

SHOWING JESUS' MIRACLES SEEM TRUE IS IMPOSSIBLE

The Church admits that it cannot conclusively prove every miracle reported of Jesus in the Bible or outside of it when you consider every miracle by itself. The Church for example has only the word of the gospel of John that Jesus turned water into wine at Cana. The gospels say that Jesus even concealed some of his miracles like when he warned nobody to tell that he raised the daughter of Jairus from the dead. If Jesus does ten miracles and you can verify them all but the last then you can't believe in the last one. You must consider him a liar if he asks you to believe in it and of course he does for in the John gospel he tells skeptics to believe in his works if they can't believe in him. If a man commits ten murders and you can only prove he committed nine of them you are not permitted to believe he committed the odd one out. You need better evidence for miracles than murders for miracles are stranger and more unusual. To claim a miracle happened is such a serious claim that naturally the evidence has to be very serious as in strong and good and convincing and every individual miracle requires it. You can't say the resurrection of Jesus is provable so the other miracles of Jesus must have happened as well. Even if Jesus rose to prove his teachings and claims and miracles to be real as the gospels say, that remains true. Bearing in mind that we need very strong evidence the stranger or more unlikely a claim is this is unacceptable. Every miracle is so serious so it has to be checked out on its own.

It would be odd if a miracle figure provided miracles as evidence and some of the miracles could not be assessed. In fact it would be enough to show that the matter is inconclusive.

The Bible teaches total depravity which means that all human goodness is unacceptable to God for it is deformed by selfish ulterior motives and the desire to be free of God. Christians may claim they can do good works but they cannot for the selfishness is always there. So miracles then are a waste of time. They look like the work of a being that is too stupid to see this.

In some religions, particularly Catholicism, it is held that God revealed the miracles of the Bible so we have to believe in them morally for it is wrong to call God a liar. They hold that miracles do happen that are not binding on belief. That only makes sense if the Bible ones are of a huge standard and anything after is not. An example of extra-biblical miracles includes Lourdes or Fatima.

It follows from all that, that the Church should reject all miracles and apparitions and say they are of the Devil if they are real. The Devil works the "miracles" so that the faith that God wants will be replaced by a shoddy substitute that resembles it and to their surprise they will find themselves in Hell when they die because they did not have and were resistant to real Christian faith. The Church officially forbids people to regard the extra-biblical miracles as obligatory to belief as the biblical miracles. We are not bound to believe in them. The Church forbids anybody from using the extra-biblicals as the main or, worse, the only ground of faith. Only a handful of the faithful would remember or know of the prohibition and the Devil would get what he wants. And that would be most Catholics having faith that is not a gift of God the kind of faith that the Bible and Catholic dogma says is necessary for salvation. In other words, a counterfeit form of saving faith. The kind of faith that saves has to be based on a divinely inspired insight that the Gospel and its claims about the redeeming death and resurrection are true and reasonable – on the revelation that has full authority in other words. Apparitions and modern miracles are lacking in that authority for they cannot add to the canon of the Bible or be infallible sources of truth like the Church. But when they appeal to the ignorant faithful and have them basing faith on them it is clear that they are trying to substitute for authorised divine revelation.

Religion asks science to deny that miracles threaten the ideas of science. It is told that one person's incurable cancer vanishing does not tell science to abandon the law that this cancer cannot be cured. So a miracle is not seen as an attack on natural law.

Even if a miracle doesn't suspend natural law or change it, it still looks and acts as if it has. How a strange event like a miracle looks comes before any other consideration. For example, if you see a kitten in your fridge ice box and it looks like a kitten then you are justified in taking it as a kitten. You have no reason to believe anything else. It is the same with a new employee. You assume he is honest on the basis of his CV even though it could be a fake. You believe in his innocence until evidence to the contrary appears. To report a miracle then is as serious as to report that sperms are no longer going to fertilize ovum. It is as serious as saying a comet is about to appear miraculously in the solar system and hit the earth. (It is actually more serious but we are trying to be kind to the believers!) All these have in common not the consequences which vary but the nature of the event is the same, it's a change in nature.

Science is science and cannot be dictated to by religion that it must not see a miracle as a challenge to natural law. That would be supposing the religion is true or right while science has to keep religion out of the picture for the reason that

geography class does not refer to the catechism!

