

Ultimate Proof of Creation-Presuppositional Apologetics (Dr. Jason Lisle)

1. People are not always convinced by a good argument, but people are often convinced by a bad argument – that’s what logical fallacies are, bad arguments that people find convincing.
2. There is a difference between proof and persuasion.
3. It’s not our job to persuade people, our job is to give a defense.
4. Evidence commonly used to confirm creation:
 - a. **Information Science / Genetics:**
 - i. “There is no known law of nature, no known process, and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter... When its progress along the chain of transmission events is traced backward, every piece of information leads to a mental source, the mind of the sender” – Dr. Werner Gitt
 - ii. The fact that we have information in our DNA tells us that DNA could not have come about by a random, chance process.
 - iii. “All point mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to reduce the genetic information and not to increase it.” – Dr. Lee Spetner
 - iv. Mutations may increase survival value under certain circumstances, but they don’t add new information to the genome.
 - b. **Biblical Timescale:**
 - i. **Carbon-14 in Diamonds** - All the C-14 on the entire earth would be gone (would’ve decayed into Nitrogen) in 1 million years.
 - ii. **Comets** – Comets are made of ice. Every time they pass near the sun, some of this ice is blasted away and the comet loses mass. A comet could orbit for a maximum of about 100,000 years before it completely runs out of material.
5. For every one of these lines of evidence that we can come up with, the evolutionist can come up with a “rescuing device”.
 - a. **Comets** – perhaps there is a vast reservoir of comets beyond the visible solar system: an “Oort cloud”. Comets are occasionally dislodged from this cloud and thrown into the inner solar system. There’s no observational evidence of this Oort cloud.
6. Creationists and Evolutionists all have the same facts. Why then do we draw such different conclusions about the past? The answer is we have a different starting point (world view).
7. Your world view is like a set of mental glasses you wear through which you see everything.
8. Your world view is all of your most basic beliefs about reality, which we call presuppositions
9. Presuppositions that everyone has:
 - a. Your senses are basically reliable
 - b. Your memory is reliable
 - c. The existence of the Laws of Logic
10. Creationists and evolutionists have different presuppositions – different rules for interpreting the evidence.
11. The battle isn’t really about evidence, it’s about how evidence ought to be interpreted. We have different standards by which we interpret the evidence.
12. Ultimate Standard: Creationist: the Bible, Evolutionist: Naturalism or Empiricism

13. Evidence by itself will not resolve a worldview conflict, because your worldview tells you what to make of the evidence.
14. Told story about a man who was convinced he's dead... (I guess dead men **do** bleed 😊)
15. A philosophically astute person will not be persuaded by mere evidence.
16. There is no neutral ground (Mat. 12:30; James 4:4). Can't take Bible out of discussion.
17. The Pretended Neutrality Fallacy – Since the Bible indicates that there is no “neutral”, the claim of neutrality is itself unbiblical. Neutrality is non-neutral, and therefore self-refuting.
18. Ultimate Authority:
 - a. Only the Bible provides the preconditions for the intelligibility of man's experience and reasoning.
 - b. If the Bible were not true, it be impossible to prove anything.
19. We rely on the following preconditions, which are all grounded in God's Word:
 - a. Laws of Logic – correct standard of reason (why in a 'chance universe')?
 - b. Uniformity of Nature – Gravity, etc. (God upholds the universe in a consistent fashion)
 - c. Absolute Morality – Why ought we (should we) behave in a certain way?
20. Evolutionist **do** believe in these things, but in their worldview, no rational foundation for these
21. **Relativism** – All things are relative. There are no absolutes. The statement that “there are no absolutes” is an absolute statement, so if it's true, it's false, therefore, it's false.
22. **Empiricism** – the belief that all truth claims are proved by empirical observation. How do you know that the statement itself is true? Did you prove that by empirical observation?
23. Unbelievers will stand on Christian presuppositions when it suits them. He is standing on Christian ground. He either needs to get saved or stop trespassing!
24. Debate on the existence of air: the critics of air must use air in order to make a case against it.
25. Likewise, the critic of the Bible must use biblical presuppositions in order to argue against it.
26. **Absolute Morality** – if God created us, He has the right to set the rules. If we are just 're-arranged pond scum', why not do what we want?
27. The moment the moral relativist says, “You can't go around telling people what not to do”, what are they doing? Going around telling other people what not to do, which is self-refuting.
28. Ask a moral relativist, ‘How do you decide “right” from “wrong”?’ Apart from the biblical God, morality can only be relative. Yet people can't live that way.
29. Possible Responses:
 - a. “Morality is what brings the most happiness to the most people”. But in an evolutionary universe, why should I be concerned about the happiness of others (if they're just 're-arranged pond scum')?
 - b. “The moral code is simply electrical impulses in the brain.” Why should I follow it?
 - c. “Laws of morality are conventions adopted for the good of society.” In an evolutionary worldview, we're just animals. The word 'benefit' assumes a standard of goodness...
 - d. “People can adopt their own moral code.” If you can, so can I and you might not like some of my moral codes – I might want to shoot you.
 - e. You wouldn't punish vinegar for reacting with baking soda – that's just what it does. You wouldn't punish the Lion for killing the antelope – animals kill animals...
30. **Laws of Logic** – these are reflections of the way God thinks, and the way He expects us to think. These stem from God's nature. God is logical. (2 Timothy 2:13; Colossians 2:3)
31. Laws of Logic are immaterial, universal, invariant, abstract, contingent on the biblical God

32. Naturalism – the belief that nature is all that there is. The naturalist attempts to use logic and reason to support his position. But logic is not part of nature. The fact that he's able to make an argument at all proves he's wrong.
33. I'm not saying you have to profess a belief in God to use laws of logic, but you do need the biblical God to have laws of logic. No other worldview can account for them.
34. Possible Responses:
- "Laws of logic are material. They are chemical reactions in the brain." If material, they're not laws. They can't be universal if they don't extend beyond your brain.
 - "Laws of logic are descriptions of how the brain thinks." If this were true, you could never violate one.
 - "Laws of logic are conventions." But some cultures have different conventions (e.g. driving on left-side of the road or the right side of the road).
 - "They are a property of the universe." But the universe changes with time, so we wouldn't expect them to be invariant.
 - "We use them because they work." But that's not my question. My question is 'how can you account for them in an evolutionary worldview?'
35. "Don't Answer, Answer" Strategy:
- The Bible itself provides a strategy for defending the Christian Faith.
 - This is the biblical way to refute anti-Christian presuppositions.
 - Proverbs 26:4-5 *Do not answer a fool according to his folly, or you will be like him yourself. Answer a fool according to his folly, or he will be wise in his own eyes.*
 - Do not embrace the "fool's" presuppositions. (Proverbs 26:4)
 - Show where the "fool's" presuppositions would go if taken to their conclusion (Proverbs 26:5)
 - Never "put on the suit", but always "reflect it back to him".
36. Richard Dawkins – here is a man that is convinced that his purpose in life is to convince people that there is no purpose in life. You see the inconsistency there?
37. Secular worldviews always blow themselves up.
38. Any argument against Christianity presupposes Christianity is true.
39. It's not our job to open people's hearts – that's the Holy Spirit's prerogative, it's our job to close their mouths. – Dr. Greg Bahnsen
40. Who can contend with the Almighty?