

The Ultimate Proof of Creation

Some time ago I read a book by Dr. Jason Lisle entitled *The Ultimate Proof of Creation*. In it he presents an argument against evolution that cannot be logically refuted, which he calls the “ultimate proof”. The book is very thorough, and I strongly recommend reading the entire thing. What I wanted to do here is give a brief summary of his argument.

Sometimes when creationists debate evolutionists the debate turns into a contest to see who has the most evidence. Creationists bring out things they believe prove their case, and evolutionists bring out things they believe prove their case. They then try to see who has the most evidence on their side.

Dr. Lisle points out that evidence doesn't work that way. Evidence does not speak for itself; it must be interpreted. For example, the History Channel once aired a documentary on some dinosaur bones that someone had dug up. To their surprise they found *living blood cells* inside those bones! When creationists learned of this they argued that the bones proved that dinosaurs lived recently and therefore Creation is true. However, evolutionists argued that the bones proved that blood cells can live for millions of years, because they were clearly still alive “after all that time”! The evidence was the same but the interpretation was vastly different because evolutionists and creationists have different *worldviews*.

The worldview is all-important. An evolutionist believes that evolution is true and interprets everything in that light. If he finds living blood cells in a dinosaur bone then *to him* that proves that blood cells can live for million of years, since he *assumes* that evolution is true. The idea that evolution is true is a founding assumption that *he does not question*. To him *there can be no such thing as evidence against evolution* – he can always find some way to explain away problems.

Dr. Lisle said that is accomplished through a “rescuing device”. The example he gave in his book was the Oort Cloud. Scientists know that comets can only last for a few tens of thousands of years before the Sun's heat burns away all the comet's ice and gasses and destroys them. If the solar system is billions of years old then there should no longer be any comets. Creationists argue that this is evidence for creation. Evolutionists argue that since comets exist, that means there must be a cloud of comets on the edge of the solar system, and occasionally one of them gets disturbed and is thrown into orbit around the Sun. They say this not because anyone has ever *seen* the Oort Cloud (they say it is too far away to be seen even with our best telescopes), but because this “rescues” their theory. In order for their theory to be true the Oort cloud *must* exist – and so evolutionists simply assume that it does.

So, while there is all sorts of evidence for creation, the evidence is not the real issue. The real problem is two competing worldviews – the Biblical one of creationists and the evolutionary one of evolutionists. It is the *worldview* that needs to be addressed. No matter what evidence creationists bring to the table, evolutionists can always use a “rescuing device” to explain it away (just as they do with comets and the Oort Cloud). In other words, *the real battle is between competing worldviews*. In order to disprove evolution once and for all you must show that the evolutionary worldview is irrational. That is what the ultimate proof of creation is all about.

This is how Dr. Jason Lisle defines the ultimate proof:

“The ultimate proof of creation is this: if biblical creation were not true, we could not know anything!” (Page 40)

He goes on to say that “only the Christian worldview...can rationally make sense of the universe.” Evolution cannot explain the laws of logic. Evolution cannot give a reason for the

uniformity of nature (the idea that physical laws apply equally everywhere, and will continue to work in the future). Evolution also cannot give any basis for morality or even knowledge itself. This is how he puts it:

“In fact, if evolution were true, there wouldn't be any rational reason to believe it! If life is the result of evolution, then it means that an evolutionist's brain is simply the outworking of millions of years of random-chance processes. The brain would simply be a collection of chemical reactions that have been preserved because they had some sort of survival value in the past. If evolution were true, then all the evolutionist's thoughts are merely the necessary result of chemistry acting over time. Therefore, an evolutionist *must* think and say that “evolution is true”, not for rational reasons, but as a necessary consequence of blind chemistry...

“Evolution is anti-science and anti-knowledge. If evolution were true, science would not make sense because there would be no reasons to accept the uniformity of nature upon which all science and technology depend. Nor would there be any reason to think that rational analysis would be possible since the thoughts of our mind would be nothing more than the inevitable result of mindless chemical reactions. Evolutionists are able to do science and gain knowledge only because they are inconsistent – professing to believe in evolution while accepting the principles of biblical creation.” (page 62)

This is not necessarily intuitive, so let me expound on this a bit. Let's take the example of morality. If evolution were true then there could be no such thing as *right* or *wrong*. After all, “right” means it conforms to a universal standard of behavior and “wrong” means it falls short of that standard. This makes sense in a Biblical worldview because God sets the standard. Murder and theft and lying are wrong because they violate God's standard. That is the *only* reason they are wrong.

However, in an evolutionary worldview there is no absolute moral standard. Nothing, therefore, can actually be wrong. Individuals may have their own personal beliefs about right and wrong, but there could never be a standard that applies equally to everyone. Person A may think that stealing is wrong while Person B thinks that stealing is right. Person A would have no grounds to condemn Person B because apart from God there cannot be a higher standard that applies to everyone. I've heard some argue that “Well, if it hurts people it's bad”, but *that is a Christian idea*. If there is no God then why is hurting people bad? Why would anyone's definition of “bad” apply to anyone else? After all, if evolution is true then we are all just chemical reactions. Does it really matter what one chemical reaction does to another? Evolutionists claim that there is no real difference between an animal and a person, and if an animal kills another animal we don't call it murder.

People inherently believe that things are right and wrong because there *is* a God and He *has* set a very clear standard that He put into all of our hearts. In a Biblical worldview there is a *reason* to believe in morality. But in an evolutionary worldview there is no reason to believe in a universal standard of behavior. Therefore, if evolution were true, morality would be *irrational*. If an evolutionist believes in morality then he is borrowing that concept from a Biblical worldview, because his own worldview provides no rational basis for that belief.

The same thing can be said about the laws of logic. Dr. Lisle points out that people believe in the law of non-contradiction, which says that something cannot be both true and false at the same time. For example, I cannot say that my car *is* parked in my garage and that my car is *not* parked in my garage *at the same time*. It must be one or the other. The laws of logic are foundational to our ability to perform science, make sense of the universe, and perform reason.

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in the laws of logic. This is what Dr. Lisle said:

“For the Christian there is an absolute standard for reasoning; we are to pattern our thoughts after God's. And we know (in a finite, limited way) how God thinks because He has revealed some of His thoughts through His Word. According to Genesis, God has made us in His image (Gen 1:26) and therefore we are to follow His example (Eph. 5:1). The laws of logic are a reflection of the way God thinks, and thus the way He expects us to think. The law of non-contradiction is not simply one person's opinion of how we ought to think, rather it stems from God's self-consistent nature. God cannot deny Himself (2 Tim. 2:13), and all truth is in God (John 14:6, Col. 2:3), therefore truth will not contradict itself. Since God is constantly upholding the universe by His power (Heb. 1:3), the consistent Christian expects that no contradiction will ever occur in the universe.

“Laws of logic are God's standard for thinking. Since God is an unchanging, sovereign, immaterial Being, His thoughts would necessarily be abstract, universe, invariant entities. In other words, they are not made of matter, they apply everywhere, at all times. Laws of logic are contingent upon God's unchanging nature. And they are a prerequisite for logical thinking. Thus, rational reasoning would be impossible without the biblical God.” (Page 52)

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe that the laws of logic are universal and unchanging because they reflect the character of God and are upheld by His power. However, an evolutionist has no reason to believe any of those things. He has no reason to believe that the laws of logic will not change this afternoon, or that they apply equally on Mars as they do on Earth, or that he will never find a logical contradiction. He may *believe* that the laws of logic are universal, but he does not have a *reason* to believe this. Since he has no reason to believe in logic, logic is therefore *irrational* in an evolutionary worldview. If he believes in logic then he must borrow that concept from a Biblical worldview, since evolution provides no reason to believe in logic.

The book has a great deal more to say about all of this but I'll close with just one more point. Dr. Lisle states that if evolution were true then science would actually be impossible. This is because science depends upon something called uniformity. Uniformity is the idea that if you perform an experiment and get a certain result, you will *always* get that same result as long as the conditions are the same. In other words, the physical laws that we see today are going to be exactly the same tomorrow, and next week, and next year, and the year after that. Physical laws *do not change*. Science is only possible because we believe that the experimental results that we get today will *never change*. This allows us to make predictions about the future and learn how the universe works.

In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in uniformity. This is how Dr. Lisle put it:

“The biblical creationist expects there to be order in the universe because God made all things (Gen 1:1; John 1:3) and has imposed order on the universe. Since the Bible teaches that God upholds all things by His power (Heb. 1:3), the creationist expects that the universe would function in a logical, orderly, law-like fashion. Furthermore, God is consistent (1 Sam. 15:29; Num. 23:19) and omnipresent (Psalm 139:7-8). Thus, the creationist expects that all regions of the universe will obey the same laws, even in regions where the physical conditions are quite different. The entire field of astronomy depends upon this important biblical

principle.

“Moreover, God is beyond time (2 Pet. 3:8) and has chosen to uphold the universe in a consistent fashion throughout time for our benefit. So even though conditions in the past may be quite different than those in the present and future, the way God upholds the universe (what we could call the “laws of nature”) will not arbitrarily change. God has told us that there are certain things we can count on to be true in the future – the seasons, the diurnal cycle, and so on (Gen. 8:22; Jer. 33:20-21). Therefore, under a given set of conditions, the consistent Christian has the right to expect a given outcome because he or she relies upon the Lord to uphold the universe in a consistent way.” (Page 58)

Science would become impossible without the concept of uniformity. If the laws of physics changed arbitrarily or if experimental results were constantly changing then it would be impossible to know anything. In a Biblical worldview there is a reason to believe in uniformity. In an evolutionary worldview, however, there is no reason to believe in it. Scientists may believe that uniformity is true but they must borrow from a Biblical worldview in order to do so.

Some may say that “in the past things have always been the same, so I believe that things will continue to be the same in the future,” but those who say that are just assuming that their argument is true in order to prove their argument. As Dr. Lisle pointed out, you might as well say that I believe I will never die because I have never died in the past! Evolutionists have no *reason* to believe in uniformity. Therefore, their belief in uniformity is irrational.

In conclusion, the Biblical worldview provides a reason to believe in morality, the laws of logic, and uniformity – but the evolutionary worldview does not. If evolution is true then morality is irrational, logic is irrational, and science itself has no rational basis. If evolution were true it would be impossible to know anything; our thoughts would just be chemical reactions in our brain, and a chemical reaction doesn't “know” anything. Evolution destroys the very possibility for science or knowledge. Since it cannot rationally explain the universe it must be wrong – and since only Biblical creation *can* provide reasons for explaining the universe, it must be true. That is the ultimate proof.