

Christian Apologetics

Phil Stilwell ·



All-star contributor

· erodtpsnSof195clmiu68h18a40hl39uf2642fa8g49014lc76cilu2926hu ·

© WOULD A RATIONAL GOD DEMAND IRRATIONAL BELIEF?

Christianity often glorifies faith that exceeds the evidence, promoting belief over inquiry, obedience over understanding, and exclusivity over accessibility. The Bible even praises those who “have not seen and yet believe,” while condemning skeptics as already lost. But is that the expectation of a rational deity?

Faith, as described in Christian doctrine, routinely asks for commitment beyond evidence (<https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>). If God created us with reason, logic, and curiosity, wouldn't a benevolent deity want us to use those tools, not discard them in favor of trust that goes beyond the evidence?

Why build humans for critical thinking, only to demand they ignore it?

A God who values truth would not demand irrational loyalty. And a God who is rational would never glorify belief that exceeds the evidence. Right?

↘ Phil's full critique of faith as irrational demand:

<https://freeoffaith.com/2024/11/11/22/>

A Michelle Orr

I mean, have you even read Scripture?

You're literally posting this in a Christian Apologetic group.

We are told to seek truth and to study.

That's precisely why Christianity gave rise to modern universities, science, and hospitals.

It's why liberty almost always accompanies Christianity in governments. It's why you're able to post in a Christian group.

- 10h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

A Michelle Orr Yes, I've read the Greek NT through eleven times and the English Bible through a great number. It is ultimately what led me out of Christianity, even though I had been ordained and was in ministry. Subsequent to that, I picked up a BA in philosophy and focused on epistemology. This is an apologetics site. This is where I would like to challenge apologists on their notion of rational belief. Hence the post.

- 9h
-
- Reply

A Michelle Orr

Phil Stilwell nothing in this OP rings true to my experience/reading. The very directives of apologetics stand in stark contrast to it.

Many, like myself, have been led TO Christianity via deep studying. I understand that your experience was different. It led you away.

It reminds me of my sister's favorite saying, the same water that hardens the egg softens the potato.

- 9h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

A Michelle Orr. Then let's walk through this step-by-step. Do you believe that the Bible's depiction of faith is correct?

↘ <https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

- 8h
-
- Reply
- Remove Preview

Tommy Howell

Phil Stilwell Sorry... You read it, but you didn't understand it.

- 8h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Tommy Howell That will be explained, not asserted. I posted this in the hope I'd receive counterarguments, not empty assertions about how I somehow did not read the Bible correctly. Once you abandon a dialogue in which assertions are substantiated, you've committed yourself to irrationality. I hope you have not done that.

- 7h
-
- Reply

A Michelle Orr

Phil Stilwell ahhh, semantics. I appreciate the meaning of words. I appreciate the link you provided

Hopefully I can find the time to explore it in depth.

In the meantime, I often use Got Questions because their knowledge/views largely represent mainstream evangelical views.

//Thankfully, the Bible contains a clear definition of faith in Hebrews 11:1: "Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen." Simply put, the biblical definition of faith is "trusting in something you cannot explicitly prove

This definition of faith contains two aspects: intellectual assent and trust. Intellectual assent is believing something to be true. Trust is actually relying on the fact that the something is true. A chair is often used to help illustrate this. Intellectual assent is recognizing that a chair is a chair and agreeing that it is designed to support a person who sits on it. Trust is actually sitting in the chair.

Understanding these two aspects of faith is crucial. Many people believe certain facts about Jesus Christ. Many people will intellectually agree with the facts the Bible declares about Jesus. But knowing those facts to be true is not what the Bible means by "faith." The biblical definition of faith requires intellectual assent to the facts and trust in the facts.//

<https://www.gotquestions.org/definition-of-faith.html>

Again, this forum and others like it exist because we believe in reason and logic. We're told to seek out truth explicitly in Scripture.

- 5h
-
- Reply

Tommy Howell

Phil Stilwell Big words, empty heart

- 5h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Tommy Howell Feel free to ask questions about my heart before passing judgment. You might also read 1 Peter 3:15.

- 3m
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

Dan Alexander

There is lots of solid evidence that there is a God and it is the God of the Bible. The creation of the universe from nothing requires a creator God and is the best extra biblical evidence for God. The Bible also got correct the sequence of the development of the earth in Genesis 1 and there is no way the Bible gets it correct without the Creator God also being the God of the Bible.

Evidencesforgod.com

- 9h
-

- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Dan Alexander The focus here is on the question of whether an actual rational God would encourage irrational belief. Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence. That is not what we find in the Bible. Right?

↘ <https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

- 9h
-
- Reply
- Remove Preview

Dan Alexander

Phil Stilwell there is nothing irrational about believing in God. There is tremendous evidence for Him. Check out the website

- 5h
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

Lalo Guzmán

Dan Alexander I thought the scientific evidence showed that the Sun existed before the Earth. The Bible's sequence says it appeared 4 days later.

- 5h
-
- Reply

Dan Alexander

Lalo Guzmán nope- check the website

- 5h
-
- Reply

Lalo Guzmán

Dan Alexander The website makes the weird assumption that the claim that the Sun appeared on the 4th day is talking from the perspective of the Earth. But Genesis 1 is talking from God's perspective.

Genesis 1:16-19 reads: "And God made the two great lights—the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night—and the stars. And God set them in the expanse of the heavens to give light on the earth, to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness. And God saw that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, the fourth day."

It doesn't say God cleared the skies and revealed the Sun and the stars to Earth, it says God made the lights and set them in the skies. The former interpretation requires disbelieving what is being described in Genesis and apply knowledge that the text is not even implying. At that point we might as well admit that Genesis is scientifically inaccurate.

- 5h
-
- Reply

Dan Alexander

Lalo Guzmán Genesis 1:2 clearly says the Spirit (who is the narrator) is hovering over the waters- so the narrative is told from the point of view of the surface of the earth, not from outer space. Once you understand the narrative is from the point of view of the surface, it all works. The dark atmosphere thins to let light in from the sun to start day v night. It all works. There's a video on How the Earth was made from the History Channel that shows it all. It's how I first got interested in this material.

- 4h
-
- Reply

Lalo Guzmán

Dan Alexander Again, the point of view is from God. Doesn't matter if he's on earth or outer space, he knows what he creates and in what order. Again, from your interpretation, even if the narrator was a human on Earth witnessing this, you would expect Genesis to read "And God cleared the skies and revealed the light". Instead, Genesis says that God created the lights and put them in the skies (doesn't even mention space, but "heavens"). This is consistent with a human writer who doesn't know space and doesn't know that the lights were already there. Genesis suggests they were placed, not revealed. This makes sense after recognizing that the writer was in fact wrong.

- 4h
-
- Reply
- Edited

Dan Alexander

Lalo Guzmán its an issue with how to interpret the Biblical Hebrew. Apparently the Hebrew verbs there can be interpreted in a past perfect tense- for they had been made. Meaning they were there the whole time but could only be seen from the surface once the atmosphere cleared. If you want to insist your interpretation or projection is correct, I don't care.

- 3h
-
- Reply

Lalo Guzmán

Dan Alexander The problem is in what Genesis doesn't say: It doesn't say, nor suggest, that the skies were cleared to reveal the lights. This idea is entirely unbiblical, because it only comes from the scientific knowledge of how the sequence actually was. One can't say that Genesis was correct with the sequence because you're applying your knowledge of the real sequence to add to Genesis instead of re-interpreting it.

- 2h
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

Chris Hooter

Well, what may or may not seem rational to we mere mortals

- 9h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Chris Hooter Can you provide the counterargument to the following? ↘ Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence.

- 9h
-
- Reply

Chris Hooter

Phil Stilwell well, it could just be we dont have all the information. Even w us mere mortals, theres always more to the story, as the plot thickens

- 7h
-
- Reply
- Edited

-

-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

Lee Monroe

This argument completely misunderstands biblical faith and creates a false dichotomy between faith and reason. Biblical faith isn't "belief without evidence" - that's a modern atheist caricature.

The Greek word pistis means trust based on evidence and relationship. When Jesus praised those who believed "without seeing," He wasn't endorsing irrationality.

Thomas had already witnessed countless miracles - the "not seeing" referred specifically to the resurrection wounds, not abandoning evidence entirely.

Christianity actually DEMANDS using reason.

Acts 17:11 praises the Bereans for "examining the Scriptures daily." 1 Peter 3:15 commands believers to "give a reason for the hope you have." Isaiah 1:18 says "Come now, let us reason together." Paul constantly "reasoned" with people from Scripture. The early church was built on eyewitness testimony and logical argumentation. Here's the real issue: Atheists define "rational evidence" as only empirical/scientific evidence. But that's self-refuting - you can't scientifically prove that only scientific evidence counts.

Rational evidence includes historical testimony, logical arguments (cosmological, teleological, moral), consciousness, and explanatory coherence. Atheists routinely believe things that "exceed evidence": Consciousness emerges from matter (never demonstrated) Life arose from non-life by chance (astronomically improbable)

Objective morals don't exist (contradicts universal human experience) The universe came from nothing (violates causation) Romans 1:20 says God designed reality so rational inquiry leads to Him.

The cosmological argument, fine-tuning, consciousness, and moral arguments all use the reason God gave us. Christianity doesn't demand irrational belief - it demands following ALL the evidence (historical, logical, experiential, spiritual) wherever it leads.

The atheist argument here is really demanding we limit "acceptable evidence" to only what supports materialistic conclusions.

When we examine all evidence honestly, it points toward God, not away from Him.

- **9h**
-
- **Reply**
- **Edited**

Phil Stilwell

Lee Monroe That is the package response I often encounter. But note what I actually said. I never said that faith is belief without evidence, but only that faith is a degree of belief that exceeds the evidence. That's the problem.

Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence. Would any rational God encourage us to be irrational by going beyond the evidence?

Here is a comprehensive survey of biblical belief: <https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

- 9h
-
- Reply
- Remove Preview

Lee Monroe

Phil Stilwell You call this a "package response," but that's just a deflection tactic to avoid engaging with the substance. These aren't memorized talking points - they're direct logical refutations of your core argument. Dismissing them as "packaged" doesn't make them wrong.

Your distinction between "belief without evidence" and "belief that exceeds evidence" doesn't solve the fundamental problem - it makes it worse. Your position is self-refuting. You argue that rational belief must "map to the degree of evidence," but this principle itself exceeds any evidence you could provide for it.

Show me the scientific study proving beliefs should be limited to empirical evidence levels. You can't, because that's a philosophical assumption that goes beyond evidence. You're applying an impossible standard that you violate constantly.

Every meaningful belief in your life "exceeds evidence" by your definition: Your belief that loved ones genuinely care (beyond observable actions) Your belief that consciousness is real (not just brain chemistry) Your belief that logic itself is reliable (can't be proven without circular reasoning)

Your belief that the external world exists (could be a simulation) If you lived by your stated principle, you'd be paralyzed into complete skepticism.

Your "comprehensive survey" misses the point entirely. Biblical faith recognizes that materialistic empiricism artificially limits what counts as "evidence."

Historical testimony, logical arguments, personal experience, and explanatory coherence are rational forms of evidence that atheists dismiss simply because they point toward God.

The real question: Why demand that belief in God meet an evidentiary standard you don't apply anywhere else?

That's not rational skepticism - that's selective bias masquerading as intellectual rigor. If my responses seem "packaged," it's because bad arguments against Christianity have been thoroughly refuted for centuries.

- 9h
-

- **Reply**

Phil Stilwell

Lee Monroe My "packaged response" comment is a truthful statement based on my many encounters with Christians and an attempt to get you to read my post more carefully.

Nowhere did I say faith was completely blind. Right?

The comprehensive study does not make a point. It is a comprehensive list of how faith is depicted in the Bible. I'd like to first establish that we cannot cherry-pick our favorite passage on faith and instead explore how faith was actually deployed in context. Can you get on board with this?

The next step will be to assess your notion of rational belief. Do you agree with the following?

↳ Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence.

- **8h**

-

- **Reply**

Lee Monroe

Phil Stilwell You're trying to control the conversation through false framing, and I'm not playing that game.

On your "packaged response" deflection: You're doing exactly what you accuse me of - deploying a standard atheist tactic to avoid engagement. "You're just giving packaged responses" is itself a packaged response used to dismiss substantive arguments without refuting them. Address the actual points or concede them.

On your "comprehensive study" setup: This is a classic bait-and-switch. You want me to agree to your methodology before seeing your conclusions - that's not how honest debate works.

I'm not "cherry-picking" verses; I'm citing clear biblical passages that directly contradict your thesis. If your "comprehensive study" can't account for passages like Acts 17:11 (Bereans examining evidence) or 1 Peter 3:15 (giving reasons for belief), then your study is flawed, not my citations.

On your "rational belief" definition: This is a loaded question designed to trap me into your framework.

You're essentially asking: "Do you agree that only empirical evidence counts?" The answer is no, and here's why that definition fails: It's self-refuting - you can't prove that principle using evidence

You don't live by it - you constantly hold beliefs that exceed strict empirical evidence. It arbitrarily excludes logical arguments, historical testimony, and rational inference. Stop trying to rig the game.

If you want to discuss biblical faith, let's examine what Scripture actually says without your predetermined conclusions. If you want to discuss rational belief, defend why your narrow definition should be accepted when it's philosophically incoherent and practically impossible to live by. Make your actual argument instead of trying to manipulate me into accepting your premises first.

- **8h**

-

- **Reply**

Phil Stilwell

Lee Monroe , Slow down and respond to me, not to someone else of your imagination. This is my post, and I'm going to "frame" my responses to my interlocutors in a way that is relevant to the post. Please do not evade engagement with my actual post.

Now, if you are a Christian, your notion of faith is dictated by how the Bible describes faith. Right?

"Ἐστιν δὲ πίστις ἐπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων· Right?

- 7h
-
- Reply

Lee Monroe

Phil Stilwell I'm responding directly to YOU and your actual arguments - you're the one evading.

First, let's address your territorial attitude. You posted this in a Christian apologetics group, then act offended when Christians actually engage your arguments.

"This is my post" doesn't give you dictatorial control over how people respond to your public claims. You made an argument about Christian faith being irrational - expect Christians to defend their faith vigorously.

Second, you're hop-scotching around to avoid refuting anything I've said.

You haven't addressed: How your "rational belief maps to evidence" principle is self-refuting. Why you apply impossible evidentiary standards to Christianity that you violate in daily life.

The multiple biblical passages showing faith working WITH evidence and reason. Your arbitrary limitation of what counts as "rational evidence"

Instead, you just pull out Greek words hoping to redirect the conversation.

You're trying to force me into a narrow linguistic box by quoting Hebrews 11:1 in Greek, as if hypostasis and elegchos will somehow prove your point about "belief exceeding evidence."

But this is exactly the manipulation I called out. Let's deal with what Hebrews 11:1 actually says: Elegchos means "evidence" or "proof" - the verse is saying faith IS the evidence of things not seen, not that faith operates without evidence.

Hypostasis means "substance" or "foundation" - pointing to faith as grounded, not groundless. The immediate context destroys your argument. Hebrews 11:2-40 lists people whose faith was based on God's demonstrated track record - Abraham had direct encounters, Moses saw miracles, Israelites witnessed supernatural deliverance.

Their faith was response to evidence. Stop deflecting and address the actual arguments I've made. Your silence on my substantive points speaks volumes.

- 7h
-
- Reply
- Edited

Lee Monroe

Phil Stilwell This will be my final response, because honest dialogue requires both parties to engage in good faith - something you've repeatedly failed to do.

Your Intellectual Dishonesty is Clear: You've employed every classic manipulation tactic in the book: Moving goalposts (faith without evidence → faith exceeding evidence → Greek

word parsing)Control framing ("This is my post," demanding I accept your loaded definitions first)Deflection (calling substantive refutations "packaged responses") Cherry-picking (one Greek verse while ignoring dozens of passages about faith and reason)False victimhood (posting antagonistic content in an apologetics group then acting offended by robust responses)Most tellingly, you've refused to address a single substantive argument I've made. Not one. That's not intellectual honesty - that's academic cowardice dressed up in scholarly language

Your Core Argument Fails Completely:Your entire thesis - that rational belief must "map to evidence" - is philosophically incoherent:It's self-refuting - you can't provide evidence for this evidentiary standard without circular reasoning.

You don't live by it - you constantly hold beliefs that exceed strict empirical evidence (consciousness, logic's reliability, others' care for you)It arbitrarily limits evidence to only materialistic sources while excluding historical testimony, logical arguments, and rational inference.

The Biblical Evidence Destroys Your Position:Scripture consistently shows faith working WITH evidence and reason:Acts 17:11 - Bereans examining evidence1 Peter 3:15 - giving reasons for beliefActs 17:2 - Paul reasoning from Scripture.

Even your Hebrews 11:1 - elegechos means "evidence," showing faith IS evidence.

The Real Issue:You came here not seeking truth but trying to score rhetorical points against Christianity.

When met with substantive responses, you've deflected, redirected, and manipulated rather than engage honestly.

A truly rational person would acknowledge when their arguments have been refuted and adjust accordingly.

Your unwillingness to do so reveals this was never about rational discourse - it was about defending a predetermined conclusion through intellectual sleight of hand.I pray you'll eventually seek truth more than you seek to be right.

- 7h
-
- Reply
- Edited

James Hodge

Lee Monroe Lee, you are going to be reported to the mods for reasoning in bad faith on this page

- 5h
-
- Reply

Lee Monroe

James Hodge I don't feel I have, but I'll respect a moderators decision if they feel I did. They likely volunteer their time, and I agreed to the rules when I joined. I recently read them and I'm not sure where I have gone wrong in this conversation, but as I said, I'll respect their decision.

- 5h
-
- Reply

Daniel Marvin

Lee Monroe fwiw, you made some good points in your initial response to Phil and I appreciate how you are not allowing Phil to evade those objections. Just want to encourage you to be gentle in your responses, maybe dial down the antagonism a tad 😊 I enjoyed reading your post!

- 4h
-
- Reply

Daniel Marvin

Phil Stilwell Why not just tell us what your definition of faith is? And how does that differ from "rational belief"?

- 4h
-
- Reply

Lee Monroe

Daniel Marvin I do apologize if I came across that way. In the moment I didn't feel I was, but it's possible I am being defensive. I'll think and pray about this. Thank you.

- 4h
-
- Reply
- Edited

Phil Stilwell

Lee Monroe You're mistaking volume for precision. Let me highlight your major errors in structure and substance—without deflection, without theistic deference, and without assuming a moral high ground I don't claim to possess.

☉ On Rational Belief: A Clarification You Continue to Evade

You repeatedly assert that my claim—that rational belief maps to the degree of the relevant evidence—is self-refuting. Yet this is not a metaphysical axiom but an epistemic heuristic, a guideline for proportioning belief to evidence. It's not a claim about the nature of reality, but a procedural principle of intellectual responsibility.

► Show me the evidence for “believe to the degree that evidence supports” is category error.

That's like asking for a measurement proving that measurements matter. This epistemic mapping principle is justified not deductively, but pragmatically: it minimizes error and increases predictive power. It's the basis of Bayesian epistemology, scientific inquiry, and rational deliberation.

You invoke cases like love, consciousness, and logic as if they violate this principle. They don't.

✓ Belief in love is not belief in something without evidence; it's belief proportioned to patterns of care, behavior, and memory—fallible, yes, but not exceeding evidence.

✓ Belief in consciousness is not “beyond evidence.” It's a direct first-person datum, epistemically basic in a way God claims are not.

✓ Belief in logic's reliability is not a leap of faith but an inductive generalization grounded in its consistent success across domains. Its validity is provisional and corrigible—again, not belief exceeding evidence.

☉ On Biblical Faith: The Problem Is Not Greek Grammar, It's Application

You make much of ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων, suggesting that “faith is evidence.” But that is precisely the problem.

Faith in Hebrews 11 is not presented as belief derived from new evidence but as the psychological stand-in in lieu of direct evidence—“evidence of things not seen.”

Your list of Abraham, Moses, and others having “evidence” misses the point. They are retroactively idealized. Hebrews 11 praises them for acting as if the unseen were seen. It’s a theological commendation of behavior that goes beyond the available evidence—just as I claimed.

Your conflation of “faith informed by some evidence” with “faith within the limits of evidence” reveals your misunderstanding of what I mean by belief exceeding evidence.

When Christians are urged to “trust in the Lord with all your heart and lean not on your own understanding” (Prov. 3:5), what epistemic framework is being promoted?

● On Evidence: You Keep Repeating That Christianity Uses Evidence—But What Kind?

You accuse me of arbitrarily excluding “historical testimony, logical argument, and spiritual experience.” But you never demonstrate how these forms of evidence yield epistemically warranted belief in a God, much less in your God.

Testimony and argument can be weak or strong, and they must be assessed with care. But “faith” as biblically promoted does not wait for strong evidence—it valorizes commitment before confirmation.

What you call “evidence” is often a vague appeal to coherence or inference from improbability. But that’s not epistemic sufficiency. That’s motivated credence.

● On Debate Tactics: Projection Is Not Refutation

You accuse me of “goalpost moving” and “intellectual dishonesty.” Yet I’ve consistently:

✓ Clarified my thesis (belief exceeding evidence).

✓ Offered a rigorous definition of rational belief.

✓ Asked whether you agree with the mapping principle.

✓ Provided links to comprehensive biblical surveys without smuggling in conclusions.

Your repeated evasion of the core question—should belief map to evidence, or not?—is the clearest indicator of which side here resists epistemic clarity.

If you can admit that biblical faith, as commended, often asks for commitment prior to confirmation, and that this is not the standard you apply to other claims (e.g., Islam, astrology, or conspiracy theories), then you’ve conceded the argument.

Until then, rhetorical heat won’t replace epistemic light.

I’m always open to rigorous engagement. But if you prefer sermon over syllogism, you’ll find me unmoved.

Warmly open to continued discussion—on substance, not volume.

- **2h**

-

- **Reply**

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

Michael Brown

Apparently Phil has not examined the demands of Moloch, Baal, Aztec Gods, Hinduism with Sati, or others. Human Sacrifice. Irrational demands by irrational gods.

- 9h

-

- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Michael Brown The irrational demand I am focused on is biblical faith. Do you subscribe to the description of biblical faith found in the Bible?

<https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

- 8h

-

- Reply

- Remove Preview

-

-

-

-

-

Ayala Ezequiel

To be persuaded have a change of mind or heart that something is True and that's what Scripture promotes, yes skeptics are already lost why because of close mindedness.



- 9h

-

- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Ayala Ezequiel But rational belief is not binary, right? Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence. Agreed?

- 8h
-
- Reply

Ayala Ezequiel

Phil Stilwell nope.



- 7h
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

Andrew Higgins

On the left, we have an idealized model of a secular, scientific thinker, one that ignores the fundamental truth that they are driven more by emotion than logic, just like all homo sapiens. On the right, we have a claim never made by any preacher from the pulpit, but nonetheless being used to represent preachers at the pulpit.

Alright, so that's the setup, pictures that advertise the author's bias as loudly as possible. And the author wants to know, what kind of thinking would a rational god honor?

For various reasons, I think that's a bad question from the start, as it presumes that there is only one possible answer to what a rational god would want, but putting that aside, I feel pretty confident in saying this much: he or she would not want this. What you're doing here, with your absurd misrepresentations of both sides, I don't think that's something a rational god would be super jazzed about.

- 9h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Andrew Higgins Let me clarify; You think "WOULD A RATIONAL GOD DEMAND IRRATIONAL BELIEF?" is a bad question. Is that right?

- 8h
-
- Reply

Andrew Higgins

Phil Stilwell

I think it's a question that can't be answered, both because we don't have enough evidence about what gods want, and because our concept of a god (switching from empirical to conceptual evidence) is very broad, open to all sorts of wild variation in desires. You really can't imagine Loki having a preference for irrational belief?

- 8h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Andrew Higgins Let me confirm. You believe a rational God might, in fact, want humans to irrationally believe in him to a degree that exceeds the evidence, right?

- 7h
-
- Reply

James Hodge

Phil Stilwell I think we might need you to define "rational" here. My experience in answered prayer and those "leaps of faith" I have taken in my walk are anything but rational (obviously, my implied definition pits rational thought in logos while faith is in the ethos category).

- 5h
-
- Reply

Andrew Higgins

Phil Stilwell

Ya, you've got that right. Not only do I believe it, I've already given you a concrete example.

- 3h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Andrew Higgins What are you referring to by "concrete example"?

- 2h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

James Hodge Core rationality is as follows: Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence. Right?

- 2h
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

Andrew Gustafson

This seems to not understand Christianity at all. I won't be lectured by those who strawman Christianity.

- 9h
-
- Reply

Gregory Clark

Andrew Gustafson The problem is he don't know who Christ is.

- 8h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Andrew Gustafson Will you let the Bible itself teach you?

↳ <https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/>

This is the conventional notion of faith established by NT writers, right?

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

- 8h
-
- Reply
- Remove Preview

Andrew Gustafson

Phil Stilwell you better explain the connection to your poorly made point.

- 7h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Andrew Gustafson Here is an exhaustive survey of biblical faith. <https://freeoffaith.com/biblical-faith/> It is the Bible that should inform you of the proper definition of faith. Right?

FREEOFFAITH.COM
Biblical Faith

Biblical Faith

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-

John Carlson

There is actually so much evidence for the Bible, that it is irrational to not believe

- 9h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

John Carlson That is not quite what the claim is. Do you agree with the following?

↘ Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence.

- 8h
-
- Reply

-

-
-
-
-

Gregory Clark

You all call for evidence and when we bring it you deny it. You deny the creation and the book He has left us. You will die in your sins. You will believe then but it'll be to late. You love death and you will get it for all eternity. You will BEG for death and it will never come. Oh my!

- 9h
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Gregory Clark I'm not sure I have denied your evidence. Can you give me an example? I believe there could be a creator, but I have read through the Bible many times and find it logically incoherent. I've listed just a few of the issues that led me away from Christianity here: <https://freeoffaith.com/category/considerations/>

FREEOFFAITH.COM

Considerations – Free of Faith

Considerations – Free of Faith

- 8h
-
- Reply
- Remove Preview

-
-
-
-
-

Mark Hull

Here is my issue with your reasoning: how much evidence is enough to exceed rational belief? The standard is entirely subjective. Who determines how much is enough? If you are a skeptic, no amount of evidence will satisfy you, if you are a believer, and have experienced the love, grace and mercy of God, through the blood of Jesus the Christ, then your experiential evidence, added to your scientific evidence, will be more than enough. God is spirit and reveals Himself in the spiritual realm, which cannot be weighed or measured in physical dimensions. As you accept the level of divine revelation God has provided, through natural law and creation, He will provide more and deeper revelation

and understanding. Once you have rejected that revelation you have been given, you have opened yourself to all sorts of deception. (Romans chapters 1-3)

- 1h
-
- Reply

Mark Hull

Add... "Then that lawless one will be revealed, whom the Lord will eliminate with the breath of His mouth and bring to an end by the appearance of His coming; that is, the one whose coming is in accord with the activity of Satan, with all power and false signs and wonders, and with all the deception of wickedness for those who perish, because they did not accept the love of the truth so as to be saved. For this reason God will send upon them a deluding influence so that they will believe what is false, in order that they all may be judged who did not believe the truth, but took pleasure in wickedness."

2Thess.2.8,2Thess.2.9,2Thess.2.10,2Thess.2.11,2Thess.2.12 NASB

If you have already rejected the truth, you no longer have the ability to accurately weigh the amount of evidence sufficient for rational belief. You are now under the "deluding influence."

- 1h
-
- Reply

-
-
-
-
-

Mary Scott

Where's the eye roll icon? Everyone welcome Phil (everyone's favorite atheist) back for his take on Christianity which he admittedly doesn't understand. Welcome back Phil S.

- 40m
-
- Reply

Zachary Braxton Self

The premise is in error. We are commended for believing without seeing because it requires more faith and is a result of more grace given from God. Consider those who saw the risen Christ and still did not believe.

And it's not as if we only believe in what we can see. So, this post is not worth much else of my time.

- 19m
-
- Reply

Phil Stilwell

Zachary Braxton Self Try faith in any other domain, whether it be Vegas, romance, or the stock market. Faith demonstrably does not work. And what does not work is irrational. What are the chances a rational God would promote irrationality?
Rational belief is a degree of belief that maps to the degree of the relevant evidence.
<https://freeoffaith.com/faith/>