

IF SCIENCE AND RELIGION FITS THEN HOW COULD MAN INVENT RELIGION AND AVOID DAMAGING SCIENCE? IS MAN PSYCHIC?

NOMA stands for Non Overlapping Magisteria. It seeks to refute the allegation that science and religion cannot fit or cohere. It orders science not to claim it can refute the idea that an intelligent power is needed to explain the origin and the seeming design in the universe.

Stephen Jay Gould argued that there is no conflict between real religion and real science. There is no overlap, according to him, between the authorities of science and religion. There is a Non-Overlapping Magisteria or NOMA.

If God and his true religion compliment science or if science and faith don't interfere with each other then God is responsible. He set this up. It follows that if religion has doctrines made by man not God or is purely manmade that this principle is undermined and ruined. Man is not infallible like God and man being right means its down to luck. Man simply also has to be making loads of errors.

Man made religion

Notice how NOMA demands that science should do its work and let it filter through religion. That only leads to religion interpreting and revising the work of science.

If religion is only man-made or if too many religions are man-made then NOMA tries to protect the men who invent the religions from refutation. That is intrinsically bad.

Some say science and religion have different jobs. They claim, "Science cannot tell us everything - it only helps us discover a part of reality. There is more to reality than what is discovered by science for there are things that will never be discovered. Religion is supposed to help make science intelligible. It helps work out things about reality that science cannot work out."

Christianity says that faith in the Christian religion and in the doctrines and truths God has revealed is not natural and is a gift from God. This recognises that the religion of God has to come from God and not man for man errs and the religions creates could turn nasty or mislead people. A man-made religion is an oxymoron. It can have no binding force. Would you really think you should say abracadabra every day five times just because some man says so? Whatever does not bind or obligate in reality is not a religion though it may be a semblance of one. Religion is in reality the experience of your faith a gift from a supernatural power that tells you the truth and only the truth and demands obedience. Anything else is fake religion for it is deliberately man-made. It would be terrible if we thought we shouldn't challenge it or criticise it constructively. Anything human is dangerous if it is made sacred or sacrosanct. In short, if man made it, fault it where it should be faulted.

So if real religion is a revelation that is between you and God and nobody else then clearly a lot of what passes for religion actually is not. Only the individual or God can know if a person really is religious or not. This would mean that we may talk about the relationship between science and religious theory but not science and religion. But let us forget this point to proceed and work out what happens if it is about science and religion.

NOMA assumes that nothing is relevant to science unless it can test it and experiment. Why something rather than nothing if it is about how things exist is relevant to science even if science cannot experiment on it. The claim that a certain liquid cures cancer is still relevant to science and still speaks to science even if the liquid is disposed of forever so science cannot get to it. You need more than 'experimentability' to make something scientific or relevant to science.

Science is doing theology if it assumes there is no way God can be tested or that God does not want to be tested. That is not science and religion in different spheres.