

The Bible needs to be interpreted as pure superstition

Miracles are events that seem to be against nature or the way natural law usually runs. In other words, they cannot be explained by nature. Examples are the Blessed Virgin Mary appearing to children, the unexplained cure of incurable illness, blood coming out of nowhere on Catholic communion wafers, the sun spinning at Fatima in Portugal in 1917 and most importantly Jesus Christ coming back to life after being dead nearly three days. It is thought that only God can do these things.

In the past, the supernatural or the miracle was invoked to explain everything that people had no explanation for. It was thought to be a miracle that the sun rose every day. Thunder was thought to be a miracle. Pregnancy another and so on. In the past, everybody then thought they had encountered miracles. The Bible never denies that any of those things were miracles. It never says it either. But if you take the rule, "Interpret old books by the way they would have been understood in their day", clearly you have to assert that the Bible does see them as miracles. It does not need to say it.

A God who is in control will be able to guide us and heal us of evil tendencies without making it obvious. He will use nature to help us. A God who instantly heals the sick or who makes 2000 year old mums appear to people today is a divine magician and not a healer or mentor. God can work with nature to cure us and teach us and religion says this is his usual policy. A God doing an instant cure for example is more interested in the magical show than in the healing. He is like a doctor who should but won't give you kidney meds that will work gradually. Instead he gives you a kidney transplant to show how good a surgeon he is. Miracles are superstitious thus any religion based on them is by definition superstitious fundamentalism. Miracles give you a low view of God and people.