



Resurrection Evidence Audit

A practical manual for honest inquiry, careful comparison, and clearer probability thinking.

Manual	Sincere seekers	Evidence audit
--------	-----------------	----------------

Core promise

The tool does not ask users to become hostile to belief. It asks them to keep confidence, evidence, alternatives, and unknowns visible at the same time.

This guide is written for Christians, doubters, former believers, teachers, and discussion groups who want to test resurrection and miracle claims without hiding the moving parts.

The aim is not a mechanical verdict. The aim is intellectual calibration: seeing what is doing the work, what is being assumed, and what would need to be stronger for the conclusion to be responsible.

<https://xhairs.com/apps/resurrection-evidence-audit/>

How to Use This Manual

This manual is meant to sit beside the app. Read the quick start first, run the teaching parallel, then return to the reference sections when a slider, chart, or warning needs interpretation.

1	Quick Start	Run one honest pass without getting lost in the machinery.
2	Value of the Tool	Why sincere seekers need visible assumptions, not hidden confidence.
3	Who Benefits Most	Christians, doubters, former believers, teachers, and groups.
4	Starting Probability	Why refusing to estimate a prior hides the comparison.
5	Teaching Parallel	Use the demon-caused crash scenario before the resurrection preset.
6-8	Core Functions	Walkthrough, terms, and how to read the visuals.
9-12	Responsible Interpretation	Common mistakes, setting profiles, results, and AI prompt use.
13-17	Group Use and Reference	Discussion guide, facilitator notes, responsible-use checklist, glossary, final word.

Quality standard for the tool

A good audit should leave the user able to name the claim, state the starting probability, identify the strongest evidence, identify the strongest alternatives, preserve reasonable room for unknowns, and explain why the result moved.

The manual uses plain language on purpose. The app includes Bayesian machinery, but the user should not need a philosophy or statistics background to understand the burden of the claim.

1. Quick Start: One Honest Session

For a first use, do not try to perfect every number. The goal is to see the structure of the reasoning and notice which assumptions control the result.

First 5 minutes	Load the teaching parallel and ask what would really justify the claim that a demon turned the wheel.
Next 10 minutes	Move through the selected claim, starting point, evidence, alternatives, and unknown reserve without trying to win the case.
Next 10 minutes	Switch to the resurrection preset and repeat the same discipline. Keep the comparison method consistent.
Final 5 minutes	Read the audit pressure, credence donut, contribution map, warnings, and report. Name the one assumption that matters most.

Do not skip this

If the user will not name a starting probability, the audit cannot compare the claim responsibly. The number can be rough, but it cannot be hidden.

2. The Value of the Tool

The Resurrection Evidence Audit is a self-audit for miracle and resurrection claims. It helps users ask whether their confidence is being carried by evidence, by background assumptions, by personal commitment, by social trust, or by alternatives that have not yet been faced.

The tool is especially useful when someone says a conclusion is obvious, but the actual pieces have not been placed side by side. It makes the user name the claim, assign a starting point, add evidence, compare alternatives, reserve room for unknown explanations, and then read the result with appropriate humility.

The central question

What would the evidence need to look like for this exact claim to be justified?

A sincere seeker does not need a tool that flatters their preferred answer. They need a tool that lets them see where the weight of the argument really sits.

3. Who Benefits Most

Christians	Christians can use the audit to strengthen intellectual honesty. If a belief is important, it should not need hidden arithmetic, exaggerated independence, or dismissed alternatives.
Doubters	Doubters can use the audit to avoid caricature. The tool lets them grant evidence where it exists while asking whether that evidence is strong enough for the specific claim.
Former believers	Former believers can use the audit to sort inherited confidence from present evidence. It helps separate emotional residue from explicit reasoning.
Teachers and groups	Teachers can use the audit as a shared whiteboard for discussion. It slows the argument down and prevents slogans from replacing comparison.

The manual assumes good faith. A person can be sincere and still miscount evidence, understate alternatives, or refuse to name a probability because the number feels spiritually uncomfortable.

4. Why Stating a Starting Probability Matters

Many apologetic conversations stall because someone refuses to assign any starting probability to a dead person rising. But comparison requires a number, even if it is only a rough estimate. Without a starting point, the user cannot tell how much evidence is needed.

Refusing to estimate the starting probability does not avoid probability. It hides it. If a user treats the resurrection as easy to believe before the evidence is examined, that is already a starting probability. If a user treats it as nearly impossible no matter what, that is also a starting probability.

Plain-language rule

A starting probability is not a final verdict. It is the confidence level before this case evidence is added.

The tool asks users to make this visible so the evidence can be compared honestly. A modest claim requires less support. A highly specific miracle claim carries a heavier burden.

5. Begin With the Teaching Parallel

The recommended first exercise is the car-crash teaching parallel: a car crashed because a demon physically turned the steering wheel. This example lowers religious defensiveness while preserving the same structure as the resurrection case.

Users compare the demon claim with ordinary alternatives such as mechanical failure, swerving to avoid an animal, falling asleep, distraction, road conditions, and unknown causes. The lesson is not that the cases are identical. The lesson is that evidence must be compared against competing explanations.

Selected claim	The claim being tested: a demon turned the wheel.
Known material alternatives	Explanations already named, such as mechanical failure or driver error.
Unknown reserve	Room left for causes not yet imagined or discovered.
Evidence contribution	Which item actually moves the claim, and by how much.

After the user sees how quickly a non-material explanation can be over-favored in the car-crash case, the resurrection case becomes easier to inspect without special pleading.

6. Basic Walkthrough

- 1 **State the claim precisely.** Choose a preset or read the selected claim carefully. The audit is about the exact claim on the page, not a vague religious mood.
- 2 **Set the starting point.** Estimate baseline confidence before the case evidence is added. This is where the user faces the prior-probability question.
- 3 **Add evidence.** Adjust each evidence item by asking how likely it is if the claim is true, how likely it is if the claim is false, and how independent it really is.
- 4 **Compare alternatives.** Give ordinary, known alternatives their fair chance. If alternatives fit well, the miracle claim should not receive all the credit by default.
- 5 **Reserve room for unknowns.** Set aside space for unconceived explanations. This is epistemic humility, not a separate theory.
- 6 **Interpret the result.** Read the summary, donut charts, contribution map, pressure warnings, and repair moves together.
- 7 **Generate a report.** Use the report to explain the assumptions and invite further challenge.

The app is most useful when users move the sliders and watch what changes. The point is not to find the most comforting setting. The point is to discover which assumptions control the result.

7. Key Terms in Plain English

Baseline confidence	How plausible the claim is before this case evidence is added.
Evidence lift	How much the evidence raises or lowers the claim after independence and counterevidence are considered.
Revised confidence	The resulting confidence inside the known cause space after the current settings are applied.
Selected claim (CL)	The immaterial or miracle claim currently being audited.
Known material alternatives (MA)	Named ordinary alternatives that could explain the evidence without the selected miracle claim.
Unknown reserve (UN)	Space kept open for explanations not yet conceived. It can include material or immaterial possibilities.
Independence weight	How separate an evidence item is from the others. Shared sources should not be counted as fully independent.
Audit pressure	A warning score showing when assumptions may be carrying more weight than they currently justify.

8. Reading the Visuals

Top summary row	Shows baseline confidence, net evidence lift, revised confidence, what is still needed for high confidence, audit pressure, and cause credence. It stays visible so the user sees the result change live.
Audit pressure donut	Shows whether the current case is under strain. A higher number means the conclusion is depending heavily on contested assumptions, weak independence, dismissed alternatives, or large evidence jumps.
Cause credence donut	Shows how the current probability is divided among the selected claim, known material alternatives, and the unknown reserve.
Evidence contribution map	Answers, 'What is doing the work?' It shows which evidence items move the result up or down and how much of the movement each item carries.

How the charts divide the labor

The credence donut shows where confidence ends up. The contribution map shows which evidence moved it there.

9. Common Mistakes the Tool Reveals

- **Counting related testimony as fully independent.** If reports share people, traditions, texts, or communities, they may not multiply confidence as much as they first appear to.
- **Treating sincerity as confirmation.** Sincere people can be mistaken, misremember, interpret under pressure, or inherit a tradition honestly.
- **Moving from unexplained to miraculous too quickly.** A gap in current explanation is not automatically evidence for a specific supernatural cause.
- **Dismissing ordinary alternatives too fast.** Material alternatives must be weighed before the miracle claim receives the remaining probability.
- **Ignoring negative evidence.** Delayed records, silence from external sources, and source dependence can pull against the claim.
- **Refusing to estimate a prior.** This hides a probability judgment instead of removing one.
- **Leaving no unknown reserve.** A zero-reserve posture often signals overconfidence, especially in ancient-history questions.

10. The Three Settings Buttons

Believer-friendly settings	A generous pass that shows how the case looks when the user grants many apologetic assumptions. Useful for seeing the strongest charitable version.
Seeker's audit settings	A middle setting for sincere inquiry. It gives evidence real force while preserving caution about independence, alternatives, and unknowns.
Stricter audit settings	A tougher pass that asks what happens when the user demands stronger independence, clearer evidence, and more serious alternatives.

The manual recommendation is to try all three. If a conclusion only survives under the believer-friendly setting, that is important information. If it remains strong under stricter settings, that is also important information.

11. Interpreting the Result

A result is not an oracle. It is a diagnostic snapshot of the current assumptions. The app is telling the user what follows if the visible settings are accepted.

Low revised confidence	The current evidence, as entered, does not yet carry the specific claim very far.
High audit pressure	The conclusion may be leaning on assumptions that need defense or repair.
Large unknown reserve	The user is preserving room for missing causes, incomplete records, or explanations not yet named.
Dominant evidence item	One item is doing most of the work. That item deserves special scrutiny.
Strong negative contribution	A counterevidence item is materially dragging down the claim and should not be hidden in prose.

A mature interpretation can say, 'This is where the current assumptions lead, and this is what would need to improve for higher confidence.'

12. Using the AI Prompt

The AI prompt is designed to challenge the user's possible irrational stances, hidden assumptions, and calculation mistakes. It should be used as a pressure-testing partner, not as an authority.

Good use

Ask the AI to identify where the user's priors, evidence weights, independence assumptions, alternative treatment, or unknown-reserve settings may be too convenient.

The user should still make the final judgment. AI can notice patterns, but it cannot replace intellectual responsibility.

13. Discussion Guide

For groups, the strongest sessions begin with the teaching parallel and then move to the resurrection preset. The facilitator should ask participants to explain why they moved a slider, not merely where they moved it.

- 1 Which slider felt most uncomfortable to move?
- 2 Which ordinary alternative did you most want to dismiss quickly?
- 3 Which evidence item carried the largest share of positive movement?
- 4 Did any negative evidence change the aggregate result?
- 5 What starting probability did you implicitly assume before the tool asked for one?
- 6 How much unknown reserve feels intellectually honest for ancient-history claims?
- 7 What evidence would actually lower your confidence?
- 8 What evidence would justifiably raise it?

14. Facilitator Notes

- Keep the tone calm. Defensiveness usually means the tool has found a pressure point.
- Do not let participants treat the sliders as decoration. Every large movement should be explained.
- Separate personal meaning from evidential support. A belief can matter deeply while still needing evidence.
- Use the report as a record of assumptions, not as a debate trophy.
- Encourage users to run the same logic on non-Christian claims. Consistency is part of the point.

The best manual use is iterative: run the teaching parallel, run the resurrection case, read the warnings, adjust one assumption at a time, and ask what changed.

15. Responsible Use Checklist

Before treating an audit result as meaningful, the user should be able to answer each of these questions in ordinary language.

Claim clarity	Can I state the exact claim without sliding between a modest claim and a stronger miracle claim?
Starting point	Have I named a baseline probability instead of hiding it behind phrases like 'possible' or 'God can do anything'?
Evidence quality	Have I separated what the evidence actually shows from what I want it to mean?
Independence	Have I reduced the weight of evidence items that may share sources, communities, memories, or later retellings?
Alternatives	Have I allowed ordinary explanations to compete before assigning the remaining probability to the miracle claim?
Unknown reserve	Have I preserved reasonable room for explanations I have not yet conceived, especially with ancient and incomplete records?
Negative evidence	Have I included the evidence that pulls against the claim, not only the evidence that supports it?
Reportability	Could another careful person inspect my settings and understand why I chose them?

Best sign of honest use

The user can say not only what conclusion the tool produced, but which assumption would most change that conclusion if adjusted.

16. Glossary

Alternative	A competing explanation that might account for the evidence without the selected claim.
Bayes factor	A measure of how much more expected the evidence is if the claim is true than if it is false.
Credence	A degree of confidence, usually expressed as a percentage.
Independence	The degree to which one evidence item is separate from another.
Prior	The starting probability before the present evidence is added.
Reserve	Probability deliberately left open because the user may be missing possibilities.
Sensitivity	How much the result changes when one assumption changes.
Specific claim	The exact proposition being tested, not a broad religious impression.

17. Final Word

Honest inquiry does not require hostility toward belief. It requires refusing to let confidence outrun the evidence.

The Resurrection Evidence Audit is valuable because it makes the hidden parts visible: starting probabilities, evidence weights, dependence, alternatives, unknowns, and pressure points. A sincere seeker can then ask the most important question with less fog: what does the evidence actually justify?