

A Review of To Everyone an Answer

EDS. Beckwith, Craig, And Moreland

© By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Journal of Biblical Apologetics, Volume 10, Number 1, Fall 2007

The book is a Festschrift in honor of Dr. Norman Geisler. It is, without a doubt, a landmark work that marks a “mega-shift” in evangelical apologetics and theology.

A mega-shift takes place when a fundamental change occurs in the foundation or basis of thought and life. For example, Thomas Aquinas caused a mega-shift in European thought and life by abandoning Platonic mysticism and replacing it with Aristotelian rationalism.

The Middle Ages

The shift in worldview from Plato to Aristotle had far-reaching consequences that are still with us today. Through the labors of Aquinas, the Medieval Roman Catholic Church became dependent upon the humanist philosophy and theology of Aristotle.

The Islamic Influence

Aquinas derived his philosophy from the works of such Muslim philosophers as Ghazali and Averroes. They, in turn, derived their ideas from the pagan Greek philosophy of Aristotle. Their arguments for Islam and against Christianity were drawn from the pagan Greek concepts of the autonomy, self-sufficiency, and dominance of human “reason.”

A Muslim Philosophic Jihad

The Roman Catholic Church faced a philosophic Jihad that threatened to overwhelm the intellectual life of Europe. Catholic priests and university professors had no answers to the rationalism of the Muslim apologists. Obviously, a “Catholic” answer had to be found that could counter the Muslim influence in academia.

The Muslims had intimidated the Catholics and made them feel inferior because, while the Muslims appealed to idealistic Aristotelian human “reason” as the basis of their doctrine, all the Catholics had was blind “faith” in the dogmas of Rome. Thus the conflict came down to the Muslim’s humanistic reason versus the Catholic’s blind faith.

If You Can’t Beat The, Join Them!

The answer came from an unlikely source. A monk who was nicknamed “the dumb ox” came up with the answer. Aquinas suggested that the best way to deal with the Muslims is to abandon their blind faith and adopt Aristotle’s reason as well! Thus Aquinas abandoned the dogmatic faith of popery and adopted the same pagan philosophic worldview as the Muslim apologists. He embraced the pagan dogma of the autonomy of human reason in which man is the measure of all things and thus the origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty.

It is no surprise to find that his ideas and works were officially condemned as heresy and viewed as undermining the authority of the papacy. But after his death, the condemnation was removed; and he was proclaimed the official philosopher of the Roman Catholic Church.

Aquinas took Aristotle's dichotomy of form/essence and turned it into the nature/grace dichotomy. He later refined it into the secular/sacred dichotomy that still plagues us today.

It was thus Aquinas who opened the way for secular humanism to take over Western philosophy, science, ethics, art, politics, and theology. Like a malignant cancer, secularism cannot stop consuming all of life and culture until there is no sacredness left.

What Is Happening Today

This gives us a practical insight into the secular humanist's all-consuming lust to root out all sacred symbols from society. It can be a monument to the Ten Commandments, "In God we trust" on our coins, prayer before a football game, etc. Any and all "sacred" things must be destroyed. Secularism cannot tolerate these things. As Francis Schaeffer and many other evangelical scholars have repeatedly pointed out, Thomas Aquinas is directly to blame for setting in motion the secularist vision of life.

Look Before You Leap

Evangelical Christians should "look before they leap" to embrace Aquinas' pagan worldview. Aquinas' "natural" theology and "natural" law are only pseudo names for "secular" theology and "secular" law!

Besides being oxymorons, "natural" (i.e. secular) theology and "natural" (i.e. secular) law are only religious forms of secular humanism. Natural (i.e. secular) theology and natural (i.e. secular) law both attempt to find final answers without God (i.e. they are God-less) or His Word (i.e. they are Bible-less) solely on the basis of "nature" (i.e. man's reason, experience, feelings, and faith).

The attempt to find God without God, and to find morality without revealed absolutes, has always been a failure according to the Bible ([1 Cor. 1:21](#)). Once Aquinas let secular humanism out of Pandora's Box, like Shiva, it became the Destroyer of worlds.

His Last Testimony

One year before his death in 1274, Aquinas had an experience that shook the foundations of his theology. His contemporaries described it as a religious or mystical experience in which he encountered God in a powerful way. As a result of this experience, Aquinas declared, "All my work is like straw!" He renounced his philosophical work and refused to write one more page of natural theology, philosophy or law.

It is amazing to us that while erstwhile Evangelicals are rushing to embrace the philosophy of Aquinas, he repudiated it as worthless as straw. If he rejected it at the end of his life, why would anyone with a sane mind view it as valid?

A Muslim Crisis

The Muslim philosophers and apologists followed Aristotle's reasoning that the world had to be eternal. But this did not sit well with Muslim theologians who pointed out that the Qur'an clearly taught that the world was created. When the philosophers were accused of heresy, they devised a trick to avoid the charge.

The Muslim philosophers and apologists divided philosophy into a dichotomy in which something can be true according to "reason" and, at the same time, be false according to "faith." The reverse could also be true.

Thus it was the Muslims who set up the false dilemma of "reason versus faith" as the only two options before us. Then they demanded that people must choose either one or the other. By reason they meant the classic pagan concept of man as the origin of truth and thus the measure of all things. By faith they meant blind Islamic faith.

They went on to restrict "knowledge" to that which comes from human reason, which rested on "facts." "Belief" came from human faith, and rested on religious authority. While reason tells us what we "know," faith tells us what we "believe."

By this ploy, when the Muslim apologists were asked if the world was created or eternal, they answered, "While my reason tells me that it is eternal, my faith tells me that it was created." They knew that the world was eternal, but they believed that it was created. Knowledge came from reason, not from faith.

Emanuel Kant

This dichotomy between faith and reason became the basis of the German philosopher, Emanuel Kant. He took the false dichotomy between matter versus mind, form versus essence, nature versus grace, and nature versus freedom and turned it into the false dichotomy of the phenomenal (secular) versus the noumenal (sacred). The upper story was the noumenal realm of faith, religion, myth, and legend. The bottom story of the phenomenal was the realm of facts, science, and reason.

Religious liberals like Karl Barth adopted Kant's upper-story and lower-story theory and placed the Bible on the upper story of myth and legend. He could deny the virgin birth on the lower level of the phenomenal, i.e. science, biology, history, etc., while affirming it on the upper level of the noumenal, i.e. myth, religious history, etc.

Modern neo-orthodox theologians are using the same trick today that was invented by the Muslims during the time of Aquinas. Truly there is nothing new under the sun!

Aquinas' Response

The Islamic dichotomy between reason and faith was adopted by Aquinas and became a central tenet of his philosophy. Some things were true according to reason and some things were true according to faith.

This classic Greek dichotomy between reason and faith was renamed "nature" and "grace." While "nature (i.e. reason) tells us most things, "grace" (i.e. faith) tells us what we cannot know through reason. But where did reason stop and faith begin?

The line between human reason and human faith was a sliding scale that moved up and down according to individual philosophers. When a Catholic thinker could not justify a Church dogma by Aristotelian reason and logic, he accepted it by blind faith on the authority of the Roman church.

The Reformation Mega-shift

The Reformation was a reaction to and rebellion against the nature/grace, reason/faith model of philosophy that had become the official position of the Roman Church. The Reformation was thus a mega-shift against against this Catholic/Islamic Aristotelian worldview.

Luther said that Aquinas went to hell like all the pagans before him! Aristotle and the other pagan philosophers were in error and we should reject them. Calvin and the other Reformers dismissed the schoolmen as heretics and fools.

The heirs of the Reformation, such as the Puritans, likewise rebelled against the pagan dogma of the self-sufficiency of human reason. Instead of looking to man's reason or man's faith as the origin and measure of all things, including God, the Reformers taught that we should look outside of ourselves to God alone for the final answers to truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty. Their doctrine of *sola scriptura* was the answer to the Catholic/Islamic/Greek dogma of *sola ratione*.

Instead of dividing life into the humanistic dichotomies of mind/matter, form/essence, reason/faith, nature/grace, secular/sacred, and phenomenal/noumenal, the Reformers brought all of life under the divine authority of Scripture and the Lordship of Christ. What we believe and how we live is to be decided by God through special revelation alone. All of life is sacred and under the rule of Scripture. There is no secular realm where the Lordship of Christ and the Bible are irrelevant.

The Reformers unified all of life, bringing all of it under the Lordship of Christ, by putting all things under the objective, absolute authority of Scripture. The Bible became the basis of theology, philosophy, science, the arts, law, government, and ethics. The Lordship of Christ was applied to all of life, and every square inch of earth was claimed for Christ alone.

The Eyes of Lady Justice

The Swiss Reformers symbolized *sola scriptura* by changing the symbol of Lady Justice. The pagans always pictured Lady Justice as being blindfolded. But in a famous statute, the Swiss took off her blindfold and had her point her sword to the open Bible at her feet. Revealed law was the only way for a nation to have moral laws. Natural (i.e. secular) law was a fraud.

Instead of the Catholic and pagan doctrine of natural law, the Reformers saw society being regulated according to the revealed laws found in the Bible. Justice was no longer blind and in the dark, but now she stood in the blazing light of the Word of God.

Our Evangelical Fathers

The Puritans the Pilgrims, and our evangelical forefathers, such as Spurgeon, Schaeffer, Henry, Clark, etc., followed the lead of the Reformers in rejecting Aquinas' bastardized (i.e. Greek/Muslim/Catholic) worldview and his distinction between humanistic reason and blind faith. They chose God as the Origin instead of man, revelation as the authority instead of human reason or faith, and Jesus as Lord; not Plato, Aristotle, Whitehead, Barth, etc.

Francis Schaeffer explained it this way:

A rationalist is someone who thinks that man can begin with himself and his reason plus what he observes, without information from any other source, and come to final answers in regard to truth, ethics, and reality...No one stresses more than I that I that people have no final answers in regard to truth, morals or epistemology without God's revelation in the Bible. This is true in philosophy, science, and theology. Rationalism can take a secular or theological form. In both, the rationalist thinks that on the basis of man's reason, plus what he can see about him, final answers are possible. My books stress that man cannot generate final answers from himself. First, even without the Fall, man was finite and needed the knowledge God gave him (revelation). Second, on this side of the Fall this is even more necessary.¹

Norman Geisler

In our day, Geisler was the first to openly break with the evangelical Protestant tradition of sola scriptura. In his seminal book on Thomas Aquinas, he stated that since the previous generation of Protestant apologists, such as Carl Henry, Francis Schaeffer, etc., were now dead, the time was now ripe for him and other secret Thomists to come "out of the closet." If they would have revealed their beliefs while the great evangelical lights were alive, they would have been shot out of the saddle and run out of evangelical circles.

Instead of sola scriptura, Geisler shifted over to sola ratione. Instead of all of life being under the authority of the Bible, he followed Aquinas—who followed the Muslims, who followed Aristotle—in dividing life into the dichotomy of reason/faith, secular/sacred, nature/grace. Man is the origin and measure of all things, including God.

Once Geisler came out of his closet and proclaimed that he preferred Aquinas over Paul and Catholic theology over Reformation doctrine, the other secret Thomists were emboldened to come out as well. This is why the contributors in *To Everyone an Answer*, such as Beckwith, Craig, and Moreland, are now confident enough to reveal their true beliefs. Beckwith comments:

This volume is a festschrift to honor the career of Norman L. Geisler...an important influence on all the contributors of this volume.²

The Great Betrayal

The betrayal of the Reformation and the return to Thomistic Catholic natural theology and natural law is a mega-shift that bodes ill for Evangelicals. Whereas the Reformation saw all of life under the Lordship of Christ as revealed in His Law/Word, these new apologist look to human reason, experience, feeling, and faith. Man is Lord—not Christ!

The present chaos and crisis within evangelicalism is due to a mega-shift in what people accept as the final authority that gives them the final answers to the riddles of life. The end result is the rise of rationalism, empiricism, mysticism, and fideism within evangelicalism.

Each humanistic form of naturalism is as relative as the next because finite man cannot generate absolute truth. If God has not spoken in Scripture and thus has not given us final answers, then we will fall into the darkness of the vanity of our own bloated and conceited speculations and prejudices. Once you build your house on the shifting sands of human autonomy, it will fall. You will be adrift in the abyss of the unrelated!

¹ Francis Schaeffer, "Appendix A," *The God Who is There* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998) 183-84.

² Francis Beckwith, William Lane Craig, James Porter Moreland, eds., *To Everyone an Answer: A Case for the Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004) 13.

The Purpose-Driven Humanist

The “seeker church” movement openly abandons the authority of the Bible when it comes to the doctrine of the church. At one seminar I attended, a representative from Willow Creek told us to “put away your Bibles because no one is interested in setting up a New Testament church!”

We were told to set up a church that was “relevant” to modern people. Thus we should look to the felt-needs of our local community instead of the Bible when it comes to the nature, structure, and ministries of the Church.

Once the authority of Scripture was thrown out and human reason, experience, feelings, and faith became the origin of the nature, function, offices, and services of the church, this has resulted in the chaos of relativism in which each church does what is right in its own mind and the Bible is ignored.

Humanist Apologists

The same is true for the new breed of “evangelical” philosophers, theologians, and apologists. Once they replaced *sola scriptura* with *sola ratione*, anything goes! Take the issue of the pagan Greek concept of “free will” that is nowhere found in the Bible.

When you challenge a rationalist for solid exegetical proof that man has a “will” that is “free” from sin and its effects, he will ignore your request for a detailed exegesis of Scripture and, instead, emphasize that free will is a philosophic “given” because it is “intuitive,” “universal,” and “self-evident.”

Of course, these simplistic clichés are only silly banners that are waved to psychologically manipulate the naïve. The foundational ideas of natural theology are not intuitive, universal, or self-evident in any sense whatsoever. They are only an example of what psychologists call “wish fulfillment.”

The Fads of Time

The Bible has been shoved aside in favor of whatever philosophical fad is in vogue in intellectual circles. If the philosophic wind is blowing in the direction of “eternal time,” then those who are “conformed to this world” will follow suit ([Rom. 12:1-2](#)).

That the Bible nowhere teaches the oxymoron of eternal time is not a problem to them because, as Beckwith argues, general revelation mediated through human reason is,

...a legitimate means by which human beings may acquire knowledge of theological truths.³

A Landmark Work

The book, *To Everyone an Answer*, is a landmark publication because the rationalists who put it together have come clean and put their cards on the table for all to see. Indeed, I am thrilled because in the past when I called them “rationalists,” I was accused of being a liar!

³ Beckwith, *To Everyone an Answer* 16.

Now that they openly call themselves rationalists, I am now vindicated 100 percent. Those who called me a liar are the ones “with pants on fire!”

The Rise and Demise of Rationalism

William Lane Craig describes himself and the other writers as “theological rationalists.”⁴ Several comments are in order.

First, Dr. Craig did not describe himself as a “rational theologian” but as a “theological rationalist.” This is important because the noun “rationalist” tells us, in terms of the history of philosophy, to which worldview he subscribes. He and other contributors are rationalists as opposed to empiricists, mystics, fideists, and Biblicists.

A rationalist believes that man is the measure of all things and the origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty. Man does not need the special revelation found in the Bible to discover final answers. By reflecting on nature, through his pristine intellect, he can discern the meaning of all things, earthly and divine.

Since the contributions to this volume believe in the self-sufficiency of human reason to discover theological truth, it is no surprise to find that no one bothers to give any exegetical support to their ideas. If an idea seems “rational” to them, i.e. it feels good, then it is true.

Where Are the Definitions?

Of course, the contributors do not attempt to give us a clear and concise definition of such words as “reason,” “rational,” “intuitive,” “universal,” “self-evident,” “common sense,” etc. They know how the game is played. The moment you define “rationality,” it becomes self-refuting! To use “reason” to define “reason” is to row with one oar! To begin by assuming what you want to prove in the end is to argue in a circle.

The Collapse of Rationalism

The eighteenth and nineteenth century European Rationalists utterly failed to come to a common definition of rationality. Thus rationalism collapsed in upon itself when it became obvious that, instead of dealing with objective and absolute truth, there were as many different and contradictory definitions of rationality as there were rationalists!

The term “rational” is a culturally conditioned word that was intrinsically both subjective and relative because it only described some kind of subjective psychological state of “comfort” in the mind of the rationalist. If an idea “felt” comfortable, it was rational. If an idea “felt” wrong, it was dismissed as irrational.

This is what “intuitive” truth is all about. If an idea feels right to you, it is true. For example, while Aristotle felt that the eternity of the universe was intuitively true, yet, other rationalists felt that the creation of the universe was intuitively true. Thus what is intuitive truth is more related to the culture and times in which one lived instead of some kind of objective rationality.

It became clear that what felt rational to a Western European may not automatically feel rational to a Western European may not automatically feel rational to non-European cultures.

⁴ Craig, To Everyone an Answer 19.

One man's rationality was another man's idiocy. Take "common sense" as a perfect example of rationalism's failure to define itself.

The Howe brothers use the phrase "common sense" as a synonym for reason.⁵ What they do not tell their readers is that they are whipping a dead horse at this point.

How "Common Sense" Died

The "common sense" school of philosophy arose in Scotland during eighteenth century as a reaction to the English philosopher David Hume. It was created by Thomas Reid (1710-1796) and was adopted by many Christian theologians and philosophers. Even the great Charles Hodge based his systematic theology upon it.

The common sense movement fell apart when no one could define what was or was not common sense. It was revealed to be a relative term limited by time, place, religion, and culture. For example, while it is only common sense for an Asian to eat the penis of a tiger to enhance his sexual virility, it is only common sense for a Western European not to eat penises for any reason whatsoever.

The phrase "common sense" refers to what makes "sense" to the "common" people in a given culture at a given time. Given its limited, relative, and subjective nature, common sense cannot be the origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning or beauty. It is a particular in search of an infinite to explain it.

Promises, Promises

The Howe brothers promised on page 25 to define the word "reason." We looked forward to a simple and concise definition of the nature, origin, and attributes of reason. But, sorry to say, they never got around to defining it.

While they could not define the nature of reason, they did repeat the Jesuit distinction between the "acts" and "objects" of reason. But, having failed to define exactly what "x" is, this renders any discussion of what "x" does useless.

The Jesuit Connection

Our evangelical and Puritan forefathers correctly understood the true motives behind the Jesuits coming into Protestant countries to set up universities and private schools. The Pope commissioned the Jesuits to infiltrate the Protestant world by education. Catholic schools were Trojan horses in which the conversion of Protestants was the hidden agenda. Their goal was to replace sola scriptura with various forms of rationalism. Once they managed to get the Bible out of the picture, the road back to Rome was secure.

The Gold of Rome

Since the wealth of the Vatican was a "bottomless pit" of money, the Jesuits could build the best well-equipped colleges and universities in the country. All the marble, the gold, and the huge buildings take your breath away. What evangelical school could compete with the gold of Rome?

⁵ Howe and Howe, To Everyone an Answer 23.

Wheaton College was, at one time, the best college we Evangelicals had. It has since gone apostate and is now in the hands of the liberals. But it was at one time the best we had. Yet, it was no more than a glorified Sunday School when compared to the glory and wealth of such Catholic schools as Loyola, Notre Dame, Fordham, etc.

Once the Jesuits had the best private universities in the land, naïve evangelical students flocked to these institutions and were brainwashed by the Jesuits with Catholic natural theology and natural law. Once these students substituted human reason in the place of the Bible, it was only a matter of time before the Reformation was rooted out of their thinking.

This is why *To Everyone an Answer* is so instructive. The educational background of a writer tells us what he was taught in his classroom days. And, given the natural laziness of man, most professors simply teach their students what they were taught when they were students. After all, why not use the same class notes, the same textbooks, and why not quote the same authors your professors cited? And, why not teach the same theology to your students that you were taught? After all, you don't know any better or different. All you know is what you were taught.

The Jesuit Legacy

This, of course, carries through to the next generation. For example, someone from an evangelical home goes off to some prestigious Catholic university where the Jesuits educate (i.e. brainwash) him. Upon graduating, he becomes a professor in an evangelical school.

He in turn indoctrinates his students with the same Jesuit teachings he had been taught. Thus, although these students did not physically attend a Catholic university, they received the same Catholic theology they would have received there. Once they are Jesuitized, they go on to teach their students what they were taught.

The Love of the World

Now, why in the world would an evangelical school hire someone from a Catholic university? Simple. Most so-called "Christian" colleges are so desperate for the world's acceptance that they would hire someone from "Satan U" if it would give them worldly acceptance!

The lust for the world's acceptance drives many evangelical schools to accept teachers trained by the Jesuits. They are stupid enough to think they are "lucky" to have a professor from a prestigious Catholic university. They do not seem to understand that they are inviting Jesuit wolves in sheep's clothing into their schools.

Recent Conversions to Rome

Dr. Frank Beckwith has announced that he and his wife have joined the Roman Catholic Church. This is the final demonstration of where the natural theology found in *To Everyone an Answer* leads. The rest of the contributors should follow his brave example and admit that they are Roman Catholic in their hearts and minds. They should be honest enough to join the Catholics and leave our evangelical churches and schools forever. Like Judas, they should "go into the right."

Now that you understand how Rome has infiltrated evangelical schools, is it any wonder that so many evangelical students have converted to Roman Catholicism? Once they were taught natural theology by their Jesuit-trained professors, they followed the yellow brick road all the way to the Vatican.

The Catholic/Evangelical Accord

The Jesuit influence in evangelical circles became so strong that a joint Catholic and Evangelical statement of faith was issued that compromised the Reformation and exalted Rome. It should be no surprise to find that those Protestants who signed the statement were products of Jesuit natural theology. They are at the forefront of ecumenical meetings with Roman Catholics, Greek Orthodox leaders, Mormons, etc.

The Background of the Authors

In this light, it is interesting to note the educational background of the writers, philosophers, theologians, and apologists who contributed to this volume. Where did they receive their education? We do not have to guess. Their biography is in the back of the book.

“Roman” Geisler

Let us begin with Norman Geisler. He is a well-known philosopher in evangelical circles. Where did he receive his Ph.D. in philosophy? He was educated at Loyola University in Chicago (1967-1970), named after the founder of the Jesuit order.

Think about it. Geisler was educated by the Jesuits! Now we know why Geisler so rigorously defends Thomas Aquinas. He is only defending what his Jesuit professors taught him to defend. No wonder he earned the nickname “Roman” Geisler!

Frank Beckwith

Let us go on to some of the other authors. One of the chief authors is Francis Beckwith. Where did he earn his Ph.D.? He also was trained in Catholic philosophy by the Jesuits at Fordham University. This explains his hostility to Calvinism and his conversion to the cult of Catholicism.

Michael Bauman

Another writer, Michael Bauman, earned his Ph.D. in Catholic theology and literature from the Jesuits at Fordham University. Since we are not told when he studied with the Jesuits at Fordham, he may have studied there when Beckwith was there. Were they friends? Who knows?

Paul Copan

Then there is Paul Copan. Where did he earn his Ph.D.? Well, lo and behold, he earned his Ph.D. in Catholic philosophy from the Jesuits at Marquette University. He also points out that he owes a great debt to Geisler.⁶

Do you see any connections between these men? Are you able to connect the dots? As I connect the dots? I can. As I connect the dots, the word “Jesuit” is spelled out!

⁶ Copan, *To Everyone an Answer* 108.

Many Others

I admit that I got curious and started looking up on the Internet all the men in evangelical circles who are part of the “natural” theology movement. They either graduated from a Jesuit school or were trained by those such as Geisler, who were indoctrinated by the Jesuits.

The Proof of the Pudding

Someone may object at this point and say, “So what! Just because they graduated from Catholic schools and were trained by the Jesuits does not mean they accepted those Catholic doctrines.”

Well, the only way to answer this question is to check what these men are teaching today. And, lo and behold, they are teaching Catholic doctrines that were condemned by the Reformation: natural theology, natural law, natural morality, Molinism, the Catholic view of free will, etc.

In this volume, the authors freely admit that they are teaching Jesuit doctrines in evangelical schools. They side with Rome against traditional Protestant doctrines nine times out of ten. Several examples will demonstrate this reality.

Jesuit Counter-Reformation Doctrine

The “Jesuit connection” is further evidenced by the recent appearance in evangelical circles of a Jesuit doctrine called “Molinism.” According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, and every other reference work we consulted, a Jesuit priest named Luis de Molina developed a doctrine that would undercut the Reformation gospel that we are saved by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone, according to Scripture alone.

Molina dedicated his pernicious heresy to the Inquisition, where thousands of Protestants were tortured and then butchered like cattle. It was so novel and new that two Popes almost declared it heresy! Yet it proved so useful in converting naïve Protestants that, in the end, it became a favorite Jesuit weapon.

Now, who would think that such a Jesuit doctrine, bathed in the blood of the Inquisition, would be taught by such evangelical thinkers as William Lane Craig, J.P. Moreland, and their numerous clones! Yet this is undeniably true!

Now, to be sure, they do not call this Jesuit doctrine by its official name, Molinism, as found in the encyclopedias. In order to divert students from the Jesuit origin of the doctrine, they renamed it “Middle Knowledge” and pretend that they found it taught in the Bible. They have painted a Jesuit doctrine with Protestant colors and then pawned it off as biblical truth!

Think about this for a minute: Molinism is a doctrine that was never heard of in the history of Judaism or Christianity. It was invented by a Jesuit by the name of Molina. Since this is true, how could it, in principle, be found in the Bible, which was written thousands of years before Molina was born? It can't!

Jesuit Textbooks in Evangelical Schools

Another example of the “Jesuit factor” is to examine the footnotes in To Everyone an Answer. Why? To whom do the authors appeal as their authority? Do they appeal to Catholic or Protestant authorities? To Jesuit scholars or evangelical scholars?

It should not be a surprise by this time to find that the authorities and books cited are Roman Catholic, not Protestant! The Jesuits are the authorities they appeal to as the basis of their teaching. They are truly the wolves in sheep’s clothing Jesus warned us about! Those who cite Jesuits as their authority have clearly sold out to Roman Catholic philosophy, theology, and apologetics. Shame!

Sola Scriptura or Sola Ratione

They have abandoned sola scriptura and replaced it with sola ratione. This is why they depend on Catholic writers such as Budziszewski, Kreeft, Tacelli, etc., who merely parrot Thomas Aquinas. They even use Peter Kreeft’s Jesuit textbook on apologetics in such evangelical schools as Biola University!

The authors of To Everyone an Answer believe that man, starting only with himself, by himself, and looking within himself, can discover truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty independent of and apart from the Bible. They have adopted the Catholic view that what we believe and how we live does not depend upon Scripture. Instead, they have swallowed Catholic natural theology; hook, line and sinker. Our ideas about God need not come from the Bible but from “nature” (i.e. human “reason,” “experience,” “feelings,” and “faith.”). Beckwith put it this way:

...the editors of this volume believe that general revelation is a legitimate means by which human beings may acquire knowledge of theological truths...we do not share the conviction of some Christians that theological knowledge is impossible apart from special revelation.⁷

The theology supposedly developed from human autonomy is labeled “rational.” Of course, they never get around to defining their key terms. Thus such terms as “nature,” “natural,” “reason,” “rational,” “general,” “free will,” “common sense,” etc., are mere psychological tools used to manipulate the emotions of naïve Evangelicals. They are like the flags that are waved at football games. They stir your emotions without defining anything. As long as no one demands they define exactly what they mean by such terms as “nature,” they are safe.

William Lane Craig

William Lane Craig’s chapter in Part 1 is only four pages long, and yet he uses the words “rationa,” “rationalistic,” “reason,” “rationalism,” 17 times! His faith is a “rational faith.” He describes those like himself as “theological rationalists” who believe in “the all sufficiency of human reason.” He supports “the pursuit of knowledge by means of unfettered human reason alone.” He does not mention the Reformation or its founding principle of *sola scriptura*.

The Howe Brothers

In their chapter, Tom and Rich Howe first appealed to “common sense.” Of course, we are not impressed by such an appeal because one man’s common sense is another man’s

⁷ Beckwith, To Everyone an Answer 16.

idiocy. What is common sense to me may not be common sense to you. It is a relative and cultural phenomenon.

The Howes then claim to be able to discover truth “by human reason alone and without any relation to divine revelation”.⁸ They cite a Jesuit book that has a chart they used. It states that man is sufficient in and of himself without God or His Word to figure out our most doctrines.

Like Aquinas, they admit that there are a few minor things, such as the Trinity, that reason could never figure out in a million years. These few things can be known only through special revelations.

The brothers also reveal that they have accepted the humanistic dichotomy between faith/grace and reason/nature that was originally developed by Muslim apologists and then adopted by Aquinas.

Special Revelation Reduced to Faith

Instead of “reason” versus “revelation,” they reduce divine revelation to man’s subjective faith in revelation. If they were consistent, they should have reduced human reason to man’s subjective faith in reason. But in order to pretend that reason is objective, they do not reduce reason to man’s subjective faith in reason.

Frank Pastora

I called the “Biola Hour” and went on the air with the host, Frank Pastora, who described himself as “J.P/ Moreland lite.” He had stated that the issue before us was “faith or reason.” I asked him several questions.

Whose faith and whose reason? Are you asking only to choose what part of man we want to make the origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty? Isn’t the real issue man versus God; reason versus revelation? He had no answer to this line of questions.

Greg Koukl

Koukl is a disciple of Craig and Moreland and uses his Sunday afternoon radio talk show to indoctrinate his listeners with Jesuit natural theology. On one show he interviewed a Catholic author named J. Budziszewski who wrote a book entitled, What We Can’t Not know.

He and Koukl argued that we do not need the Bible to find morality. Human reason and common sense are sufficient in and of themselves to prove abortion, homosexuality, etc., ethically wrong. We do not even need the Bible to discover the Ten Commandments!

I was so aghast at such nonsense that ordered the book and read it. Budziszewski does indeed claim to find morality independent of and apart from the Bible! As a loyal Catholic, he rejects those who go to the Bible alone for their theology and morality.

It is thus no surprise to find Koukl’s chapter in To Everyone an Answer less than helpful.⁹ He appeals to the works of Peter kreeft as his authority. Who is he? Other contributors also appeal to Kreeft and his writings as their authority for their apologetics.

The Apostate Peter kreeft

⁸ Howe and Howe, To Everyone an Answer 26.

⁹ Koukl, To Everyone an Answer 47-56.

Peter Kreeft was raised in a Protestant home but renounced the gospel of salvation by grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone, according to Scripture alone. He converted to Roman Catholicism and ended up teaching at a Catholic college.

Despite the fact that he denies the gospel and has fallen away from “the faith once and for all delivered unto the saints,” he is being heavily promoted by ‘evangelical’ natural theologians; and through their influence, IVP, at one time a Christian publisher, has published a number of his books. These books are used as textbooks in such schools as Biola University.

In his book, Ecumenical Jihad, Kreeft argues that Buddha, Confucius, Muhammad, Plato, Socrates, etc., all made it to heaven without hearing or believing in Jesus Christ. But the Protestant Reformers, such as Luther, ended up in hell!

He argues that everyone who goes to heaven unites around the worship of Mary. She is the unifying force for all religions. His idolatrous and blasphemous teachings are clearly condemned by Scripture, and his false gospel of a works-based salvation through Mary will land people in hell, not heaven.

With such heretical teachings, would any real born-again, Bible-believing Christian recommend him as his authority in theology? I don’t think so. Yet this is what Gregory Koukl, Tom Howe, Richard Howe, and Witherington III do in this volume. What accord has Christ with Baal; the temple of devils with the temple of God; Athens with Jerusalem?

Craig Hazen’s Jesus

Did the prophets, apostles or the Lord Jesus ever appeal to “common sense” as the basis of truth or morality? No. Did they ever appeal to human “reason” or “rationality”? No. They appealed to the Scriptures as the basis of their teachings. They used such phrases as “as it is written” “according to the Law and Prophets,” etc.

The prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles never appealed to such things as reason or common sense as the basis of truth or morals. As a matter of fact, Paul condemned such methods when he said,

May it never be! Rather, let God be found true, though every man be found a liar, as it is written, “That Thou mightest be justified in Thy words, and mightest prevail when Thou art judged. (Romans 3:4)

μη γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.

Paul set up a situation where the entire human race says that something is true (i.e. common sense), when God in His Word says it is false. In this situation, common sense and reason contradict the Bible. Who will triumph in the end? Who is lying and who is speaking the truth?

Paul says that if we must choose between what is self-evident, intuitive, universal, common sense, and reason to most people and what the Bible says, we are to go with the Bible as true and reject the common sense and reason of humanity as lies.

This reality has never dawned upon Hazen. He claims in his chapter that Jesus, like Socrates and Plato, used “reasoned argumentation” as the basis of truth and morality. Of course, one looks in vain for any exegesis from Hazen. His footnote tells us to look for the

biblical evidence in the works of his fellow natural theologians. But when we looked them up, they also failed to provide any exegetical demonstrations where Jesus argued like Plato or Aristotle.

R. Douglas Geivett

Geivett begins by telling us that he learned his natural theology “at the knee” of Norm Geisler, whom he describes as “an unrepentant Thomist.”¹⁰ Geivett is thus a perfect example of someone who went to an “evangelical” school (Dallas Seminary), where he was indoctrinated with Jesuit theology by a professor (Geisler) directly trained by the Jesuits (Loyola), and now is teaching this same Jesuit theology in another evangelical school (Talbot) to his students.

At Talbot, Geivett has spent his time developing “a viable program of natural theology”¹¹ in opposition to and independent of biblical theology. If his chapter is any indication of what he is teaching his students at Talbot, we have warrant to fear their apostasy.

His task is to define and defend the “Kalam Cosmological Argument.” He correctly tells us that it was William Lane Craig who popularized this particular argument for the existence of God. To his credit, he admits that Craig did not invent the argument. Who then developed it? Where did it come from?

The word “Kalam” sounds Muslim because that it is exactly what it is. It was an argument developed by Muslim apologists during the Middle Ages *against Christianity*. Its purpose was to prove the existence of the god of Islam, Allah, whom we have demonstrated elsewhere was originally the Moon-god of Arab paganism.

Ask Yourself a Question

The reader must stop and ask himself a question at this point. If the Kalam argument was originally developed by those who hated Jesus Christ, who denied that He died on the cross, who denied that He was the Son of God, who rejected the triune God of the Bible, who believed that the surest path to Paradise was to kill infidels like Christians, to prove the existence of a pagan demon god called “Allah,” does this strike you as somewhat odd to find Christians using it to prove the existence of the Christian God?

If the Muslim argument is valid, then it disproves the God of the Bible and proves the god of the Qur’an. If the Muslims were right, then the Christians were wrong! But if the Kalam argument is invalid, then it cannot be used to disprove Christianity or to prove Islam.

Of course, these implications are never faced by those who promote the Kalam argument. But then, they are always using arguments that were originally developed by pagans, Jews, Catholics, and cultists to attack Jesus and His gospel. How they manage to pull this off is a study in abnormal psychology and not within our immediate concern.

Geivett defines the Kalam argument as “the claim that the universe began to exist.” This claim is “more intuitively accessible” than the claim that it did not have a beginning.¹² The key word is “intuitively.”

¹⁰ Geivett, To Everyone an Answer 61.

¹¹ Geivett 62.

¹² Geivett 64.

The Kalam argument is based upon the humanistic dogma that “man is the measure of all things,” including whether the universe is eternal or it had a beginning. But what aspect of man is abstracted and made into the Archimedean point?

In this case, it is the “normal” man’s “metaphysical intuition”¹³ that tells him the universe is an “effect” and that every effect requires a cause; thus there must be a cause that brought about the effect which we call the universe. This cause is God.

Hello, Earth to Mars!

Now, what in the world is this metaphysical intuition that tells us all these things? Geivett has a tough time defining exactly what he means by metaphysical intuition because he is describing an emotional experience in which he has “direct rational awareness” of these things.¹⁴

Following the European tradition of rationalistic, intuition-based claims, Geivett explains that intuition is a “faculty of cognition” that is universal in all “normal” people. It is the ability to apprehend the “the so-called truths of reason.”¹⁵

That Geivett is trying to describe a subjective experience in which one “feels” that an idea is “true” in some kind of psychological flash or insight is seen by his use of such psychological terms as “confidence,” “awareness,” and “expectation.”¹⁶

What Makes Sense to Whom?

People in the Judeo-Christian West grew up with such biblical ideas as:

- the universe we experience every day is not an illusion but is real;
- matter is real;
- the body is good;
- pain, sickness, and death are real and not an illusion;
- the universe is not divine;
- the universe had a beginning and will have an end;
- the unity and dignity of man; etc.

Yet, if we go to the East, which has a Buddhist or Hindu cultural base, the “common sense” of people tells them:

- the universe we experience every day is an illusion and is not real;
- matter does not exist;
- the body is evil;
- pain, sickness, and death are not real and are only illusions;
- the universe is divine;
- it is eternal and has no beginning;

¹³ Geivett 70.

¹⁴ Geivett 70.

¹⁵ Geivett 71.

¹⁶ Geivett 71.

- it will never end; etc.

What is self-evident, universal and intuitively true to an Asian is not what is self-evident, universal, and intuitively true to a Westerner. To a Westerner who has a Christian background, it is obvious that things have a beginning and an end. But for most cultures throughout human history, it was obvious to them that the world was eternal and had no beginning.

Aristotle is a good example. His reason, intuition, and common sense told him that the world was eternal and thus never had a beginning. He did not believe in a Creation *ex nihilo* in any sense whatsoever.

Now, Aristotle represents what the majority of human being have believed down through the centuries in nearly every culture. The concept that the universe is one, and that it is an effect for which there must be a divine cause, is an idea held by a small minority of people in the Christian West due to biblical instruction.

The Conceit of Racism

Given the fact that what Western Christians “intuitively” believe due to biblical influence is not something known or accepted by the majority of humanity elsewhere in the world, it is sheer racism of the worse sort to say,

...our intuitions about such things seem to supply a premise...We have the intuition...Our intuition tells us.¹⁷

“Intuition” is a slippery psychological term whose meaning is relative to the time and culture of people. One man’s “intuition” is another man’s folly.

In order to escape the charge of relativism, Geivett defines an intuition as an idea that is “common to all normally functioning human persons.”¹⁸

One natural theologian was bold enough to say that when he claimed a certain idea was self-evident, intuitive, and universal, he was excluding the savages and barbarians of the third world! If something “feels” true to a white, Western European, well, then it is true. If the other races don’t see it that way, too bad for them. They aren’t “normal” anyway and what they “feel” is true doesn’t count.

Listen to Geivett again:

Reasonable belief is guided by what makes the most sense to believe.¹⁹

Stop and think about what he said. “Reasonable belief” is determined by “what makes the most sense” to YOU. Do you understand the implications of what he said?

The Fly in the Ointment

The “fly in the ointment” is that “what makes the most sense to believe” changes from culture to culture, from age to age, from one religion to another. What makes sense to a

¹⁷ Geivett 69.

¹⁸ Geivett 70.

¹⁹ Geivett 73.

middle-class, white, evangelical Christian living in suburbia America doesn't make any sense to a poor Hindu living in a mud hut along the river Ganges. Thus what constitutes "reasonable belief" is relative and subjective being determined by the surrounding culture. How then can it be the Archimedean point and the Origin of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty? It is only a finite particular in search of an infinite universal to explain it!

At the end of his chapter, Geivett admits that even if the Muslim Kalam argument was valid, it still does not prove the existence of the God of the Bible. He quotes Draper, an agnostic philosopher, who said,

The argument does not get all the way to God's existence.²⁰

This is the final fatal flaw of the Kalam argument and all the other arguments put forth by natural theologians and philosophers. They claim that their goal is to demonstrate, on some rational basis, the existence and attributes of the God of the Bible. But that goal can never be reached. You cannot make the jump from the finite to the infinite, the particular to the universal, what *is* to what *ought* to be, the impersonal to the personal, matter to spirit, etc.

I am reminded of the carrot hung on a stick in front of some poor jackass. No matter how hard and fast the jackass runs, he never eats the carrot because it is always just out of reach!

The natural theologian is that poor jackass who is trying to eat the carrot of truth, justice, morals, meaning, and beauty. I admire his zeal and his sincerity; but, in the end, the carrot is always out of his reach. The attempt to find God without God is a fruitless enterprise.

Dembski's Designs

William Dembski had the unfortunate task of trying to whip the dead horse of arguments based on specific designs found in nature. He correctly begins with the famous William Paley and his watch illustration from a book he wrote in 1802.

If Paley is so great, as natural theologians boast, I have always wondered why they don't just reprint his book and use it as a textbook? I purchased a copy of Paley's book and found out why they don't use it today. His arguments were tied to the culture and science of his day. But Western culture and science have moved on and no longer teach the principles upon which Paley based his arguments.

Since Paley's arguments were based on ideas that are now dismissed, his book does not work today. Modern natural theologians have to switch his arguments from old science to new science, from Newton to Einstein, from geometry to quantum mechanics, etc.

Paley assumed the Newtonian worldview of a mechanical universal run by immutable scientific laws. He thus based his arguments on the Newtonian model of the universe. But Einstein demonstrated that Newton was wrong. Einstein's theory of relativity has swept aside Newtonian physics and deposited it in the dustbin of history. Thus those theories and arguments based on the Newtonian worldview should be put into the dumpster along with Newton. But modern natural theologians ignore these salient facts and never deal with these issues. They will have to face the music on this issue eventually.

The argument from manifest design has several fatal flaws that are rarely discussed.

²⁰ Geivett 76.

- 1) The first flaw is the mass of gratuitous assumptions that must be “given” to the natural theologian in order for the argument to work. In other words, he expects you to give him the rope by which he will hang you. You have to assume:
 - a. the Western European concept of “design” before you go out to look for it;
 - b. the “designs” you find are not just projections from you own cultural and religions prejudices;
 - c. finding five or ten things that “look” like or “feels” like they were designed gives you the right to leap to the conclusion that the entire universe is on vast design and, hence, an effect looking for a cause to explain it;
 - d. finite designs point to only one Infinite Divine Designer, i.e. God;
 - e. good effects can be traced back to a good Cause, i.e. a good Designer.
- 2) The second flaw is that even if the “cause-effect” model is valid on some level, the only “effects” that anyone has ever seen are *finite*. Since a “cause” need only be equal to or slightly greater than its effect, the argument from design can only generate a *finite* cause for each *finite* effect.
- 3) It does not matter how many finite particulars you pile up, like the Tower of Babel, you will never reach heaven, i.e. to an Infinite Being.
- 4) Why must we assume that there is only *one* cause for everything? Why can't we trace things back to a multitude of gods and goddesses like Aristotle and other pagan philosophers?
- 5) If it is valid to argue from finite good effects back to an Infinite Good Cause, then is it equally valid to argue from finite evil affects back to an Infinite Evil Cause? Are there two Designers, one good and the other evil?
- 6) Since we encounter events that seem to be random and in conflict with other things, do we trace those back to random causes that contradict each other?
- 7) How do we make the jump from what *is* to what *ought* to be? In other words, how can we squeeze morality out of rock? The natural theologians do not seem concerned with their blind leap of faith on this issue.
- 8) Why do they assume that manifest design that conveys information of a high order logically implies the existence of an omni-attribute Deity like the one revealed in the Bible?
- 9) Isn't it possible that manifest design is proof that some really smart aliens seeded this planet with life and have been guiding our evolution? Could it be that there is so much chaos on this planet due to sabotage by other aliens, who are in conflict with the ones who originally terraformed this planet?
- 10) Lastly, after getting you all excited with great expectations that finally we have a solid rational proof that God exists, honest natural theologians, like Dembski, let you down at the end by sheepishly admitting that the argument for design is actually a flop because it doesn't prove the existence of the God revealed in Scripture!

Who is the Designer?

As a Christian I hold that the Christian God is the ultimate source of design behind the universe...But there's no way for design inferences based on features of the natural world to reach the conclusion.²¹

It is neither valid nor useful to promise something but then turn around and in the end admit it cannot be done. Natural theologians admit that they cannot demonstrate the existence of the God of the Bible. The most they can do is to demonstrate the existence of some "thing" that has some "divine attributes." This is what makes natural theology a waste of time. When the rubber meets the road they cannot produce a valid proof for the existence of the God who is there.

The Thomist David Beck

Dr. Beck chose to handle the cosmological argument. Emanuel Kant shot that horse years ago and left its carcass where it fell. But in the early 1960's, it was resurrected by the Jesuits at Fordham University. They dressed it up with some new terminology, put a pretty ribbon on its tail, and hoped that no one would notice that it was dead. Catholic philosophers such as Gilson, Maritain, Bertocci, Tecelli, etc., have labored long and hard to convince people that it has been successfully resurrected.

In 1974 Geisler took the lead in introducing the new Jesuit form of the argument in his book, Philosophy of Religion. Those influenced by him have gone on to defend it in countless books and journal articles.

Beck traces the cosmological argument back to Aquinas, and then from him to the Muslim apologists. He then traces their argument back to Aristotle, and from him to Plato, and then all the way back to Parmenides.²² This is truly amazing.

Aristotle used a form of the cosmological argument to prove (sic) the necessary existence of some "thing" he called "Thought Thinking Itself." But "it" only knows itself. Whatever "it" is, "it" is not the God of the Bible.

Parmenides argued for the necessary existence of non-personal "being" as opposed to Heraclites' "becoming." While Hindus will appreciate the necessary existence of non-personal being, Christians believe in a personal God who loves and cares for us.

Down through the centuries the cosmological argument has been used by many different philosophers and religions to prove (sic) the necessary existence of many different kinds of contradictory deities: finite and infinite, one and many, personal and non-personal, omniscient and ignorant, etc.

Beck refers us to Richard Gale, who has argued that the "god" who necessarily exists is time-bound and cannot know the future. This finite deity does not even know what he (or she, or it) will or will not do in the future. He is frequently disappointed and frustrated with unforeseen events.

If an argument proves anything and everything, including totally contradictory ideas, it proves nothing. If it were valid, it would produce only one necessary personal omni-Being who is God by nature—anything less than that is a waste of time.

To his credit, Beck admits that the worldview of Parmenides, Aristotle, etc, included an eternal universe. Since Thomas Aquinas was following them down the yellow brick road, he had to admit the possibility that the universe exists in infinite time.²³

²¹ Demski, To Everyone an Answer 94.

²² Beck, To Everyone an Answer 101.

What is important for Christians to understand is that the cosmological argument does not and cannot deliver the goods. To his credit, Beck admits that the argument,

...by itself, does not uniquely identify God in its conclusion.²⁴

Stop and ask yourself: “If an argument does not in the end prove the existence of the biblical God, why are they wasting my time with fruitless enterprises, and my money with worthless books?”

The Same for the Rest of the Chapters

What do we say about the rest of the chapters in the book? They are uneven at best and disappointing at worse. Copan, Craig, Corduan, Habermas, Moreland, Nash, Groothius, Bauman, Beckwith, Clark, and Zacharias do their best to resurrect the same old tired arguments invented by pagan thinkers to prove the existence of pagan deities. These arguments were developed in the context of a pagan worldview that is a total contradiction of the biblical worldview.

Conclusion

Like the Medieval alchemists who claimed to change lead into gold, modern, humanistic natural theologians claim to be able to take pagan arguments and turn them into Christian evidences. But after over 40 years of studying their best and brightest attempts, I have yet to find anything that ushers me into the presence of the God who is there and is not silent. The world with all its philosophical arguments never found God.

All these so-called “rational” arguments lead to false gods of whom the Bible says, “You shall have no other gods before me” ([Exo. 20:3](#)).

We are forbidden to worship the gods of Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle, Muhammad, etc. There is only one god, one Way, and one Name revealed in the pages of Scripture whereby we must be saved.

To the Triune Majesty be all the glory,

Father, Son, and Spirit divine.

²³ Beck 105.

²⁴ Beck 104.

Recommended Book:

[The Bible, Natural Law and Natural Theology: Conflict or Compromise?](#)
By Dr. Robert A. Morey



FAITH DEFENDERS
www.fithdefenders.com