

Week 8: The Use of Evidence in Apologetics

John 10:22-26, 37-38

Our position is that God has offered more than enough evidence for us to know He is there.

We are saying that the proof of God's existence is the impossibility of the contrary.

Now, we have said that offering evidence in and of itself does no good as long as someone's presuppositions do not permit them to see evidence.

This is true, **yet** in an attempt to get them by God's grace to see that they are unwilling to see the truth **we have provided evidence**- namely TAG and its fellow arguments.

You see, it is useful, after having gone through TAG and its companions to show the unbeliever that the God we claim has revealed Himself to us and to the unbeliever, to **then** show that He has even left physical evidence as to His existence that is plain and indisputable to those who are not suppressing the truth. *Now, understand this-*

we are not going to take physical evidence and use it to appeal to them as the final authority, we are going to show the unbeliever that unmistakable evidence has been there all along, but they are blind to it- because of their presuppositions.

We want to show that there are reasonable answers to skeptic's questions about our faith for those who are willing to see that their presuppositions have prevented them from seeing the truth.

And we want to show the reasonable answer and then claim that the unbeliever will not believe the reasonable answer we have because of their presuppositions.

For instance, to those who might say "the Bible is not historically accurate", we may want to respond by saying "there is plenty of evidence that the Bible is historically accurate, **but you will not accept that evidence because of your presuppositions and your commitment to autonomy.**"

But to say this we must be prepared in some manner to offer the evidence we speak of.

Sometimes we can take a reverse approach with TAG (but its not always wise.) What we can do is show the unbeliever that there is reasonable evidence first, then show them that they are squirming around that evidence because of their presuppositions.

The danger is that we will get bogged down in a wrong worldview or will fall into the trap of appealing to the unbeliever's autonomous final authority.

So we will set out evidence knowing that it will not convince, but we can use it to show the unbeliever that he has set himself up as the ultimate authority.

Part 2

Evidence

The argument from Design (Teleological argument)

An introduction to Darwinian Evolution

Darwin's theory is quite simple. What Darwin says is that those creatures best suited for their environment will survive and pass on their traits to the next generation. Over time, it is argued, this passing on of the good and the weeding out of the bad could account for whole new organisms arising.

The good- Natural selection does work. It happens. There is no debate here.

The bad- Macro-evolution- the taking of this theory and saying it is how one organism becomes a new *more complex* organism- simply is not supported by the theory.

Let's start by considering life itself:

The problem of the origin of life

Were the circumstances in which life began on this planet the same as they are now, or not? If not, the theory falls apart in that we are saying "special circumstances" had to exist. The problem with special circumstances is that it is so unscientific! I can say the same thing- the special circumstance was God! If we say yes, then the question of *why it still does not happen* comes up. In fact, science today says that "spontaneous generation" that is- life arising from non-life, simply does not happen. Now that's a biological fact. How do we get around that problem?

But let's even grant that there are "special circumstances" that existed. Let's consider what we need to see happen:

We need to have amino acids, in the right place, at the right time, in the right conditions. The chances of this are astronomically poor. Where did the amino acids come from? How did they combine into the first proteins without the instructions of DNA?

But the problem is actually much worse- Not only do we have to have amino acids forming proteins forming living cells, **we need to have the first cell able to produce itself over again.** This level of complexity in the first living cell is insurmountable.

This poses a great problem for the Darwinian scientist- how did the first living creature become complex enough to reproduce, when it was not able to reproduce and pass on any progress in complexity it may have gained? And this is giving the ground up that there were "special circumstances" that existed.

But let's even give the atheist life to start with. We now have another problem.

Irreducible complexity

Can natural selection explain *the complexity* of life?

The theory of irreducible complexity says "no." Irreducible complexity argues that

there are some biological mechanisms that are so complex that natural selection could not have built them over time, because they simply do not function *unless all their parts are in place at once.*

The eye- let's say we can have just a small light sensitive spot. Over time an indentation is formed, in more time a covering extends over it, etc. and so on.

The problem- we need to go backwards- what does it take to make *even a light sensitive spot?* A light sensitive spot, we have discovered, **can not be our starting point-** it's way to complex. Darwin didn't know this. There are a host of biochemical reactions that need to take place, a cascade of chemical interactions, that are extremely complex and fine tuned.

Our starting point must be smaller- but there's a problem with that- if we go back further, ***we find that the most basic elements of this system, by themselves, really are of no benefit to the organism, and is thus not preserved through natural selection.***

We would have to have an astronomically large amount of complexity evolve in one generation simultaneously in order for it to be beneficial.

This is true for a host of functions in organisms. The clotting of blood, the bacterial flagellum that propels bacteria so that they can move, the workings of the the simplest eye, on and on we could go. These complex systems are so complex that they could not have developed over time. (mouse trap example).

The dilemma of information (DNA)

Another huge problem for the atheist is to explain how information came about and is now coded into every living thing. Information as a basic building block of life. It's not just matter and energy that is needed for life- information is needed.

There is information inside every living thing that defies explanation.

- the smallest, simplest living cells have hundreds of pages of information in their genetic code.

Where does this information come from? The evolutionist answers- mutations.

Does this really happen? **We do not see mutations creating more information in the world today.** We see mutations for sure- and we see natural selection guiding life- but it always results in **a lose of information**, not the generation of more, new information.

How did information arise, and become stored, inside of living things?

Do the facts support evolution?

What makes a good theory?

The need for less and less explanations as evidence is uncovered!

One thing that evolution does not explain, but creation predicts-

Gaps in the fossil record.

The fossil record, if evolution is correct, should contain millions upon millions of the "step creatures" that existed between the groups of living things we see today. Not only do we not see millions- we don't see **one!**

(What about carbon dating?)

1- Carbon dating is based on a closed system- such a system does not exist.

2- God created the first humans with age- why not the earth as well?