

A MIRACLE IS LESS CONVINCING WHEN IT CANNOT BE TESTED IN AN EXPERIMENT

Scientific proof for the resurrection of Jesus is not possible. Jesus would need to die and rise again in a lab under strict conditions in order for science to say there is such proof. Scientific proof depends on an effect being repeatable.

Suppose the resurrection of Jesus was a historical event. Then it follows then that when you say the law of nature is that people do not come back from the dead you have to say there have been at least one exception Jesus. So all miraculous statements are in opposition to science which needs reality to be able to work out what is out there and what is happening for a scientist cannot talk that way. Jesus weakens the strength of the claim that people do not come back from the dead.

Critics say that miracles are unrepeatable events and are very improbable. They say that the evidence for repeatable events like winter coming at the end of every year in Europe is better than any evidence for miracles. So they conclude that miracles are not believable even if they do happen. It is wrong to say that the evidence for the repeatable is always better for the unrepeatable for we have evidence that the unrepeatable happened. They won't give belief in miracles a chance and just reject them outright without considering them.

BELIEVERS READ THE UNREPEATABILITY INTO THE MIRACLE EVENT

Religion is conscious that science bases itself on the constant repetition of events. It thinks by taking a sceptical approach to enough miracles it will not be a threat to the validity of science.

Religion to protect repeatability has been known to say a person can be a fallen messenger. If x does to many wonders the religion will find a reason for saying it was fewer than that and the person started faking at some point and from then on.

Just because a miracle is not repeatable in our experience or mine does not mean it is not repeatable. What if there are billions of worlds science does not know of with their own Lourdes where Mary appears all the time? Who says we have no know of the repetitions? Just because I think Mary at Lourdes in 1858 was a once-off and no threat to science in terms of repeating all the time does not mean I am right? What if Mary is appearing there all the time but nobody is tuning in to see her?

We must remember that we don't mean miracle repetition to denote that everybody who goes to a particular healing stream to get a instant cure. We count miracle cures at any stream as part of the repetition. Similar events will do - it does not have to be the miracle we know of repeating all the time like a loop.

Some argue that miracles are not constantly repeating events and there is zero predictability so science does leave room for them. You can believe in them or not and still be fully in line with science which is about the constantly repeated.

This is wrong.

So we know then that miracles must be eliminated from the realm of scientific understanding.

COMMENT: Evidence is based on the idea of repeatable. If unrepeatable events like miracles happen you cannot be sure of anything evidence says. Thus if you want to believe in the value of evidence you are only weakening that idea by taking on the notion of miracles. It is more reasonable to hold that miracles shouldn't be believed in. The repeatable is more important than any miracle or unrepeatable supernatural event. It happens more. So the evidence is naturally going to be better for the repeatable. This is not dogmatically refusing to give miracles a chance. It is simply doing what we have to do.

Miracles blaspheme human intelligence. The religion of miracle is also the religion of bigotry, intolerance, unfairness and deceit. The best miracles can do is give people a "holiness" and piety that reposes on self-deceit and self-inflicted blindness.

Antony Flew argued that miracles are uncommon and unrepeatable events. Christians agree with that. Flew said that even if miracles are possible they are not believable because you can't for example prove that Jesus rose from the dead by making him repeat it. He is saying that the evidence for the general and the repeatable will always be necessarily better than the evidence for the particular and unrepeatable. Christians deny this. The Christians are saying in effect that something you can scientifically test in the lab and repeat is not as convincing as human testimony to miracles or the sight of a very sick person who was miraculously healed and is now the picture of health. We have only human testimony to the resurrection of Jesus and it is extreme fundamentalism to argue that such testimony is better than any experiments we can do.

FLEW

Atheist philosopher Antony Flew stated that a miracle should not be believed for:

PREMISE: Miracles are by nature particular and unrepeatable.

PREMISE: Natural events are by nature general and repeatable.

PREMISE: The evidence for the general and repeatable simply has to be by default and by nature always greater than that for the particular and unrepeatable.

CONCLUSION: The evidence will always be greater against miracles than for them.

He could have noted that you may have x amount of evidence for something and y against it. The amount of evidence is the same but despite that x or y still does not have the same weight. You may dismiss evidence on such grounds upon deciding the other side is the one with no weight.

Christians say that Flew erred in saying the evidence for the repeatable is better than the evidence for the unrepeatable for natural unrepeatable things happen and we believe them. They say that opens the door to miracles. It does not. It opens the door to natural anomalies that never repeat. A miracle is a different type of claim.

It all hangs on the validity of our repeated observation. So man has to decide if God spoke or did a miracle! This gives great power to man. Man controls and censors and filters the word of God.

Science can only see natural anomaly where there is miracle. Where is the natural anomaly? In your perception. Science avoids using any explanations beyond those that are strictly necessary. This is Occam's Razor - "keep with the simplest explanation". So if 12 people see a man raised from the dead then the mystery is how nature is making them perceive that not how the man is alive or if he is alive. Science examines the miracle witness's mind not what he or she claims happened.

You only need a brain to see that supernatural and secondly paranormal claims are so out of the ordinary that they have to be tested and examined at a higher standard than anything else. This is the same principle that tells us not to assume the truth of or believe any miracle report easily. Assuming a miracle is a terrible thing for it is too serious for assuming. Believing is just as bad for its implying disrespect for evidence. Believing is often just assuming in disguise.