

# The Existence of God

## Prerequisite To Evidence

By Ben Bilyeu

The existence of a transcendent being cannot be addressed until one first determines exactly the possible ways this hypothetical being can be known. In fact, **it is logically absurd for anyone to even think about considering a serious inquiry into the rationale for the existence of Deity without first giving specific attention to the categorical prerequisite: sources of knowledge.** Epistemology, or sources of knowledge, is the grammar, which governs the direction of the inquiry. Apart from these rules, any inquiry into the existence of a Transmaterial Entity is futile banter. Elmer Sprague, in his treatise regarding the sources of knowledge, defines the issue succinctly: **“Until we settle questions about the ways in which we can know, we cannot settle questions about what we can know.”** “Matters of faith, and matters of logic” p, 17, *The Range of Philosophy*. Elementary epistemology instructs one that all knowledge—all of it—is obtained two ways, and only two ways: empiricism and inference.

Thus, if God does exist, the certitude of his existence may be discerned but two ways. Why only two? Because these two avenues of knowledge constitute the epistemological oracles of discernment. Everything known—

everything knowable—is acquired via one or both of these two avenues: directly or immediately i.e., empirically, face-to-face, that is if God chose to reveal himself overtly or indirectly—mediately via inference, that is, discerning His existence via his “fingerprints” or “footprints” he has left on his creation.

If God, i.e., the creator of material reality, does in fact exist, it is to be anticipated that the residue of his creative act will be impressed upon his creation. In fact, the existence of this being will be discernable indirectly via inference. It is not to be expected that this entity will be discerned directly by the scrutiny of His creation. **The perception of His existence, via inference, is axiomatic. His existence via empiricism, however, is conjecture.**

If physical reality is the consequence of the premeditative act of Deity, then physical reality will evidence his presence! **It is metaphysically impossible for a transmaterial entity to have created material reality and not have left some residue of his existence!** Creation is a shadow of its creator and the shadow will invariably exhibit a silhouette of its creator! It is impossible for even God himself to conceal his presence in his creation.

If God does indeed, exist, a specific kind of evidence, a

unique species of evidence, is necessary to be convincing.

**That special kind of evidence must be atypical or non-normative in contrast to the normative typical proof required proving physical theories and scientific hypothesis.** The evidence for the existence of a transmaterial being must be unmistakable! The evidence must be so definitive, present such a superlative demarcation, that it cannot, (repeat can—not), be confused with explanations typically given to account for the laws and the processes of the physical world. But a word of warning is in order: No evidence of any kind, of any caliber, is so categorically unmistakable, so undeniably demonstrative that it is immune from being explained away as a figment of the imagination by a charlatan determined to cast aside the atypical evidence. Repeat: no evidence—no evidence of any nature whatsoever, is so diametrically overwhelming in its presentation and demonstration, that it is impervious to the calculating deceit and chicanery of man, to whom the concept, the very idea “God”, is a noxious absurdity. Further, the real possibility exists that even the most indelible evidence could be (would be!) distorted by those biased.

The second reason that the most sterling evidence could

be rejected (rejected but not necessarily refuted) is due to the fact that all knowledge even empirical knowledge, is derived from a mediated reality. To say that all knowledge is known via a mediated reality is to say that nothing (not one thing) is ever known directly, e.g., face to face, meaning that transparent clarity is lacking.

Just as it is categorically requisite for one to determine the ways one can know, before one can determine what one can know, one discerns, via analogy, that one must first determine what kind of evidence is necessary to prove a given hypothesis or proposition before one begins the search for evidence. (If this principle is not first fixed in the mind, the inquiry is futile.) Stated simply, “**what kind, what species, what genre, caliber, or magnitude of evidence is required to prove that a transmaterial entity does indeed exist?**” The response-‘no evidence of any kind could ever prove the existence of deity’ is blatant irrationality. Why? If God exists (note-if) and if (if) he chose to confront man with the facticity of his existence, the

architect of the Milky Way Galaxy (This is a primary attribute of the Deity under discussion, viz, creator.) would not be stymied in His effort to get the attention of a distracted mass of protoplasm. (The question for Friday’s exam, in 100 words or less, “state the kind of evidence that would be convincing”.) But what if this Being chose not to overtly reveal himself? The question, however, is the same. What evidence, after the fact, could be detected?

**The primary requirement of evidence to convince a rational and objective person that a transcendent entity does exist is thus: Evidence must be presented in proportion to the magnitude of the claim.** The issue here is one of qualitative evidence, not quantitative e.g., It is not necessary that the Being in question create a thousand worlds, one will suffice. Thus, if Deity does exist, and if this Being wants man to know of His existence, e.g., His person, then He must overtly, empirically, present Himself for scrutiny. However, if God only wants man to know of His

existence, all He is required to do is to create something because it is impossible for God to conceal His existence in His creation— impossible! In fact, there does exist, three unmistakable markers, etched in physical reality explainable only as the “fingerprints” of Deity! With certainty, the burden of proof rests upon Deity to present evidence, either directly or indirectly – empirically or circumstantial (or both) that would convince a skeptical, yet objective observer. This God must (must) present evidence that possesses a non-normative and atypical nature. Any other species of evidence would be immediately confused with normative and typical evidence advanced to document the laws and processes of the physical world and would thus be discounted as representative of Deity. © 2005 From The Existence of God: A Rational Inquiry, By Ben Bilyeu; P. O. Box 1452, Cookeville, TN. 38503 bilyeu@usit.net