you quote Einstein?

A. Two reasons: first, we show that those who are highly esteemed in science, such as Einstein and Hawkins, held a view that can only be described as pantheistic. If these, the deep thinkers of science are pantheists, those who follow them may be also. Second, we use them to illustrate that pantheistic beliefs in science are not explicit, and that’s probably because, unlike theism, pantheism is an undefined and unstructured religion.

Q. How do you answer the evolutionists’ alleged common descent, uniformity of geologic processes, deep time, and Big Bang cosmology?

A. These answers are readily available in print and on many websites. We cannot offer better arguments than have already been made by very capable people for a young-earth creation followed by a global flood.

Q. Why are you critical of those who believe that theism and evolution are compatible?

A. Many reasons. Just as God demanded loyalty of His ancient people, Israel, Jesus demands loyalty of those who follow Him. Loyalty means holding firmly and courageously to the Word of God. It has to be that way, because faith is taking God at His Word, confident that what He has said about otherwise unknowable things can be relied upon as absolutely true. We maintain that evolution is the outworking of pantheism, a religion that seeks to extinguish theistic religion. Evolution is the pantheists’ weapon by which to defeat Christianity. So for a Christian to adopt evolution as how “creation” occurred is to betray God. And in the Bible we see Jesus as the despised and rejected One, who was scorned and put to a shameful death, knowing that God would eventually vindicate Him. And

Jesus asks us to imitate Him, to identify with Him, to suffer ridicule if necessary for His sake. It's an obligation of salvation. A disciple of Christ should seek to honor God and not seek honor that comes from men, from unbelievers. If scoffers refuse to trust God, we should *confront* them, not join their rebellion by adopting their false beliefs. Moreover, as others more capable than we are have pointed out both in print and on the internet, evolution is a theological disaster; it corrupts every doctrine traditionally held by the Church. To cite just one example, redemption requires the biblical teaching that death entered as a judgment upon Adam's sin; in contrast, evolution holds that death (natural selection) is how life as we know it today came into existence. Evolution and Christian theism are therefore absolutely incompatible. Evolution *cannot* be the way God created. Furthermore, evolution can be shown to be all bluff. The unresolvable issues that creation scientists have identified that apply to evolution the theistic evolutionist (or the evolutionary creationist) also owns – an intellectually unenviable position to be in. In love, we appeal to those who thoughtlessly and foolishly suppose that God created using evolution, or that the world is billions of years old, or that the Flood of Genesis chapters six to eight was local only and not global, to consult the books and websites of competent creation scientists who show that science confirms what Scripture says regarding origins.

Q. Can scientists (or anyone for that matter) really be religious – pantheistic – and yet not be aware of it?

A. Yes, indeed. Those who adhere to pantheism don't have the same type of religion as Christians, Orthodox Jews, or Muslims, but pantheism is a religion nevertheless. Theistic religions have established doctrines and practices, a common identity, and meetings for corporate worship. Pantheism is different. It's a personal religion that emerges from the presuppositions that a Creator God, a God of the Book, doesn't exist and that evolution fully accounts for the world we live in. (As we have stated elsewhere, pantheism has only these two essential beliefs: there is no supernatural Being that is outside of nature, and meaning comes from aligning ourselves with the principle of evolutionary progress.) Scientists (and others, in government, in the media, etc) who are committed to these beliefs therefore are religious whether they realize their beliefs constitute a religion or not. To the extent that they suppose themselves secular or irreligious, they are self-deceived.

Q. What do you think of Intelligent Design?

A. The renowned British atheist philosopher/intellectual Anthony Flew became disenchanted with evolution because of its failure to scientifically explain the origin of life. If evolutionary science can't account for how it all began, he reasoned, it can't support atheism. So he turned to those who promote intelligent design and became enamored of their reasoning. But abandoning atheism, he didn't convert to biblical faith. He didn't become a Christian. He became a Deist! Those writing for the Discovery Institute are doing outstanding work exposing the fatuities of evolution. But they come short of identifying the God who created. We believe that God is honored by acknowledging Him before men. It's not enough, in our thinking, to seek to deliver people from the bamboozle of evolution; we want them to come to Christ and receive salvation.