

Miracles: Intellectual Absurdity?

By Ben Bilyeu

If God, the creator of physical reality exists, and if He chose to reveal His existence to man, **the singular species of evidence that God must—MUST—give to document His presence is the suspension of natural law e.g., a non-normative event commonly called a “miracle”.** Why the suspension of natural law? If God is the creator, He would be expected to be able to manipulate physical reality. **If the Being who made the claim to be “God”, is indeed “God”, i.e., the arch—engineer of material reality, His dominion over the processes of the natural world is a foregone conclusion and the suspension of natural law is the only demonstrative act on the part of God that could not be confused as some illusion perpetuated by man!** (The logic, here, is elementary.) It thus follows that any meaningful search for “traces” of Deity will be the search for and the intense scrutiny of the claims of individuals attesting that they were witnesses to the demonstration of atypical phenomena—miracles, atypical phenomenon being the only kind of evidence that would suffice.

In the modern world, the very idea of a “miracle,” to many, is viewed as an expression of rank ignorance on the part of the claimant. The usual rationale for the

rejection of even the idea of a miracle is to banish any objective inquiry into the credibility of a supposed miracle. That is, the orderly (and predictable) processes of the natural world—natural law—reject the phenomenon, e.g., the “laws of nature” and forbid even the idea of miraculous phenomenon as such is counter to establish science.

It is of merit to note that this argument rejecting miracles, de facto, is deductive, the major premise being “the immutable laws of nature forbid miracles”. Of course, the strength of a deductive argument rests upon the truth of the major premise. Can one strictly form an objective, logical decree “the immutable laws of nature forbid miracles? That proposition should be deemed true only if it has been proven to be true. If proven to be true, then, indeed, the very idea of a miracle is truly absurd! But if that proposition is not true, then “The immutable laws of nature forbid miracles” is dogma! The claim of “immutable” is not the mere observation of what has been, but is the declaration of what must be! If the proposition is true, e.g. “the immutable laws of nature forbid miracles”, then the question follows: “Who proved that the ‘laws of nature are immutable’” since those who reject miraculous phenomenon always appeal

to science as an absolute. More specifically, what experiments proved the laws of nature to be immutable? The expression “law of nature” is only a generalization recognizing the pattern of function of any given natural phenomenon. The decree that any part of physical reality acts in a set manner rests upon the induction e.g., the observations for the past fifty to three hundred years. **However, there does not exist any rationale, which guarantees that natural phenomena must act in the future based upon how it has acted in the past.** This is called the “inductive leap”. This is the inherent weakness of inductive logic, scientific method, when applied to natural phenomenon. **There does not exist any logic—any rationale which insists that matter and energy categorically must behave in a certain way** and that they must behave in a set way in the future. Thus, the generalization “immutable laws of nature” is a superficial generalization and is not an axiom. To disregard the provisional nature of inductive logic in reference to the function of the laws of nature as being “immutable,” is dogma.

In the modern world, two principal arguments are in vogue which banish not only any critical investigation into observations attesting that an

atypical event, viz., a miracle has occurred (regardless of the credibility of the observers), but also banishes even the idea of a non normative event viz, miraculous phenomena, from serious consideration. One argument is philosophical; the other argument is “scientific”.

The author of the philosophical argument is David Hume, while the author of the scientific argument is Charles Darwin. The author of the philosophical argument, David Hume, discovered a new argument, which supposedly cast any and every account of atypical phenomenon to the rubbish heap of ignorant and superstitious ideas. Hume claimed to have discovered a new argument which renders every claim to the miraculous as void of credibility and thus void of consideration: “I flatter myself that I have discovered an argument of a like nature which, if just, will, with the wise and learned, be an everlasting check to all kinds of superstitious delusions.”(p. 118 An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding, 1748) “A miracle is the violation of the laws of nature and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws.... nothing is esteemed a miracle if it ever happened in the common course of nature...there must, therefore, be a uniform experience against every

miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation, and as a uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full proof, from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any miracle...” (Ibid. p. 122,123)

“We readily reject any fact which is unusual and incredible in an ordinary degree.” (Ibid. p. 125) The exponent of the “scientific argument” is none other than Charles Darwin, the author of the modern thesis of organic evolution. The essence of Darwin’s argument is that deity, the creator, is not necessary because every living thing came into being due to chance and arbitrary circumstance eons ago. Since life inherently exhibits order and design via its chanced existence, one does not need to appeal to a “creator” to explain the existence of life. **It is of merit to note that Darwin did not claim to have proved in his influential book Origin of The Species, 1859, or in any other book for that matter, that life had evolved or that Deity does not exist!!** Darwin only advanced a hypothesis regarding the evolution of life over vast epochs of time—not a “theory” and categorically Darwin did not contend that evolution is a “scientific fact.” It was left to the latter day disciples of organic evolution to propagate the deception and propaganda

that life evolved and that evolution was an established scientific fact! As the evolutionist Gaylord Simpson wrote: “In the present study, the factual truth of organic evolution is taken as established...” (p. 5 The Meaning of Evolution, 1949)

Hume’s proposition that whatever is not the normal human experience must be rejected, represents an inexperienced and provincial view of reality! (The proposition is also fallacious!) Hume’s mental world was both pre-scientific and experientially secluded and cloistered. To accept Hume’s proposition would mean that one could not accept the discovery of the planet Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto, the electron, (an innumerable number of subatomic particles), radio waves, x-rays, and DNA. Each of these realities upon their first discovery were both “unusual and incredible in an ordinary degree.” **Hume’s argument assumed that the knowledge of eighteenth century England represented the zenith of the human experience—for all time!!** **The central fallacy of Hume’s argument is that it denies the possibility of new experience!** Not one of the preceding subtles of physical reality is of the common human experience—not one— nor will any one of the aforementioned subtles ever be the “common experience”. Hume’s

rejection of miraculous phenomena is consequently invalid and represents a stunning example of poor reasoning, if not blatant sophistry! As Mill wrote: “Hume’s celebrated doctrine, that nothing is credible which is contradictory to experience, or at variance with laws of nature, is merely this very plain and harmless proposition, that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible.”(p 439 A System of Logic, 1874). The fact that Hume’s grandiose fallacy was given so much credibility for over two centuries is a testament to the inexcusable ignorance of generations of supposedly educated scientists and supposedly learned academics and their bias and their consequent disregard of the science of logic!

Darwins' contention that life evolved over vast eons of time was never proven by Darwin nor has Darwinian evolution been proven since 1859— the propaganda of academe notwithstanding!! Further, **Darwin’s “theory” can never be proven!** Why? Because the supposed process of the transformation of the species over billions of years cannot be subjected to experimental method. The process can never be repeated in the lab and thus validated.

Is the idea of miraculous phenomena intellectually absurd? In a word— No! Conceptually, is the idea of an atypical non-normative phenomena absurd? Again,

the answer is— No! The prospective existence of miraculous phenomenon is simply a hypothesis, a candidate for examination and analysis. **There does not exist any logical rationale for the rejection of the theoretical possibility of atypical phenomena!!** © 2005 from The Existence of God: a Rational Inquiry by Ben Bilyeu, P.O. Box 1452, Cookeville, TN. 38503 bilyeu@usit.net