

Get That Supernatural Out Of Here!

Category: Supernatural

Example A)

"What can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence."

Christopher Hitchens

Example B)

"If someone doesn't value evidence, what evidence are you going to provide that they should value it? If someone doesn't value logic, what logical argument could you provide to show the importance of logic?"

Sam Harris

Example C)

"A virgin can conceive, a dead body can walk again, the blind can see. Nonsense. It's not moral to lie to children. It's not moral to lie to ignorant, uneducated people..."

Christopher Hitchens

Example D)

Methodological Naturalism: The exclusion of the supernatural from all discussions. The philosophical doctrine that for any study of the world to qualify as "scientific", it cannot refer to God's creative activity in any way

(It is the philosophical basis for science.)

Metaphysical Naturalism: Anti-supernatural

Anti-supernaturalism: Anti-supernatural

Naturalism: Nothing but nature exists

Example E)

Implicit bias can be the ruination of science.

“Our willingness to accept scientific claims that are against common sense is the key to an understanding of the real struggle between science and the supernatural. We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for the unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism.”

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our prior adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated: I see moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a divine foot in the door.”

Prof. Richard Lewontin

“When a man stops believing in God, he doesn’t then believe in nothing, he believes in everything.”

G.K. Chesterton

Example F)

“If you are willing to answer yes to God outside of nature, then there’s nothing inconsistent with God, on rare occasions, choosing to invade the natural world in a way that appears miraculous.”

Richard Dawkins

Example G)

“The Catholic church... seized on the Big Bang Model and in 1951 officially pronounced it to be in accordance with the Bible.”

Stephen Hawking

Example H)

"Theology is not what we know about God, but what we do not know about nature."

Robert Ingersoll

Example I)

"One can't prove that God doesn't exist, but science makes God unnecessary. The laws of physics can explain the universe without the need for a creator."

Stephen Hawking

Example J)

"Because the law of gravity exists, the universe can and will create itself from nothing."

Stephen Hawking

Example K)

"Before we understand science, it is natural to believe that God created the universe."

Stephen Hawking

Example L)

"I think the universe was spontaneously created out of nothing."

Stephen Hawking

Example M)

"A scientific man ought to have no wishes, no affections, – a mere heart of stone."

Charles Darwin

Example N)

"The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain agnostic."

Charles Darwin

Example O)

"I think the universe was spontaneously created out of nothing, according to the laws of science. It has no beginning and no end." (contrast this with L)

Stephen Hawking

Example P)

"Science investigates nature, but that doesn't mean it should limit all causes to naturalistic explanation."

Creation Ministries International

Food for Thought

When someone you're speaking with charges out of the gate with,

"I will discuss this with you, Bill, but I won't tolerate a single word about that supernatural nonsense. If you intend to do that, I'm out of here. Are we clear?"

What are your options?

1. Agree to exclude the supernatural from the discussion because of the chafing statement you were just treated to.
2. End the conversation and bring up the Red Sox.
3. Ask a question.

Okay, #3 is best, but what kind of question?

If you listened to what the speaker said, several options appear:

- A. Ask about the "I will discuss" comment.
- B. Ask about the "won't tolerate" comment.
- C. Ask about the "supernatural nonsense" comment.
- D. Ask about the speaker's view on the natural.

Before I give you actual responses, I want you to be clear that the speaker's statement, no matter how it's said, is merely a preemptive strike.

Atheists are especially silly about the "supernatural." They needn't be as fearful as they are about a discussion of the supernatural. In a few minutes I think you will discover why their priests and propagandists make this preemptive strike. The person you are speaking to, the average person, the one just like you, has no idea why he is making this preemptive strike; he or she is just following the script. Christians are often, no, almost always, guilty of the same. We follow a script. Let's stop with that.

Let's return to our questions: (A, B, C and D above).

Option A: Ask about the "I will discuss" comment

“My friend, (slowly while smiling, but only a bit) you began with, ‘I will discuss’ – Tell me please, how do you define discussion?”

Since I know that a discussion is an exchange of ideas, I am going to continue to ask about what having a discussion would and should look like. But, I will only mention the exchange of ideas in passing. I do not care to have them surrender; I only desire a discussion, even if I sneak in a side door to have it.

“What is it about the supernatural that bothers you so?”

Believe me, you will be lucky, if you even get a reply like,

“It’s absurd.”

Mostly there is only stumbling on the speaker’s part.

“Christopher Hitchens, the famous Atheist, used to say this thing, Atheists call it ‘Hitch’s Razor’, which states that what can be asserted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence. Is that what you mean, maybe?”

I help out our Atheist here so I can keep a discussion going, and it helps me understand how able a thinker my friend is in the moment. Remember, I wish to persuade, not win.

Eventually, in some way, I’m going to ask if the “natural is all there is” theory faces a difficulty when it is asked, why is there anything at all? Is there a natural only explanation for “something from nothing”? Sounds like magic, right? The Atheist’s magic smells a good deal like my supernatural, don’t you think?

Option B: Ask about the “won’t tolerate” comment

“Okay, suppose I agree to hush my mouth about the supernatural, don’t you think ‘won’t tolerate’ is a bit strong? Maybe you should use ‘I’d love to discuss things with you, but do me a favor, please leave out any talk about the supernatural, okay’?”

(Say it slowly, softly, and while gently smiling). Then ask about a completely natural explanation for “anything existing” (It will be magic in the end).

Option C: Ask about the “supernatural nonsense” comment

“Well, I don’t consider the supernatural to be nonsensical, but let’s suppose I agree not to discuss it, can you help me understand all that I see around me? I mean, where did it come from?”

Option D: Ask about the speakers View on “natural”

Can you see that A, B, and C are really all D?

Look, this conversation always ends up in a discussion about:

- Something from nothing
- Cause and effect
- Chance

These 3 must be stressed. All 3 are uncomfortable to discuss, even for seasoned Atheists. The junior Atheists you will encounter will fare poorly, and when doubt creeps in about Atheism, it opens doors for you to persuade.

- Which is better at explaining why there is anything at all, naturalism or supernaturalism?

Since I have gone over these earlier in the questions, I won’t rehash them here. But, please bear down on these four – they will become clearer and clearer to you as you discuss them.

You will learn that the preemptive strike is made necessary due to the weakness of the naturalist's view. Wise Atheists refuse to engage in a serious discussion about beginnings and something from nothing – they know it's a loser position, and they are out to win, don't you doubt it.

Reread Example E, by Lewontin. Here an Atheist handles this, "[Get that supernatural out of here](#)" brilliantly. Dogmatism cripples science.

As Lewontin says, "[because we have a prior commitment to materialism](#)". Science does not compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world. For example, these great scientists all believed in God:

- Isaac Newton
- Galileo
- Copernicus, and many others

So, why this dogmatism? Lewontin replies, "[We are forced by our prior adherence to material causes.](#)" Yes, a prior commitment to materialism will make one fearful, to the point of absurdity and the degradation of science, of allowing a divine foot in the door.

Surprisingly, Richard Dawkins, in Example F, states simply that if one accepts the notion of God, then there's nothing inconsistent about God invading the natural world (I did mean to point out how odd it was that Dawkins used "appears". It contradicts what he just said).

"When a man stops believing in God, he doesn't then believe in nothing, he believes in anything."

G.K. Chesterton

Sad proof of this truth/observation by Chesterton resides in Example I, Example J, Example L, and Example O – all by Stephen Hawking. What a sad case, a brilliant mind desperately attempting to bury God. You may recall that Hawking finally spewed out his Multiverse Theory (infinite number of universes without a hint of scientific proof). At least he died before stooping to Panspermia, the alien life-sperm distribution theory.

Two quotes by Darwin that ought to be remembered.

"A scientific man ought to have no wishes, no affections – a mere heart of stone."

Charles Darwin

If only Darwin and Hawking believed this. Darwin published, The Descent of Man in 1871, and he proved that he did not live out the quote above.

"The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain agnostic."

Charles Darwin

Why insoluble? Why no heart of stone for this scientist as his quote says? Because, for Darwin, the supernatural is not allowed. *Reason, logic, and science be damned, we must not allow God's foot in the door!*

Miracles? Really?

Hitchens, in Example C, lists but a few, to him, absurdities, which are to me but what I would expect of an omnipresent, omnipotent God. Once again, Hitchens commitment to naturalism paralyzes his thinking.

- A virgin conception? Yes
- A dead body walking? Yes
(Several dead bodies are restored to life)
- The blind can see? Yes

All lies, saith the English-American blowhard. The man with no absolute morals does insist we adopt his version – Hitchens says, "[It's not moral to lie to ignorant, uneducated people](#)". I'm more stupid than ignorant and uneducated.

All Atheists, would-be-Atheists, and pretend Atheists crying out, "Give us a reason, give us rationality!" will, in the next breath, swear undying allegiance to "something from nothing" or having an "effect without a cause". They are a wearisome tribe.

As a Christian, it's necessary that you know what a miracle is, as you will be called on to defend them. I revel in that opportunity.

Scripture speaks of “**Wonders, mighty works, and signs**”, all expressing the fact that there are miracles. I truly like “wonders” as that is what happens when a miracle occurs, you are filled with wonder.

Consider the dead who were raised:

Who was raised	Raised by	Reference
The son of the widow of Nain	Jesus	Luke 7:11-17
The daughter of the ruler of the synagogue	Jesus	Luke 8:49-56
Lazarus	Jesus	John 11:38-44
The son of the widow of Zarephath	Elijah	1 Kings 17:17-24
The son of the Shunammite woman	Elisha	2 Kings 4:18 – 37
Tabitha of Joppa	Peter	Acts 9:36-41
Eutychus	Paul	Acts 20: 9-12

These miracles were wrought by God through Jesus, Elijah, Elisha, Peter and Paul. **Can you name any others?**

What is irrational about a God, who spoke all of creation into being, intervening in His creation to do as He wills? The number of miracles recorded in the Bible is a large, a very large number. The foolish Atheist, self-constrained materialist that he is, asserts defiantly, “God cannot break His own laws!” The laws of nature the Atheist means. This has always puzzled me. God did not set the globe a-spinning and go away for the winter. **God upholds, directs, disposes and governs all creatures, actions and things from the greatest to the least by His most wise and holy providence** according to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and I believe it and take comfort in it, because the Bible exhibits it. God does whatever He wishes to do. Only a devout materialist would elevate natural law above the God whose natural law it is.

It is the doubt concerning Biblical miracles that is absurd.