

## LESSON 1: WORLDVIEWS



### Four Questions Any System Has To Answer:

1. Origin

2. Morality

3. Meaning

4. Destiny

### WHAT IS A WORLDVIEW?

A *worldview* is a set of presuppositions (assumptions which may be true, partially true or entirely false) which we hold (consciously or subconsciously, consistently or inconsistently) about the basic makeup of our world.

Everyone has a *worldview*. Whenever any of us thinks about anything--from a casual thought (Where did I leave my watch?) to a profound question (Who am I?)--we are operating within such a framework. In fact, it is only the assumption of a *worldview*--however basic or simple--that allows us to think at all.

Our own *worldview*...is generally unquestioned by each of us, rarely, if ever, mentioned by our friends, and only brought to mind when we are challenged by a foreigner from another ideological universe.

Another way to get at what a *worldview* is, is to see it as our essential, rock-bottom answers to the following seven questions:

1. *What is prime reality--the really real?*
2. *What is the nature of external reality, that is, the world around us?*
3. *What is a human being?*
4. *What happens to a person at death?*
5. *Why is it possible to know anything at all?*
6. *How do we know what is right and wrong?*
7. *What is the meaning of human history?*

When stated in such a sequence, these questions boggle the mind. Either the answers are obvious to us and we wonder why anyone would bother to ask such questions, or else we wonder how any of them can be answered with any certainty. If we feel the answers are too obvious to consider, then we have a *worldview* but we have no idea that many others do not share it. We should realize that we live in a pluralistic world. What is obvious to us may be "a lie from hell" to our neighbor next door. If we do not recognize that, we are certainly naïve and provincial, and we have much to learn about living in today's world.

The fact is that we cannot avoid assuming some answers to such questions. We will adopt either one stance or another. Refusing to adopt an explicit *worldview* will turn out to be itself a *worldview* or at least a philosophic position. In short, we are caught. So long as we live, we will live either the examined or the unexamined life. It is the assumption of this book\* that the examined life is better.

James W. Sire, *THE UNIVERSE NEXT DOOR, A Basic Worldview Catalog*

## Five Worldviews

Mention the word 'diversity', and most people today think only in terms of race, gender, age, or economic status. However, far greater are the 'worldview' differences which separate members of our society, one from another. People are often surprised to learn that these diverse viewpoints fit into five major categories or 'paradigms'. While some in society may successfully co-mingle ideas taken from two or more categories; most unconsciously strive to live their lives within the singular context of one of the categories below.

	REALITY	HUMANKIND	TRUTH	VALUES
<b>Modernism</b> <i>Naturalism</i> <i>Rationalism</i> <i>Agnosticism</i> <i>Existentialism</i> <i>Atheism</i>	The material universe is all that exists. Reality is 'one-dimensional'. There is no such thing as a spirit, soul, or the supernatural. Everything can be explained on the basis of natural, physical laws, and reason alone.	Humankind is the chance product of a biological process of evolution. Man is entirely material, as well as autonomous. The human species may one day pass out of existence.	Truth is typically understood in terms of scientific proof or logical deduction. Only that which can be observed with the five senses, verified scientifically, or grasped with logic is real or true. Science and Reason are the guides to the future.	No objective values or morals exist. Morals are only individual preferences, socially useful behaviors, or political expedencies. Morals are subject to evolution and change. Relativism in moral and ethical realms is reasonable.
<b>Post-modernism</b> <i>A revolt against modernism</i> <i>A growing new form of thinking in Europe and America</i> <i>Cultural Marxism</i>	The one-dimensional world must be interpreted through each individual's language and cultural "paradigm." Since, reality is "socially constructed," these realities can also be "deconstructed."	Humans are 'nodes' in a particular cultural reality; they are a product of their environment. The idea that people are autonomous and free is a myth; they are 'puppets' on their respective social stage.	Truths are mental 'constructs', meaningful only to each individual within a particular cultural paradigm. They do not apply to other paradigms. Thus, reason and logic are simply expressions of European / American cultural bias.	No objective values exist. Morality, or lack thereof, is part of each social paradigm. A politically-correct tolerance, freedom of expression, inclusion, and refusal to claim to have answers are the only universal values. Relativism rules!
<b>Theism</b> <i>Historical Christianity</i> <i>Traditional Judaism</i>	An infinite, personal God exists. This God created an extraordinarily large, yet finite, material world. Reality is both material and spiritual. The universe as we know it had a beginning and will have an end. Ultimate accountability exists; it's just a matter of timing.	Humankind is the unique creation of God. They were created "in the image of God," which refers to attributes of intellect, emotions, and will, and with the possibility of 'spiritual' relationships. Due to the Fall, mankind became alienated from God.	Truth about God and reality is gained through both general and specific revelation. God has 'selectively' and supernaturally revealed His existence. Truth about the material world is gained via observation using the five senses in conjunction with rational thought.	Moral values are the objective, propositional statements of an absolute Moral Being -- God. He has revealed these standards throughout history. This position is incompatible with relativism.

	REALITY	HUMANKIND	TRUTH	VALUES
<b>Aberrant Theism</b>  <i>Islam</i>				
<b>Pantheism</b>  <i>Hinduism</i>  <i>Taoism</i>  <i>Buddhism</i>  <i>New Age</i>	Only the spiritual dimension exists. All else is illusion, <i>maya</i> . Spiritual reality, <i>Brahman</i> , is eternal, impersonal, and unknowable. It is common to say that everything is a part of God, or that God is in everything and everyone.	Humans are one with ultimate reality. Thus man is spiritual, eternal, and impersonal. The belief of individuality is an illusion since mankind is just a part of the Whole.	Truth is an experience of unity with "the oneness" of the universe. Truth is beyond all rational description. Rational thought as it is understood in Western civilization cannot show us reality.	Because ultimate reality is impersonal, many pantheistic thinkers believe that there is no real distinction between good and evil. Instead, "unenlightened" behavior is that which fails to understand essential unity. Relativism demonstrates enlightenment.
<b>Spiritism and Polytheism</b>  <i>Tribal and so-called "native" religions</i>	The world is inhabited by spirit 'beings' who govern what goes on. Demons and gods are the real cause behind "natural" events. Material things are real, but they have spirits associated with them and, therefore, can be interpreted spiritually.	Humans are a creation of the gods like the rest of the creatures on earth. Often, tribes or races have a special relationship with some gods who protect and reward them or can punish them.	Truth about the natural world is discovered through the shaman figure who has visions telling him what the gods and demons are doing and how they feel.	Moral values take the form of taboos, which are things that irritate or anger various spirits. These taboos are different from the idea of "good and evil" because it is just as important to avoid irritating evil spirits as it is good ones.

Adapted from - The Crossroads Project

from WithChrist.org

*"Modernism is typically defined as the condition that begins when people realize God is truly dead, and we are therefore on our own."*

*"Postmodern ideology rejects the authority of reason and views all claims to objective truth to be dangerous."*

## A Modernism Primer

While the First Amendment to the United States Constitution forbids the federal government from establishing a national religion, this has not stood in the way of the establishment of a national religious philosophy. And today, that philosophy in America is Modernism. What's Modernism?

Law professor Phillip E. Johnson explains:

1. The long name for our established religious philosophy is *scientific naturalism* and *liberal rationalism*; for convenience I will simply refer to it as "modernism." Modernism is typically defined as the condition that begins when people realize God is truly dead, and we are therefore on our own. Modernism has a number of real or apparent advantages that have enabled it to become the ruling philosophy of our time. I will first state these advantages now, as a defender of modernism might describe them. My critique will come later.
2. Modernism's metaphysical foundation rests firmly upon scientific naturalism, which is "the way things really are." Through science we now know that nature, of which we are a recently evolved part, really is a purposeless system of material causes and effects, whether we like it or not. Any other system--particularly one based upon supposed divine commandments--would therefore be founded upon illusion rather than reality. The fact is man invented God, rather than the other way around. Once science has established the facts, there is no going back to pre-scientific beliefs, however attractive those beliefs may have been in their time.
3. Modernist naturalism equals rationality because it excludes consideration of miracles, defined as arbitrary breaks in the chain of material causes and effects. This way of defining rationality is particularly important to scientists, who see the success of science as inextricably linked to the presumption that no supernatural mind or spirit ever interferes with the orderly (but purposeless) course of natural events. For most modernists, the identification of naturalism with rationality is so complete that they do not think of naturalism as a distinct and controversial metaphysical doctrine, but simply assume it as part of the definition of "reason."
4. Modernist naturalism is liberating, especially in gender roles and sexual behavior, because it frees people from the illusion that outdated cultural norms have permanent validity as commands of God. Persons who attack scientific naturalism, or the theory of evolution, probably do so as part of a disguised agenda to re-establish a patriarchal and stifling code of sexual behavior. Thus *The Los Angeles Times* has repeatedly attacked the Vista, California (San Diego County), School Board for threatening to allow challenges to Darwinism in the curriculum and for attempting to institute a sex education curriculum based upon abstinence rather than "safe sex." The modernist media see challenges to Darwinism or sexual freedom for teenagers as equivalent manifestations of religious fundamentalism, and hence unconstitutional.
5. Modernist naturalism supplies the philosophical basis for democratic liberty, because it relies only upon knowledge which is in principle available to every citizen. Persons who wish to make public policy from some divine revelation are inherently undemocratic, because they assert authority based on knowledge revealed only to them, and hence is not available to others. In contrast, the observations and methods of reasoning employed by science are universally accessible in principle, although the special study required limits the capacity of ordinary citizens to understand them in practice. If public debate is carried out only on the basis of knowledge derived from sensory experience and scientific investigation, then in principle everyone can participate on equal terms. Debates between competing supernaturalistic ideologies can be settled only by force, whereas debate on naturalistic principles is open to reason and hence to peaceful solution.
6. Finally, modernist government is acceptable even to many religious people, including theists who prudently want to avoid clashing with natural science. Modernism is not anti-religious, as we have seen, provided that "belief in God" stays in its proper place in private life. Believers may have their own churches, and may send their children to private religious schools if they can afford to do so, provided they do not try to claim a place for their views in the public square by, for example, seeking to advocate them in the public schools.

## *Post-modernism*

We live in strange times. Increasingly, American academics [as well as many average citizens] regard claims to objective and universal truth as intolerant and uninformed. What accounts for this bizarre and growing consensus? It's called postmodernism. Postmodern ideology rejects the authority of reason and views all claims to objective truth to be dangerous. For these enormously influential thinkers, truth is political and created by "belief communities," not discovered rationally and objectively. That the academic community is experiencing a major ideological revolution is beyond doubt. Like all intellectual movements, postmodernism deeply effects the broader culture.

We are witnessing a broad-based backlash against reason in our culture. This backlash is widely promoted in contemporary higher education. The argument is that every time somebody claims to be in possession of the truth (especially religious truth), it ends up repressing people. So its best to make no claims to truth at all.

Rejecting objective truth is the cornerstone of postmodernism. In essence, postmodern ideology declares an end to all ideology and all claims to truth. How has this seemingly anti-intellectual outlook gained such wide acceptance in history's most advanced civilization? That question requires us to understand how postmodernists conceive the past three hundred years of western history.

Postmodernism abandons modernism, the common and widespread humanist philosophy of the European Enlightenment. Enlightenment thinking is based on the authority of French philosopher Rene Descartes' autonomous man--the one who starts from his own thought ("I think, therefore I am") and builds his world view systematically from reason alone. Naively, postmodernists charge, modernists assumed that the mind was a "mirror of nature," meaning that our perceptions of reality actually correspond to the way the world is. From this presumption, modernists built a culture that exalted technological achievement and mastery over the natural order. Expansion-minded capitalism and liberal democracy, outgrowths of modernist autonomous individualism, subjugated the earth to the eurocentric, male dominated paradigm.

But modernism planted the seeds of its own undoing. As arrogant, autonomous modernists conquered the globe and subjugated nature in the name of progress, oppressed and marginalized people have responded. "Progress toward what?" they cry. Postmodernists say that the idols of autonomous reason and technological proliferation have brought the modern age to the brink of disaster. The "myth of progress" ends up in a nightmare of violence, both for marginalized people and for the earth.

Enter postmodernism. Postmodernism rejects modernism's autonomous individualism and all that follows from it. Rather than seeing humanity as an ocean of individuals, postmodernists think of humans as "social constructs" -- nodes in a particular cultural reality. We do not exist or think independently of the community with which we identify. So we can't have independent or autonomous access to reality. All of our thinking is contextual. Rather than conceiving the mind as a mirror of nature, postmodernists argue that we view reality through the lens of culture. Consequently, [in contrast to theists who allow for revelation, or modernists who limit truth to that which can only be scientifically verified], postmodernists reject the possibility of all objective truth. Reality itself turns out to be a "social construct" or paradigm. In the place of objective truth and what postmodernists call "metanarratives" (comprehensive world views), we find "local narratives," or stories about reality that "work" for particular communities--but have no validity beyond that community. Indeed, postmodernists reject the whole language of truth and reality in favor of literary terms like narrative and story. It's all about interpretation, not about what's real or true.

Postmodernists hold that the pretense of objective truth always does violence by excluding other voices (regarding other world views to be invalid), and marginalizing the vulnerable by scripting them out of the story. Truth claims, we are told, are essentially tools to legitimate power. That's why in postmodern culture, the person to be feared is the one who believes that we can discover ultimate truth. The dogmatist, the totalizer, the absolutist are viewed as both naive and dangerous.

A growing number, especially among the emerging generation, believe that reason and truth are inherently political and subversive. That's why they are often so cynical. According to the voices in contemporary culture that shape "Generation X" thinking, claims to truth are clever disguises for the pernicious "will to power." Consequently, rather than dominating others with our "version of reality," we should accept all beliefs as equally valid. Openness without the restraint of reason, and tolerance without moral appraisal are the new postmodern mandates.

For most people, the postmodern outlook I've described is more "absorbed" than thought out. An impressive majority of Americans believe that truth is relative. But few know why they think that way. Still fewer have any clue about how their beliefs practically relate to their own lives. In general, people are more ideologically confused than deeply committed to their convictions. So while we hear the rhetoric of openness to everything and tolerance for everyone, it's rare to find someone who really understands what this means. It's just the socially appropriate attitude to have. Postmodern ideologues have been successful in transforming ideology into popular zeitgeist. Ironically, this radical subjectivity leads to the dangerously arrogant inference that no one can ever be wrong about what they believe. If we are free from the constraints of rationality, nothing separates truth from self-delusion.

Jim Leffel

*Jim Leffel teaches philosophy at Ohio Dominican College in Columbus, Ohio. He is a co-author of the book, The Death of Truth, What's Wrong with Multiculturalism, The Rejection of Reason, and the New Postmodern Diversity, ed. Dennis McCallum (Bethany House Publishers, 1996).*

*Why is it important to understand Modernism and Postmodernism?*

*Most people never stop to evaluate what their worldview is, or whether it is valid. This unexamined way of living can lead to a life of self-delusion.*

*How does this affect the traditional theistic worldview?*

*How does Postmodernism affect our attitudes about God?*

*Read on...*

## *Crisis of the Age*

The fundamental crisis of the twentieth century [and 21st] is neither political, nor social, nor economic. It is intellectual, and the primary intellectual problem is neither metaphysical nor ethical: It is epistemological\*. No attempt to solve the various problems and end the seemingly interminable crises of the twentieth century will be successful unless it is recognized that the justification of knowledge is always the ultimate problem, and that unless this problem is solved, no other problem can be.

In past centuries the secular philosophers have generally believed that knowledge is possible to man. Consequently they expended a great deal of thought and effort trying to justify knowledge. In the twentieth century, however, the optimism of the secular philosophers has all but disappeared. They despair of knowledge. Like their secular counterparts, the great theologians and doctors of the church taught that knowledge is possible to man. Yet the theologians of the twentieth century have repudiated that belief. They also despair of knowledge. This radical skepticism has filtered down from the philosophers and theologians and penetrated our entire culture, from television to music to literature. The Christian in the twentieth century is confronted with an overwhelming cultural consensus—sometimes stated explicitly, but most often implicitly: Man does not and cannot know anything truly.

What does this have to do with Christianity? Simply this: If man can know nothing truly, man can truly know nothing. We cannot know that the Bible is the Word of God, that Christ died for sin, or that Christ is alive today at the right hand of the Father. Unless knowledge is possible, Christianity is nonsensical, for it claims to be knowledge.

What is at stake in the twentieth century is not simply a single doctrine, such as the Virgin Birth, or the existence of Hell, as important as those doctrines may be, but the whole of Christianity itself. If knowledge is not possible to man, it is worse than silly to argue points of doctrine—it is insane. John Robbins

## *Cultural Marxism?*

The term "cultural Marxism" is frequently used in discussions regarding culture, politics, ethics, and current affairs. As is often the case, no easily understood definition of the nomenclature is readily available. In our opinion, the following quote taken from *REASON IN THE BALANCE, The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law & Education* by law professor Phillip E. Johnson, does an excellent job of explaining the parallel between a failed economic theory and this increasingly popular paradigm for social relationships.

Other examples of modernist natural law involve the many versions of Marxism. What is common to all varieties of Marxist thought is the proposition that the fundamental moral fact about the human condition is that a class of victims is dominated by a class of oppressors. It follows that the cure for oppression is liberation, whether through violent revolution or by cultural transformation. In classical [economic-oriented] Marxism the oppressor class was the bourgeoisie or capitalists, while the revolutionary class was the proletariat or industrial wage-laborers. The specific cure was for the workers to seize control of the factories and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat, to be followed by the utopia of communism.

Contemporary versions of this exciting drama flourish in universities, with a new cast of characters. Now the oppressor is the heterosexual white male; the new proletariat consists of racial minorities, women, gays and lesbians; and the struggle is for control of the terms of discourse\*. Great victories are won, as when newspaper editorialists and judges accepted the term *homophobia* as a fair descriptive term for the state of mind that leads people to oppose gay-rights ordinances. Institutions once thought to be obviously healthy, such as motherhood and the family, become reinterpreted as means of oppression--just as the original Marxists reinterpreted employment as "wage slavery." (Page 145)

\* The phrase "terms of discourse" means the rules for speech and discussion. It answers the questions of who, what, when, where, and how regarding expression of viewpoints.

### Not another Worldview?

What many believe to be a natural outgrowth of Modernism and Postmodernism is the growth of another related worldview - Hedonism. This worldview has become more and more popular in my lifetime until it is accepted as the norm. Oh, people don't call it that - that sounds like it's all about debauchery. Hedonism, though is defined in my dictionary as *1. a devotion, especially a self-indulgent one, to pleasure and happiness as a way of life, and 2. a philosophical doctrine that holds that pleasure is the highest good or the source of moral values.*

Does this not describe our culture today? For many people in this country, the pursuit of happiness through acquiring more things and more experiences is their primary goal in life. All other activities in life are either a means or an impediment to that end.

How did this happen? It was not always this way. It used to be that most people didn't have time to sit around and worry about such things as personal fulfillment, meaning, satisfaction, or even happiness. They were too busy trying to survive. This wasn't that long ago, only about a half-century. Life was hard, and you accepted it as such, you didn't question it. Personal fulfillment was found in working hard, doing your duty, being a good citizen, a good mother or father. Those were the highest goals in life. You found your identity and fulfillment in those things. Traditions were accepted as good, and values came from the Bible.

Faith was considered the highest level of knowledge. Heaven and Hell was accepted as fact. The best life was that of true obedience. God was the final object of all theorizing. To contemplate God and all the variety of His creation was considered the highest good.

With the rise of Modernism and the "death of God", a new way of looking at the world came about. Now,

- Instead of conforming to the reality that exists, we try to transform reality.
- Since Modernism or Postmodernism has nothing to say about ultimate ends, we have to get all we can out of this life.
- We're more concerned about alleviating the daily miseries of living, rather than a commitment to some healing doctrine of the universe.
- The universe is merely there for our use.
- Traditional stories are undermined.
- History is ignored.
- Tradition itself loses its currency.
- Theory at its highest is not faith, but power.
- From the creation of that power, man now has freedom to choose among any and all opinions laid down in any theory.
- What people want, and what government, therapists, and even religious leaders try to give, is **power**. Power to control their circumstances, power to manage their life, power to escape their angst, power to subdue their hunger for meaning, for hope.

**And so, from the 1960's on, we enter a world in which looking good and feeling good replaces being good and doing good.**

Even in many churches today, most people don't know the difference.

So what binds us together now? Many sociologists say Shopping. Products place the bonding level in this country. People are branded - they share and commune through Nike, Coca-Cola, McDonalds, etc. We're part of a growing community in which it doesn't matter what kind of person you are, but what products you use that defines you. Of course, money is, and has always been the great leveler, but now you don't even need money, since credit is so easy to come by. Now you can buy that big house, that Lexus, that big screen TV, even if you don't have the money.

We are finding meaning in our lives through products, fashion, electronics, etc., and nowhere is it easier to see than among young people. Kids find their identity in products like clothing and hair styles instead of traditions, because science has destroyed



traditions. They're being told that if they don't have these clothes, this hair style, these things, this music, then you don't belong, you're not "In". That's powerful, that's a world view.

**It's actually a pseudo-attempt at a sort of redemption, but it is a lie, and we know it, but we still keep buying into it.**

It all comes down to this - In the marketplace of worldviews available to us, **if God is not God, then something else must be God to us.** Our lifestyle, our values, our behavior, the things we do must be structured by something else, if it is not God. If you reject the living God, something else must fill the void.

*Dusty Rhodes*

## **The Essential Christian Worldview What is Truth?**

**Excerpt By:**

**[Charles T. Buntin, M.S., M.A.R.](#)**

You have a worldview. Many of you might deny that you have a worldview, but you have one. If you say, "Hey, all I want to do is party, I don't have a worldview, and don't need one," then that is your worldview--the Bible describes that way of thinking as "eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we may die." Philosophers would probably call such a view of life "hedonistic nihilism,"(now there's a couple of \$50 words!)--which means "have a good time and don't care about anything." Your worldview might have been shaped by religious belief and tradition, by occultism and superstition, by humanism and rationalism, by what you learned as a child from "Sesame Street" and "Mister Rogers," or by what you hear and see now on "Phil" and "Oprah," but you have a worldview. Your worldview may be clearly thought out or almost totally subconscious, it may be base or noble, it may be sensible or wacky--but you have a worldview. What is more, your worldview is very important to you. It governs the way you think and live; it guides your decisions about everything you do.

If you are a professing Christian, you have an obligation to think out your worldview. You are pledged by your covenant with the God of the Bible to learn His ways and to follow Him ([John 10:27](#)). If you are going to follow Christ, then you need to be aware of how God wants you to view the world, and you need to learn to live by His worldview.

Historically, the Christian Worldview has been determined by the answers to two questions: What is Truth? Why are we alive? These are the two most basic questions that can be asked about human existence. Of course, for us to even ask these questions flies in the face of the common modern worldviews, which deny the existence of Truth, Purpose, and Direction in the universe. For us to say, "these questions make sense," presupposes the Christian Worldview.

## What is Truth?

The accused stood before the Roman governor, who had the power of judge, jury, and executioner. This powerful ruler was accountable to no one on earth but Caesar himself, and his only thought was how to handle this thorny situation in such a way as to please Caesar and advance his own cause. Pontius Pilate was a typical Roman politician--skilled, devious, educated, and thoroughly cynical in his approach to life--he would have made a good 20th century American corporation man. Pilate, no doubt, was not in a fine mood. For Pilate, as for all Roman rulers of Judea before and after him, this time of the year was always a tense one, which is why he had left his normal residence in comfortable Caesarea by the Mediterranean Sea and traveled to this miserable, grim city of Jerusalem--a place full of trouble and troublesome people. The Jews were gathering for one of their interminable religious festivals where they worshipped their strange oriental God, their uniquely solitary deity who was so jealous that He wouldn't even let them make an image of Himself. It was the Passover, the chief of their feasts, so Pilate was in Jerusalem, where he did not want to be, and he was awakened very early in the morning at the summons of the Jewish religious leaders, to handle the case of this prisoner, Jesus. Pilate had already sent Him to Herod, trying to avoid making the decision, and that wily old fox had deftly sidestepped the issue and landed it back in Pilate's lap. So here they stood, an inscrutable Jewish prophet, and the Roman governor.

[John 18:33-37](#) Pilate then went back inside the palace, summoned Jesus and asked him, "Are you the king of the Jews?" "Is that your own idea," Jesus asked, "or did others talk to you about me?" "Am I a Jew?" Pilate replied. "It was your people and your chief priests who handed you over to me. What is it you have done?" Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world. If it were, my servants would fight to prevent my arrest by the Jews. But now my kingdom is from another place." "You are a king, then!" said Pilate. Jesus answered, "You are right in saying I am a king. In fact, for this reason I was born, and for this I came into the world, to testify to the truth. Everyone on the side of truth listens to me." "What is truth?" Pilate asked. (NIV)

We know the rest of the story. Pilate, who really had nothing against this solitary prophet, tried everything he could to worm out of the situation, but when faced with a political threat to himself, ". . . If you let this man go, you are no friend of Caesar." ([John 19:12](#)), he turned him over to the executioners. Pilate's words to Jesus, however, ring in our ears, because they sound so current, so "now." "What is Truth?" Pilate, the cynic, probably had no idea of the answer to his own question--he most likely wasn't sure there was such a thing as truth, and so it is with many, if not most of the world's people today. We live in a civilization that will admit the existence of "little truths," and technological facts. For example, we know that  $2+2 = 4$ , that elements have certain chemical and physical properties, and that bodies in motion behave in a predictable way. However, our civilization officially denies the existence of ultimate Truth--the concept that Francis Schaeffer called "true truth." For the Christian, however, Truth exists, and it is ultimate, rational, and real.