

Does God Exist? The Burden Of Proof

By Ben Bilyeu

If God exists and if He wants humanity to know of His existence, then the burden of proof rests directly upon Him to prove to a hurried and disinterested species (which oft flirts with the delusion of godhood in its own right) that He —IS! It is not the responsibility of man to prove that God exists. **It is the categorical responsibility of God—Himself—to prove His own existence!** (No ambiguity here—none whatsoever!) The only responsibility of humanity is to subject any prospective claims attesting to Deity to scrutiny. Specifically, it is incumbent upon God that He prove His existence according to the established normative criteria that man uses to establish the truth claims of his history and his science.

The only meaningful knowledge of Deity is not the certitude that God really does exist after all, but is the discernment of **who** God is. The issue is relevance. The two questions that the student of logic always asks regarding any proposition of fact or proposition of value are: “Is it true”? and “Is it important”? Thus, “Is it **true** that God exists”? And “Is it **important** that God exists”? The knowledge that God merely—objectively—exists is as relevant to human existence as is knowing that the atmosphere of Neptune is composed of methane—In a word—worthless! **The only meaningful knowledge of**

Deity is not the discernment that He—IS, but the knowledge of what He is—specifically, whether or not He a person!! Further, it is worthless to know, that Deity is rational, cerebral—or “the creator”. His importance to human existence is meaningful only if one discerns that He is a person! (By ‘person’ is meant the capacity to feel as another sentient being feels, “feeling” meaning a common understanding regarding value or worth— an affective attribute) Any meaningful demonstration on the part of **Deity must prove not only that He is almighty but also must prove that He is altruistic!**

If God chose to prove His existence—as a person—He categorically must do so empirically, unmistakably, and objectively. (Any presentation of proof lacking these three criteria would be dismissed as non-evidentiary and could not gain serious attention.)

If God chose to introduce Himself—as a person—to humankind, a Being possessing a value system akin to the axiology of man, **He must present Himself empirically.** To insist that God must present Himself empirically embraces the subsumed requisite that **He must—MUST—present Himself in anthropomorphic form,** as a man (or a woman)! Why must God show Himself in this manner? If the intent of God is to communicate to the human species that He is a

person, He must present Himself in a form that the Human species could relate to e.g., the form of a person i.e., bodily. (It is impossible for one to think of an entity as a person, disembodied.) There does not exist any other three-dimensional form that a supposed Deity could assume that mankind could relate to e.g., understand, other than anthropomorphic, due to imprinting from infancy. Any non-anthropomorphic representation would be viewed as alien to the human experience and consequently would be repulsive! Any objectification of Deity less than man would be rejected by man as a non-person i.e., as a no affective Being. Any objectification of Deity greater than the anthropomorphic experience of man would be rejected by humankind for the same reason—as an unfathomable frame of reference. It would be impossible for man to accept Deity as a person (with an affective attribute), apart from an anthropomorphic manifestation! It would be impossible for man to relate (in the sense of a common value system) to a “caring” nebula or to accept pathos from an organic slime, or “understanding” from a vapor or a mist, regardless of its intellectual prowess! Specifically, **there must be the expression of pathos toward man as a living entity, some concern for the enigma of human existence,**

some compassion for the pain and misery which is the manifest destiny of the human species!

If God chose to present Himself to the human species in the anthropomorphic form as a man, **it is incumbent upon Him to present unmistakable proof that He, in His essence, transcends material reality.** If God is the creator of material reality (any definition of “God” as being less than the creator would be a pseudo-deity.), the singular quality of evidence that God could present to get the attention of a species so preoccupied with its own synthetic universe would be to demonstrate His ability to suspend and override the reality that man deems immutable—natural law! **The suspension of natural law by a phenomenon known as “miracles” is the only kind of evidence** (read carefully—the only kind) **that even God Himself could advance to support His claim** before a skeptical and cynical species! His demonstrated negation of natural law would have to be definitive so as not to be “explained away” by the processes of nature or deception via the cunning of man. **The only example of the class of evidence known as “miracles” that would grasp the attention of humankind is the abolition of one immutable law of nature in particular—the law of death!!** Why would this one miracle in particular grasp and hold the attention of every person? Because every person is destined to die,

consequently, every person has a vested interest in the possibility that death might be vanquished! **Every other conceivable miracle other than the suspension of physical death would be deemed by a species so easily bored, as nothing but a divine magic show and the performer to be nothing but a cosmic joker—and not Deity.** (A note on the inherent problem of epistemology: It is impossible for even God to present evidence of His existence in a mediated reality that is so convincing that the evidence could not be explained away as so much superstition and ignorant gibberish. Perhaps this is the thought Pascal had in mind when he wrote: “There is enough light for those who desire only to see, and enough darkness for those of a contrary disposition.”)(149 Pensees) But if darkness exists, it exists only because one has not examined the ground of evidence justifying belief in the personal demonstration of Deity! **If darkness exists, it is due to a lack of perception, not to a lack of illumination!** By the same rationale, there does not exist a single proposition of fact in the panoply of physical science and in recorded history that is immune from being dismissed as so much jaded speculation and inane sophistry—not one! Every objective truth in the archives of the human experience, with a wave of the hand and the cry “blatant sophistry”, can also be explained away!

If God chose to manifest Himself to the human species—as a person—He is restricted to two options: to present Himself to everyone, or to present Himself to a select group (who will be obligated to communicate to the rest of the species His anthropomorphic and thus empirical appearance.) It is evident that if Deity exists, He has not presented Himself to every one! Consequently, **any search for the existence of God will not begin with the Hubble telescope, electron microscope, or with a particle accelerator but must begin with the search for and the critique of those who claim that God, in fact, has manifested Himself to them.**

There does exist a collection of ancient documents which records the corroborating testimony of six individuals who unanimously attest to the claim that Deity assumed the form of a person and declared Himself to be transcendent to space, time, matter, energy, cause and effect—and death. These six observers document His claim to be God by His suspension and negation of natural law -- the provocative example being the abolition of His own physical death. The observations of these six men are verified by the three primary criteria of proof: empiricism, objectivity, and corroboration. The recorded observations regarding the demonstration of Deity are not “mere words in a book”, but are the observations of events that transpired in space and time—which are written in a

book. (There is a difference!) If one will resolve to acquire a critical mindset viz. to become a student of logic, if one will resolve to study the primary documents— **to reason with one's own mind**, oblivious to the sophistry of infidelity and to the dogma of orthodoxy, one just may discern the certitude of the following proposition: **“God once walked upon the earth.”**

Assuredly, the burden of proof **rests upon this Being to prove Himself.** Yet, a burden also rests upon Human kind to acquire a critical and objective mindset indicative of a rational being, and examine the claims of these six witnesses. . © 2005 From **The Existence of God: A Rational Inquiry** by Ben Bilyeu, P.O. Box 1452, Cookeville, TN. 38503 bilyeu@usit.net