

BURDEN OF PROOF

Definition: The obligation to provide evidence for one's claims. The burden rests on the one making the claim (e.g., law and science).

Common Assumption: Theism alone bears the burden of proof. In the absence of compelling evidence, atheism is the default view.

Correcting the Assumption: The debate is actually a clash between competing explanations for reality as we know it. There is a burden of proof on both sides.

Atheism's Substantive Entailments: Rejecting a creator is not a cost-free or neutral position. It implicitly or explicitly requires a positive commitment to several massive, counter-intuitive assertions:

- The universe came into being completely uncaused out of nothing (or similar problematic ideas).
- The fine-tuning of the universe happened either by chance or necessity.
- Objective moral truths don't exist or can be explained without an authoritative lawgiver.

Notes:

A LINGUISTIC SLEIGHT OF HAND: ATHEISM VS. AGNOSTICISM

The Modern Shift: Popular and online atheists frequently redefine their position from a strong truth claim ("God does not exist") to a psychological state: "I just lack belief in God."

The Strategic Goal: This is a rhetorical tell. By framing their position as neutral, they attempt to dodge the burden of proof, sit back, and demand to be convinced without defending their own worldview commitments.

True Agnosticism: The actual term for suspending judgment due to lack of knowledge or certainty is agnosticism. Conflating atheism with agnosticism obscures the fact that atheism lacks compelling positive arguments.

Notes:

SCIENCE AND METAPHYSICS: AVOIDING OVERREACH

Overreach: Atheist scientists and their supporters use their credentials to make authoritative declarations that science has “disproven God,” stepping outside their field of competence into philosophical and theological territory.

Distinct Domains:

- **Science:** Investigates natural phenomena using empirical evidence to build testable explanations. God is supernatural by definition, placing him outside the domain of scientific inquiry.
- **Metaphysics:** Uses logic and conceptual analysis to explore foundational questions like ultimate origins, causality, consciousness, and the fundamental nature of reality.

Scientism: The only things worth knowing or true are those that can be tested by science. This is both self-refuting and vulnerable to many counterexamples.

Multiple Causation vs. “God of the Gaps”: Labeling theism as a “gap” argument incorrectly rules out abductive reasoning (inference to the best explanation). Furthermore, multiple causation proves that understanding a mechanical mechanism does not rule out an agent (e.g., the Ford Model T).

Notes:

THREE COMMON MISTAKES IN CONVERSATIONS

Mistake 1: The Charge of Indoctrination (Atheist Error)

- **The Claim:** Theism is false because people are indoctrinated to believe as young children.
- **The Correction:** This commits the Genetic Fallacy—evaluating an idea based entirely on its origin rather than its evidence. Where you learned a truth does not dictate whether it is true. Also, secular society bombards and indoctrinates us daily with its own materialistic assumptions.

Mistake 2: The Charge of Wish Fulfillment (Atheist Error)

- **The Claim:** Christians only believe in God as a psychological crutch or coping mechanism because they cannot handle reality.
- **The Correction:** While faith provides comfort, this is another Genetic Fallacy. In reality, wish fulfillment exists on both sides. Many embrace atheism because they desperately want there to be no ultimate moral lawgiver to whom they are accountable, allowing them to pursue complete moral autonomy.

Mistake 3: Treating Arguments as the Root of Faith (Christian Error)

- **The Claim:** Assuming Christians hold their beliefs primarily because of philosophical arguments.
- **The Correction:** Rational justification does not require a mastery of formal apologetics. True saving faith is generated by the Holy Spirit working through the Word of God as it dynamically convicts, comforts, and challenges. Theistic arguments are excellent tools that protect and strengthen faith, but they are not the foundation of a living relationship with God.

Notes: