SHOW ME GOD!

Show me your qualification!

Ajit Krishna Dasa

Show Me God

Show me your qualification!

Ajita Kṛṣṇa Dāsa

First edition, 2026

Note on Scriptural Quotations

Scriptural quotations from the *Bhagavad-gītā* are taken from *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is* by A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda, used under fair use for purposes of commentary, criticism, and philosophical analysis.

Introduction – Why This Question Refuses to Die

Few questions sound as reasonable as this one: *"Show me God."*
It feels fair, honest, and intellectually responsible. To many people it sounds like the voice of common sense standing up to superstition. Some carry the question quietly for years, unsure what to do with it. Others wield it confidently, as if it settles the matter at once.

And yet, for all its apparent strength, the question never seems to lead anywhere. It does not resolve disagreement, it does not bring discussions to a close, and it does not even succeed in clarifying what is actually being asked. Instead, it lingers. It resurfaces in conversation after conversation, across cultures and generations. Over time, it hardens into a posture rather than functioning as a genuine inquiry.

This persistence is itself revealing.

If the question were as clear and decisive as it sounds, it should have done its work long ago. Either God would have been shown, or the demand would have been exposed as unreasonable. Instead, the question continues to circulate, unchanged, suggesting that something in it remains unresolved. Not unanswered, but unexamined.

This book exists because the question itself is rarely examined.

Most discussions move too quickly past it. They rush toward arguments about evidence, miracles, science, or history, assuming that the demand *"Show me God"* is already clear and unproblematic. God, it is assumed, has failed to appear, and the only remaining task is to debate whether the evidence that has been offered is sufficient. But what if the problem

lies earlier? What if the question already carries assumptions that quietly determine the outcome in advance?

What if *"Show me God"* is not the beginning of inquiry, but the end of it?

In ordinary life, we do not approach reality this way. We recognize without difficulty that understanding requires preparation, that seeing depends on perspective, and that some truths reveal themselves only under the right conditions. No one demands to understand mathematics before learning its language, or to judge music without first learning how to listen. No one insists on evaluating a medical diagnosis while refusing the basic tools required to interpret it.

We accept these limits easily. We do not experience them as humiliating or oppressive. We simply recognize that some forms of understanding come only after discipline, training, and adjustment.

All of this seems obvious — until the subject becomes God.

At that point, something curious happens. The demand for qualification disappears. The demand for humility vanishes. The demand for self-examination is quietly removed. God alone is placed on trial, as if the human standpoint required no scrutiny of its own. The one subject that would most obviously exceed the limits of ordinary perception is treated as if it should be immediately accessible to untrained, unexamined judgment.

This inversion rarely feels strange to us, because it has become culturally normal. We are taught to trust our instincts, to regard doubt as virtue, and to treat resistance as honesty. The modern ideal of the "critical thinker" is someone who questions everything except his own standpoint. The possibility that we might need adjustment before judging reality is rarely entertained.

This book does not attempt to prove God as a theory or defend Him as an abstract idea. It does not ask the reader to suspend reason, nor does it offer comfort in place of clarity. What it does is simpler, and for that reason more unsettling: it examines the demand itself. It asks what kind of being could be "shown" on command, what kind of seeing is being assumed, and what kind of neutrality is being claimed when the demand is made.

It also asks whether the question has been framed in a way that makes recognition possible at all.

To ask *"Show me God"* is not merely to ask for information. It is to assume something about how knowledge works, about who stands in judgment, and about what counts as a legitimate answer. These assumptions are rarely stated, but they shape the entire discussion. Until they are brought into the open, no amount of argument will ever be enough.

You will not find technical philosophy here, nor appeals to blind faith. You will not be asked to accept conclusions prematurely or submit to emotional pressure. What you will encounter instead is a careful examination of a familiar assumption: the assumption that refusal to accept God begins from an empty, innocent place, free of commitments and prior judgments.

But human beings never stand on empty ground. Even the act of questioning presupposes order, meaning, and trust in reason. One cannot even deny God without borrowing from God.

If the assumption of neutrality holds, then the demand *"Show me God"* makes sense. If it does not, the question changes entirely.

This book is an invitation to slow down and look again — not at God first, but at the posture from which we demand to see Him.

Show Me God!

Few sentences sound more confident than this one: *"Show me God."* Few, at the same time, reveal more confusion. The phrase is usually spoken as if it were a humble request for evidence, a reasonable challenge, even a mark of intellectual honesty. It presents itself as open-minded and cautious, as though acceptance of God has merely been postponed until the proper demonstration appears.

But the sentence is not as innocent as it pretends to be. Hidden inside it are assumptions so large that they usually go unnoticed. Before we ask whether God has shown Himself, we should pause and ask something more basic: **who is asking, and from what position?**

The demand *"Show me God"* assumes that the speaker stands in judgment over reality, that God — if He exists — is obliged to appear on command, and that the human senses and intellect are already qualified to evaluate whatever might appear. God is treated like an object on a table, a suspect in a lineup, or an exhibit in a museum. *"Bring Him out,"* the demand says, *"and then I will decide."*

But this is not how knowledge works in any other area of life.

A student does not demand that mathematics prove itself before learning its basic rules. A patient does not interrogate the doctor as an equal before accepting diagnosis or treatment. A person unfamiliar with a foreign language does not insist that the language explain itself to him before he learns to listen. In every meaningful field, qualification precedes perception. Training precedes understanding. Submission to reality precedes mastery of it.

Even in ordinary, non-technical matters, we recognize this without difficulty. No one expects to appreciate music without learning how to listen, or to judge a complex craft without first understanding its internal standards. We accept that ignorance disqualifies judgment — not because we are weak, but because reality does not bend itself to our impatience.

Yet when it comes to God, the order is suddenly reversed. The least qualified observer assumes the highest authority. The human being, limited, conditioned, and finite, places himself in the position of judge over the source of existence itself.

This is not skepticism. It is entitlement.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses this mentality directly in the Bhagavad-gītā:

> *nāhaṁ prakāśaḥ sarvasya*
> *yoga-māyā-samāvṛtaḥ*
> *mūḍho 'yaṁ nābhijānāti*
> *loko mām ajam avyayam*
> (Bg. 7.25)
>
> "**I am never manifest to the foolish and unintelligent. For them I am covered by My eternal creative potency [yoga-māyā]; and so the deluded world knows Me not, who am unborn and infallible.**"

This verse is often misunderstood. It is not saying that God hides arbitrarily, or that He withholds Himself out of cruelty or favoritism. It is stating something far more uncomfortable: **visibility depends on qualification.** Kṛṣṇa does not say, *"I do not exist for them."* He says, *"They do not recognize Me."* The problem is not absence. It is misalignment.

Consider a simple analogy. If a person is color-blind, the world does not become colorless. Red does not vanish. Green does not disappear. The limitation lies in the observer, not in reality. Demanding that colors rearrange themselves to suit one's deficiency would be absurd. The only solution is correction of vision.

Or consider someone who lacks musical training. A complex symphony may sound chaotic or dull, not because the music is defective, but because the listener lacks the capacity to hear what is there. The music does not announce itself as profound to the untrained ear. Understanding follows preparation.

In the same way, the Bhagavad-gītā does not flatter human perception. It does not treat the senses as neutral instruments automatically fit for ultimate truth. On the contrary, it repeatedly warns that perception is conditioned, distorted, and shaped by desire. What we want to see influences what we are able to see. What we are unwilling to accept quietly determines what we declare to be "unseen."

So when someone says, *"Show me God,"* the first questions are unavoidable: **with what eyes? With what attitude? Under what assumptions?**

God, according to the Gītā, is not an inert object waiting to be detected. He is not a chemical element, a distant planet, or a mathematical constant. He is a person. And persons do not reveal themselves under coercion.

Imagine demanding intimacy from another human being. Imagine insisting, *"Prove that you love me — now — on my terms — or I will deny that you exist."* The demand itself would make genuine relationship

impossible. Trust cannot be forced. Love cannot be compelled. Recognition cannot be extracted like data.

We understand this instinctively in human relationships. A person who demands proof of loyalty before offering trust ensures that trust will never arise. The posture destroys the very thing it claims to seek.

The same applies here, but on an infinitely higher level.

God does not submit to human inspection because He is not inferior to the inspector. The demand *"Show me God"* quietly assumes the opposite: that the human being stands above God as judge, examiner, and final authority. It assumes that the human mind is already clear, neutral, and competent, and that the only obstacle to accepting God lies on God's side.

This assumption is never argued for. It is simply smuggled in. And that is precisely why the question feels powerful while proving nothing.

Śrīla Prabhupāda often responded to this demand by calmly turning it around: *"First show me your qualification."* This was not a clever rhetorical trick. It was a statement of how reality works.

If God is the source of all existence, all intelligence, and all meaning, then approaching Him as if He were on trial is already a category mistake. One does not interrogate the foundation of one's own reasoning without standing on it at the same time. One does not deny the sun while using its light to see. One cannot even deny God without borrowing from God.

The demand *"Show me God"* pretends to be open-minded, but it is often the opposite. It is a refusal to adjust one's posture. It is the insistence

that reality conform to one's expectations rather than the willingness to conform to reality.

And this is why the question never leads where it claims to want to go.

God is not hiding behind a lack of evidence. He is not absent from the world. He is not playing a game of cosmic hide-and-seek. What stands in the way is something far more ordinary and far more stubborn: the unwillingness to accept that **seeing requires qualification**.

Until that is faced, no amount of "showing" would ever be enough. The problem is not that God has failed to show Himself. The problem is that we demand to see Him without changing anything about ourselves.

And reality does not work that way.

Seeing Requires Qualification

We speak casually about “seeing” as if it were automatic. Open your eyes, and there it is: reality, delivered raw, requiring no preparation. Seeing, in this everyday sense, feels passive and effortless, as though the world simply presents itself and the mind receives it without distortion.

But in every serious area of life, this idea collapses almost immediately.

You cannot see mathematics without training. A page filled with symbols is meaningless to someone who has never learned how to read it. You cannot see music on a page without learning its language; notes remain marks on paper until the ear and mind are trained to hear what they signify. You cannot see a disease on an X-ray without medical knowledge; what looks like a meaningless blur to one person becomes a clear diagnosis to another.

In each of these cases, the information is present long before the understanding arrives. The problem is never that the reality is missing. The problem is that the observer is unqualified.

We accept this without protest. No one feels insulted by the idea that learning precedes judgment. No one demands that advanced knowledge submit itself to ignorance for validation. We simply recognize that some kinds of seeing require preparation.

Yet when it comes to God, many people suddenly insist that seeing should be effortless. If God exists, they say, He should be visible to anyone, immediately, without preparation, correction, or change. Anything less is dismissed as failure on God’s part.

This expectation is not rational. It is naïve.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses this directly in the Bhagavad-gītā when Arjuna asks to see Him in His universal form. Kṛṣṇa does not say, "Look harder," nor does He suggest that the problem lies in insufficient effort. Instead, He says:

> *na tu māṁ śakyase draṣṭum*
> *anenaiva sva-cakṣuṣā*
> *divyaṁ dadāmi te cakṣuḥ*
> *paśya me yogam aiśvaram*
> (Bg. 11.8)
>
> "**But you cannot see Me with your present eyes. Therefore I give to you divine eyes by which you can behold My mystic opulence.**"

This verse is devastating to the casual demand *"Show me God."* Arjuna is not a skeptic. He is standing in front of God Himself. He is sincere, respectful, and already devoted. And still Kṛṣṇa tells him plainly that his present eyes are not enough.

The limitation is not distance. It is not lighting conditions. It is not a lack of evidence. The limitation is the instrument of perception itself. This should not be controversial. We accept it everywhere else.

A person born blind cannot see the sun. That does not make the sun invisible, imaginary, or hidden. It makes the observer blind. The sun does not owe the blind man a new definition of light, nor is it obligated to rearrange itself to accommodate his condition. The only solution is a change in vision.

The same applies to someone who lacks hearing. Music does not cease to exist because it cannot be heard. Silence does not become the truth

simply because perception is limited. The deficiency lies in the receiver, not in the reality being received.

In the same way, the Bhagavad-gītā does not flatter the human senses. It does not treat them as neutral tools that deliver reality exactly as it is. Again and again, it describes them as unreliable, easily misled, and deeply shaped by desire. What we see is not determined solely by what is "out there," but by what we are prepared — and willing — to receive.

This is why qualification matters.

When someone says, *"I don't see God,"* that statement by itself proves nothing. It does not tell us whether God is absent. It tells us something about the condition of the observer. And until that condition is examined, the claim has no force.

In ordinary life, we instinctively understand this. If someone claims that advanced physics is meaningless, we do not assume physics has failed. We assume the person has not studied it. If someone dismisses a foreign language as incoherent noise, we do not conclude that the language lacks structure. We conclude that the listener has not learned how to hear it.

But when God is the subject, this basic reasoning is often abandoned.

The modern mindset resists this conclusion fiercely. We are trained to believe that our perception is sovereign, that our reasoning stands above all judgment, and that anything which cannot be immediately accessed by our senses is suspect. The idea that we might require correction before judging reality feels insulting. It is experienced as an attack on autonomy rather than a recognition of limitation.

But reality is not obligated to flatter us.

If there is a Supreme Being — the source of consciousness, intelligence, and existence itself — then it would be strange if He were immediately accessible to untrained, undisciplined, and self-interested perception. It would be strange if the highest truth required less preparation than a university degree, a scientific discipline, or a musical instrument.

We accept years of training to see patterns in data, to hear harmony in sound, or to recognize meaning in symbols. Yet many insist that God, if He exists, should be visible without any corresponding transformation of the observer. This expectation says more about human impatience than about divine absence.

The demand *"Show me God"* quietly assumes that no preparation should be necessary. It assumes that the human being already stands at the center of reality, equipped with everything needed to judge the ultimate. It assumes that the problem, if there is one, must lie elsewhere.

The Bhagavad-gītā says otherwise.

Seeing God is not a matter of accumulating information. It is a matter of transformation. It requires a change in orientation, not an increase in data. Just as Arjuna required a different kind of sight, the soul requires purification of vision — not louder evidence or more dramatic displays.

This immediately exposes the weakness of the demand.

If someone refuses to adjust their eyesight, refuses to question their assumptions, and refuses to accept that perception itself can be conditioned, then nothing will ever be enough. Even if God were to stand directly in front of them, they would still be looking with the wrong eyes — borrowing from God the very capacities by which they deny Him.

That is not skepticism. It is stubbornness disguised as caution.

The Bhagavad-gītā does not say, *"God is difficult to see."* It says, in effect, *"You are not yet equipped to see Him."* And until that truth is faced, the question *"Why doesn't God show Himself?"* is premature.

The real question is simpler — and far more uncomfortable:

What qualifies me to see anything at all?

You Are Already Seeing Him

When people say, “If God exists, why can’t I see Him?” they usually imagine a universe empty of divine presence. God, if He exists at all, is thought to be far away—hidden behind clouds, silence, or some unreachable distance. The world itself is treated as neutral ground, a kind of raw material waiting to be interpreted. God, in this picture, would have to intrude into an otherwise godless scene in order to be noticed.

But this picture is already mistaken.

The Bhagavad-gītā does not describe a world in which God is absent. It describes a world saturated with Him—so saturated, in fact, that we no longer recognize what we are looking at. God is not presented as a rare interruption in nature, but as its constant foundation.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa states this plainly:

> *raso ’ham apsu kaunteya*
> *prabhāsmi śaśi-sūryayoḥ*
> *praṇavaḥ sarva-vedeṣu*
> *śabdaḥ khe pauruṣaṁ nṛṣu*
> (Bg. 7.8)
>
> “**O son of Kuntī [Arjuna], I am the taste of water, the light of the sun and the moon, the syllable om in the Vedic mantras; I am the sound in ether and ability in man.**”

This is not poetic decoration or metaphorical flourish. It is a direct statement about perception. God is not claiming to be hidden behind the world. He is claiming to be present within it.

Every day, without effort, without philosophy, and without training, you encounter taste, light, sound, intelligence, and ability. You rely on them constantly. You trust them without reflection. You organize your life around them. And according to the Bhagavad-gītā, each of these experiences is already a form of divine self-disclosure.

Water quenches thirst. Light reveals form. Sound carries meaning. Intelligence solves problems. Ability allows action. These are not rare or mystical experiences; they are the most ordinary features of life. Yet Kṛṣṇa identifies precisely these as expressions of His presence.

So the question quietly shifts.

If God is present in the most basic features of experience, why does He feel absent?

The uncomfortable answer is not that God has failed to reveal Himself, but that we have learned to rename what we see. Instead of seeing God, we say "nature." Instead of intelligence, we say "biology." Instead of order, we say "chance plus time." The experience remains the same. Only the interpretation changes.

This is not neutrality. It is substitution.

A person who says, "I don't see God anywhere," is still seeing the same world everyone else sees. The same laws, the same regularities, the same astonishing coherence. What has changed is not the data, but the story told about it. The raw experience remains untouched; only its meaning is reassigned.

Imagine someone standing in bright sunlight and insisting that there is no sun—only "brightness." Or imagine someone listening to a symphony and denying the existence of music while praising

“vibrations in the air.” The denial does not remove the reality. It merely redescribes it in a way that avoids personal implication.

That is exactly what happens here.

Calling the world “godless” does not make it so. It simply drains it of meaning while continuing to live off the meaning that is already there. The mind borrows order, intelligence, coherence, and trust from reality while denying that reality has a source. It uses the gift while refusing to acknowledge the giver.

Even the attempt to deny God depends on Him. I cannot think, reason, or argue against God without borrowing from God — using the very intelligence and order that His presence sustains.

Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam makes this point explicit, and in doing so removes the last refuge of the hiddenness objection. It states that the problem is not lack of access, but distorted intelligence:

> “**A materialist, his intelligence perverted by the action of his deceptive senses, cannot recognize You at all, although You are always present within his own senses and heart and also among the objects of his perception. Yet even though one’s understanding has been covered by Your illusory potency, if one obtains Vedic knowledge from You, the supreme spiritual master of all, he can directly understand You.**”
> (SB 12.8.48)

This is a decisive clarification.

God is not merely inferred from the world. He is present within perception itself—within the senses, within the heart, and within the very objects being perceived. Non-recognition is not caused by absence,

but by perversion of intelligence shaped by deceptive senses. The issue is not that God is too subtle to be seen, but that consciousness has become misaligned.

This is why purification of consciousness, not accumulation of evidence, is the decisive factor. When understanding is corrected at its source, recognition is not indirect or theoretical. It becomes direct.

This strategy of reinterpretation is subtle, and that is why it is so effective. Nothing obvious needs to be denied. No experience has to be rejected. One only needs to rename. God does not have to be argued against; He only has to be explained away.

And this is where the idea of divine hiddenness quietly collapses.

God is not hidden in the sense that there is no access. He is hidden only in the sense that He does not force recognition. He allows Himself to be ignored, renamed, and reinterpreted. He allows the soul to explain Him away without removing the very experiences that point toward Him.

This is not absence. It is restraint.

If God wanted to make denial impossible, He could. A single overwhelming display would be enough. But impossibility of denial would also mean impossibility of freedom. Recognition would no longer be meaningful; it would be automatic. Love would no longer be chosen; it would be imposed.

Instead, the world is structured in a subtler way. There is enough light for those who want to see, and enough ambiguity for those who want to look away. The same sun that reveals everything can be ignored by someone who keeps their eyes shut. The same order that awakens wonder in one person can be dismissed as coincidence by another.

This explains a great deal about the persistence of denial.

Two people can live in the same world, breathe the same air, rely on the same intelligence, and observe the same order—and come to radically different conclusions about God. This is difficult to explain if acceptance of God is merely a matter of evidence. It becomes obvious once we recognize that interpretation is guided by orientation and desire, not by data alone.

So when someone says, “I don’t see God in the world,” what they are really saying is, “I see the world in a way that excludes Him.” That is not a failure of evidence. It is a refusal of recognition.

The Bhagavad-gītā does not ask you to imagine a God hiding behind reality, waiting to be discovered like a lost object. It asks you to recognize a God already expressing Himself through reality—quietly, consistently, patiently.

You are already seeing Him. You always have been.

The real issue is not God’s presence, but whether we are willing to acknowledge what we are looking at.

God Is a Person, Not an Exhibit

When people say “Show me God,” they usually imagine the same kind of showing they expect everywhere else. Show me a planet. Show me a molecule. Show me a photograph. Show me the evidence. The demand assumes a familiar pattern: something exists, it can be isolated, inspected, measured, and then judged from a position of control.

But this expectation quietly assumes something crucial — that God, if He exists, should behave like an object.

Objects can be inspected. They can be measured, dissected, repeated, and placed under experimental control. They do not respond. They do not withhold themselves. They do not care how they are approached. A rock does not reveal itself more fully because one is respectful, nor does it conceal itself because one is hostile.

Persons are different.

A person cannot be known in the same way an object can. You cannot reduce a person to data without losing what makes them a person. You cannot force a person into genuine self-disclosure. You cannot demand friendship, intimacy, or trust on command. Even the simplest human relationship collapses under that kind of pressure.

This distinction is so obvious in ordinary life that it rarely needs explanation — except when it comes to God, where it is routinely ignored.

If you want to know another human being, you must approach them in a certain way. You listen. You wait. You allow space. You show a degree of openness yourself. You accept that the other person remains free to

reveal as much or as little as they choose. Any attempt to control the process destroys it.

Imagine approaching someone and saying, “Prove that you are trustworthy.” Or, “Demonstrate your love for me right now, or I will deny that it exists.” The very demand poisons the relationship. Whatever is shown under coercion ceases to be what it was meant to be. Love shown under force is not love. Trust extracted under threat is not trust.

Yet this is precisely the posture many people adopt toward God.

They speak as if God were an exhibit in a courtroom, required to appear on command, submit to interrogation, and justify His existence before a skeptical judge. The human being becomes the examiner; God becomes the suspect. The assumption is that God owes an explanation, and that the human being is entitled to withhold recognition until satisfied.

This is not how personal reality works.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa describes the nature of divine revelation in a single, devastating sentence in the Bhagavad-gītā:

> ye yathā māṁ prapadyante
> tāṁs tathaiva bhajāmy aham
> (Bg. 4.11)
>
> **“All of them—as they surrender unto Me—I reward accordingly.”**

This verse does not describe revelation as automatic or mechanical. It does not suggest that God reveals Himself once a certain evidential

threshold has been met. It describes revelation as relational. God responds according to the attitude with which He is approached.

Revelation, in other words, is not triggered by demands, but by orientation. Not by challenge, but by approach.

This immediately exposes the flaw in the demand “Show me God.” The demand assumes that God must reveal Himself regardless of the posture of the one demanding. It assumes that intention, desire, humility, and openness are irrelevant. It treats divine self-disclosure as if it were a natural process rather than a personal exchange.

But no personal being operates that way — not even on a human level.

We instinctively understand this in every other context. A person who approaches others with suspicion and hostility will experience the world as cold and unresponsive. Someone who treats every interaction as a test will rarely encounter trust. The problem in such cases is not that other people are incapable of relationship. It is that the posture of approach makes relationship impossible.

The Bhagavad-gītā applies this same logic to God.

God does not subject Himself to forced disclosure because forced disclosure would destroy the very purpose of revelation. The goal is not mere acknowledgment. It is relationship. And relationship requires freedom on both sides.

This is why the Gītā consistently presents God not as an impersonal force or abstract principle, but as a conscious, independent person. He speaks. He chooses. He reciprocates. He withholds or reveals Himself according to wisdom, not obligation. He is not a passive object waiting to be discovered, but an active subject who responds.

This independence is often mistaken for hiddenness. But hiddenness is the wrong word.

God is not hiding out of fear. He is not absent out of weakness. He is not concealed because He lacks evidence. He is reserved because He respects the soul's freedom to approach Him willingly — or not at all.

If God were to override that freedom by overwhelming display, recognition would become unavoidable. But unavoidable recognition is not devotion; it is compulsion. Love would be replaced by submission to brute force. Relationship would collapse into mere acknowledgment of power.

The irony here is sharp.

Many of the same people who insist that God must reveal Himself unmistakably also complain about authoritarian religion, coercion, and loss of freedom. Yet the kind of revelation they demand would produce exactly that: a universe in which denial is impossible and freedom is largely cosmetic.

The Bhagavad-gītā offers something far more coherent.

God reveals Himself enough to be known, but not enough to be unavoidable. Enough light for those who want to see, and enough ambiguity for those who want to look away. Enough presence for relationship, and enough distance for freedom. This balance is not a defect in the system. It is the system.

Once this is understood, the demand "Show me God" begins to look deeply confused. It treats a personal being as if He were an object. It treats relationship as if it were data. It treats freedom as if it were an inconvenience rather than a necessary condition for love.

God is not an exhibit waiting behind a curtain. He is not a specimen to be produced on demand. He is a person who responds.

And that means the decisive factor is not how loudly we demand, but how we approach.

If we approach God as a suspect, we will always find reasons to remain unconvinced. If we approach Him as an object, we will be disappointed that He behaves like a person. But if we approach Him as a person, we open the door to recognition.

The question is no longer whether God has shown Himself. The question is whether we are approaching Him in a way that makes seeing even possible.

The Myth of Neutrality

One of the most powerful assumptions behind the demand “Show me God” is rarely stated out loud. It is simply taken for granted. The assumption is this: *I am neutral*. Neutral in outlook. Neutral in reasoning. Neutral in judgment. God, we are told, must present Himself to this neutral observer, and only then will acceptance of God be considered justified. Until that moment, rejection is framed as cautious, responsible, even virtuous.

But this neutrality does not exist.
It never has.

Every human being approaches reality with expectations already in place. Long before we begin arguing, we are already trusting. We trust our memory. We rely on reason. We assume that the world will behave tomorrow roughly as it did today. We expect meaning, coherence, and intelligibility—not just emotionally, but practically. We plan, infer, predict, and judge without hesitation.

None of these commitments are proven first. All of them are assumed.

In ordinary life, this is unavoidable. You cannot wake up each morning and re-establish the reliability of your memory before getting dressed. You do not test the laws of logic before finishing a sentence. You do not verify the uniformity of nature before crossing the street. You simply trust that the world makes sense and that your mind is capable of navigating it.

The modern skeptic often speaks as if acceptance of God were the only commitment that requires justification, while everything else simply comes for free. But this is an illusion. Long before anyone asks whether

God exists, they are already standing on a web of unexamined trust: trust in logic, trust in perception, trust in language, trust in causation, trust in meaning itself.

These are not conclusions reached after careful analysis.
They are the conditions that make analysis possible in the first place.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa points directly to this deeper layer when He says in the *Bhagavad-gītā*:

> *sarvasya cāhaṁ hṛdi sanniviṣṭo*
> *mattaḥ smṛtir jñānam apohanaṁ ca*
> (Bg. 15.15)
>
> "**I am seated in everyone's heart, and from Me come remembrance, knowledge and forgetfulness.**"

This verse quietly dismantles the myth of neutrality. Knowledge itself is not self-sustaining. Memory is not autonomous. Even forgetfulness—the ability to overlook, suppress, or reinterpret—is accounted for. The very faculties we rely on to evaluate God are already dependent on something deeper than themselves.

And yet, the skeptic insists on judging God by means of tools whose existence he cannot account for.

This is the great irony.

When someone says, "I will accept God when the evidence convinces me," they are already assuming that evidence is meaningful, that reasoning is reliable, and that truth is something the human mind can access. These assumptions are not established by atheism. They are

inherited. They are borrowed from a worldview in which reality is ordered, intelligible, and trustworthy.

In other words, the skeptic stands on ground he did not build.

And this dependence cannot be avoided.
I cannot even deny God without borrowing from God.
The intelligence I trust, the reason I appeal to, and the meaning I assume are already coming from the very reality I am attempting to exclude.

The claim of neutrality collapses as soon as we examine how knowledge actually works. No one reasons from nowhere. No one observes without interpretation. No one evaluates evidence without a framework already in place. Even deciding what counts as evidence presupposes values, priorities, and expectations.

Consider something as simple as scientific inquiry. Science depends on the assumption that the universe is orderly, that causes precede effects, and that human reasoning is capable of grasping real patterns in nature. None of these assumptions are scientific discoveries. They are philosophical commitments made in advance of experimentation. Without them, science would never begin.

Yet the skeptic often treats science as if it floats in midair, requiring no deeper grounding. God is asked to justify Himself, while reason, logic, and meaning are quietly exempted from scrutiny. They are treated as self-evident and self-sustaining.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* does not flatter this picture. It presents consciousness as dependent, conditioned, and situated within a larger order. Our ability to know is real, but it is not autonomous. Reason is powerful, but

it is not self-explanatory. Memory functions, but it does not generate itself.

This is why the demand for proof so often rings hollow.

The skeptic demands that God justify Himself to human reason, while quietly exempting human reason from any justification at all. Reason is treated as the final court of appeal rather than something that itself needs an explanation. But if reason is merely an accident of matter, if consciousness is a byproduct of blind forces, and if thought is nothing more than chemistry rearranging itself, then the very act of trusting reasoning becomes questionable.

Why should chemical reactions be trusted to reveal truth rather than merely promote survival? Why should thoughts shaped by reproduction and efficiency be assumed to track reality itself? Why should what is *useful* be confused with what is *true*?

These questions are rarely followed to their end, because doing so is uncomfortable. Taken seriously, they destabilize the confidence with which rejection of God is usually expressed. So instead of being examined, neutrality is asserted. The starting point is assumed rather than defended.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* offers a different picture. Knowledge is not floating free. It is grounded. It has a source. And because it has a source, it has direction. It can be aligned—or misaligned.

This is where the idea of suppression enters, quietly but decisively.

If knowledge ultimately flows from a personal source, then refusing to acknowledge that source does not make knowledge disappear. It distorts

it. It redirects it. It bends it away from recognition. The skeptic does not lack access to truth; he lacks willingness to follow it where it leads.

This explains something that otherwise appears puzzling: why denial can coexist with intelligence. Why brilliant minds can argue passionately against the very foundations that make their arguments possible. Why rationality can be used to undermine the conditions that make rationality meaningful.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* accounts for this by including forgetfulness alongside knowledge. Forgetfulness is not merely a failure; it serves a function. It allows the soul to avoid conclusions it is unwilling to accept. It allows intelligence to be used selectively, preserving autonomy at the cost of coherence.

The myth of neutrality allows the skeptic to feel intellectually responsible while never questioning the ground he stands on. It allows him to say, "I'm just waiting for evidence," while quietly assuming that evidence, meaning, and reason require no explanation. It postpones the real question indefinitely.

But once neutrality collapses, the conversation changes.

The question is no longer, "Why hasn't God shown Himself?"
It becomes, "Why do I trust my mind while denying its source?"

That question does not go away easily. It lingers. It presses. It destabilizes the confidence with which rejection is often held.

And once it is faced, the original demand—"Show me God"—no longer sounds like cautious inquiry. It begins to sound like evasion.

Hiddenness or Resistance?

One of the most popular modern objections to God sounds compassionate and reasonable. It is often framed carefully, almost gently. It goes something like this: *"If God is loving, why does He remain hidden? Why are sincere people left in doubt? Why does God not make His existence clear to everyone who honestly seeks Him?"*

At first glance, the objection feels humane. It speaks the language of fairness and care. It assumes that rejection of God is often innocent, that many people would gladly accept God if only He made Himself clearer. In this picture, divine hiddenness appears puzzling, even troubling — especially if God is meant to be loving.

But this entire line of reasoning rests on a picture of the human condition that the *Bhagavad-gītā* does not accept.

The Gītā does not describe human beings as neutral seekers standing in the dark, waiting for divine light to switch on. It does not portray rejection of God as the natural result of insufficient information. Instead, it describes conscious beings who have already turned away — and who now interpret that turning as absence.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa says:

> *īśvaraḥ sarva-bhūtānāṁ*
> *hṛd-deśe 'rjuna tiṣṭhati*
> *bhrāmayan sarva-bhūtāni*
> *yantrārūḍhāni māyayā*
> (Bg. 18.61)

“**The Supreme Lord is situated in everyone's heart, O Arjuna, and is directing the wanderings of all living entities, who are seated as on a machine, made of the material energy.**”

This verse leaves very little room for the idea that God is distant. God is not described as far away, silent, or withdrawn. He is described as present — intimately present — accompanying the soul in every condition of life. He is not watching from afar; He is within.

The problem, then, is not divine absence. It is divine rejection.

Hiddenness, in this light, is not something God does to the soul. It is something the soul does *with* God.

The modern argument assumes that rejection of God results from a lack of information. If only the right evidence were supplied, acceptance would naturally follow. But this assumption collapses as soon as we examine how human beings actually function.

We do not absorb truth passively. We interpret, resist, reshape, and redirect it. We accept what suits us and suppress what threatens our sense of independence. Knowledge does not automatically produce acceptance, and evidence does not automatically lead to recognition.

This is not speculation. It is everyday experience.

People ignore uncomfortable medical diagnoses even when the evidence is clear. They reinterpret destructive habits despite knowing the consequences. They rationalize obvious moral boundaries when obedience becomes costly. We all know what it is like to *know* something and yet live as if we do not.

Why should God be the one exception?

The *Bhagavad-gītā* presents forgetfulness not as a tragic accident, but as a consequence of orientation. When the soul turns away from God, forgetfulness follows — not because God vanishes, but because recognition becomes unwanted. The light does not go out; the eyes turn away.

This perspective explains something the hiddenness argument struggles to account for.

Why do people with access to the same world, the same experiences, and the same basic evidence reach radically different conclusions about God? Why does one person see meaning everywhere while another sees none at all? Why does suffering awaken humility and devotion in one person and deepen resistance in another?

If rejection of God were simply the result of insufficient evidence, this should not happen. Equal exposure should lead to roughly equal conclusions. But if acceptance and rejection are tied to posture rather than data, the pattern makes perfect sense.

God allows Himself to be resisted.

He does not overpower the soul's desire for independence. He does not override the will with irresistible proof. Instead, He permits reinterpretation. He permits distance. He permits the illusion of autonomy. The soul is allowed to say, *"I see nothing,"* even while surrounded by signs.

This permission is often mistaken for abandonment.

But it is not abandonment. It is respect.

A God who forced recognition would also force relationship. A God who removed all ambiguity would remove freedom. If acceptance were unavoidable, it would no longer be meaningful. If recognition were compulsory, love would collapse into compliance.

The God of the *Bhagavad-gītā* does neither.

Instead, He remains present enough to be found by those who genuinely want Him, and restrained enough to be avoided by those who do not. He does not make rejection impossible, nor does He make acceptance effortless. He allows the soul to choose not only what it acknowledges, but how it interprets what it encounters.

This balance explains a great deal.

It explains why some people experience God as obvious and immediate, while others experience Him as distant or nonexistent — even in the same circumstances. It explains why profound experiences are taken as guidance by one person and dismissed as coincidence by another. It explains why rejection of God often feels settled and self-justifying rather than tragic.

The hiddenness argument assumes that the sincere seeker is abandoned.
The *Bhagavad-gītā* suggests something more unsettling: that sincerity itself is often overestimated.

This is not a moral accusation. It is a diagnosis.

We are very good at mistaking resistance for neutrality, and reluctance for honesty. We describe ourselves as open-minded while carefully avoiding the one conclusion that would demand change. We frame our hesitation as intellectual caution, when it is often existential reluctance.

The question, then, is not why God remains hidden. The question is why we prefer Him to be.

God's presence does not vanish when He is ignored. It is simply reinterpreted as absence.

And that reinterpretation can continue indefinitely — not because God is far away, but because He refuses to violate the soul's freedom to turn away.

Hiddenness, in this sense, is not evidence against God. It is evidence of how seriously He takes us.

What Would “Showing Himself” Even Mean?

At this point in the discussion, the demand “Show me God” begins to wobble. Not because God has been successfully defended, but because the demand itself has never been properly examined. It has been treated as self-evident, as though everyone already knows what it would mean for God to “show Himself.”

But that assumption does not survive even a moment of scrutiny.

So let us finally ask the obvious question: **what, exactly, would count as God “showing Himself”?**

This question is almost never answered. It is repeated endlessly, but rarely clarified. And without clarification, the demand remains vague enough to feel powerful while being impossible to satisfy.

Would God have to appear visibly in the sky? Would He need to speak audibly to every individual, in their own language, on demand? Would He have to suspend natural laws at will, performing public miracles whenever requested? And even if He did all of this — then what?

Would recognition automatically follow?
Would interpretation disappear?
Would doubt evaporate?

History already provides an answer.

According to the *Bhagavad-gītā*, God has spoken directly. He has appeared personally. He has revealed extraordinary forms, performed acts that defy ordinary explanation, and interacted openly with human beings. And still, many who witnessed these things rejected what they were seeing.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa addresses this directly:

> *avajānanti māṁ mūḍhā*
> *mānuṣīṁ tanum āśritam*
> *paraṁ bhāvam ajānanto*
> *mama bhūta-maheśvaram*
> (Bg. 9.11)

"**Fools deride Me when I descend in the human form. They do not know My transcendental nature and My supreme dominion over all that be.**"

This verse exposes the fantasy behind the demand for manifestation. God can appear openly and still be dismissed. God can stand directly in front of someone and still be misinterpreted. The problem is not visibility. The problem is **recognition**.

Why does this happen?

Because interpretation always precedes acknowledgment. A miracle does not interpret itself. An appearance does not explain itself. A display of power does not automatically reveal meaning. Events, no matter how extraordinary, still have to be understood — and understanding depends on the framework the observer already brings.

Someone who does not want to recognize God will always have an alternative explanation ready. If something extraordinary happens, it becomes coincidence. If it happens repeatedly, it becomes a law of nature. If it defies known laws, it becomes illusion, hallucination, deception, or mass psychology. The explanation changes, but the conclusion is protected.

The goalposts never stop moving.

This is not hypothetical. It is how rejection actually operates. We see this pattern everywhere. Clear evidence in one domain does not compel acceptance if the implications are unwanted. People reinterpret facts all the time when those facts threaten identity, autonomy, or control.

Once this is understood, the demand for God to "show Himself" begins to look deeply confused.

The demand assumes that there exists some level of evidence so overwhelming that rejection would become impossible. But that assumption ignores how human beings actually relate to reality. We do not passively absorb facts. We frame them. We contextualize them. We decide in advance what counts as an acceptable explanation.

Evidence never stands alone. It is always read through a lens.

And if the very category of God has already been rejected, no amount of manifestation can compel recognition. The problem is not the strength of the evidence, but the refusal of the category itself.

This reveals something crucial. The demand "Show me God" is not really about seeing. It is about **control**.

It demands a God who submits to human terms, appears on cue, and conforms to expectations already in place. It asks for a God who can be summoned, evaluated, and either accepted or dismissed at leisure.

But such a being would not be God.

He would be a phenomenon — perhaps impressive, perhaps mysterious, but ultimately manageable. He would be something *within*

the world, not the source of it. Something subject to interpretation by a higher authority — namely, the human mind.

The God of the *Bhagavad-gītā* does not allow Himself to be reduced in this way. If He did, He would no longer be the foundation of reality, but one object among others. He would no longer ground meaning, but require meaning to be granted to Him by human judgment.

That inversion is precisely what the demand requires.

So when someone insists that God must "show Himself" in order to be accepted, they are unknowingly asking for a contradiction: a God who is supreme yet subordinate, ultimate yet accountable, absolute yet answerable to human standards.

Such a being cannot exist.

This explains why the demand never ends. Even if it were satisfied temporarily, it would immediately generate new requirements. More proof. Clearer signs. Less ambiguity. Greater certainty. Each concession would only produce the next demand.

But certainty is not what is really being sought.

What is being sought is safety — safety from implication, safety from surrender, safety from having to change. A God who can be controlled by evidence is a God who cannot demand allegiance. A God who must answer to us is a God who cannot command us.

If God were to show Himself in a way that removed all doubt, rejection would not be replaced by love or trust. It would be replaced by fear or compliance. Recognition would be forced, not chosen. Relationship would be impossible.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* does not present a God who plays this game.

Instead, it presents a God who reveals Himself enough to be known, but not enough to be unavoidable. Enough to invite, but not enough to coerce. Enough to awaken devotion, but not enough to destroy freedom.

Once this is seen, the demand "Show me God" loses its force. It no longer sounds like an honest request. It sounds like a refusal disguised as a challenge.

The problem is not that God has not shown Himself. The problem is that no amount of showing would ever be enough — because the terms of recognition have already been rejected.

And that means the obstacle lies elsewhere. Not in God's silence. Not in a lack of evidence. But in the unwillingness to accept what God would mean if He were truly seen.

The Real Cost of Seeing God

By now, the demand “Show me God” should sound different than it did at the beginning. It no longer feels like a simple request for evidence, nor like an innocent question asked from a neutral position. Something else has come into view — something quieter, more personal, and far harder to dismiss.

The real obstacle was never a lack of proof. It was the cost of recognition.

To see God is not merely to add a belief to an otherwise unchanged life. It is not like adopting a new opinion or revising a theory. To see God is to accept that reality has an owner, that meaning has a source, and that independence has limits. It is to admit that one is not self-grounding, self-explaining, or self-sufficient.

That admission is not cheap.

This is why resistance to God so often presents itself as intellectual. It feels safer to argue about evidence than to face implication. It feels more dignified to question God’s visibility than to ask what His visibility would require. The discussion stays abstract, and the self remains protected.

But the *Bhagavad-gītā* does not allow the issue to remain abstract.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa states the matter with disarming clarity:

> *sarva-dharmān parityajya*
> *mām ekaṁ śaraṇaṁ vraja*
> *ahaṁ tvāṁ sarva-pāpebhyo*

mokṣayiṣyāmi mā śucaḥ
(Bg. 18.66)

> "**Abandon all varieties of religion and just surrender unto Me. I shall deliver you from all sinful reaction. Do not fear.**"

This verse is often quoted devotionally, but its philosophical weight is immense. It does not say, "Acknowledge that I exist." It does not say, "Accept a proposition about Me." It says, "Surrender."

That is the price.

Seeing God means no longer standing at the center. It means no longer treating one's own preferences as final. It means accepting that meaning, morality, and purpose are received rather than invented. It means recognizing that life is not authored exclusively by the self.

For many people, this is the real reason God must remain "unseen." Not because He is implausible. Not because the evidence is weak. But because recognition would require reorientation.

And here something even more unsettling emerges.

The demand "Show me God" already assumes God.

The sentence itself only makes sense because logic is binding, because meaning is real, because truth is worth demanding, and because reality is expected to answer to reason. None of these make sense in a godless universe. Order, obligation, intelligibility, and value are already being borrowed in order to issue the demand.

I cannot even deny God without borrowing from God.

The very act of demanding that God be shown presupposes intelligence, meaning, normativity, and order — all of which point beyond the self. The protest is not spoken from outside God's reality. It is spoken *from within it*.

This is why the resistance feels so persistent. It is not the resistance of ignorance. It is the resistance of implication.

We see this pattern constantly in ordinary life. People delay decisions they already understand will change them. They avoid truths that would require responsibility. They postpone commitments that would narrow their options. The problem is not lack of knowledge, but reluctance. The hesitation is not intellectual, but existential.

Why should God be any different?

The modern world trains us carefully in autonomy. We are taught to see ourselves as authors of our own values, judges of our own truth, and owners of our own lives. Meaning is presented as something we construct and revise at will. God, if allowed in at all, is expected to fit politely into that framework — as a source of comfort, inspiration, or cultural identity.

But the God of the *Bhagavad-gītā* does not fit.

He does not exist to validate our independence. He exists to expose it as illusory. He does not confirm the self as sovereign; He reveals the self as dependent. And that revelation feels threatening before it feels liberating.

This does not mean that seeing God destroys freedom. It means it redefines it. Freedom is no longer the ability to invent reality according to preference, but the ability to live in harmony with what is real. The

fear is not that surrender will diminish us, but that it will reveal how fragile our self-made independence really is.

That fear explains a great deal.

It explains why objections multiply even when answers are available. It explains why hesitation persists even when explanations are coherent. It explains why many who claim to be open to accepting God remain permanently undecided. The cost has been sensed, even if it has not been admitted.

So the resistance continues — quietly, persistently. We ask for clearer signs. We raise new questions. We delay recognition in the name of balance, caution, or intellectual humility. All the while, the cost remains exactly the same.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* does not accuse the skeptic of dishonesty. It does something more unsettling: it takes him seriously. It treats his freedom as real — so real that God Himself will not override it.

God does not force recognition. He does not trap the soul into acceptance. He does not coerce surrender.

He allows resistance to continue as long as it is desired.

That permission is often mistaken for absence. But it is not absence. It is restraint. It is the decision to preserve freedom even when that freedom is used to turn away.

And this brings us full circle.

The demand “Show me God” began as a question about evidence. It ends as a question about willingness — not willingness to be convinced, but willingness to be changed.

One final point must be stated plainly. The demand “Show me God” is not merely resistant or cautious. It is internally self-defeating. The sentence can only be spoken by borrowing everything it denies. To demand proof already presupposes logic, meaning, moral obligation, and trust in reason — realities that make no sense in a godless universe. Even the expectation that an answer should be intelligible assumes an ordered reality and a mind fitted to truth. I cannot even deny God without borrowing from God. The demand stands only because the reality it rejects is already in place. God is not absent from the sentence that denies Him; He is what makes the sentence possible at all.

God is not hidden because He is weak. He is not silent because He is distant. He is not unseen because He is absent.

He is unseen because seeing Him would mean letting go of something we are not yet ready to release.

Control.
Autonomy.
The illusion of being self-made.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* does not force that release. It invites it — quietly, patiently, without compulsion. The light is already there. The knowledge is already present. The cost is already known.

What remains is not a lack of evidence. It is a decision.

Closing – He Is Not Hiding

We began with a demand: “Show me God.” At first, it sounded confident, reasonable, even responsible. It presented itself as a fair request made from a neutral position, as though acceptance were simply waiting for the right demonstration.

By now, that demand should no longer feel as secure as it once did. Not because it has been shouted down or dismissed, but because it has been understood. Examined carefully, it rested on assumptions that quietly carried the conclusion in advance. It assumed neutrality where none exists. It assumed qualification where none was established. It assumed that seeing requires no change in the seer.

Once those assumptions fall away, the question itself changes.

God is not hiding behind a lack of evidence. He is not absent from the world, nor is He silent because He is distant. According to the *Bhagavad-gītā*, He is present — in the world, in consciousness, in reason, and in the heart itself. What He does not do is override freedom. What He does not do is force recognition. What He does not do is submit to human control.

That restraint is often mistaken for absence. But it is not absence. It is respect.

A God who forced recognition would also destroy meaning. A God who made denial impossible would make love irrelevant. Recognition would no longer be chosen; it would be automatic. Faith would collapse into mere acknowledgment of power. The world we inhabit is balanced differently — deliberately and precisely — so that recognition remains possible, but never compulsory.

This balance explains much of what initially feels puzzling. It explains why the same world can appear saturated with meaning to one person and empty to another. It explains why acceptance and denial persist side by side without being settled by argument alone. And it explains why the demand “Show me God” continues to resurface even after its assumptions have been quietly exposed.

The uncomfortable implication is this: the question is no longer whether God has shown Himself. The question is whether we are willing to be shown to ourselves.

For the demand itself already testifies to something deeper. To demand that God be shown assumes logic that binds, meaning that matters, truth that obligates, and a reality expected to make sense. None of these are neutral. None of these are self-generated. The very sentence “Show me God” borrows from the order, intelligibility, and normativity it seeks to deny.

We cannot even deny God without borrowing from God.

This is why the issue never reduces to information. We are not standing outside reality, waiting for a signal. We are already living inside a world that presupposes meaning, coherence, and truth at every moment. The question is not whether God has made Himself known, but whether we are willing to acknowledge what our own reasoning already depends upon.

Seeing God is therefore not merely an intellectual event. It is not simply the acceptance of a proposition or the resolution of a debate. It is an existential encounter. It reorders priorities. It exposes pretenses. It dissolves the comforting illusion of self-sufficiency. It reveals that life is

not self-grounding, that meaning is received rather than invented, and that independence has limits.

And that is a cost many people are not prepared to pay.

So the demand remains. The question is repeated. The distance is attributed to God rather than to posture. The problem is framed as evidential rather than existential. But the light does not vanish because it is ignored. The sun does not disappear because eyes are closed. Reality does not become empty because it is reinterpreted.

God is not hiding.

He is present enough to be found by those who seek honestly, and distant enough to be avoided by those who prefer independence. This is not a defect in revelation. It is the condition that makes freedom real. Nothing more is required of Him. Nothing less would preserve the dignity of choice.

This is why the issue never resolves itself through argument alone. Arguments can clarify, expose assumptions, and remove confusion. But they cannot decide willingness. They cannot choose surrender. They cannot replace the personal reckoning that recognition demands.

In the end, what remains is not a lack of evidence, but a decision. Not a decision about whether God exists, but about whether we are willing to live in a reality where He does.

That decision does not announce itself loudly. It does not arrive with drama or force. It often appears quietly, disguised as hesitation, delay, or intellectual caution. It can be postponed indefinitely — not because the answer is unclear, but because the implications are unwanted.

The *Bhagavad-gītā* does not coerce that decision. It does not threaten resistance into submission. It offers clarity and leaves the response intact. God does not force recognition. He invites it.

The invitation remains open. The light remains present. The cost remains unchanged.

God is not hiding.

What remains is whether we are willing to stop demanding that He show Himself — and instead allow ourselves to be seen.

An Invitation

If this book has unsettled you, clarified something, or simply refused to go away, it has done its work. It was never meant to replace deeper inquiry. It was meant to remove an obstacle.

The arguments you have encountered here are not new. They were spoken plainly, repeatedly, and without compromise by one of the most extraordinary spiritual teachers of the modern age: **A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda**.

Śrīla Prabhupāda was not a speculative philosopher, nor a professional academic. He did not write to negotiate with modern doubt or adapt ancient truth to contemporary fashion. He spoke as a representative of a living tradition, with complete fidelity to its sources and complete confidence in its conclusions.

He presented the *Bhagavad-gītā* not as mythology, metaphor, or cultural artifact, but as what it claims to be: the direct words of God. He did so without apology, without dilution, and without concession to prevailing resistance.

What made Śrīla Prabhupāda unique was not merely what he taught, but how he taught it.

He did not flatter skepticism. He did not bargain with materialism. He did not treat God as a hypothesis to be negotiated.

He began where the *Bhagavad-gītā* begins — with God as the foundation of knowledge, meaning, and reality itself — and from there exposed the contradictions of a worldview that tries to think, reason, and live without Him.

When confronted with the demand “Show me God,” he did not retreat into abstraction or sentiment. He calmly revealed the confusion hidden inside the challenge and redirected attention to the only place where genuine understanding can begin: qualification, humility, and sincerity of approach.

If you wish to pursue these questions further — not as arguments, but as a serious engagement with reality — the natural next step is to read Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books themselves.

Begin with *Bhagavad-gītā As It Is*.

Read it slowly. Read it honestly. Read it on its own terms.

You will not be asked to abandon reason. You will be asked to stop pretending it stands on its own.

You may agree or disagree. But if you read sincerely, you will no longer be able to say that God has not spoken — or that He has not made Himself known.

The invitation stands.

Not as a demand.
Not as pressure.
But as an open door.

About the Author

Ajit Krishna Dasa writes from within the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition, drawing primarily on the teachings of A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda. His work examines the assumptions that lie beneath modern debates about God, reason, and skepticism, with a focus on clarity rather than persuasion.

More of the author's writings can be found at:

www.ajitkrishnadasa.me

“Show me God.”

It sounds reasonable. Careful. Even humble.

But what if this demand already assumes more than it can justify?

What if the very act of demanding proof presupposes logic, meaning, moral obligation, and trust in reason—things that make no sense without God in the first place?

This book does not try to prove God as a hypothesis or defend Him as a comforting idea. Instead, it examines the demand itself. It asks what kind of being could be “shown” on command, what kind of neutrality is being claimed, and whether disbelief really begins from an innocent position.

Drawing from the Bhagavad-gītā and the teachings of Śrīla Prabhupāda, Show Me God! exposes the hidden assumptions beneath modern skepticism and reveals a deeper problem: the attempt to deny God while borrowing everything that denial requires.

The question is no longer whether God has shown Himself.

The question is whether we are qualified to see Him.