

WHAT IS PROOF?

Date: 11 03 2019

Words: 6150

INTRO: Some time ago in our Sunday School class the subject came up as to whether we have proof that God exists and that the Bible is true. After my wife asked some more questions later I realized that I had never done a study of the word *proof*. What is proof? Can we prove God exists? Can we prove the Bible is true? Does the Bible help us to determine what proof is? It caught my interest and since I had taken a break from the Ephesian messages, I thought I would do one message on this subject since I spent a lot of hours studying it.

Here is a question one needs answer: if you have full proof for something, do you still believe it or do you now know it. If we have full proof for God and the Bible, do we still need faith? I want to show you a picture. Now you see that little truck with that huge load. Now let me ask you, how many of you believe that is a picture of something that really happened? [] How many of you believe it could possibly be true? [] How many of you doubt it is true? [] How many of you believe it is not true. It is a doctored up picture? [] How many of you know it is not true? [] How many of you know it is true? []



Today, with pictures seeing is not necessarily believing. We can't really know if it is true or not unless we were there ourselves to see it. But you can all either believe it is true, or believe it is not true or, doubt it is true.

Well, our question is, "What is proof?" Do we have proof God exists? Do we have proof He created the heavens and the earth? What is proof? Well, one of our men sent this from one of our previous Prime ministers, Jean Chrétien. Well, the name Chretien means Christian, so we expect he would know. He was asked on a certain matter what kind of proof he needed. And he said: "I

don't know, a proof is a proof. What kind of a proof is to prove? But prove is a proof. But when you have a good proof it is because it is proven." As he walked off the further question came, "But what kind of proof do you want?"

Well, according to him, when you have a good proof it is proven. So there we have it. But like the follow-up question we might still ask: But what is proof?

Now let me just say that proof is a logical and personal thing. Proof only has meaning for personal beings because only they can reason. And proving things requires reasoning abilities. If you cannot reason nothing can be proved to you.

I. PERSONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PROOF

Since proof is only of use and value for personal beings, what is required of a personal being in order for proof to take place? Proof is accomplished by thought processes. It is accomplished in the mind. And if one is to prove anything to another, here is the first requirement: both the one proving something and the one to whom something is proved must be logical persons. You cannot prove anything to an illogical person. For example, a creationist said to an atheist, "If I could prove to you there is a God, would you believe it?" And the answer was he would not. You cannot reason and prove anything to a person like that. It is a waste of time.

Now I propose that to a large degree our society has become illogical. Logic is using reason to learn or discover things. Truth in our day, like in Isaiah's day, has fallen in the streets. When you can claim you are a woman when 100% of the factual data shows you are a man, you are illogical, period. When we are illogical, we are what the word 'stupid' really means. I checked a dictionary online on what the word 'stupid' means. Here is what I got: It is, "having or showing a great lack of intelligence or common sense." With this whole gender thing our society has largely shown itself to be illogical. I think when Jesus said we are not to throw our pearls before swine, the swine includes such people to whom logic makes no difference.

God, according to the Bible, is logical. Listen to God Himself in Isaiah 1:18. He said, "'Come now, and let us reason together,' Says the LORD, 'Though your sins are like scarlet, They shall be as white as snow; Though they are red like crimson, They shall be as wool.'" According to that God is reasonable; He is logical. And according to that salvation is reasonable and logical. And those who will give themselves to it will find it so.

So first, proof can only be given to one who is logical. Second, to prove something you have to agree that there is such a thing as objective truth. Truth defined, is that which conforms to reality. When a man claims to be a woman, does that claim conform to reality? If words mean anything at all, that is %100 a lie! Now let me tell you what a person is who believes a man is a woman when that man claims he is a woman. It does not matter how smart the person is who makes that claim or who believes that claim, he or she is not logical. Nor can you reason with them. Neither is he or she honest or truthful. He or she does not believe in objective truth. The one who makes such a claim is a liar. The one who believes that claim, willingly believes a lie. Until you can get such a person to think logically, it is best not to waste time.

Once one is willing to believe a man is a woman or a woman a man, where else is such a person willing to go after that? Well, listen to the liberals or progressive thinkers today and the liberal news media and you get an idea where they are willing to go next.

So, conclusion; proof only has value for logical, personal beings. You cannot prove something to an illogical person or one who does not believe there is such a thing as objective truth. Logic and truth are essential in proving anything, even in giving evidence for anything.

Now let me give you a proposition to prove: In our public school system in Canada we are teaching students to be illogical. Evidence? LGBTQ.

II. IMPORTANT POINTS FOR PROOF

Now let me give you three important points of reference in proving something. First you have the matter to be proved. It may be to prove a suspect of a murder case is actually guilty. Or it may be a proposition or a question. So let me give us something to prove. Here is the proposition to be proved:

PROPOSITION: $1,649 \times 3 = 8,145$ (8245).

The second point is the method of proving. In science it may be DNA. In math, it would be mathematical calculations. If you put my math proposition to the test you would find out if it is true or false.

TEST: Second is the method of proving.

Third, we have the outcome. True or false, guilty or not guilty etc. Now our math question can be proved with 100% certainty.

PROOF: Proof must have 100% certainty.

The proposition I gave you in math is not correct. You can prove it. So we have three points of reference: The thing to be proved. The method of proving. And the conclusion.

So let us now do that which I usually do first, and that is to define proof.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Actual Proof

Well, what is proof? The Cambridge Online Dictionary says proof is: a fact or piece of information that shows that something exists or is true. I would define proof as that which demonstrates in some way with 100% certainty that some claim or proposition or statement is true. Some claim or assertion or proposition has been made as being true. Proof is that which shows the thing claimed is actually true. Now I am using the word *truth* with this definition: Truth is that which conforms to reality.

I am going to distinguish between what I call actual proof and evidential proof. Actual proof is that which we can

personally ascertain with one or more of the five senses but especially by the sense of sight. So in Scripture walking by faith and walking by sight are set over against each other. 2 Corinthians 5:7 says, "For we walk by faith, not by sight." In general, when you see something you know it to be, you don't believe it to be.

When you have actual proof you can now go beyond saying, "I believe this is true," to saying, "I know this is true."

B. Evidential Proof

So we have looked at actual proof and now we want to look at what I call evidential proof. When we have what I here call evidential proof we cannot say, "I know that is true." We can only say, "I believe that is true." There is a difference between knowing something and believing something. You can truly know something only when it is based on things you yourself have verified. By far the most of those things we say we "know" are based on evidence. I will explain the difference I see between knowing and believing later.

In the judicial system, sentences are handed out based on evidence beyond reasonable doubt. It is not evidence beyond all doubt, but beyond reasonable doubt. When you have evidence beyond reasonable doubt, you have that which we commonly call proof. It is proof enough to us for us to say, "I believe that is the truth." It is not proof enough to say I have verified that to be the truth myself.

All the history we learn is of that kind. All things we have not verified ourselves we can only believe. For example, we have learned historical things and we accept them as true. We do not have actual proof, but we have what we would call evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. We speak of it as so certain that we say we know it.

When you think about it, most of what we say we know, we believe based on various kinds of evidence. We base our belief on the reliability of those who have passed that

information down to us. For the most part we can say then that it has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

So the Bible teaches that the just shall live by faith. This faith is based on the Bible. And we believe the Bible because of the evidence for its veracity. One teacher I heard years ago said that faith is commitment on evidence. I would say that that is a good definition of the true faith. Many exercise faith in that which does not have good evidence such as Mormonism or the teaching of evolution. That is also faith, but it does not have good evidence. We'll see some of that later.

So, can we prove there is a God? Well, not by actual proof. You cannot take anyone and say, "Come, I will show you God." But you can say, "Come, I will show you the evidence." If we could prove the existence of God or the truth of the Bible, or that Jesus Christ was God's Son, the Bible would not say, "The just shall live by faith." Good faith is based on good evidence. The idea of faith is what upsets the atheist, though in actual fact, that is all he has. The atheist does not like the word faith. The facts are that his view of evolution is a faith. He cannot take anyone back and show them the actual proof of the things he insists are true. Furthermore, his faith is based on a theories drawn from evidence. His conclusions are theories. And because he believes those theories and does not know they are actually true, he has a faith.

So what evidence does he have for evolution? An internet article gave these five main evidences:

1. Ancient organism remains.
2. Fossil layers.
3. Similarities among organisms alive today.
4. Similarities in DNA.
5. Similarities of embryos.

The Bible believer has the same evidence. He does not deny the evidence, he just comes to a different conclusion. All the evolutionists conclusions are theories. An online definition of a theory said: "a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something,

especially one based on general principles independent of the thing to be explained." They give this as an example: "Darwin's theory of evolution." The suggested synonyms were given as: hypothesis, thesis, conjecture, supposition, speculation, postulation, postulate.

So in the teaching of evolution there is nothing definite, only suggestions or guesses or theories. The evidence they have leads them to a theory, a theory called evolution. But for creation, evidence abounds to such an extent that it goes beyond reasonable doubt. Anyone who doubts that needs only to study one area: DNA.

So now let me ask an important question: if we cannot have 100% proof of what we believe, and all we have is evidence, why wouldn't we just become a Mormon or any other religion? Why? Well, because of both the quality and quantity evidence. I looked online to see what evidence there was for the book of Mormon. You can go online and check out the evidence for the book of Mormon. Listen to how the Book of Mormon apparently came about. I am reading from the New York Times. It says:

"According to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, an angel named Moroni led Joseph Smith in 1827 to a divine set of golden plates buried in a hillside near his New York home.

"God provided the 22-year-old Smith with a pair of glasses and seer stones that allowed him to translate the 'Reformed Egyptian' writings on the golden plates into the 'Book of Mormon: Another Testament of Jesus Christ.'

"Mormons believe these scriptures restored the church to God's original vision and left the rest of Christianity in a state of apostasy," end quote.

You could check and see what evidence the Mormons give for the truth of the book of Mormon and you might be amazed. But on further research you would find that all those things that are very problematic. For example, the

book of Mormon talks about sheep in America at a time when there were no sheep in America etc... and there are many more.

Then consider the thousands of changes made in the book of Mormon since it was first published. Then consider that the Book of Mormon claims the North American Indians are the 10 lost Jewish tribes. Now secular anthropologists never believed that was true to begin with, but how could you prove it one way or another? But today with DNA you can prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this is not true. If this kind of evidence could be labeled against the Bible I would try to find another religion or drop it altogether.

Listen further to the New York Times article:

"The book's narrative focuses on a tribe of Jews who sailed from Jerusalem to the New World in 600 BC and split into two main warring factions.

"The God-fearing Nephites were "pure" (the word was officially changed from 'white' in 1981) and 'delightful.' The idol-worshipping Lamanites received the 'curse of blackness,' turning their skin dark.

"According to the Book of Mormon, by 385 AD the dark-skinned Lamanites had wiped out other Hebrews. The Mormon church called the victors 'the principal ancestors of the American Indians.' If the Lamanites returned to the church, their skin could once again become white.

"Over the years, church prophets -- believed by Mormons to receive revelations from God -- and missionaries have used the supposed ancestral link between the ancient Hebrews and Native Americans and later Polynesians as a prime conversion tool in Central and South America and the South Pacific."

The article then quotes a Mormon president speaking to people in Peru whom he has told that they are the offspring of some tribe mentioned in the book of Mormon. Here is what the Mormon president said:

“As I look into your faces, I think of Father Lehi [patriarch of the Lamanites], whose sons and daughters you are,” church president and prophet Gordon B. Hinckley said in 1997 during a Mormon conference in Lima, Peru. ‘I think he must be shedding tears today, tears of love and gratitude.... This is but the beginning of the work in Peru.’”

The article then continues like this:

“In recent decades, Mormonism has flourished in those regions, which now have nearly 4 million members -- about a third of Mormon membership worldwide, according to church figures.

“That was the big sell,’ said Damon Kali, an attorney who practices law in Sunnyvale, Calif., and is descended from Pacific Islanders. ‘And quite frankly, that was the big sell for me. I was a Lamanite. I was told the day of the Lamanite will come.’

“A few months into his two-year mission in Peru, Kali stopped trying to convert the locals. Scientific articles about ancient migration patterns had made him doubt that he or anyone else was a Lamanite.

“Once you do research and start getting other viewpoints, you’re toast,’ said Kali, who said he was excommunicated in 1996 over issues unrelated to the Lamanite issue. ‘I could not do missionary work anymore,’” end quote.

<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2006-feb-16-me-mormon16-story.html>

Well, it is amazing to me that any Mormon can remain a Mormon when you consider just DNA and their claim of the North American Natives alone. And there are many other huge problems if one is objective. If DNA studies did to Christianity what it does to Mormonism, I would drop out.

So what kinds of evidence are used in law courts? What kinds of evidence do you need to prove something beyond a

reasonable doubt? From what I read, here are the four major kinds of evidence are:

- 1 Real evidence: What kind of evidence would be called real evidence? Well, say a gun, or a knife or a shoe etc... Consider the man Judah in the OT. He went to visit a harlot, and he left a pledge with her, and to get his pledge back he had to bring the payment he promised. She had her face covered and he did not recognize her.

Later he sent someone to bring the payment to her and they could not find a harlot there. But when this woman was expecting, Judah found out his daughter-in-law was expecting and Judah said, "Let her be burnt." But when she brought 'real evidence' it was Judah who was in trouble not this woman. What she brought is what is called real evidence.

Do we have real evidence for God? Well, how about a dandelion? Or any flower for that matter. Or anything else that has actual existence for that matter. Can animals make the universe? Of course not. Can man? Of course not. Then who can? All evidence says that someone above and beyond man must have done it, and that is what we call God. The evidence in one cell, of which we each have about 32 trillion, is enough to give evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that there is a God. This evidence does not tell us who God is or how many there are, but it tells us there is at least one God.

The second kind of evidence law courts use is:

- 2 Demonstrative evidence. And we ask, what is demonstrative evidence? Demonstrative evidence is things like pictures, sound recordings, movies, diagrams, maps, drawings and more.

Do we have any of that kind of evidence for the existence of God? We have far beyond that. We have the real evidence of creation above us, below us, and all around us.

Third, law courts use:

- 3 Documentary evidence. Documentary evidence is mainly such as a writing on paper such as a receipt etc.. When we want

to return something to a store that we bought there they want a document which we call proof of purchase.

I was going to give you Jeremiah 32. Jeremiah kept documentary evidence for the purchase of some land in case he needed proof of purchase. You may wish to read the chapter. Documentary evidence is almost as old as mankind.

In verses 10, 11 and 12, in the KJV we have the word 'evidence.' The word *evidence* here is a written document or receipt. We would call it 'proof of purchase.' We accept such things, if they are signed, as proof. I would call it evidence. If it is contested later, the judges would not have seen this take place, but they would have this strong evidence. It points to the truth of some claim.

Now I ask you, do we have documentary evidence for God? Wow! Do we! We have the most powerful documentary evidence you can possibly find anywhere! Let me recommend our message on sermonaudio, "Is the Bible the Word of God?" I give ten of the most powerful pieces of evidence you could imagine in any document. It is evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

But if the Bible is true, and we have much evidence that it is, then we now not only know that there is a God but we know exactly who He is!

Fourth, law courts use the evidence of testimonies or witnesses:

4 Testimony or witness evidence.

Now I ask, do we have testimonies of the existence of God or that the Bible is His Word? I am not educated in law, but without any doubt at all, evidence abounds here. I want to give one example. Take the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If Jesus Christ was resurrected you have one of the greatest piece of evidence for the existence of God, the truth of the bible, and the truth about salvation any logical person could wish for.

So what testimony or witness do we have for the resurrection? In the Bible, in order to convict anyone of murder, it

required more than one witness. Well, do we have more than one witness to the resurrection of Jesus Christ? It is amazing how sure God made there would be enough witnesses and a lot of historical evidence for the resurrection of Christ, which is one of the most monumental events of all history.

-The resurrection event

Consider now the event of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Jesus had been crucified. Enough people had seen it that the fact of His crucifixion was unquestionable to those then living. After He had been in the grave three days and three nights and now on the fourth day some women go to the grave. But an angel tells them He is alive (Mark 16:1-8). They could not yet know if this was true. They told the eleven disciples but the disciples thought these were idle tales. Peter and John ran to the tomb and sure enough it was empty. But neither could they know for certain that it was true. They only had some evidence that it might well be true.

Well, Mary stood outside the tomb weeping. She saw two angles and they asked why she was weeping. She said, "Because they have taken away my Lord and I don't know where they have put Him" (John 20:13). When she said that, the Lord stood behind her and said, "Woman, why are you weeping?" She was so sure Jesus was still dead that she did not even recognize Him but thought He was the gardener. Then Jesus said, "Mary!" It was then that she recognized Him and she said, "Rabboni!"

Well, she now not only believed He was alive, she now KNEW it to be true. She ran and told the eleven but they did not believe her. Her saying He was alive was not enough evidence for them. Well, the other ladies who had gone to tell the disciples, as they were going Jesus met them. Turn now to Luke 24. Well, they worshipped Him and then Jesus told them to go tell His disciples. He then went to Emmaus and you know the story how He appeared to two of them and went with them. When He had revealed Himself to them and had eaten with them, He vanished. But some of them went to Jerusalem and told

the disciples. So let's pick up the story in Luke 24.
We begin in verse 33:

33 *So they rose up that very hour and returned to Jerusalem,
and found the eleven and those who were with them
gathered together,*

34 *saying, "The Lord is risen indeed, and has appeared to
Simon!"*

35 *And they told about the things that had happened on the
road, and how He was known to them in the breaking of
bread.*

Now look at one word in verse 35, the word 'known'. They no longer believed He was risen from the dead, they knew. But the disciples did not know yet. But now they have a little more evidence. But now look at what happened, verse 36:

36 *Now as they said these things, Jesus Himself stood in the
midst of them, and said to them, "Peace to you."*

37 *But they were terrified and frightened, and supposed they
had seen a spirit. (They did not yet believe.)*

38 *And He said to them, "Why are you troubled? And why do
doubts arise in your hearts? (They were now down from
not believing to doubting.) Verse 39:*

39 *"Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself. Handle Me
and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones as
you see I have."*

40 *When He had said this, He showed them His hands and His
feet.*

41 *But while they still did not believe for joy, and marveled,
He said to them, "Have you any food here?"*

Now it says they believed not for joy. This is what we call, 'to good to be true.' Verse 42:

42 *So they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish and some
honeycomb.*

43 *And He took it and ate in their presence.*

44 Then He said to them, "These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms concerning Me."

Here we have documentary evidence. Verse 45:

45 And He opened their understanding, that they might comprehend the Scriptures.

46 Then He said to them, "Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day,

47 "and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

48 "And you are witnesses of these things.

And here we have witnesses. Verse 49:

49 "Behold, I send the Promise of My Father upon you; but tarry in the city of Jerusalem until you are endued with power from on high."

Although it does not say they now believed, it is obvious from all that happened after this that they now not only believed but had come to realize they had actual 100% proof of His resurrection.

We go now to John 20. We are told here that Thomas was not with them when the Lord appeared to the others. So we'll now see when he came to know the truth. We begin in verse 24:

24 Now Thomas, called the Twin, one of the twelve, was not with them when Jesus came.

25 The other disciples therefore said to him, "We have seen the Lord." So he said to them, "Unless I see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe."

Look at what he is saying. Unless I have 100% proof, "I will not believe." He had a fair amount of evidence but even

after the rest of the disciples tell him Jesus was risen, it was not enough evidence. And furthermore, He needed to know that this one they claimed to be Jesus was not some imposter. He said he had to put his fingers in the nail prints and put his hand in his side where the sword cut him open. Even just eyesight evidence was not enough. His sense of feeling had to agree with his eyes. He needed more. Some of us are like that. Verse 26:

26 *And after eight days His disciples were again inside, and Thomas with them. Jesus came, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, "Peace to you!"*

27 *Then He said to Thomas, "Reach your finger here, and look at My hands; and reach your hand here, and put it into My side. Do not be unbelieving, but believing."*

Jesus reproved Thomas for needing so much evidence. And now He said to him, "Do not be unbelieving any longer, but believe!" So look at verse 28:

28 *And Thomas answered and said to Him, "My Lord and my God!"*

So we call him doubting Thomas. In what we read earlier we could call them the doubting disciples. But we understand. We have the same problem. Verse 29:

29 *Jesus said to him, "Thomas, because you have seen Me, you have believed. Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed."*

That is where we are. We cannot say we know Jesus was raised from the dead because we have seen Him and our hands have handled Him and we have seen Him eat etc.. We can only say, "We believe the evidence." The disciples could say, "We know He was raised from the dead." When we say we know it, we say it by faith. There is a substantial difference between faith and knowing and the word faith is what atheists hate, though they are overrun by it. And what they believe they believe without the kind of evidence we have.

-Events after the resurrection

So go with me to Acts 1 to consider more evidence for the resurrection after these things. Luke writes:

- 1 *The former account I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach,*
- 2 *until the day in which He was taken up, after He through the Holy Spirit had given commandments to the apostles whom He had chosen,*
- 3 *to whom He also presented Himself alive after His suffering by many infallible proofs, being seen by them during forty days and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.*

Now note that Luke speaks in verse 3 of 'infallible proofs.' The original word is *deiknumi*. Infallible proof is that which cannot logically be contradicted. It would be evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. It was verifiable by the senses. Listen to the Apostle John in 1 John 1:1-3:

- 1 *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life—*
- 2 *the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare to you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested to us—*
- 3 *that which we have seen and heard we declare to you, that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.*

So look at how Jesus showed Himself to be alive after He had been crucified. He showed Himself to them visibly. They had, not only visible evidence, they had visible proof. They could now not only say they believed Jesus was raised from the dead, they could now add to that that they knew it.

With regard to our faith and the resurrection of Christ it required witnesses and God made sure there would be

witnesses. So He showed Himself alive for 40 days and that, to a lot of people. Forty is the number of testing, of giving evidence. Paul says in 1 Corinthians 15 that at one time over 500 witnesses were present, and most of them were alive at the time he was writing.

-The ascension into heaven

We go now to Acts 1:8-9. It says:

8 *"But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be witnesses to Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth."*

9 *Now when He had spoken these things, while they watched, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight.*

When you read the book of Acts and take note you will find that they mention the resurrection again and again. It is one of the greatest pieces of evidence possible for our hope in the future.

So we have looked at what I call actual proof and evidential proof. The Apostles had actual proof of Jesus' resurrection, we have evidential proof, from their witness and testimony.

III. THE RESULTS OF PROOF

So what are the results of proof? Well the results of actual proof gives us things that we know personally. But there is evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. This gives us what we believe.

But there is yet one more matter I have pondered. They are statements like we find in Joshua 4:24 which says:

24 *"that all the peoples of the earth may know the hand of the LORD, that it is mighty, that you may fear the LORD your God forever."*

1 John 5:13 says:

13 *These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal*

life, and that you may continue to believe in the name of the Son of God.

When God speaks to us through His word and we believe those things, He says that we may know those things. If the God of the Bible is the right God, if the Bible is the inspired Word of God as we believe it is, then on that basis we can know things that we cannot personally prove.

CONCL: So we conclude. What is proof? I define it as: that which demonstrates in some way with 100% certainty that some claim or proposition or statement is true. Actual proof gives you what you know.

Evidence beyond a reasonable doubt gives us what we believe. We believe the Bible is the Word of God. If it is in fact true, and we believe it is, then it gives us things we can now know without having been there in history past to see them with our own eyes.

Do we have proof that God exists; that the Bible is true; that Jesus Christ existed, died, was buried and rose again? Yes! We have evidential proof. Our proof is beyond a reasonable doubt. God gave us enough evidence for all of this in order that we might have a reasonable faith. And God chose not to give us actual proof because it pleases Him to save man by grace through faith. So Scripture says: Without faith it is not possible to please God. In other words, the only way to please Him is to live by the one true faith.

So let us consider two Scriptures in closing. First Hebrews 11:1. It says:

1 Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

So here is what we have.

THINGS HOPED FOR



FAITH

First, faith is the foundation of things hoped for.



THINGS NOT SEEN

Second, faith is the evidence of things not seen.

True faith is based on evidence of things that are not seen. Furthermore, true faith gives rise to hope.

1 Corinthians 13:13 says:

13 And now abide faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.

Why is love greater than faith or hope? Faith and hope will come to an end when we have actual 100% proof in glory. But love will endure forever. It will never come to an end!