

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS REVELATION OR HISTORICAL CLAIM

Christian academic and faith defender Norman Geisler, "The mere fact of the resurrection [of Jesus] cannot be used to establish the truth that there is a God. For the resurrection cannot even be a miracle unless there already is a God."

This is saying that a historian can say Jesus rose but cannot call it a miracle. But it is true that a historian can even go that far?

You may have a right to your views on religion but you don't have the right to your facts. One fact is that the historical method demands evidence and demands that you let the evidence do the talking. However, different views arise of what the evidence is and what it is saying but that happens. It does not change the fact that it is not intended. It does not change the fact that the historical method is valid - the problem is individuals not the method.

History that allows you to make good assumptions about the evidence and form your own idea of what the evidence is saying is history. History that commands you to agree with x or y or z is really ideology. But I'm after saying that the problem with different historical perspectives of the same thing are to be counted a human fault and history is not to blame! Surely history lets you think for yourself. The solution is that if you had the right facts and understood them right you would agree with everybody else who does that too. So history should be coherent because people should be letting the evidence talk to them. History is not commanding you to accept Hitler existed. It is helping you to see that for yourself.

Christianity is based on the assumption that you have no right to oppose its deliberations about the historical data that supposedly says Jesus was virgin born, God's son and rose from the dead to be with us forever through the Church. Islam and Judaism and Christianity simply HAVE to lead to harm for they are ideologies that will not debate and will not take an objective view of what God supposedly did in their history. God allegedly acts and teaches and forms the religion through history. No ideology however kindly it seems is safe. The debates the believers engage in are not debates for they decide what the conclusion will not be and what it will be beforehand.

Christianity does not treat its idea of historical events as discussion points but facts and thus abuses the fact that this is not the way to do history. It does not have a right to its view for the historical method is a fact and is not up for debate.

The historian's methods neither help or hinder the miracle fan when a record claims a miracle or magical occurrence. Nor does the historian need to figure out an alternative explanation for the miracle. It is enough to say it was reported and leave it at that. As history cannot help, that is a reason for arguing that a miracle story needs good backing up as much as a murder accusation would need. Big magical claims needing a high standard of evidential support is not just a saying. There are sound reasons behind it.

It is true that there are situations in which you don't know what the evidence is saying if it is pro or con. A sceptic can believe evidence has the final say but it does not follow that evidence is always able to.

Why are historians not saying Jesus rose? What is it only theologians who distort the data? That tells you all you need to know.