

MIRACLE VERIFIES MIRACLE

A miracle is a supernatural act of God that cannot be explained naturally.

Miracles change the nature of evidence.

A believer can say that when he sees a shooting star, its evidence that his suspicion that his wife is cheating on him is correct. The unbeliever cannot say that. Instead he will follow her or try to catch her out.

It is strange for religion to insist on normal evidence for a miracle. That really implies that miracles should not be verified by miracles. That implies that miracles are so suspicious that we cannot use say the miracle of the healing of a paralytic at the shrine of the miracle moving statue as evidence that the statue really moves. Religion checks out the moving statue claim independently of the healings. If we cannot use miracles as evidence and use mundane evidence that is us showing we are completely aware that miracles are rubbish. It shows that we are unfair for we believe and disbelieve at the same time.

There is one insane exception to religions attitude to attempt to verify a miracle by a miracle. Do not forget that religion says it is not fair to demand miraculous evidence for a miracle while it does indicate, in spite of itself, that it thinks that faith in miracles is based on miraculous evidence. Religion is about a relationship with a miraculous being, God. Religion argues that God has to help you with his supernatural guidance to see that a miracle is a sign that he is there calling you. A miracle is not about external evidence so much as internal. The argument that God can be known and found through religious experience is behind it. Now this requires the miracle of God inspiring you. It requires the miracle of how your experience can be valid when that of another person who experiences an evil violent God and becomes a suicide bomber is not even if he can be more convinced than you. Faith in the miracle say of a man rising from the dead is based on even worse miracles. Faith in the miracle of the resurrection is based on miracles that are so absurd that they cause one to think of advising believers to go and get professional help.

If a set of claims is accepted as fact, a miracle may be understood as the best explanation for them. But this would be provisional. Just because something is the best explanation now does not mean it will be tomorrow. Also, the accepted facts are only accepted as such by the majority of scholars. What is accepted can change overnight.

The Christians say,

1 Jesus died by crucifixion.

2 The tomb was found empty.

3 The disciples were transformed from fearful cowards into bold proclaimers who were willing to face persecution and death for their message.

4 His disciples subsequently had experiences which they believed were literal physical appearances of the risen Jesus. Paul, who had previously been a persecutor of the Christians, had an experience that he also believed was an appearance of the risen Jesus.

5 The Christian Church got off the ground very fast.

CONCLUSION - The miracle of the resurrection of Jesus is the best explanation for what happened.

This is illogical. None of the above warrant a real miracle. None of the 5 points is a miracle itself. Therefore they cannot point to a miracle as the explanation for the set.

Suppose it is true that people do not die for what is lies. They do. But if it were true, then the steps fail to prove the resurrection. They prove that a miracle happened but that the miracle could easily have been the resurrection as men dying for a lie!

The conclusion is worthless for we are not told WHY a miracle is the best explanation. That is too complicated a matter to be treated so briefly.

Also, we are only given 5 facts. There are undoubtedly more facts than that including ones we may never think of or hear of. Having them all could lead to the conclusion that there is no way to decide if there was a resurrection or not. Or perhaps

it will lead to the conclusion that the resurrection was improbable.

And what about the best explanation? If it is only marginally the best then what then?

Christianity likes to dish out argument after argument in favour of the miracle of the resurrection of Jesus. This is for the purpose of tricking enough people who think that the matter is too complicated for them. They may believe that the quantity of arguments points to the resurrection. Its quality that does that. The Christians like to over-complicate the issue so that people will be put off looking too closely.