

Nasty doctrines and the need for mammoth proof for them

A miracle is what is not naturally possible. It is a supernatural occurrence. It is paranormal.

Religion uses miracles as evidence for the truth of its claims.

Miracles are claimed to be ultimately about propelling us to love God and other people. Thus there is an incentive for lying that you have seen a miracle. It turns you from Joe Soap into somebody who is boosting the common good. Suppose faith in miracles is about helping you to love others. Then why not say that a person who committed suicide didn't do it on purpose for some miraculous force had taken control of him and made him do it? You should if you are to assume the best about people.

If miracles are ultimately about love then you need very good evidence that a miracle happened. You have to make sure that no evidence for or against is overlooked. This is because love is important. What happens in fact is that hardly anybody cares to investigate properly. Miracles are not a good thing in terms of the fruits. To say God is doing them is to blame God. No God would do a miracle that only gives ammunition to those with an agenda or who are too credulous.

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.

You need incredibly good and plain evidence that a miracle report is true. Otherwise, your standard will be too low and you will be tricked.

This is the extraordinary claims need extraordinary evidence philosophy. Religion says what we really mean is miracle claims need miraculously good evidence. Lets say we would settle for evidence as good as that Hitler once lived. Nothing unfair or too demanding about that!

Miracles in themselves require exceptional evidence if not in quality then in quantity.

But if the miracles present themselves as supporting some very strange or disturbing doctrines - for example, that Heaven is so enjoyable because we will torment babies that were never baptised into the Church for all eternity - then the evidence needs to be even better. We would need miraculously good evidence for the miracle then!

The Church teaches some very unpopular and disturbing doctrines.

Here is one. Jesus said that the complete love of God is the greatest and most important commandment. A God commanding people to love him is bad enough for love should be free but one that wants to be loved that much is extreme. Its not good to have such a narcissistic role model.

In 2012, the Pope said to ambassadors from 179 countries that have diplomatic relations with the Vatican that "the right to religious freedom is the first for it expresses the fundamental reality of the person." Is that so? Do you need a religion more than you need food on the table? Such extremism clearly implies that religion and therefore God must come first. The pope will not think that any religion will do. For him, the religion that maximally expresses the fundamental reality of the person is the Roman Catholic Church. The implication is that other religions are only to be tolerated for they fine-tune and channel and maintain the religious impulse that may lead the believer to come into the Catholic Church. There is a bigger right to have the freedom to become a Catholic than there is to become anything else.

Here is another disturbing doctrine.

Praying for somebody to do something such as give you a job translates as, "May God manipulate this person to do my will."

God cannot make the person give you the job if it is true that we have free will. And most prayers are for others to be manipulated.

If you really believed, "God will see to it that I get the job if it is the right thing for him," you would not make the request. You would simply be confident that whatever happens it will be for the best. If you believe God will get you the job because it is right for you that shows no concern for other people who might need it more than you do.

The prime concern of prayer is that God will bless you and the other person by guiding you and the other to see that nothing matters but God and getting his approval. God must be loved totally - others are only treated as means with which to please him.

To love God with all your heart means to hate sin with all your heart as well. This means you are better off hating your enemy. That would be less hatred than the hatred you are expected to harbour towards sin.

Here is another gem. If you masturbate and die you will suffer the Hell of everlasting torment. You must pretend that hating the evil character (sin is not an act but describes a kind of person) is not to hate the character of the person. There is much much more.

Serious stuff. And the doctrines are to be feared for the whole idea of the Catholic religion is, "Live and let live," does not mean, "Do what you want!". You'd need very strong proof for such incredible doctrines. You would need enough evidence for God before you can love him above all things. You need to obtain the evidence personally. After all, you don't grow in love with your wife because of what other people say about her. You get to know her yourself. You would need to see Hell before you would have the right to believe something so serious.

Catholicism says we have a need to believe in those doctrines because we are very bad and in big trouble if we do not. We have enough needs without people trying to oppress us by creating new needs for us. Anybody can try that trick. Maybe a beggar might say, "Give me money or I will curse your health and kill you with my curse". You can't reason that you have to believe in him just in case.

Also, believing just in case is not believing at all. If you really believed the warnings and threats would not motivate you to believe. Belief is separate from all that. The fear masquerading as belief would be dangerous. It would make you dangerous too.

God will not do a miracle to help us believe in teachings that are not important or that we don't need. If miracles support and give evidence for the doctrines then we need to believe in them. Then the atheist who does not believe is taking a stand against human rights. Miracles suggest atheists should be silenced and censored.

The implication is that the New Testament in claiming that Jesus did miracles and rose from the dead and ordered us to believe or rot in Hell forever is evil.

There are thought to be proofs and evidences that we should be agnostic on miracles. Christians never mention them. The only exception is when they distort them to make them look stupid. They like to refute inadequate proofs. Those are the kind of people that are depended on to provide evidence that miracles happened!

Miracles should not be even honoured with the agnostic treatment! They are too ludicrous even for that!