

## Classical Apologetics

These four basic laws, which allow for the growth of human knowledge, are regularly attacked. If any of these rules are compromised any kind of irrationality is possible. It is often a violation of these rules that are used to justify the necessary 'miracles' of existence required by the atheistic/secular/evolutionary community. See the section below entitled 2. The Universe Created Itself.

### R. C. Sproul, "Classical Apologetics"

#### 1. Law of Non-Contradiction or sometimes Law of Contradiction

The law of non-contradiction is the most basic building block of logic and therefore rational thought. Everything else flows from this. It says that a thing cannot be its opposite in the same way at the same time.  $A = \sim A$  is a rational impossibility. "My car is in the parking lot and my car is not in the parking lot" is a physical impossibility. This law is at the heart of all truthful, rational thinking. Its attempted usage in life can be construed as lying, deceit or fraud in saying that something is so when it is not or something is not so when it is.

Aristotle (384-322 BC) put it this way:

"To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false,  
while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true".

"Thou shalt not bare false witness." Ex 20:16

"All denials of the law of non-contradiction are forced and temporary. You can't drive a car, [or do science,] and deny the law of non-contradiction." R.C. Sproul.

#### 2. Law of Causality

The law of causality is an extension of the law of non-contradiction and has been used as an argument for the existence of God going back millennia. God is the First Cause or Prime Mover. Bertrand Russell 'believed in God' until he read John Stuart Mill who said "everything must have a cause" So God must have a cause. Russell died believing this false but common definition.

The true definition is that "every effect must have a sufficient, antecedent cause." A related definition says that "everything that comes into existence must have a cause." If a new disease manifests or a building collapses a 'cause' is sought to explain the event. Causal thinking is at the heart of all natural science and the scientific method, at least the 'observable, testable, repeatable' kind of 'how things work' science. David Hume (1711-1776) argued that an actual cause cannot be known, and the best that can be shown are "customary" or "contiguous" relationships. His main example comes from a pool table. One pool ball hits another pool ball and sets it in motion. It is "customary" to think one ball makes the other ball move based on the assumption that when one thing follows another there is a 'causal' relationship. But, according to Hume, this can't be known for sure. There might be some other, invisible, unknown forces also at work waiting to be discovered.

These ideas caused quite a reaction. Hume also implied that there could be an effect with no cause or an 'uncaused effect' thus nullifying the law of causality. This has never been demonstrated. However, nothing is believed to have caused the Big Bang. The key-word is 'believed'. This irrational belief dominates cosmology. More on that later.

#### 3. Basic Reliability of Sense Perception, Language

In the wake of Hume's skepticism renewed efforts were asserted to establish the notion that human sense perception is basically reliable. It is true that "our senses do not have perfect perceptions of reality. That is why we have machines to heighten and extend our senses." Hume drew attention to those limits showing there may be invisible forces at work. Yes, he was absolutely correct, because one of those causal forces is

the power of God. Hume's work was as an enlightened atheist so he thought he was removing God. But even the great David Hume could not close the door on God.

There persists, in this day, an idea that if something is not 100% it should be discarded. If you can be deceived by your senses (like an optical illusion) then your senses can't be trusted to any degree. It is a radical 'all or nothing' position. You can imagine the chaos if people actually lived like that. But they can't, at least not for very long. Their purpose is to create a disturbance not advance truth and understanding. It is true that language changes with time. When you read the King James Bible, or Shakespeare, you are reading the English language of 400 years ago. Much has changed but it is still, with a little help, intelligible. It hasn't mutated into something impossible to understand. Over the last 150 years, as philosophical atheism became more internally consistent, even language has come under scrutiny.

#### **4. Analogical Use of Language**

As each of the above laws were philosophically broken down language became the next victim. They would say that like our senses, language, because it changes, is unreliable. As a means to express human thoughts it is useless. I always find it amusing to hear someone that believes this using language to say that language is meaningless, and then expect you to know what they mean by what they say. College professors are especially good at pushing nonsense into young, impressionable minds. This is a particularly diabolical attack. If language can be destroyed in the minds of people then the Gospel breaks down because the words are meaningless.

As I mentioned above, this is materialism becoming consistent with itself. There is no communication of any kind in the world of physics and chemistry. The very foundation is chaos and any notion of 'language' is meaningless since there is no 'mind' to perceive such things.

Thomas Aquinas divided up language like this:

- a. Univocal – a single meaning; "The door is open."
- b. Equivocal – multiple meanings; "That is really cool!"
- c. Analogical – scaled or proportional meanings; good dog, man, God

#### **Philosophical Origin of The Universe**

**There are only a few possibilities:**

1. The Universe Is An Illusion
2. The Universe Created Itself
3. The Universe Has Always Existed, It Has Eternal Being
4. The Universe Was Created By An Eternal Being
5. Our Universe is one of an infinite number of universes subject to natural selection
6. Our Universe is one of many designer universes, i.e. intelligent hi-tech creator aliens

I will leave 5 and 6 for Spike Psarris in "The Big Bang Never Happened" on YouTube.com, as they are so far removed from reality I will not commit any more space to their discussion. Highly recommended viewing. Thank you R.C. Sproul, "Classical Apologetics" for the structure of 1-4.

Thomas Aquinas saw it this way, and corresponds to 2-4 above, the universe could be:

1. Self-caused
2. Uncaused
3. Caused by another

## 1. The Universe Is An Illusion

We can thank Rene Descartes (1596-1650) for the solution to this possibility in his famous conclusion "Cogito Ergo Sum" or "I think therefore I am". If something, anything, exists the universe cannot be an illusion.

How does this solve the problem of the universe being an illusion? Following the Protestant Reformation, a crisis in authority emerged, both ecclesiastically and scientifically. Who actually speaks for the truth of things? Rene wanted to apply his mathematical rigor to questions of reality and truth.

He set out by doubting literally everything: his own perceptions, senses, thinking, existence, reality, everything! As he worked through layer after layer of doubts he realized that he reach a place where he was doubting his doubts. Kind of crazy, but there was pure method to the madness. When Rene doubted that he was doubting, and doubting the doubts, he realized a great revelation: the very act of doubting requires thought or thinking. A thought requires a thinker, a mind. Only a mind can think about doubts. So he thought, "It may be everything outside my mind is an illusion but 'I think therefore I am'." Something exists so reality itself cannot be an illusion. Therefore the universe cannot be an illusion. It may not be clear what it is, but it does exist.

Check off #1.

Now Rene's work led to other problems as some ran with the idea that nothing can be known outside the mind. The mind became the center of the universe, the ultimate self-centeredness. This is where the western version of "we create our own reality" came from. There is also an eastern version based on the idea all of reality really IS an illusion or Maya. This violates the principle of "the basic reliability of sense perception." I find it interesting that most problems today derive from solutions to previous problems! People tend to focus only on the current problem with no regard for the chain of events that led to the current problem. True problem solving today needs to be focused at the root not the fruit. Also in the aftermath of the Protestant Reformation developed the tradition of leaving God out of the formulation philosophical thought, and man's mind became the starting point.

Side note: when someone who believes the "we create our own reality" idea gets mad at you for being a Christian, say to them, "Wait a minute; I thought you said we create our own reality." When they say "We do", say to them, "Well then, I'm your fault!" Thank you Frank Peretti, "The Chair"

## 2. The Universe Created Itself.

"Why does something exist rather than nothing at all?" G.W. Leibniz

"Because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing. Spontaneous creation is the reason there is something rather than nothing, why the universe exists, why we exist. It is not necessary to invoke God to light the blue touch paper and set the universe going." Dr. Stephen Hawking, "The Grand Design"

"Nothing is what rocks dream about." Aristotle

Here is the short form of the answer: It is possible that X can create Y as long as X is sufficient to cause the effect Y. But when someone says something can create itself they are saying X can create X. This means X must exist before it can create X. This is an absurdity. Even worse, if X is nothing, then the most that can be created is nothing. This has been logical nonsense and a philosophical absurdity for thousands of years.

Ok, Hawking is a brilliant cosmologist, so what about the science of nothing? Let's look carefully at what he said, "...create itself from nothing". He assumes that in the beginning there was nothing, nada, zip, zero. Oh wait, zero is a something (a number), sorry. Until the 1990s the Big Bang supposedly started from an infinitesimally small, infinitely hot singularity sometimes called 'the cosmic egg'. The cosmic egg contained the entire universe, which at some point exploded. This was abandoned because it violates Point 3 below: matter and/or energy ( $E=mc^2$ ), cannot exist eternally, it continually deteriorates. The Big Bang theory was originally formulated to eliminate God but became associated, falsely, with a definite beginning.

#### Two Possibilities for Red Shift

1. We appear to be at the center of an expanding universe because we are!
2. We appear to be at the center of an expanding universe because it would look that way from every location in the universe.

"The hypothesis (#1) cannot be disproved but is unwelcome and would only be accepted as a last resort... Therefore, we disregard this possibility and consider the alternative (#2)... The unwelcome supposition of a favoured location must be avoided at all costs... a favored position is, of course, intolerable... Therefore, in order to restore homogeneity, and to escape the horror of a unique position, the departure from uniformity (cosmological principle)... must be compensated... There seems to be no other escape."

Edwin Hubble, *The Observational Approach To Cosmology*

Many Christians bought into this faulty idea. via "Let there be light", Gen 1:2. What will they do when the Big Bang is finally discredited, throw away their Bible?

The 'In the beginning nothing' theory needed someone like Hawking to gain steam, especially as he showed how it could be done mathematically. BTW, just because something has a mathematical reality doesn't mean it has physical reality. Since 'the nothing theory' had/has many problems, some scientists monkey around with the idea of 'nothing' so they can start with something. Grant one exception (miracle) and you can get a universe! This shows the serious awareness, and their desperation, of the nothing problem.

Terence McKenna says, "Modern science is based on the principle: Give us one free miracle and we will explain the rest. The one free miracle is the appearance of all the mass and energy in the universe and all the laws that govern it, from nothing, in a single instant"

A common statement is that there was a 'fluctuation in the quantum field' and the nothing exploded and 13.7 billion years later, here we are. Think with me, just a little. Is a 'quantum field' a something or a nothing? A child can answer this one. It takes years of specialized training to get it wrong. Even calling 'empty space' nothing fails because the Big Bang model starts with no space and no time. Can you say "nothing really means nothing"? From nothing, nothing can come.

Next Hawking says, "because there is a law such as gravity". Let me ask another question, is "a law" something or nothing? Next, do physical laws describe something or cause something? Is it gravity or the law of gravity what keeps you on the ground? The law of gravity describes how different masses, like you and the earth, will interact. Gravity is the force that causes the interaction. A law has no causal power. Has a law against crime ever physically stopped a criminal? A physical law can only describe what will happen when physical

$$F = \frac{GMm}{r^2}$$

F = force of gravity  
 G = gravitational constant  
 (6.67 x 10<sup>-11</sup>)  
 M = mass of one object  
 m = mass of other object  
 r = distance between the two objects

objects interact. So, if there is nothing, and gravity depends on the existence of matter, then how can there be any gravity at all? Even worse, how can there be a law that describes how nothing can interact with itself.

If nothing ever existed, then nothing is all that can exist, in a purely materialistic universe, according to real physical science and philosophy.

Check off #2

Their ideas just keep getting crazier the harder they try to eliminate God. Every problem is answered with an even worse solution. Then it is taught to students as scientific fact! No wonder science in America is declining as the absurd increases. I am calling on Christians that want to be scientists to prepare themselves, both as teachers and practitioners. It will become necessary for students that can actually think to fill the vacancies left by the foolish professors as they descend into raving madness, Ecc 10:13. Everything corrupt has an end, but who will fill the vacancies they leave behind?

### **3. The Universe Has Always Existed**

This idea was a common feature in the enlightenment project. The most appealing aspect is that it eliminated the need for a beginning, and thus a problematic explanation for such a beginning. This was dashed with the acceptance of the Big Bang and general relativity which required a beginning for all space, time, matter and energy.

The fundamental question here is this: Can matter/energy exist eternally? The short answer is NO. Let me explain. One of the most consistent observations concerning matter is its mutability, that is, it changes with time. Even the most stable objects we know about will decay eventually. Time and eternity are incompatible, mutually exclusive systems. Eternity is changeless.

As matter changes it requires an energy exchange. The area of science given to examining such exchange is called 'Thermodynamics'. Every exchange carries a non-refundable fee, called entropy. Law 1 says the amount of usable energy is decreasing as, Law 2, entropy increases. Law 0 says that matter/energy cannot be created or destroyed, only change form, for a fee, of course.

So, rewinding the tape of the cosmos, a true 'come into existence' moment occurred as the usable energy is at its initial maximum and entropy starts at zero. Because of the finite nature of the tape there must be a beginning. What as before this moment? The great Creator God. "In the beginning God..." Space, time, matter, energy and the laws that govern how they work are all His invention.

Cosmologist's conclusion for the universe is called 'Maximum Entropy'. The University Of Wyoming used to host a yearly Maximum Entropy Conference, to examine the state of the science regarding the end of the universe. Max Entropy says that entropy will increase until all the useful, usable energy in the universe has been used up: every sun will expend its fuel and grow cold. Likewise every planet. Eventually even the atoms themselves will break down. When all the usable energy has been spent all that will remain is a universe made up of a sub-atomic particle mist that will be cold and dead...forever after. Understandably, this depressing future is not widely or often talked about.

Thank God we can look forward to a 'new heavens and a new earth' long before that happens. Also, according to Romans 8:21, "the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay". Somehow God will cancel out Law 2, the entropic fee will be repealed.

Check off #3

Note: Eliminating options 1 – 3 also eliminate 5 and 6

#### 4. The Universe Was Created By An Eternal Being

Having resolved the first three points we are left with what is called “the impossibility of the contrary.” If the universe is not an illusion, not self-created, has not always existed, then the only remaining possibility (and Occam’s Razor) is that it must have been created by an eternal Being. In #1 I said “It is possible that X can create Y as long as X is sufficient to cause the effect Y.” Therefore the cause of the universe must be greater than the universe itself. Further, (and there are many) that Cause must be outside of space and time, i.e. transcendent, omnipresent and eternal. Rom 1:20 says the Creator is known in His creation. We see law and order at every level of the universe. We observe the “uniformity of nature”, nature behaving consistently over space and time, which is at the very foundation of science. Physical constants don’t vary. Interesting side note: In a physical world of constant change, how is it physical constants and laws don’t change? Where does the changing and the changeless meet?

The question once asked by Greg Bahnsen, “What justifies your proceeding on the expectation that the future will be like the past?” is at the heart of induction and therefore science itself. Both depend on the uniformity of nature. Both David Hume and Bertrand Russell showed that no one can know the future, causing a tremendous disturbance in the scientific community. But the scientists continued being scientific anyway because it works, even though they had no justification or explanation as to why it worked.

Induction is the principle that lets us take specific observations and make general conclusions. Induction allows us to foresee the future. This is at the heart of the ‘Uniformity of Nature’ and science itself.

Here are some examples:

Suppose we ran out of copper on earth, and discovered large copper deposits on the moon. How do we know that lunar copper will behave like Earth copper?

How do you know that when you squeeze your tube of toothpaste tomorrow toothpaste will come out?

How do you know that gravity will be the same next year as today or sugar will still be sweet?

Note the future tense of all of these. It is Induction that allows us to predict the future.

Induction is a ‘faith based’ principle and the foundation of science. Thus science itself is faith-based!

And materialism denies this is even possible.

So, here we are at a line of thinking which concludes “reason requires the existence of God”.

Some may ask “Well then, which God?” To which I ask “Do you then concede that God exists?”

Note that this does not prove the Trinity, or even the God of the Bible, but just that some generic supreme being is a rational necessity.

### 1. Cosmological – The first cause argument – Concept of Cause, Kalam Argument

I have an experience “D”, but something caused it, call it “C”. But “C” had a cause, call it “B”. We end up at some initial or first cause, call it “A”, and that ‘cause’ we call God. Aristotle recognized this first cause as the ‘Unmoved Mover’. Aristotle’s prime mover was nothing like the God of Scripture but the reasoning is good. The problem is that this argument looks at God as one more natural cause in the chain. It also assumes that an unbeliever can make sense out of the causal relationships  $D \rightarrow C \rightarrow B$  from the atheistic worldview, independent of God and without bringing God into the picture at all.

The change here is from making God one more cause in the causal chain to examining the entire way of reasoning about the ‘concept of cause’. There could be no ‘concept of cause’ if God did not exist. God is the necessary precondition for the intelligible use of causal reasoning. Apart from God no causal connections can be made for any customary relationship anywhere. No connections could be made about squeezing toothpaste to rolling billiard balls to the uniformity of nature to science itself. The Christian worldview now provides a foundation for inductive reasoning. God as the Creator, First Causer and Unmoved Mover is that necessary precondition for the intelligible use of causal reasoning and all other forms of reasoning.

Concepts of Logic, Reasoning, Morality, Nothing or Something, non-existence or existence

“John Taylor complains that the *kalam* cosmological argument gives the appearance of being a swift and simple demonstration of the existence of a Creator of the universe, whereas in fact a convincing argument involving the premise that *the universe began to exist* is very difficult to achieve. (it was 100 years ago) John Taylor disagrees. The *kalam* cosmological argument cannot in his view be endorsed because its adherents have not shown its main premise, that *the universe began to exist*, (see the Creation section for that proof) to be more reasonable than its denial.” John Taylor, "Kalam: A Swift Argument from Origins to a First Cause?" *Religious Studies* 33 (1997): 167-179. Quoted by William Lane Craig, A Swift and Simple Refutation of the *Kalam* Cosmological Argument? <https://www.reasonablefaith.org/writings/scholarly-writings/the-existence-of-god/a-swift-and-simple-refutation-of-the-kalam-cosmological-argument/>

### 2. Ontological – The argument from being – Necessary Being

The most prominent modern advocate of the ontological argument is Alvin Plantinga. Plantinga is best-known for his defense of the view that religious belief (FAITH) is foundational, i.e. that religious belief does not stand in need of external justification, but is also known for his work on modal logic, i.e. on the logic of possibility and necessity. Plantinga applies his approach of modal logic to the ontological argument, presenting the argument in a revised form.

Plantinga favors a possible world analysis of statements about possibility and necessity. Possible worlds are ways that the world might have been. Any logically consistent description of a world is a possible world. On Plantinga’s view, to say that something is possible is to say that there is a possible world in which it is actual, and to say that something is necessary is to say that in every possible world it is actual. Such as  $A=B$ ,  $B=C$  therefore  $A=C$

The modal ontological argument, like Anselm’s, begins with a statement about God. God, if he exists, is a necessary being. That is, if God exists at all then he must exist in every possible world.

The first premise is based on the idea that God is perfect, and that something is better if it has necessary existence rather than if it has merely contingent existence.

The presupposition is we can know something of ‘being’. How is it that the concept of God exists in our consciousness in the first place? Rom 1:18-23, God Himself put it there!

### 3. Teleological – The argument from design – Created Order

Teleology means purpose or goal. Note that built in to this argument is the presupposition of a creative personality with a mind that has intentionality and has the power of accomplishing those goals. Again, it is God Himself that provides the original design specifications and creative power. We observe design in the world because it was, in fact, created for a purpose. Again Romans 1:18-23

But those with a different starting point, or atheistic presuppositions, must come to a different conclusion. They just can’t help themselves, their religion dictates how they see what they see.

“Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.” Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p.1

“Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but rather evolved.” Francis Crick, *Natural History*, v.97, 1988

By handing over creative power to inanimate matter God is robbed of His self-described place and authority.

### **A Part of the Intelligent Design Argument**

If you are trying to look at events in the distant past you should rely on the cause and effect operations that exist today and look for a cause that is known to have the power of producing the effect under investigation. So, we ask the question, what are the causes now in operation that are known to produce the effect being examined?

Note the word ‘known’. No speculation allowed.

And who can we thank for this advice? James Hutton, Charles Lyell and Charles Darwin. From this principle the term ‘uniformitarianism’ emerged. “The present is the key to the past.” But what they had in mind, being hostile to God, was to only allow purely natural causes. This was later expanded to include every possible cause and effect that materialistic science might investigate and is known today as ‘Methodological Naturalism’. Any non-natural cause, by definition, is filtered out. Again being hostile to God, they predetermine what kind of evidence will be considered. So, science is no longer the search for the truth of the natural world, it is the search for a purely natural explanation. Some have said “science is atheistic”. This is a denial of even the possibility that some causes may have a supernatural source.

So, what are the causes, now in operation, for the production of digital information? DNA is digital information via the AT, CG pairs in very specific arrangements. It is considered, by far, the most complex digital code known. There is no close second. A phrase often used here is “Specified Complexity” In the construction of proteins, for which DNA provides the code, the four base parts A, C, G & T are selected three at a time. This allows for 24 possible combinations. Each one of these combinations code for one of 20 amino acids, with four left over. The amino acids are arranged in a specific order, according to the code, and then folded into a 3 dimensional shape to form a protein. The average chain of amino acids is 500 units long. Some are thousands. There are 100,000 proteins in the body. BTW, the blue print for the creature is not found in the DNA. The same DNA could produce two different creatures, in the same way a pile of lumber could produce different houses. The blueprint is outside the code.

There is one, and only one, known cause capable of producing information, and that is an intelligent mind. But what kind of intelligence? It also has the power of constructing the DNA code. This intelligence has to know the complete design specifications for tens of thousands of the body parts of all creatures (including any aliens out there) that this Mind’s power creates. I am talking about the Almighty, Triune, and Creator, God of the Bible. Yea God!

“The machine code of the genes is uncannily computer-like. It looks like something designed by a software programmer. Apart from differences in the jargon, the pages of a molecular biology journal might be interchanged with those of a computer engineering journal” Richard Dawkins

The central proposition of the Darwinian synthesis (random mutation and natural selection) is that things look designed but they are not really designed. It is a purely undirected process giving the appearance or illusion of design (Dawkins’ *Blind Watchmaker*) but is not guided or directed in any way. The blind watchmaker doesn’t even know he is making a watch!

All computer simulation have targets or goals, including Dawkins’ program (David Berlinski). Contrasting Apparent Design vs Intelligent Design or Intelligent Causation is at the heart of the Intelligent Design project.

More and more what we do know is conflicting with what the materialists religion requires. Yet, there is increasing movement to restrict and oppose anti-Darwinian knowledge. “You can’t stop the signal Mal.”

This is an extra page that goes with the Presuppositional Apologetics section

### **Presuppositional trajectories for proving the existence of the Biblical God.**

This is by no means all the ways.

#### **1. If anything exists God exists**

- A. Rational Necessity – reason requires the existence of a transcendent, eternal, omnipotent Creator.
- B. Ontological Necessity – if anything exists a transcendent, eternal, omnipotent Creator exists

#### **2. Preconditions for Intelligibility**

- For anything to be meaningful a transcendent, eternal, omnipotent Creator is required.

#### **3. Impossibility of the Contrary**

- If A and B are the only possibilities, and A is shown to be false, then B must be true.
- Occam's Razor requires the existence of a transcendent, eternal, omnipotent Creator, as every other explanation falls short. What is simpler than God?

#### **4. AIUs, Abstract, Immaterial, Invariant, Universal objects**

- Transcendentals require the existence of a transcendent source which is an eternal, omnipotent Creator.

#### **5. Creation Itself – Everybody knows, Rom 1:16-24**

#### **6. Don't Answer/Answer Strategy –**

Prov 26:4 Do not answer a fool according to his folly, Lest you also be like him.

I completely reject with your claim... (ex: that the Bible has contradictions)

Prov 26:5 Answer a fool according to his folly, Lest he be wise in his own eyes.

But given your worldview...(ex: what is wrong with contradictions?)