

## SCIENCE AND MIRACLES

Religion likes to tell us that science can never say, "Miracles do not happen". But if science says that then what does it mean? Does it mean, "Evidence or not, there are no miracles"? or does it mean, "There is no evidence that miracles happen but there could be true miracles we don't know of." There is nothing wrong with that if it has looked at the evidence and found none. Religion of course never mentions this. It seeks to give the false impression that miracles have been found to be compatible with science and that science does not believe in miracles for it does not care about the evidence.

If science does not say that miracles don't happen, then why is nobody in the religious camp saying it is okay if it says, "Miracles don't happen but tomorrow might be different?" Because it knows science cannot say that as it would mean saying it is possible antibiotics might just stop working tomorrow and thus it would be saying science is useless. Science rejects that its research might be by a stroke of a miracle pen be only valid until midnight. Religion would be overthrowing science by asking for that.

As science endorses a healthy attitude of doubt to the point where it describes proven facts as theories, it will doubt miracle claims more than anything else. Science is actually based on the "theory" that miracles do not happen. Its unspoken methodology is that all things are to be doubted and the supernatural is to be doubted most.

Religion says that science can never say, "Miracles can never happen as that would be it claiming that it has disproved the existence of God. Science denying miracles happen is the same as denying the existence of God." But both reason that if miracles may not happen and God can still exist. God doesn't have to do miracles. So that is a bare-faced lie. Why are they trying to make miracles matter more even than God?!

**Moderate Christians say that science should say that a miracle claim must be critically examined as thoroughly as humanly possible before it may be decided that it is possible that something people might surmise is a miracle has taken place.**

**But science is being definite here that it is something it cannot explain and that does not mean it includes miracle in that assessment.**

**It is possible to say that evidence says a man died and evidence says he was alive again but that is not the same as suggesting it was possibly a miracle.**

**The idea is that science meets religion but there is no meeting intended.**

**They say that miracles are not cases of God showing he has power over nature and is stronger than it. But they are about God helping us through them to understand what kind of God he is so that we might learn from him and be better people and more conformed to his character. They see miracles not as intervention but as interaction. God must be bad at interacting then for he doesn't do that many miracles!**

Christianity is not based on the resurrection of Jesus Christ but on the miracle of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If science could say that Jesus was somehow alive after dying on the cross it still cannot affirm the religious understanding.

Even if Jesus was alive after his crucifixion, the theologian cannot prove that this was a miracle and if he can prove that, the next burden is to try and prove that God did it. This of course is impossible. Science can't explain how God who is spirit can interact with matter. Spirit is not matter. It is not matter with parts. It is not matter without parts. It is really nothing - like the Emperor's New Clothes but the believers can't see that.

Robert Ingersoll wrote: "Science has nothing in common with religion. Facts and miracles never did, and never will agree." Christians call that statement dogmatic and answer "There are more things in Heaven and on earth". So let us try, ""Science has nothing in common with religion. Facts and faith in miracles never did, and never will agree." That stresses that it is more important to condemn belief in miracles than miracles. And it is. Faith in something cannot turn it into a fact if it is not a fact. Faith gets in the way of seeing the facts. If science cannot account for what seems to be a miracle it will call it unexplained not a miracle. Miracles are about faith not science. Even if science could prove a miracle it cannot comment on what is doing it or what did it. That bit is for faith.

Finally

The best theories in science are the best because of the good evidence they are supported by. There are theories that are not as good. God is one of the worst theories for the concept is put beyond the reach of any scientific, moral, spiritual and religious test. For every spiritual person who experiences God's loving presence there is another who experiences the non-existence of God like a Buddhist would.

Science does not have a theory of God. Therefore it regards God as disproven.

The notion that science has no way of touching on God is untrue. It has. It has shown that God is a false hypothesis.

Science ignores possibilities and cares only about facts and probabilities. It rejects the notion that there was any intelligence such as God guiding evolution for it says evolution did not need guidance. Evolution looks and acts unintended - period. The notion of guided evolution is not science.

Religion teaches that God is activity. So his being able to exist without the universe would not mean that he is not part of it. He is not part of it and he is. He is part of it by acting on it and in it. The religious attempt to put God outside of nature is really about trying to put God outside the expertise of scientific investigation. They suspect or know God does not exist and want to protect their delusion.

Theologians who lie to promote God and who say God is right to let terrible things happen to babies are guilty of a terrible wrong. They are using dishonesty to make God seem plausible. If the problem of evil is solvable, it is not solvable if you have to resort to such tactics. Even a believer would have to see that you are deliberately condoning evil. There is malice in your heart.

Science will always matter more than religion or anything else because it checks its data and self-corrects where necessary and that is what it is all about. Science then in principle is superior to any human ideas about God.

