

Science & Secularism: Real Secularism is Scientific

Science is not separable from philosophy. It is a form of philosophy. Philosophy and science depend on the same tools. They require methods and tests so that concepts can be analysed for meaning and for credibility. Argumentation is fundamental to both of them. Both use thinking techniques to root out bad arguments and mistakes. They are on a continuum.

Science and a lot of philosophy is about realism - it cannot see spirits as real for it only sees what which is made of parts or based on parts as real. Spirits are the opposite of material things. Science is about increasing good feeling which means it is willing to tell us to discard religion and God should they hinder it statistically. It defines how the brain is able to determine what is real. Unless some vision can be tested and shown real, it will be categorised as an illusion. Science opposed tautology. Religion says there is evidence for God and God creates the evidence. But that is tautology or circular reasoning. A criminal making evidence that he committed the crime is not giving you evidence at all. Evidence has to be independent. For these reasons science is the opposite of God faith and religion. For these reasons, science embraces the philosophy of secularism.

Science is testing claims to find the truth and eliminate the lies and errors - science is about learning the truth through testing and questioning and doubting and revising. Religion cannot be as good as science for it is not about testing. Faith does not test. Faith has no method but religion does. It has methods for inducing faith or making you think you have it. There is no other word for that but manipulation.

Secularism is acting as if there is no God or as if what God wants is immaterial.

How does science relate to secularism?

Science has to take the attitude, "Even if we cannot prove or disprove God or his activity by testing, if there is evidence for his non-existence or existence then we will follow it to the conclusion. The evidence for or against God is what matters which means God does not matter if there is evidence against him or no proper evidence." This cares about evidence for God and not God. This cares about evidence for a no-God and not atheism. Science is secular. If science finds God, it will be like the secularist who has intellectual belief in God but no relationship or love for God.

Religion has resolved to ignore science if it proves that all things happened without an intelligent designing God. It says that if science fails to find evidence of God or debunks all evidence for God that it only means there are ways other than science to verify God sufficiently. But a non-testable verification is not a verification at all. It is as bad as saying that if x was proven to have been physically incapable of murdering Tony that there must be another way of showing he did it. It is really just politely saying, "Evidence means nothing to me but I cannot admit that." Also, testable reasons for believing something are the best reasons.

Surely an all-good God could design a universe that allows science to be a gift from God that shows us a lot about what God is like? A testable God? A God who is put outside the reach of testing is suspect or rather his supporters are!

Religion says that, "Faith as in relationship with God depends on belief in God in the same way a husband needs to believe he has his wife if he is to love her." Some think that science if it gives evidence for God would mean that science is now speaking to faith. But science would not talking about to talking to faith. Science giving evidence for the existence of God would not mean that science and religion/faith are now one. It still does not endorse god based faith but opens the door to it. Belief and faith are related but not the same. Science brings you to belief and if there is a God we should start off with belief in God. Then faith can come

The argument that religion and science work in separate spheres fails to recognise that some religions like science are into belief not faith. Some religions are not into faith but belief. You could argue that if science shows any interest in belief in God that is religious. Religion is based on secular ideas not just religious or spiritual ones. Religion finds a way by which the secular is absorbed and turned into a part of it.

Christianity's hyper-core doctrine is that God called all things into existence from nothing. The doctrine is thus so important and so sacred that anything that does not base itself on it is thus by definition anti-God. Science cannot base itself on the

doctrine and admits that if it could test it and find it cannot be true it would reject it. The alleged good relationship between science and Christian faith is a facade.

Science has debunked creation out of nothing. "There is no creation ex nihilo. As Sean Carroll said: The axis for time goes from the top to the bottom and it goes forever. The only sense in which this universe is not eternal is that there is a moment in the middle where entropy is lowest – that has nothing to do with the kind of beginning you would need to give God room to work." (Christianity in the Light of Science).

If there is an inseparable relationship between science and secularism then is it the job of science to show that God probably or definitely does not exist? It is. It would be the central job. It would need to show as far as possible that God does not if he does not. God research then is ultimately its only job. It is because God whether true or not is the biggest and most important idea and theory one can imagine.

God in principle is the being that alone matters which means pressure is put on the scientist to care only about him and that leads to bias. The scientist becomes too unreliable to do science any more. Is it better then for science to be anti-god? Certainly. It takes the pressure off for you will never oppose God with all your heart but you can love him with all your heart (in principle). In other words, do not oppose God as in hate for that is too emotional. But do not love him but oppose him. Then you reduce bias and become free to do your job.

It is said that society on the whole needs politics, science and religion. In fact society needs science the most. Politics cannot function unless people do enough science. For example, we need science to see what is happening in society. We need science to find solutions to problems. The state cannot make money unless it learns from science.

We treat life as an experiment trying to see what works and what does not. So science comes first. Checking things out comes first. Politics then comes second. As for religion we can say that it is the least in importance. Or better still, it is not important at all. A religion is really just every person being their own religion and pretending they all really share the one faith. They might share a similar one but that is about it! Religion as an organised belief system is not important at all. It can be done without. Many societies treat faith as a private matter and they are reasonably thriving and healthy societies. A religion being important in a society does not mean it should be important in it. But science and politics are intrinsically important. The likes of Keith Ward who say that society needs politics and science and religion are showing their underlying religiously motivated intolerance by adding religion in. Its intolerant merely by being added in for it has no right to be in. And religion claims to be sacred and the voice of God - it is claiming to be more important than science or politics. It is saying that it is better for them to collapse than for it to collapse.

Nothing beats testing. Science is about testing. Science gives you no beliefs or dogmas but only tells you what the testing said. If science is the best way to know things it follows that if there is a sensible God then that God is pro-science. But what does religion give us? It gives us a God who does miracles and who writes Bibles full of lies. That is not a sensible God. That is not a God who can be a friend to science. That is not a God who can be friendly to a remotely okay idea of God!

Has science come about because people believed a smart intelligent and rational God made all things and so to honour him we have to learn and research and engage in science? No - even believers usually keep religious motivations out of their work or are too unconvinced to care about God. And if God alone matters and you want to find him through research and hard work your avenue would be theology not science. And if you did look at science it would not be important in comparison to theology.

Religion says, "Science and religion seek truth in different ways. That is why they are not mutually exclusive." That is a lie. Two things can look for truth in different ways and be mutually exclusive. And as science claims to be always seeking truth it has to

Another reason it is a lie, is that science cannot tell you that you must find a religious way of knowing for that requires evidence and religion has no use for evidence. If you are doing forensic tests to see if X committed murder and the tests show X might have done it that is evidence that you need evidence of a different kind. You may need to look for CCTV

footage. The evidence tells you to look for different evidence but not just any evidence. Evidence from the astrology chart is irrelevant. Evidence from eyewitnesses will not even be an avenue if the village where X murdered is full of drug addicts. It depends. Any evidence then must stand on scientific evidence. If there are other ways of knowing apart from science, science will give evidence that you need to find other ways to know even if it does not tell you exactly what those ways are. It is enough if science tells you what those ways are not. If something else is a way of knowing there will be evidence.

Another reason it is a lie is that when religion says it agrees with science it means some science not all. The American Psychological Association says homosexuality is natural which is against Church teaching. That is one example. Religion is against much of the science of psychology.

Psychological testing and studies have found that people tend to dehumanise those who do not agree with them. If you are in a grouping that is or thinks it is socially dominant and influential you will look at other groups of people as being less people than the people in your group. Kteily and his researchers used a scale to measure how one group dehumanises others groups (Bruneau & Kteily, 2017). The results were alarming for example Israelis virtually rated Palestinians as being almost animals. It is no wonder then those who are pro-Trump tend to care less if something awful and destructive happens to Obama supporters and vice versa. Haslam and Stratemeyer (2016) determined that this denial of the humanity of others in a different group is caused by how different groups emotionally respond differently to different situations. The Irish in the past hated the British partly for allowing abortion or tolerating it instead of being enraged. This hate was enough on its own but you see the point: people prefer those who have the same feelings as themselves about most things as this makes their social interaction easier.

If religion is about God primarily or only God, then it follows that science should be defined as, "Investigating and experimenting and testing to see how God has set the universe up." Science in that view is the study of how God makes nature function. Science is not about how nature works but about how God makes nature work. The conflict between science and religion is about how science is defined. Science leaves God out and religion puts him in. Science wants to avoid a God bias and religion wants it in. Even if religion uses science, it is therefore still the enemy of science. Science will not assume anything to be true without evidence so involving God is anti-scientific.

Secularists and atheists are accused of believing only what they understand. Understanding isn't everything. But beliefs you understand ought to be valued more than ones you do not. Thus science comes before anything else including God - the doctrine that God comes first is an insult to that principle and to the sacrifices people make for it.

Science bans you from saying what is in somebody else's mind. Religion routinely does that with God so if science does not tell you everything that is an argument against involving God and faith not an argument for it.

Another reason it is a lie because all sensible people see science as a tool and the best tool we have for finding truth and working for progress. Christians object that it is not the only tool.

Nobody says it is. But Christians cannot see science as the best tool we have when they hold that the truths that really matter are revealed by God in the Bible.

Science is based on valuing knowledge and testing as good. Christians say that science then is based on faith for it just assumes that knowledge and testing are good and cannot do experiments to prove they are good. That claim is a lie. If you say that knowledge and testing are bad then you are saying it is good in the sense of being true that they are bad. So you just see knowledge and testing as good and there is no assuming involved.

Science says that all questions can be answered by science. But many questions are not answered. That is not the point. Science says in principle they can be but that does not mean in practice it always can be done. Science does not answer all questions but in practice it can. So if science does not proclaim God then clearly it denies the importance of God. It as good as says God does not exist. Silence in that case is rejection.

It is maintained by some that secularism does not ask how people can live in the world without God or religion. In other words, secularism does not try to figure out what ethical or scientific or whatever - operating principles we must have if there is no God or if no religion is true. The secularist then is not concerned with ethics or God or anything other than politics.

Those people are not making sense. The secularist has to consider things such as, "How do we stop the state being so unfair to all religions except the state Church?" That brings in the ethical notion of justice. And he has to consider, "How do we stop that religion from killing other religions?" If ethics doesn't matter then why care?

Science, many say, cannot tell you that a person is intrinsically valuable or important. It treats a person as a pile of parts not as something inherently worthy of respect. If that is true, then why do those people claim science and religion can fit together? They are lying.

Science does not treat you as a collection of parts. If it cannot say how you are a valuable person that does not matter as long as it treats you as such. And it does. There is no point in science trying to cure cancer just for the sake of a learning experience. No scientist takes that approach.

Some say that atheists who think that religions should not exist at all are really non-secular atheists. Their view is described as completely alien to the logic of the secular idea. But it would be odd to say that you need religions around to be secular!

The excellent book from 2014, *Christianity is Not Great!* fills us in on the lies Christians tell about how you don't have to flush science down the toilet to become a true Christian.

It points out that Robert Ingersoll noted that the Bible and the faith have not given us one useful fact to help us technologically or medically or any other way. Thus the person of religious faith is not intrinsically better than the secularist who through science and wisdom helps us to progress materially and in terms of our health. Faith in religion is not better than faith in secularism. Even if faith in secularism seems barren and difficult it is what you owe the best things in your life to at the end of the day.

Richard Carrier in the book makes the extremely significant point that Christianity did nothing to encourage science and democracy in its first millennium. This attitude held the world back.

Christianity was to blame for the Dark Ages.

Some say that scientists cannot show how creation came to be.

For some, there was always something there.

For some, the universe popped into existence from nothing and it was spontaneous and had nothing to do with God.

For others, a time warp might explain how the universe started itself.

For others, an infinite intelligence, perhaps a God, made the universe from nothing.

Many prefer to say we cannot know.

Christians argue that all these options fail to take us to science. They take us outside of its expertise. So they say then that

any atheistic theory about the origin of all is just as faith-based as a religious one.

It does not follow that if both are based on belief or faith that they are both equally based. If science simply believes or assumes that there is no magic and religion assumes there is the magic of something coming from nothing then science is not as much faith as religion is. Religion cannot say faith in creation and faith in science are separate because once you say things are created you are saying they are not brute facts. But science treats them as if they are for it cannot detect any power bringing them into existence and keeping them there.

Science and religious values do not have to agree. They often oppose each other. Religion assumes there is no point in looking to live to 500. Science says there is. Religion does not like three parent babies but science does. Religion threatens what is best for us. If it does good for us it makes sure it does not do what is best for us!

Science and secularism are inseparable. Where there is no secularism, science cannot emerge or be truly respected. Secularism creates an environment where religious and metaphysical and spiritual questions are not looked at or pursued. That allows people to examine religious theories and beliefs and re-visit scientific discoveries.

Science and secularism and democracy, not religious faith and religion, save us. Secularism and science are two sides of one coin.