

wesley_huff

Logical Propositions

1. "If there is a God, that God has utterly failed at understanding good standards of evidence."
2. "There should be no debate."
3. "If this is all true, this has got to be the single most important thing in the entire history of the world."
4. "It is not sufficiently attested to and backed up with evidence, and that has to be God's fault."
5. "God's revelation is not clear enough."
6. "Clarity of revelation is a subjective assessment."
7. "Who gets to define what's clear and what is not?"
8. "It is very important to parse out the difference between terms like evidence and proof."
9. "Evidence is an objective category."
10. "Whether any piece of evidence amounts to proof of something is dependent on how an individual accepts it, or even whether an individual accepts it to begin with."
11. "A person's choice to accept evidence has layers."
12. "No one comes to an assessment of evidence neutral."
13. "We all have biases, presuppositions, preconceived ideas, and even emotions."
14. "People don't make decisions simply based on the evidence."
15. "Dillahunty makes it sound like it's just a matter of having enough evidence."
16. "At that point of saturation of evidence, then the rational person is just going to conclude and concede and accept that said viewpoint."
17. "People don't work like that."
18. "We're not robots who operate on input data, output health perspective."
19. "Nobody is neutral and objective, including Dillahunty himself."
20. "Dillahunty says that good standards of evidence should be at so much of a level that merits no debate."
21. "This isn't how history works."
22. "This isn't how science works."
23. "Physicists debate on the existence of gravity and consciousness, energy, whether sound is a wave or a particle."
24. "That doesn't mean that we can't come to a conclusion based on not necessarily a saturation of evidence, but enough evidence."
25. "Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence."
26. "Extraordinary claims require sufficient evidence."
27. "It could be argued that even if God provided irrefutable evidence of his existence, what would be the end result?"
28. "James 2.19 says that demons believe and shudder."
29. "God doesn't merely want our belief."

30. "He wants our love."

31. "He wants our devotion."

32. "He wants a relationship, not just an intellectual acceptance of his existence."

Transcription

If there is a God, that God has utterly failed at understanding good standards of evidence. There should be no debate. This has got to be, if this is all true, this has got to be the single most important thing in the entire history of the world, and it is not sufficiently attested to and backed up with evidence, and that has to be God's fault.

Copy

The core of what Matt's objection appears to be, though, is that God's revelation is not clear enough. Clarity of revelation, I would actually contend, is a subjective assessment. Who gets to define what's clear and what is not? This is where it's very important to parse out the difference between terms like evidence and proof. Evidence is an objective category, but whether any piece of evidence amounts to proof of something is dependent on how an individual accepts it, or even whether an individual accepts it to begin with.

Copy

And a person's choice to accept evidence has layers. No one comes to an assessment of evidence neutral. We all have biases, presuppositions, preconceived ideas, and even emotions. People don't make decisions simply based on the evidence, and Dillahunty makes it sound like it's just a matter of having enough evidence. And at that point of, like, saturation of evidence, then the rational person is just going to conclude and concede and accept that said viewpoint.

Copy

People don't work like that. We're not robots who operate on, like, input data, output health perspective. That's not who we are. That's not what we are. Nobody is neutral and objective, including Dillahunty himself. Dillahunty says that good standards of evidence should be at so much of a level that merits no debate. This isn't how history works. This isn't how science works. Physicists debate on the existence of gravity and consciousness, energy, whether sound is a wave or a particle.

Copy

That doesn't mean that we can't come to a conclusion based on not necessarily a saturation of evidence, but enough evidence. Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence. No, I think extraordinary claims require sufficient evidence. What is Dillahunty actually asking for? Like, what amount of evidence and level of proof does he want? Because it could be argued that even if God provided irrefutable evidence of his existence, what would be the end result?

Copy

James 2:19 says that demons believe and shudder. God doesn't merely want our belief. He wants our love. He wants our devotion. He wants a relationship, not just an intellectual acceptance of his existence.

Copy