

CAN WE ARGUE CREATION WITHOUT THE BIBLE?

I have been speaking on creation and Biblical topics for 17 years now and have yet to see scientific evidence persuade one to believe in Christ, however, I haven't expected it either. Science will never bring anyone to faith, it is the Spirit of God working through the Word that does that. It isn't my job to save people, my job is to shut their mouths. In fact this is what the Word says, "Now we know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are under the law, so that every mouth may be silenced and the whole world held accountable to God" (Rom 3:19). So what is the role of scientific creationism? That is really the point of this article and as you will see, it isn't the scientific evidence that is the problem, it is the worldview that people look at the evidence through. The best science can do is make people question and then look to the Bible for that truth. This is one reason why our ministry doesn't just deal with science but with the Word of God. Actually, the Bible is our primary support of truth and evidence is only secondary. The Bible is clear that it isn't our wisdom or scientific evidence that leads people to faith: "For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know Him" (1 Cor 1:21). The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor 2:14). "So that your faith might not rest on men's wisdom, but on God's power" (1 Cor 2:5). These verses clearly show us that while scientific evidence does have its place in evangelism, it can not and must not be our primary source to argue with when dealing with the secular world.

Jason Lisle from Answers in Genesis has a wonderful book called "Ultimate Proof of Creation" which is available on our website. Much of this article will relay what the Spirit has shown him, and I can say amen to that based on the years of experience in this creation ministry as well. I highly recommend his book and know you will enjoy it if you find this letter helpful.

First let me share a story from Dr Lisle that is a bit crazy, however, it illustrates a good point. Imagine if a man went to the doctor and told the doctor that he believed he was dead. The doctor tells him he can't be dead because he has charts showing him he is alive. However, the patient says, "yeah but that might be because you are interpreting the charts wrong." The doctor points out that he is walking and talking and dead men don't do that. Again, however, the patient reasons that this could be a result of muscle spasms. The doctor asks the patient, "Okay I will prove to you that you are not dead." "Do dead people bleed?" The patient thinks that without the circulatory system that a dead man can't bleed. As a result the doctor takes a pin and pricks the patient's finger and the blood starts coming out. This time the patient said, "Well how about that, dead men do bleed." Clearly the doctor had evidence for his position but the patient didn't believe the evidence because he had a worldview different from the doctor. In my experience in ministry I often find it the most intelligent and philosophical person who denies God's existence. I believe the reason for that is that a clever person will always have a rescue device that will keep him from abandoning his worldview. As Dr. Lisle

states, "The more philosophically astute a person is the more evidence will not convince them because they can always come up with a rescue device."

Our worldview tells us what to make of the evidence. It isn't because the Bible doesn't have enough evidence to support creation, the Bible says everyone knows it is true, they just simply suppress the truth in unrighteousness. We read in Romans, "The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them" (Rom 1:18-19). We all have a rescue device to defend our worldview belief and theirs is to suppress the truth. Some may argue that they don't have a worldview and are neutral or accepting of all ideas. That in itself is a belief or a worldview isn't it?

Let me give you a few examples of how people suppress the truth. A creationist looks at comets and observational science tells us that they only last about 10,000 years at best. We reason that since they have a short life the earth must be young since we still see comets. However, the evolutionist reasons that there is a cloud of comets far beyond our solar system called the Oort cloud (which by the way, has never been seen by anyone, not even the Hubble Telescope). They reason this Oort cloud must exist out there and they get bumped into our solar system because their worldview tells them there is no god and the earth is millions of years old. A creationist says the Bible and Noah's Flood is supported by the fish fossils found in the middle of continents like those in Nebraska. An evolutionist looks at the same evidence and says that the oceans have been moving around and Nebraska used to have ocean front property. The creationist says, canyons form quickly because we see that happening in science today, yet the evolutionist says, "well we know that this one did but how do you know the Grand Canyon did?" The creationist says we know the rock layers form quickly as displayed by Mount St. Helens and other catastrophies today while the evolutionist says, "yes, maybe those at Mount St. Helens did but we don't know that is what happened in the Grand Canyon." The creationist says animals reproduce after their kinds and the evolutionist says, "yeah but given enough time they may have changed outside of their kinds." The creationist says DNA show information and design and the evolutionist replies, "Well, there may be some unknown mechanism that produces it. Give us time and we will find it." Clearly, evidence by itself is never decisive because your worldview will always interpret the evidence as a rescue device. Now I understand that the evolutionist would also argue that it is the creationist who is using a rescue device of the Bible, however, observational science is supporting the Bible much more the evolution. As you will see, it is the Bible that is the basis for where truth is found, even for an evolutionist.

Why do people have a problem with understanding that this is a worldview issue, not a scientific one? We are already on some of the same ground as both a creationist and an evolutionist can agree with scientific studies can't we? This isn't entirely true. If I tell you my car is in the driveway one would think I could prove that to you easily by walking you outside, pointing to the car and say, "there it is." However, a hindu person might say, no the car is an illusion because they have a different worldview and believe things are abstract. We can't argue our worldview based on the evidence because the

evidence is interpreted by the worldview. Therefore, we need to show our standard for our worldview is the correct one.

As I said, both sides are standing on their own presuppositions. Although an evolutionist would like to think he is standing on neutral ground he isn't. Often times I have had professors tell me things like, "Let's just talk about the things we can agree with." "We both believe science is helpful so let's use that and since I don't agree with the Bible let's get rid of it and not discuss religion tonight." "This way we are on neutral ground." The problem with this is that there is no neutral ground. Jesus said, "He who is not with Me is against Me; and he who does not gather with Me scatters" (Mat 12:30). We also read in Romans, "The mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God; for it does not subject itself to the law of God, for it is not even able to do so" (Rom 8:7). Not allowing me to discuss the Bible when talking about science doesn't sound like neutral ground because to ignore God is to reject Him and you are either for Him or against Him.

Another problem with a professor trying to be neutral is that since the Bible claims there is no neutral, the claim for neutrality is itself unbiblical. If they say "I'm neutral" they are admitting or claiming the Bible to be wrong. Therefore, if we say, okay we can leave the Bible out of it as well, then we have agreed to his terms of the debate and we have already lost because the bottom line is that the debate really is about Biblical authority. You can't win on a scientific level, because it is the very basis of our worldview being true. In rejecting the Bible as part of our "evidence" we have just stepped onto his secular opinion and we have lost the battle. You can't defend Biblical authority by abandoning Biblical authority. Therefore when a secularist tries to tell you that they are neutral remember these two things: 1) They aren't, and 2) You shouldn't be. The Scriptures tells us, "He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it" (1 Titus 1:9).

It amazes me that many Christians try to say that you can't stand on the Bible while defending it. You can't argue the Bible if people don't accept the Bible. My question is, "Why not?" As Dr. Lisle says, you can stand on a hill and defend it at the same time can't you? After all doesn't the evolutionist stand on evolution while defending it? The same standard should apply to the church as well.

The question then becomes, "How do we get anywhere if we are both standing on our ground?" The answer is that we must realize that in both cases it is the Biblical presuppositions that will make knowledge possible. Remember, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, but fools despise wisdom and discipline" (Prov 1:7). If you want to know something you have to start with God. One can't deny Christ in science because it is in Christ, "In whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col 2:3). I'm not saying an atheist doesn't have knowledge, however, he can't apply that knowledge to life and truth. An unbeliever knows in his heart of hearts that there is a god and whether he knows it or now he stands on Biblical presuppositions. What I mean by this is that certain things have to be in existence for us to be able to even do science. Some examples of these prerequisites to knowledge would be the laws of **logic**, laws of **nature**, **morality** and trusting that our **senses** are reliable. It is important

to realize that only the Bible provides these foundations of truth. In order to have logic, morality etc. the Bible has to be true. Think about it, why would we have morals if evolution was true? If we are just animals why should we behave in a certain way when animals just do what they do. If evolution was true it wouldn't make sense to have morality but, if the Bible is true, we have an answer as to the origin of morality. God has placed in us a conscience to know right from wrong and because He made us, we are responsible for our actions and how we respond to His laws.

Let's look at one of the foundations of truth, that being the laws of logic. Why would there be a standard of reason in the chance universe of evolution. If we are just chance chemicals and enzymes that have come together, there is no order or reason to our thoughts. However, if the Bible is true, it makes sense in a christian worldview that we would have logic and reason.

Why do we have the laws of nature? You mean to tell me that by chance processes gravity and the laws of motion came about that govern this universe. There is no explanation for these laws with an evolutionary worldview. However, the Bible tells us that it is God who upholds the universe with His created laws.

There is no question that an evolutionist believes in these laws of nature, logic and morality, but if they really are honest, these ideas don't make sense in an evolutionary worldview and there is no justification for them. The evolutionist argues that he doesn't believe in the Bible but he still believes in logic. Of course he should, but logically, he shouldn't because it is inconsistent with his worldview. All worldviews end up being inconsistent except for the Biblical worldview. Think about it. Why do we have hospitals today if evolution were true? Shouldn't we let the weak die so that our species will be stronger? Shouldn't we be consistent with our worldview?

On the surface it may seem like the evolutionist and the creationist have two separate worldviews, however, the truth is the evolutionist has borrowed from the Christian worldview. We know that the secular worldview is standing on sinking sand and logically falls apart while the Christian stands on the rock of Truth. It is much like the old song goes, "On Christ, the solid Rock we stand and all other ground is sinking sand." Because an evolutionist knows that his foundation is faulty, what he has to do is climb onto our solid rock to stand on christian presuppositions. They are able to do this because God has hardwired them to know Him, however they are in self denial and intentionally suppress the truth they don't agree with. The evolutionist will say, "Logic isn't Biblical it is neutral ground when it fact, the basis of logic is inconsistent with his worldview. As Dr. Lisle states, "The evolutionist needs to get saved or stop trespassing."

Typically, an atheist believes that truth can only be found with emperical evidence or scientific research. However, we can't emperically prove life after death can you? Therefore, their idea that truth can only be found emperically within the natural realm is false and illogical. Ask them, "How do you know the statement itself is true that all truth claims have to be proved by empirical observations?" Do you see the problem they have? You can't prove that statement with emperical evidence. Even the statement itself does not hold up to its own standards, it's self defeating. That is like saying there is no truth when the statement itself is believed to be true or believing there are no absolutes when this is believed to be an absolute truth. When looking at all of the

worldviews, ONLY the Bible remains consistent and doesn't destroy itself. A good example of this would be to imagine a person trying to argue that air doesn't exist. The critic of air must use air to breathe and to have his voice travel through in order to make a case against air. Likewise, the critic of the Bible must use Biblical presuppositions in order to argue against the Bible.

How do we as Christians respond to the fact that **Morality** is based on the Bible? If God created us He has the right to set the rules for our lives doesn't He? However, if we are pond scum that has come about by blind chance then why not do whatever you want to do? Therefore, we simply need to ask an atheist how he decides right from wrong? Where is his morality coming from if he is a product of chance?

All the possible responses that an atheist might give are irrational. They might say that you don't need God for morals because morality is what brings the most happiness to the most people, therefore, it naturally comes about. Really? If I was an evolutionist, why should I be concerned about the happiness of others if the Bible isn't true? How do you measure what happiness is? Aren't poor people happier than rich people statistically anyway? If some people get pleasure out of torturing others is it wrong to torture? Again, this is inconsistent with reality, yet the reality of things is consistent with the Bible that tells us people are inherently evil: "The heart is deceitful above all things and beyond cure. Who can understand it" (Jer 17:9, see also Rom 3:23, Rom 3:9, Ps 51:5)?

Others might try to argue that the moral code is simply an electrical impulse in the brain. Really? Do you follow all your brains impulses? Many of them aren't good ideas. In fact, if people followed all the impulses of their brain we would really be in trouble. Morality seems to go against many of these impulses.

Still others may say we need morality for the benefit of society to run properly, therefore, it has come about to maintain order. In other words, what they are saying is that we need morality so that we don't behave like animals! Hmmm? Hitler thought it was good for his society to kill the Jews so was that a moral thing to do? If this were true each society would have different moral codes as well, yet morality is universal and only the Bible can explain where morality comes from. We all have a conscience because God has placed it there. When we do immoral things we know it because the word "conscience" is derived from "con," meaning "with" and "science," meaning knowledge. Therefore we sin with knowledge that it is wrong. We read in Romans, "Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law, since they show that the *requirements of the law are written on their hearts*, their **consciences** also bearing witness, and their thoughts now accusing, now even defending them" (Rom 2:15). God also said to Israel, "I will put My laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God, and they will be My people" (Heb 8:10). Therefore, for an evolutionist to have morals is to stand on Biblical authority. Again, either stop trespassing on our solid ground, or be saved.

Some may even say that people can adopt their own moral codes. If this is true, then I can adopt my own morality as well and, therefore, if I decide that I don't like you I should be able to shoot you. How silly is this.

Consider an evolutionist that is outraged by seeing a violent murder on TV. If he is consistent with his worldview we must ask, "why is he outraged?" If this murder is just a result of what chemical accidents do you can't blame the murderer. You wouldn't punish a cat for killing a mouse because it is just what cats do. Likewise, this is just what evolution has produced so for him to be outraged at a murder is a behavioral inconsistency. One doesn't have to a rocket scientist to see that atheists are grabbing at straws to find an explanation for morality, however, their worldview safety devices won't allow them to admit the Bible is true. In other words, like our previous doctor/patient example, "I guess, dead men do bleed."

So how do we as Christians respond to the evolutionist belief about **LOGIC**? First of all we must realize that logic is a reflection of the way God thinks and the way He expects us to think. How do we know what God thinks? God tells us in the Bible. The laws of logic stem from God's nature. This explains why there is a law of noncontradiction because God cannot contradict Himself. This is also why it has to be the Biblical God because all other worldviews contradict themselves. For example, the Koran accepts the Gospel, however, it denies it at the same time.

What are the laws of logic? We know that they are immaterial, universal, unchanging no matter what day of the week it is, and contingent upon the Biblical God. God doesn't change with time (Heb 13:8), therefore, His laws and thoughts can't change either. None of these things line up with an evolutionary worldview.

Naturalism believes that nature is all there is and denies the supernatural. They believe that it is through nature and reason that we find truth. However, logic isn't part of nature is it? No, it is immaterial so nature can't be all there is. Despite this, an evolutionist still says, "You don't have to be a christian to use logic." "I'm an atheist and I use logic." That's like saying I don't need air to breathe. I don't even believe in air and I can still breath." It makes no sense.

Some may argue that logic is material because it comes from chemical reactions in the brain. However, if they are material, they are not laws and you shouldn't have the same logic between two people because all chemical reactions would be different. Just as your brain is material and your thoughts are immaterial, the Bible is material and the logic it produces is immaterial.

In order to dig themselves out of this hole some try to say logic is only a description of how the brain thinks. If this were true, why would we need laws of logic to correct the way the brain thinks? You don't always think logically and if logic was just a description of how the brain works, the brain wouldn't ever be illogical. Once again, the safety device for evolution is illogical.

We also know that the laws of logic are universal whether in the USA or Mexico. Logic describes concepts that are not bound by location yet an atheist might say that we only use logic because it works. Yes, but why does it work? We answered that in that they are God's rules that are consistent throughout the universe.

Uniformity of the laws of Nature will reveal that the Biblical worldview is the only one that works. Science assumes that the laws of nature don't change and, therefore, the future will reflect the past. We assume that tomorrow I won't float away from the earth just like yesterday the laws of gravity held me firmly to the ground. You

assume that if you slam your finger in the door it will hurt just like it did the last time you did it. Only the Biblical worldview can account for this uniformity in the laws of nature. Genesis 8:22 shows us that God promised the seasonal cycles will remain until His return. Now, God is under no requirement to do so and He can go above and beyond these laws of nature by doing miracles etc., but in the natural realm this holds true. However, evolution has no basis to believe in the uniformity of nature. Why would these laws have remained unchanged throughout eons of time?

An evolutionist might respond to this by saying “everybody knows there is uniformity.” Yes, but that doesn’t answer the question of WHY is there uniformity. That is the real question. Some have said that matter is such that it just behaves that way. In other words, it is because it is. With this kind of argument why can’t a creationist just say, “Well then, creation is true and that is just the way it is.” This kind of argument won’t work for either side.

An evolutionist might also say, “Well it just always has been this way.” Again, isn’t that really what the question is? WHY are natural laws in the past consistent with the future. If they say that in the past, the future has always been like the past, THEREFORE, in the future, the future will always be like the past, this is circular reasoning and is not scientific. This really shows us we can’t know anything without God and His Word as a basis for our worldview.

So how do we use this information in a debate with an evolutionist? There is a basic apologetic procedure one can follow when discussing these matters with an atheist. First, you should present the Christian worldview so he can see why you look at things the way you do. Secondly, you need to critique their worldview. Third, you need to pray for them because it is God who brings men to repentance, not you. You will never be able to reason someone into the faith. We can put this into practice by using what is called the, “Don’t Answer, Answer” strategy based on Proverbs 26:4 where we are told not to answer a fool according to his folly. We don’t embrace his standards because then we would only be like him. For example, if an evolutionist asks you to leave the Bible out of the discussion, if you agree to those terms you have become like him. Verse 5 of Proverbs 26 tells us we are to answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes. Though this seems contradictory to what verse four said, in reality what God is saying is that we are to **reflect back** his own absurdities so he can see his foolishness. For example, if someone says there are no absolutes you reflect that back to him by asking, “is that true?” Or if someone says, “I believe in naturalism. Show me logically how the earth could be young?” You answer by saying “I don’t accept your belief in naturalism, however, if it were true, how would it be possible to prove anything since there could be no laws of logic in the natural realm?” If they say, “The Bible is full of contradictions” you can answer by saying, “I don’t accept that the Bible has contradictions because God doesn’t contradict Himself, however, if it did, in your worldview, why would that be wrong?” Again, you have brought him back to the viscous circle of morality because everybody knows contradictions are wrong, but HOW does he know that? If they say, “It is wrong to teach Creation in schools and lie to children” we can bring it back on him by disagreeing with his premise and asking a

simple question: “Doesn’t lying imply moral standards?” “Why would it be wrong to lie to children?” “I know it is wrong but why do you know lying is wrong?” When the atheist tries to say, “The Christian God isn’t good because he killed children etc.” we again point out that he is borrowing on the Christian worldview to argue against it. God defines what good is, and apart from Him how can you determine who is good and who is innocent?

To refine what we have talked about a bit further it might be good to realize that when critiquing another’s worldview you can look for three basic things: **1)**

Arbitrariness, 2) Inconsistency and 3) failure to provide the preconditions of intelligibility, in other words, it doesn’t make sense with logic and morality.

First let’s examine the **arbitrariness**, which really boils down to mere opinion that isn’t based on any logical or scientific explanation. Children are arbitrary because they believe there is a monster under the bed without any reason to believe it. Adults are not to be like that. We should have reasons for what we believe. When people ask you, “Do you really believe that dinosaurs lived with people?” They don’t have any facts to back up their belief that dinosaurs did not, yet creationists do. Relativism also falls into this category because they say there are no absolutes, but remember they are being absolute in their relativism. Prejudicial conjecture is also an arbitrary fallacy. This is where they make a guess about something when there is evidence that could be looked up to prove it. For example, “The Bible has been translated so many times there are so many errors in it,” or, “Jesus probably didn’t even ever exist.” These statements are simply not true and there is all kinds of evidence that would lead you to a proper conclusion if you would only study a bit. Finally there is an unargued philosophical bias where people have a bias that is unstated. It is just assumed and he wants you to assume it to. For example: “The Bible can’t be true because there are miracles and everyone knows miracles aren’t true.” Again, he is assuming things that can’t be true. These are all arbitrary statements.

Second, a correct worldview must be consistent and as we said, only the Bible is consistent among all worldviews. Therefore we must look for **inconsistencies** in our opponents arguments. Technically, the inconsistency category can be divided up into sub groups as well. Inconsistency include the following: **logical fallacies, reductio ad absurdum, behavioral inconsistency and presuppositional tensions**. An example of a logical fallacy would be when one says, “There is no such thing as truth.” Well, is that true? It is a self-defeating statement. **Reducing to absurdity** is simply where you push something to its logical conclusion like, “We should be free do to what we want.” All you do is push it to its absurd conclusion by saying, “Oh, so I can shoot you if I want?” **Behavioral inconsistency** is where their actions speak louder than their words. If they tell you we are just products of chance and really just pond scum why does he go home and hug his kids and treat them as special? He is professing one thing but he isn’t really acting as if he believes it. **Presuppositional tensions** is where a person knows in his heart that God is real but he also accepts evolution. He tries to put one foot in both worlds which leads to inconsistencies. For example, one may want to believe in millions of years and death being in existence before man’s existence as represented by

the fossil record. However, this is inconsistent with the fact that the Bible says death came about because of man's sin.

Third, **preconditions of intelligibility** must be met. This is when an evolutionist says, "Your not being scientific." First, this means they are relying on God's standards and His uniformity of laws to even be able to say this. Likewise, if they say, "Your not being rational or logical" they are relying on the Bible's standards of logic. If they say, "Your not right, your being immoral" they are relying on God's foundation of morality because evolution can not answer how any of these things have come about. The very fact that you are having a debate with an evolutionist suggests you have won already because rationality in debate means we can hear both sides and choose which one is correct, yet the evolutionary worldview would mean chemicals don't choose and there should not be rationality. These atheists are simply borrowing from the Christian worldview to defend themselves.

The worldview of evolution destroys itself in that an atheist must admit the Christian worldview is the only one that provides a foundation for his worldview, however, his worldview is inconsistent with the foundation. Only the Biblical worldview is consistent without contradicting itself. It is ironic how people like Richard Dawkins have made it their purpose in life to show people that there is no purpose in life. They live in a world of contradictions. Only in Christ can the Truth be found and we, as Christians, must never give up this solid ground on which we stand. "But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ may be ashamed of their slander" (1 Pet 3:15).