

## WHO REALLY DECIDES THAT MIRACLES ARE TRUE? MEN WITH AN AGENDA!

Religion likes to say, "We are the true religion for God did miracles to show that we teach his truth." They say they have reliable witnesses of these miracles. But it is not the reliability of the witnesses we should be looking at. We should be looking at the general picture. We should be looking at the question, "is the human tendency to delude oneself and others with claims about the supernatural common enough and strong enough to make us assume that the reliability of a reliable witness is unproven?"

Religion abuses the witnesses for its approach is, "Believe these people for what is the point of any testimony if you don't? Testimony is no good at all if you think its no good for miracles. Don't be selective!" That is just an argument from testimony that actually just exploits them and that is cruel if the witnesses suffer over what they say.

The Catholic Church says that if you don't believe in miracles then you are saying that the wonderful testimonies from the most reliable of people that they happen are to be dismissed. The Church says that if people are that lacking in credibility, we can believe nothing they say. You can reply that you are not saying they must be dismissed or ignored. Trust means that you expect to hear sane things and decent things from decent people. You can trust them while having no opinion on their miracle claim. You don't have to take a position on everything somebody says.

Christianity is forced to say that if we say testimonies about miracles are based on mistakes or lies, then we can't believe anybody who testifies to anything. This is not true. It would mean that we are accepting all plausible human testimony except when miracles are spoken of.

There is no such thing as a miracle witness going to experts to report the miracle so that they can help others to be justifiably sure that their testimony is true, that they must have experienced a miracle.

Scientists lie for money. If it were not for religion being so powerful and creating the incentive, this would not happen. If there was little interest in the Turin Shroud or it was invested with insignificance it would not happen either. We are entitled to reject or be suspicious concerning a miracle story even if "verified" by a top scientist.

Reliable people in one religion testify to miracles that contradict the miracles testified to good people of another religion. Within a religion, there will be miracles that it rejects as inauthentic despite the testimony of reliable people that something miraculous was happening. Religion lies that it looks for reliable testimony to the supernatural and believes because of that.

It's discrimination to accept one miracle because of a reliable testimony and not others. To believe in a miracle is always irrational for you have to accept all testimony to all miracles and you cannot do that. When you accept say Fatima as a place of visions and miracles you are saying there could have been mistakes but you still believe. What right then would you have to disbelieve in any other miracle report then?

The Christian religion claims to be based on the word of God. It claims to believe in miracles. But in fact it believes in men not miracles!

It is men who decide what the word of God is and what books belong in it. They use this then as a yardstick with which to judge the authenticity of miracle claims.

It is men who decide what miracles are evidence from God for their faith. They accuse the witnesses of miracles that contradict their theology of being liars just because these miracles indicate that some other faith is true. They say that to disbelieve in miracles is to say that human testimony is worthless. But they ignore most miracle claims. In doing that they are saying that there is more testimony for miracles not being true or dependable as sources of doctrine!

We do not have to believe in any human decisions and decrees. The best courts in the land can be wrong and often are. The arrogance of religion for claiming to be right!

The men of religion call themselves experts but even in the simplest things like what diet is the best for us you have the experts arguing with one another.

A following b does not mean b caused a. It can mean it might have or it happened in spite of it. If people believe and miracles seem to follow that does not mean the belief had any role in causing the miracles or allowing them to happen.

Testimony has no power to help.

A following b does not mean b caused a. It can mean it might have or it happened in spite of it. Which should we assume if we have to assume only one of them? It depends. Given that a miracle is uncommon it is better to assume it is b and only came about in spite of a.

Believers say that when God makes a Virgin Mary appear to you or raises your dog from the dead as a sign, that the biggest miracles are what he does in your heart. The outside miracle is like a sacrament that channels inner miracles. So the internal testimony comes first. The 911 hijackers were witnesses to the miracle of God telling them Islam was true and to die for his sake. They felt God was inspiring them. At least you see how dangerous the testimony doctrine is and it is a Trojan Horse.

Miracles typically are reported in the early years of a faith. Then conveniently they cease or become so rare that they may as well not bother happening. That alone makes testimony suspect. All scammers like their lies to be far in the past so that they might solidify and confuse forever.

The testimony argument in favour of believing miracles is over-simplistic.