

Facts Versus General Evidence

When a detective investigates a crime scene, he looks for all evidence that may be relevant to the case. This includes eyewitness testimony, which he usually scribbles down in his book. The *facts* of the case, however, become the basis for judging the accuracy and explanatory power of eyewitness statements and any theories the detective may develop. The facts, pieces of information that are *directly* verifiable via the senses, speak for themselves. They do not require inference/interpretation.

When an individual investigates the fundamental mysteries of our universe, literally *everything*, every facet of our world, qualifies as evidence. The *facts* of our universe are things that humans indisputably observe and experience day to day. The facts of our universe encompass more than the tangible, concrete evidence, such as the existence of the sun, moon and stars, for example. General facets of life are also indisputably experienced, such as the realities of pain, pleasure, instincts, communication, aging, death, intelligence, sleep, humor, emotions, philosophy, aesthetics, war, morality, ethics, and self-consciousness.

That religious claims exist is a fact, but clearly there are *many* conflicting claims to divine revelation, therefore (in the author's opinion), it is not helpful to regard any such claims as factual. Such claims can be compared to eyewitness testimony in court of law. Both can be evaluated on their internal consistency, coherency, alignment with the facts, and explanatory power.

Insisting that religious claims are not "real evidence" implies that one can throw them away without any real detriment to the investigation. Nothing could be further from the truth. If *any* claims to divine revelation are true, they will reveal *far, far* more than a simple evaluation of the facts would. Those who rely on the scientific method alone could never hope to trump revelation from a Creator God.