

RELIGION LIES ABOUT THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT MIRACLES AND DRESSES UP GUESSES AS EVIDENCE

Our first thought when we hear of a vision from Heaven or a man coming back from the dead is that it might not be true. So we need evidence to get our attention and back it up. The evidence for miracles is often lies and guesses. When somebody supposedly gets cured of cancer by drinking holy water that is a challenge to science. Suppose the science shows it. Science has to assume that holy water cures cancer until other people start drinking it and nothing happens. Science is about looking at facts and updating as further information comes in. Here the holy water cures cancer until more light comes in. That is what we mean about miracles overthrowing science. If the holy water bottle is lost then science is made to say forever, "Holy water cannot cure cancer except that bottle from xxxland on 25 May 2021 which cured X Jones." That illustration clears up the Christian lies which say, "Science has its field and religion has its field."

Some Christians lie that some miracle stories do succeed to pass the test of evidence. They may put forward the resurrection of Jesus as the best verified and most believable miracle of all time. And that in spite of the fact that even the gospels don't clearly eliminate any chance that Jesus was not put in the tomb. So there is no evidence that the body was in the tomb or if it was that it went missing because it rose. These people exaggerate the quality of the evidence. They lie outright that the gospels make it undeniable that Jesus was buried!

Religion agrees with the fact that the bigger the claim then the bigger the evidence that is needed. But when you tell it that its evidence say for the resurrection of Jesus is hardly outstanding it says the claim is not that big or strange after all. This dishonesty and proneness to self-deception and the deception of other people is hardly going to make us confident in believers who say have witnessed miracles or who claim they have understood and garnered evidence that miracles really do happen.

You need to eliminate all the possible ordinary explanations before you go on to the extraordinary or supernatural. Miracle investigators do not look at all the explanations. They pick out one or two and eliminate them. Then by a process of elimination they arrive at the conclusion that the miracle is authentic. That kind of exploitation and dishonesty would not be tolerated in any other profession.

Even a believer in miracles must or should concede that the resurrection of Jesus cannot rationally be believed in. We don't even have depositions stating that Jesus rose. We need those at least. To say, "but if you had them you still wouldn't believe" is unfair and judgemental. It is also trying to excuse absent evidence, poor evidence or unconvincing evidence.

If the evidence is good and some still disbelieve and refuse to accept what the evidence implies, this is not an argument for belief in miracles. They are entitled to think the evidence is not enough for if that is how they see it that is not their fault. We all differ in how we take evidence.

There is an argument from religious experience for the resurrection. It goes, "I feel the risen Jesus with me. Somehow I know he is in my soul and I enjoy the benefits of his resurrection which shows me it really happened." But even if this proves that a saviour rose from the dead it doesn't prove it is Jesus. There could be a mistake that the saviour was Jesus. It could be that they do experience the power of a risen saviour but that does not mean they are right in thinking the saviour is Jesus. Arguments from religious experience only show that you trust your experience to reassure you. They have nothing to do with proving the experience to be true. For example, you may have a religious experience that gives you drive and ambition in life. But that only proves the power of the experience not that the thing experienced has any power.

If Christian scholars say there is enough evidence to warrant belief in the resurrection of Christ that does not mean they are right. Even if they are right, we have the right to disagree just as we all have our individual take on things.

The limits

If such a thing as evidence for miracles exists then it stands to reason that there are cases where there is very strong evidence for some events being true miracles even though they are not. The Solar Miracle of Fatima looks impressive until you look below the surface. If you see that x must be a murderer and then something happens that shows he could not have done it that could be called a miracle. Cases have happened where somebody was nearly proven to be a murderer and they were not guilty. We would need to investigate to see what alleged miracle has the best evidence. This would set the bar for us. We would only then consider believing in a miracle if it had better evidence than that one or evidence equally as good.

Believers say it is ridiculous to say miracles don't happen without looking at the evidence for them. It is not ridiculous. It's another of the lies that belief in miracles leads to. We are not under obligation to investigate miracles. We are not silly if we don't. If a woman wants to believe that relationships with men are dangerous let her even if she hasn't investigated. Even if she is wrong it might be the best belief for her. We respect peoples belief that they should marry their chosen partner and we know they could be wrong so we leave them to it.

The Church says that sceptics have made up their minds that miracles don't happen instead of accepting the evidence that they do.

The sceptic will either reject the evidence or ignore it.

The sceptic who ignores the evidence cannot be accused of having made up their minds about miracles being false without any concern for evidence. We are not under obligation to examine the evidence for anything unless we want to examine it or need to.

So what about a sceptic who sees the evidence for miracles and rejects it by still refusing to believe? Is he being dogmatic? Dogmatic and unreasonable are not necessarily the same thing. Everybody has to hold that there are truths that must be accepted. If something is known to be true it is reasonable to be dogmatic about it and unreasonable not to be. So lets ask if he is being unreasonable. The sceptic could be right even if he is being unreasonable. For example, the sceptic who disbelieves in the resurrection might be right to but disbelieve for the wrong reasons. Maybe he hates the resurrection for he thinks dead bodies rising again is the stuff of horror.

The Church makes up its mind that it knows all about nature and so can be sure that a miracle is not a freak natural law at play and therefore not a miracle. The Church's view obviously cannot be right.

Who then is guilty of the worst dogmatism? Who is being the more unreasonable? Who is being the worst know-all?

If a person needs evidence and is accused of all kinds of dishonesty just because he or she needs it and looks for it, the accusers are not the servants of truth they pretend to be.

Extraordinary belief makes you extraordinary

If you believe in something that is extraordinary for a person to believe in that makes you extraordinary. Are you asking for others to look for extraordinary evidence that you believe it? Yes. The first thing to assess about a miracle claim is, "Do people believe it who could know if it were true?" There is no such thing as people checking out supernatural claims nobody believed in or believes in. If the believer believes in something that is very unusual or odd or supernatural, the believer has to give you evidence that she believes. She has to justify the notion that she is not simply being a crank.

Hard evidence is needed and why religion should need it more than sceptics do

Nobody can understand evidence better than the person working with it. It follows then that only those who investigate miracles and find good evidence for them should believe. The general public should not. To encourage it to believe miracles is exploitation even if the miracles are proven. They are not proven to them and that is the problem.

Now we all know that there has to be some things we must see ourselves before we can be asked to believe in them or before we can believe in them. If miracles do not fall into that category then what does? Miracles look like magic for goodness' sake! Religion takes it for granted that some miracle reports at least should not be believed unless you see it for yourself. It should say that of all miracle reports because it is denying that evidence or the reliability of the testimony to miracles counts.

"Hard evidence is needed for miracle claims for they are such big claims". Religion needs this more than sceptics.

The sceptic values truth which is why he or she insists on a high standard of evidence before belief in such big claims as miracles or magic can be considered.

The religionist too says that truth is to be valued.

The religionist who believes that God is truth had an additional reason to the sceptic for valuing it. It is valuable to the sceptic just because it is truth. It is valuable to the religionist for that reason and also because God makes it sacred and demands that it be honoured and clarified and endorsed. If there is an obligation to honour truth, the obligation is more serious if there is a God of truth. And if God is truth as Christianity says.

If the sceptic wants a lot of evidence to endorse a miracle as probably true or believable then the believer needs far far more.

The believer assumes God exists and for her that paves the way for believing in miracles done by God. If she criticises the sceptics demand for good evidence that justifies believing in such a big thing as a miracle then she insults her own belief in God. She opposes truth and is criticising the sceptic for being more moderate than what she should be.

If you claim special powers such as the power to heal people or to see the future, science needs replicable evidence before it can be expected to believe you. If you perform healing for X and X gets better then if you fail to help anybody else then that shows that X's cure was not down to you. Good evidence for miracles is needed for there is a problem with people thinking that a caused b just because b came after a. Correlation does not necessarily indicate a causal link. Belief in miracles is always based on the notion that you know there is a causal link when none is there.

FINALLY - THE EVIDENCE FOR MIRACLES IS NEVER CONCLUSIVE. THE CONTEXT WHICH SAYS "THERE COULD BE CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE HERE" NEVER WORKS EITHER. LIES ABOUT THE QUALITY OF THE EVIDENCE AND INVENTING EVIDENCE ARE WHAT FOLLOW ALL MIRACLE ALLEGATIONS THAT SERVE SOME IDEOLOGICAL PURPOSE.

