

CONCLUSIVE DISPROOF OF THE RATIONALITY OF BELIEF IN MIRACLES

According to Christianity, miracles are supernatural events that God does to indicate that he exists and that he loves all people. They are defined as signs which he does to show that his doctrines are true. They are evidence that his revelation to man is really his revelation and is not a man-made delusion or creation.

Suppose for example a missionary is preaching the Bible to unbelievers. God might make a man instantly sprout legs when they were amputated to verify that the missionary teaches the truth. A miracle can be broadly defined as whatever is not naturally possible. That is not the same as saying it is impossible. It is saying the supernatural ie God performs it.

Unbelievers in miracles say, "Suppose there is evidence for miracles. There being evidence does not mean there is enough evidence to justify believing in miracles. You would need outstandingly good evidence before you could believe people who said they witnessed a prince being turned into a toad or a man dead for several days being restored to life without scientific intervention. That is because it seems impossible. If there is a God he will make sure the evidence will be good enough to convince any reasonable person."

Religion says that the evidence is good and unbelievers just don't want to know. The unbelievers are accused of assuming that the evidence is not good enough instead of looking at it. That would be biased and unfair. It would be insinuating, "God, we condemn your miraculous ways and refuse to admit you may be doing these miracles." But if the evidence is not as good as they say, they should not be accusing unbelievers of intellectual dishonesty.

The accusations are false. You only need to read the unbeliever's position to see that it is correct and that it is not biased. You see that it is honest and fair. The unbeliever is not guilty of ignoring the evidence. The unbeliever is taking the only reasonable approach.

The person doing the least assuming is the unbiased person. The unbeliever in miracles simply assumes that there may be a rational explanation for a so-called miracle. The believer has to assume that there is not. The believer has to assume that certain miracles are authentic and others are not. He has to assume that instead of helping us to become holier by putting better influences our way, God does miracles. That is quite an assumption! There is one assumption made by the unbeliever. Even believers have to assume it too for not every miracle claim is necessarily true. But the believer adds assumption after assumption until quite a collection is made up!

If you claim the right to believe in miracles such as that Jesus rose from the dead, you have to hold that your neighbour has the right to believe that the sun will not rise tomorrow morning or that he must commit suicide to save the world from aliens who demand his sacrifice. The implications of belief in miracles are horrendous and intolerable.

Religion is making false accusations against the unbelievers. It bullies because the unbelievers are right and it wants to intimidate them into silence.

Thus religions of miracles and alleged miracles are indirect attacks on the integrity of the unbeliever. Its insulting to God to say he would do the miracles.

Believers say dead people stay dead but Jesus was an exception for he rose again. But how do they know that he is the only exception? They say the evidence tells them. But evidence is not everything! Perhaps it happens a lot and no evidence is left behind? What gives them the right to assume that dead people staying dead is really a regularity?

The person who does not believe that anybody rose is more supportive of regularity than they are.

The supernatural attacks science. It denies regularity. It cannot be tested. It provides then no direction for doing research.

The believer cannot be expected to believe in say, the miracle of Jesus being dead three days and rising again, unless he is given the training and the tools with which to test the dead and living body himself. Is that unreasonable? Not a bit. It is difficult but not unreasonable. There have to be claims so big that they demand that treatment. If a miracle is not such a claim then nothing is. To deny that is bigoted and obstinate and superstitious.

What gives a religion the right to assume when miracles can take place?

Surely it can only be when the miracle has the focus on promoting sound ethics and making people feel loved and generally

having good consequences that justify it. But we should work out morality by studying ethics instead of looking for signs that this is good and that is bad. We are not children!

There is something warped about trying to show a miracle happened and that it happened to inspire us to oppose say abortion or some evil. That suggests we need to take it on trust from God that its bad instead of trying to reason with those who are pro-abortion or pro-something evil. It suggests we must obey what is supposed to be the word of God even if we suspect that the word of God is cruel and wrong. We play right into the hands of the likes of animal killers who won't stun the animals before killing them and who do this in the name of religion. We play into the hands of those who expect the state to give them the right to torment animals so that their religious beliefs are not offended.

Christianity teaches that morality is real (objective morality) and that it is only God that makes it real. We need to believe in God to see it as real.

Options:

We can see morality as real.

We can see morality as just being our own preference.

We can be neutral and undecided between the two.

No matter what anybody says, you do not need a god or authority to tell you to refrain from hurting a baby when you can leave it alone.

To say you do is actually dehumanising. It is trying to base goodness on authority rather than on concern.

To be concerned because you are ordered to be, is not as good as to be just concerned.

The religious argument is simply itself disgusting and it must never ever go unchallenged.

The case against the notion that a person who believes in miracles is being rational is conclusive.

Religion has been told all this for centuries. It persists in refusing to admit the truth! This is a poor credential for religious miracle investigators who tell us miracles happen!