

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 which can't be logically refuted. He called this the "ultimate proof". The book is very thorough and I recommend reading it. 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 evidence they believe prove their case, and evolutionists do the same thing. They then try to see who has the most evidence.

Dr. Lisle points out that evidence doesn't work that way. Evidence doesn't speak for itself; it must be interpreted. For example, the History Channel once aired a documentary on some dinosaur bones that had been dug up. To everyone's surprise, scientists found *living blood cells* inside those bones! When creationists learned of this they argued that the bones proved dinosaurs lived recently and therefore Creation must be true. However, evolutionists argued that the bones proved that blood cells can live for millions of years because they were 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. Evolutionists believe that evolution is true and interprets evidence in that light. If he finds living blood cells in a dinosaur bone then *to him* that proves blood cells can live for million of years, since he *assumes* evolution is true. The idea that evolution is true is a founding assumption that *he doesn't question*. To him *there can be no such thing as evidence against evolution!* He can always find a way to explain

away any problems.

This is accomplished through a “rescuing device”. The example Dr. Lisle 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 thrown into an orbit around the Sun. They say this not because anyone has ever *seen* the Oort Cloud (it's too far away to be seen with even the best telescopes), but because this “rescues” their theory. In order for their theory to be true the Oort cloud *must* exist – and so evolutionists assume that it does.

While there's all sorts of evidence for creation, the evidence isn't the real issue. The real problem is two competing worldviews: the Biblical one of creationists and the evolutionary one of evolutionists. It's 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). *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's what the ultimate proof of creation is all about.

This is how Dr. 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 can't explain the laws of logic. Evolution can't 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 can't give any basis for morality or even knowledge itself. This is how Dr. Lisle 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)

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. These concepts makes sense in a Biblical worldview because *God sets the standard*. The reason murder, theft, and lying are wrong is because they violate God's standard. That's the *only* reason they're wrong.

However, in an evolutionary worldview there's no absolute moral standard. This means nothing can actually be wrong. Individuals may have their own personal beliefs about right and wrong, but there can never be a universal standard that applies equally to everyone. One person may think that stealing is wrong while someone else may think that stealing is right. The first person would have no grounds to condemn the second person for stealing because apart from God there can't be a higher standard that applies to everyone.

Some people may say that if a behavior hurts someone it's wrong, but *that's a Christian idea*. If there's no God then why is hurting people bad? Why would anyone's definition of “bad” apply to anyone else? If evolution is true then we're all just chemical reactions. Does it really matter what one chemical does to another? Evolutionists claim that people are just another type of animal, and if one animal kills another we don't call it murder.

The reason people inherently believe in right and wrong is because there *is* a God and He's placed His standard into our hearts. In a Biblical worldview there's a *reason* to believe in morality, but in an evolutionary worldview there's no reason to believe in a universal standard of behavior. If evolution were true then morality would be *irrational*. If an evolutionist believes in morality he's 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 can't be both true and false at the same time. For example, I can't say that my car *is* parked in my garage and my car is also *not* parked in my garage

at the same time. It must be one or the other. We depend on the laws of logic to perform science and make sense of the universe.

In a Biblical worldview there's a good 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)

The reason it makes sense to believe that the laws of logic are universal and unchanging is because they reflect the character of God and are upheld by His power. However, an evolutionist has no reason to believe in those things. He has no reason to believe the laws of logic won't change this afternoon, or that they apply equally on Mars as they do on Earth, or that he'll never find a logical contradiction. He may *believe* that the laws of logic are universal, but he doesn't have a *reason* to believe this. Since he has no reason to believe in logic, that means logic is *irrational* in an evolutionary worldview. If he believes in logic then he must borrow that concept from a Biblical worldview because evolution provides no reason to believe in logic.

The book has more to say about all 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, which is the idea that if you perform an experiment and get a certain result, you'll *always* get that same result as long as the conditions are the same. The physical laws that we see today are going to be the same tomorrow, and next week, and next year, and the year after that. Physical laws *don't change*. Science is only possible because we believe the experimental results we get today *won't change*. This allows us to make predictions about the future and learn how the universe works.

In a Biblical worldview there's 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's a reason to believe in uniformity because God never changes. In an evolutionary worldview, however, there's no reason to believe in it. Scientists may believe that uniformity is true but in order to do so they must borrow from a Biblical worldview.

Some may say that in the past things have always been the same, so it makes sense to keep believing that. However, those who say that are assuming their argument is true in order to prove their argument. As Dr. Lisle pointed out, you might as well say that you believe you'll never die because you haven't died yet!

Evolutionists have no *reason* to believe in uniformity, so 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 doesn't. 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 can't 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's the ultimate proof.