

My Rebuttal of Astrophysicist Dr. Jason Lisle

<https://answersingenesis.org/big-bang/>

All of my essays can be found at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com

In Ken Ham's website *Answers in Genesis* Dr. Jason Lisle gives a four-minute video presentation which purports to discredit the Big Bang on both biblical and scientific grounds. Each of his charges are followed by my corresponding replies.

Charge: "The Big Bang (BB) and the Bible are not remotely compatible."

Charge: "The days are all clearly ordinary days being bounded by evening and morning and so on."

Reply: To the contrary, the BB is fully compatible with the text of Genesis 1:1-2, while Dr. Lisle's position must ignore the fact that Gen. 1:1 describes the creation of the entire heavens and the earth as God's first act of creation prior to Day One referenced in 1:3. As for the second quote, Lisle altogether denies the clear point of 1:1 by instead implying that its contents happened within the first 24-hour day. The problem for him is that Day 1 doesn't begin until 1:3. Lisle is also incorrect in his assertion that the "evening"/"morning" refrain bounds the time periods into 24-hours duration. Whatever that refrain attempted to convey, it cannot have served as a "binder" in the way he intends, or by any sense of the word at all. See my essay, "How Genesis 1:1 Easily Accommodates the Big Bang."

Charge: "The Bible makes it clear that God created in six days and that it was thousands of years ago."

Reply: To the contrary, nowhere at all in the biblical text is it either specified or even made "clear" that creation occurred "thousands of years ago." Instead, by his refusal to acknowledge that 1:1 narrates God's first creative acts (which occurred **prior to Day 1**), Lisle categorically deprived himself of that very creation episode where no passage of time is specified whatsoever!

Charge: "In fact [the BB and Genesis] are really competitors."

Reply: To the contrary, they can only be competitors on Lyle's utterly faulty assumption that the BB is "naturalistic" (see below).

Charge: "The BB is the *naturalistic* explanation for how the universe came into existence."

Charge: "The BB would teach us that the universe was created naturalistically."

Reply: Lisle cannot be excused for his apparent ignorance of the historical events which led to the acknowledgment by the scientific community that the growing body of evidence favoring the BB was evidently all true. Renowned atheists (Albert Einstein, Arthur Eddington, Fred Hoyle, etc.) were the most ardent opponents of the BB on the grounds that, if true, it implied inescapably that a creator who transcends space, time, matter, and energy must be the cause of cosmic existence. There simply cannot be a naturalistic cause of a universe which came into existence out of nothing.

Lisle expresses "disappointment" that, as he says, Christians somehow believe God created through the BB when in fact they "don't understand the Big Bang." Yet just below the video, a printed text asserts the following falsity: "The big bang...proposes that...the universe began in a **tiny**, infinitely hot and dense point called a singularity. This story of origins is **entirely fiction**" (ellipses and boldface mine). First of all, The BB has not held that the beginning was "tiny," but that there was no physical existence then at all. To suggest otherwise entails a denial of Einstein's General Theory of Relativity. Astrophysicist Dr.

Paul Davies states that, to extrapolate backwards across the history of cosmic expansion, “*we reach a point where all distances in the universe have shrunk to zero...on this view the big bang represents the creation...not only of all the matter and energy in the universe, but also of spacetime itself.*” Lysle’s failure to consider that this is so strong an indicator of a suspicion on his part that an actual zero-volume singularity cannot be reconciled with his assertion that the cause of the BB is naturalistic.

Neither can astrophysicist Lisle be excused for confusing the distinction between causes and effects. At the same time that the BB must have a cause, its *cause* cannot conceivably be scientific for the reason that, **prior** to the beginning of the universe, there was neither space nor time nor matter nor energy out of which any potential scientific cause could take place. Hence, the BB is not the *cause* of the universe, but instead merely the *effect* of God the Creator who, by His Word of power, created the entire cosmos.

Lysle apparently refuses to believe that God could have created by secondary causation. I, for one, can’t imagine why a cosmos coming into existence through a “big bang” cannot be the effect (or means) by which *God*, [in the beginning] *created the heavens and the earth.*” The notion that the created things developed over time (however measured) in fact appears repeatedly in Genesis chapter 1, including firstly in 1:2. On three other occasions in Genesis 1, the suggestion of the text is that God’s creative work happened through secondary causes (vs. 11, 20, and 24). See also Exodus 14:21, where it states that the Lord drove the Red Sea back “*by a strong east wind.*”

Charge: “*The BB teaches that the stars were formed billions of years before the earth was, whereas according to the Bible the earth was made before the stars.*”

Reply: The Bible (when taking into consideration the original Hebrew vocabulary) does not necessarily teach that the celestial bodies were created on Day Four. Taken in its entire context Genesis 1 instead teaches that these heavenly objects, having already been created in 1:1, first *appeared* as distinct objects which were useful for measuring times, days, seasons, and years only after the clouds which had darkened the earth (1:2) finally abated. See both of my essays, “How Genesis 1:1 Easily Accommodates the Big Bang,” and “The Biblical Demand to Take Another Look.”

Finally, although Lysle would lead Christians to deny the scientific evidence that affirms as true the BB beginning of the universe, Romans 1:18-20 to the contrary forbids us from suppressing the testimony of nature. See my essay, “Damaging Ramifications Far More extensive than Just the Age of the Earth.”

By Gary Jensen, Pastor©, May 18, 2018
Pastor, Holy Trinity Lutheran Church (NALC), Berlin, PA, USA