

SCIENCE AND RELIGION - THE CLAIM THAT THEY CONFLICT IS THE SIMPLE TRUTH!

Science is about being open to abandoning its ideas if they are shown wrong. Religion says God tells it its ideas are true and trust means you believe God's testimony even if evidence comes up that it is wrong.

It is clear that religion is a threat to truth and science is not. Religion makes a sideshow to distract from that by saying science has its sphere and business and religion has a different one so one cannot really refute the other.

Religion calls evil a malfunction. It is not real but is just good failing to reach its potential. Science is the study of what functions and what does not. Normal is important to it. That is how theories come about. So religion cannot say science is about the physical not the moral or the spiritual. It may be indirect but real. Religion says there is no evil unless there is a God and thus no normality. Then it is lying by saying that science which is heavily concerned about the normal is outside the realm of religion.

The laws of science and the laws of nature are hoped to match up but they may not. Laws of nature are also laws of science in principle. It takes work to make sure you have got it right. When there is no match, all that is wrong is that there is science to be discovered. Science is not about just what we have but about what is out there and that is waiting to be found.

Reason is science. Science is reason. Reason is basically if a then not b. Science does everything with that principle. Just seeing that your tea is cold not hot is science. Your body is the machine you do the experiment with. The computer in your head is what is assessing and interpreting and understand the experiment. Science at its core goes back to all that. Science is about what can be tested to see if it is there. Then it thinks about it. So reason is based on natural things. Metaphysical reasoning is not reasoning at all. There is no test to see if a being without parts or material components or a body can exist. Thus science and supernatural claims are in conflict. Notice I said supernatural claims. That is not the same thing as saying science and the supernatural cannot agree. It is the same thing as saying that the problem with the supernatural is not the supernatural but the claims made about it.

Science whether secular or coming from Christians has destroyed many religions. It has shown that you cannot control how the sun rises by offering human sacrifices. It shows that there are no gods living on Mount Olympus. Most religions have been exposed by science. Some go a step further and argue that science debunks, at least implicitly, the religions of Christianity and Islam.

Religion cares about what you believe and what you think and not how you think. That is what religion is for. Some religions try to brainwash while others try to draw you in by being nice to you.

Science does not care in the slightest what you believe or want to believe. It is ruthless regarding truth and finding it. Even scientists who assert something in the name of science cannot appeal to their own authority - they have to present the case for what they say and are subject to ruthless examination.

We have already shown that scientists/theologians who say religion and science fits are lying. Both the scientists and the theologians are probably just Trojan Horse people or liars who want to wear down the other side gradually while pretending to respect it.

Science is not based on proof by experiment. It is proof. The experiment is only necessary to show that it is proof. It is thought that science has nothing to say about religious faith for it is verified or shown probably true by ways and means other than science. But the reality is that science only regards testable stuff as possibly true and the testing is done by experimentation and reasoning to see how a discovery fits other discoveries. Religion never experiments in any form. Science upholds all experimentation even if it is testing nonsense and regards anything that does not experiment as not only non-scientific but anti-scientific. Even bad experimentation methods are better than nothing in the estimation of science. There is nothing worse than something that is put outside the realm of testing. Science rejects whatever is unconcerned about experimentation 100%.

Science depends on the working assumption that the supernatural does not happen. The supernatural does not help science understand the universe so science sees itself as mattering and religion as not mattering. It is that simple. But many ignore it and tell lies to obscure and confuse.

The other matter is that not a single religion gets the official support of science not even as being the one religion that is more scientifically supported and respectful to science than the others. Science does not say any religion has got it right in terms of science. Religion never lets science ratify its own scientific statements.

The Questions

Is it true that science and religion are in conflict? Some prefer to say that science and faith in God (as in the Islamic or Christian version) are in conflict. They think that is clearer.

Others think that science is the only field that can show that religion's truth claims are false or at least without believability. That is an error. A religion with an incoherent and fanciful theology shows itself to be a man-made concoction rather than the true religion. So science is not the only way to debunk religion. It might be the best for debunking some religions but not others. It depends.

For some, science is demanding that religion prove itself on scientific terms. They say this demands unfairly that you either be for science or against science. What do they mean? They mean that religion cannot be tested for truthiness in the lab and it's unfair. And if it is not testable in the lab you are accused of being anti-science.

Think about evidence and why it is important. Ask yourself why saying, "I believe Jesus turns bread and wine into his body and blood" cannot be as good as saying, "I believe that if I jump into deep water I can drown." Then you will understand what kind of question we are asking. The person speaking as a religious person wants his belief to be exalted over everything else and that is unfair and unreasonable.

They add that it is not fair to ask religion to scientifically verify its claims for that is not what religion is about. But religion is more than just God and magic and supernatural revelations but is a way of looking at everything including science and politics.

Religion does not want to be about science to any degree. The reason that is that if there were tools to check itself out it would not use them or let others use them.

Some religion does not think science is a totally different thing from religion but embraces it. Liberal religion changes its beliefs and waters them down to avoid any overlaps with science. For example, liberal Christians claim the story of the first man and woman is only a parable and there was no Adam and Eve.

Some feel that science has sometimes misled people and brought in harmful discoveries and help to make weapons. They say that it is unfair to blame science for this so one should not blame religion for all the lies and violence and superstition that seems to follow it. But science is a need and religion is not. We can all adjust without being in a religion. And each one of us is a scientist in our own way. It is science that you need to go out with the broom when it is raining heavily. Science then is a basic human right.

Religion is a worldview. Some say science is not a worldview but a limited tool. If it is just a tool, then it appears it can fit religion or at least some religions. But science is not about using a tool. It is about using a tool to work out a picture and the truth about reality!

In a nutshell, science is about what the evidence says and about checking theories out before they can be accepted. It is self-correcting. Religion does not care about evidence much and will hold on to nonsense regardless of the weight of the evidence against it. So in a contest should you believe science or religion? The self-correcting system is the one that should get the benefit of the doubt. And that is science. Also there is more agreement among scientists than there is among religionists so science promotes unity through truth and love of truth. Even if religion believes in using evidence for its own claims, it presents that evidence in a way that it cannot be checked. It gives you the wrong kind of evidence. Its brand of evidence is dangerous for even evidence is bad if it cannot be checked out or has not been.

Scientific and natural beliefs are self-correcting. If you think bees can live in the snow that is easy to check. The supernatural belief is necessarily non-self-correcting. For example, if somebody thinks the risen Jesus, undetectably except by faith, boiled her kettle this morning there is nothing that can be done to help the person see this is nonsense. You cannot do an experiment. It cannot be checked. A belief that is not testable is not as valuable as one that is. The risk of error is greater. And the craftiest lies cannot be found out. They make the worst and most persistent lies of them all!

Science is about testing and taking nothing for granted. Science is superior to some religion even if such religion is okay and seemingly reliable. Science is in conflict with many religions and their scriptures.

COMPLEMENT EACH OTHER?

The statement that religion and science complement each other is useless. What religion is compatible? It makes no sense to say that every religion is compatible. How could Mormonism agree with science when it holds that we are only on earth

6000 years?

Some would say, "No scientist is being professional if he judges which theologies and religions fit science. That is not his job. The prophet, pope, Messiah, theologian and minister has to assess the science to see if it fits the religious beliefs of his sect. Therefore science can't say they fit unless religion says it." That is putting one or two religions over science. They are its adjudicators. It makes a mockery of science.

But suppose science or religion should decide each other's boundaries and judge.

Who should say it first? While both voices may matter whose voice matters most - the religionist or the scientist? The self-checking discipline is science. Science owns the voice that matters. Religion does not matter at all if push comes to shove.

What if there is nothing in a religion that contradicts science. Being compatible does not mean they agree. It does nothing to make the religion more credible for anybody can invent a religion that fits.

Some religions say there is only one correct religion. If Christianity is the true religion then if religion and science can go together that is the same as saying that Christianity and science go together.

The argument that science started with religion and particularly Christianity actually accuses religions that don't bother with science or research of being anti-science or indifferent to it. They are accused of not compatible with science. As for Christianity causing science, it was only copying the pagans who attempted it and no command from God can be found in the Bible that demands that science be respected never mind carried out.

The Christian religion as a whole does not finance or engage in scientific research. Many anti-science faiths have members that go their own way and engage in scientific research. It does not follow that the religion approves or that its version of God agrees with it.

Some go as far as to argue that Islamic Iran which is extremely religious has scientists. But these scientists are not investigating religion or travelling into religious territory. Their kind of science is about warfare and medicine and sadly so is most science. Thankfully Christianity is no longer able to stop scientists probing into other matters.

Science within parameters is not proper science though it may get results. Science treated like that is treated as something that needs to be contained for furthering a religious-political agenda - it is more like treating science as a necessary evil as something necessary but regrettable. That attitude ruins and threatens science by despising its majesty.

Religious people say that religious truths are not discoverable by science but by other ways. They point out that something can be true without science being able to prove it. Their argument could be sincere or it could be just a ploy to put religion outside the pale of scientific scrutiny to fool the people. I would insist that sincerity should only be assumed if the religion has a marked and above average production of good works and good and smart people. But if a person tries to protect his doctrines and religion from refutation the person is more interested in deceiving himself than in the truth. Even if he is not deceiving himself he is suspect for he wants to too much.