THE ULTIMATE PROOF OF CREATION – Dr. Jason Lisle (AiG)
Resolving the Origins Debate
See Dr. Lisle's presentation at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xjcliX40W8s

Warning: People aren't always convinced even by a good argument but can be convinced by a bad one! Just because the argument doesn't persuade does not mean there is a problem with the argument –it's usually a problem with the hearer. People are not always rational! **What we have to share tonight has no rational comeback – it's irrefutable!**

COMMON ARGUMENTS FOR CREATION

Information: cannot originate by itself in matter – encoded messages like DNA come from a mind; mutations and selection reduce – don't add – new information as is needed with microbes-to-man evolution.

Biblical Timescale: Carbon-14 in diamonds, fossils and coal – none left after 100,000 years; limits the age of the earth to a few thousand years. Comets – run out of material in just a few thousand years; cannot exist in an old solar system. Dino soft tissue – cannot last for millions of years. Confirms recent creation and a global Flood.

These and other evidences **DO NOT** constitute an **ULTIMATE PROOF** – the clever evolutionist can always evoke a **RESCUING DEVICE** to protect his **WORLDVIEW** – e.g., comets in an old solar system: invoke hypothetical 'Oort Cloud' – the skeptic's worldview dictates that he MUST re-interpret the data.

WORLDVIEWS

- We all come to the evidence with a bias; we all have the same **FACTS** (science, evidence, data, scientific method) – it's about our **INTERPRETATION** about origins (axiom, starting point, worldview, 'lenses'). When it comes to origins, we all come to the data with a worldview, or 'lenses'. Creationists and evolutionists have different rules for interpreting evidence.

- **BIBLE:** corrective lenses that allow you to see the world as it really is – the evolutionist believes that **HE** is wearing the corrective lenses! The Bible should be the ultimate standard for the creationist; a secondary standard would be the reliability of senses, memory, laws of logic, etc.

- Skeptic: "I come to the evidence neutrally" - the philosophy that we should come to the evidence without a bias is in itself a philosophy or worldview about how to interpret evidence! This is one example of a self-refuting argument.

- **WORLDVIEW:** all of your most basis beliefs about reality; rules of interpretation that we assume before any investigation; e.g., the belief that our senses are reliable allows us to conduct scientific investigation – we must presuppose that our senses are reliable! The same applies to reliability of memory, laws of logic, uniformity of nature.

Examples of Secular Worldviews:

- **Naturalism:** nature and matter is all there is; everything can be explained materially.

- **Empiricism:** all truth claims can be tested by investigation.

EVIDENTIAL ARGUMENTS

- Evidence **cannot solve a worldview conflict** because all evidence is interpreted through a person's philosophical lenses. That's why evidence won't win an argument – your opponent will filter all evidence through his philosophical 'lenses', which will tell him what to think of the evidence!

- Everyone has sufficient evidence – Romans 1:18-32 (v.20)

- People don't simply need more evidence or reasons to believe in Creation and a young Earth (information, DNA, natural selection, canyon formation, comets, etc.) because they will just invoke a rescuing device (excuse, special pleading) where necessary. **They need their worldview challenged!**

- A philosophically astute person cannot be convinced by evidence because he will invoke a rescuing device in order to protect his worldview.

- No neutral ground; you can't just talk in terms of science and leave the Bible out: Matthew 12:30; Romans 8:7; 1 Corinthians 2:14; James 4:4. A claim to neutrality is unbiblical. If you agree to leave the Bible out of your debate, you've effectively started the debate assuming the Bible is wrong, thus conceding defeat.

- Two things to remember when your opponent asks you to be neutral: 1. They're not; 2. You shouldn't be.

- It's not a circular argument to stand on the authority of the Bible in order to defend it: You can use your eye to examine and correct your eye; you can stand on a hill and defend it.

THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY

- Is it possible to argue effectively from a **BIBLICAL PRESUPPOSITION**? Yes! Only biblical presuppositions make any knowledge possible: Proverbs 1:7; Colossians 2:3.

- The evolutionist or skeptic will object: *"Non-Christians have knowledge!"* But non-Christians are relying on biblical presuppositions (as we will discuss)... they're just being inconsistent with their materialistic worldview.

- **Preconditions:** Absolute morality, laws of logic, reliability of senses and memory, uniformity of nature (not uniformitarianism – the laws of nature are consistent although the conditions may change).

- **Absolute Morality** – animals are amoral; if we were just more evolved animals there would be no moral code for us; Creation worldview it makes sense as we are made in God's image and are responsible for our actions.

- **Laws of Logic** – universal laws of logic don't exist in a chance universe; makes sense in a created universe. **Uniformity in Nature** – no uniformity / repeatability to nature from a big bang but yes in Christian worldview.

- Evolutionists accept the above although they have no rational basis within their worldview – they are being inconsistent; **ALL SECULAR WORLDVIEWS BLOW THEMSELVES UP!** Like lighting a stick of dynamite that winds around to behind you! Only the biblical worldview doesn't blow itself up – it is self-consistent. Secular examples:

- **Relativism** – All things are relative – no absolutes. Are you absolutely certain?

- **Empiricism** – the belief that all truth claims are proved by empirical observation. How do you know that the statement itself is true that all truth claims are proved by empirical observation? You can't see a truth claim. The belief is rejected by its own standard.

- All non-Christian worldviews are ultimately irrational at their foundation, so non-believers stand on our Christian presuppositions in order to argue against the Bible; they do this knowing in their heart of hearts that the Bible is true. When told that they are in self denial... **THEY DENY IT!** They need to stop being inconsistent.

- **The Air Debate:** A debate over biblical Creation is a lot like a debate over the existence of air – the critic uses air (breath, speak) in order to make an argument against air. In the same way, the secularist's position is self-refuting because he is presuming the Bible by accepting the uniformity of nature, laws of logic, and so on.

Absolute Morality

- If God created us, He has the right to set the rules. Otherwise, why not make our own rules? If you are just rearranged pond scum – relative morality.

- But insisting on relative morality is a self refuting argument because you are now telling someone what to do!

- **Question to Ask:** How do you know "right" from "wrong"? Apart from the biblical God, morality can only be relative. There is no requirement for absolute morality in an evolutionary worldview.

- Yet people can't live that way: everybody knows right from wrong because God has revealed it to us in our consciences (Romans 2). Possible (albeit irrational) responses:

- *"Morality is what brings the most happiness to the most people."* Response: Why should we be concerned about the happiness of others if we are just rearranged pond scum? But it does make sense within a biblical worldview (Golden Rule – Luke 6:31). Besides, how can we know what brings the most happiness? Many people are happiest when doing immoral things to others!

- *"Laws of morality are conventions adopted for the benefit of society."* Response: So, what's wrong with disorder and people acting like animals? Besides, different cultures would adapt different moral codes anyway. Benefit assumes a standard of goodness anyway.

- *"People can adopt their own moral codes."* Response: *"But if you can so can I... what if I want to shoot you?"* Why should an evolutionist ever be angry at an immoral act? After all, we are just re-arranged chemicals from pond scum. Would you punish baking soda for reacting with vinegar, or the lion for killing the antelope?

Laws of Logic

- Example: *Law of Non-Contradiction* - two contradictory statements cannot be true. "The car is there... is not there."

- Why is this true? Why is there a law of non-contradiction? God has revealed His nature to us in His Word. And He cannot contradict Himself or lie (2 Timothy 2:13; Colossians 2:3); cannot be Allah because he contradicts himself – Koran endorses the Gospel of Jesus and then denies it.

- What are laws of logic? They are immaterial, universal (apply everywhere), invariant (don't change with time), abstract entities which govern all possible conceptual relationships. Laws of logic are contingent upon the biblical God; other worldviews cannot account for logic:

- **Naturalism**: the belief that nature is all that there is. The naturalist (evolutionist) attempts to use logic and reason to support his position.

- Problem: Logic is not part of nature; it is immaterial; these laws are not natural; naturalist uses something that cannot exist within his own worldview so he is refuting his own position; just because he uses logic does not mean that it is logical for him to use! Possible (albeit irrational) responses:

- *"Laws of logic are material. They are chemical reactions in the brain."* Response: If they are material then they are not laws. They wouldn't be universal because they wouldn't extend beyond your skull. And we wouldn't have the same laws of logic between any two people.

- *"Laws of logic are descriptions of how the brain thinks."* Response: Then why would we need laws of logic to correct the way that the brain thinks. In other words, if logic is simply how a brain thinks, it could never be wrong!

- *"Laws of logic are conventions."* Response: Then different cultures can adopt different conventions (Nazi Germany).

- *"They are a property of the universe."* Response: Then they wouldn't be invariant because the universe is changing all the time.

- *"We use them because they work."* Response: That doesn't explain why they exist and work.

HOW TO USE THIS INFORMATION PROPERLY: "DON'T ANSWER, ANSWER" STRATEGY

- This is the biblical way to refute anti-biblical positions.

- Proverbs 26:4 – Don't answer a fool; answer a fool (a fool in this case is not someone who is stupid but someone who underlines denies the authority of his Creator).

- *"Let's leave the Bible out of the discussion."* – That's a silly presupposition. If you agree to these ridiculous terms and just try to argue evidence then you are foolish too. You have conceded what you are trying to prove.

- Proverbs 26:5 – Answer a fool: Show the folly of the fool – **you are holding a mirror to his own folly!**

- *"There are no absolutes."* Answer according to their folly: *"If there are no absolutes then you couldn't argue that there are no absolutes."*

- Fun example: *"I don't believe in words. Prove to me creation is true without using words."*

- **Don't Answer:** *"I don't accept your belief that words don't exist."* **Answer:** *"But if words don't exist, you couldn't argue anyway. The fact that you are able to make your case demonstrates that it is wrong."*

APPLY TO THE AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE WE'VE TALKED ABOUT

- *"I believe in naturalism. Show me logically how the earth could be 6,000 years old."*

- **Don't Answer:** "I don't accept (or share) your belief in naturalism." **Answer:** "But if naturalism were true, it would be impossible to prove anything, since there could not be laws of logic."

- *"You can't take the Bible seriously. It's full of contradictions."*

- **Don't Answer:** "I don't accept your claim that the Bible has true contradictions." **Answer:** "But if it did, why in your worldview would that be wrong?" "I know that contradictions are wrong because they are against God's nature and that His mind is universal."

- *"It's wrong to teach Creation; you're lying to children."*

- **Don't Answer:** I don't accept that teaching Creation is lying to children." **Answer:** "But if it were, why in your worldview would that be wrong?"

- *"The Christian God is not good. He slaughters innocent children."*

- **Don't Answer:** "God is good and is the standard of goodness." It's like the skeptic is saying God is not very "Godish" **Answer:** "Apart from God, how can you determine what is 'good' and who are 'innocent'?

- **Personal Favourite:** Richard Dawkins believes it's his purpose in life to tell people that there is no purpose in life!