

WHEN RELIGION DOES SCIENCE AND CALLS IT SOMETHING ELSE IN THE PRETENCE OF BEING SCIENTIFICALLY NEUTRAL

Someone stated online that the resurrection of Jesus is nonsense scientifically and got the following response: "Science deals only with (measurable) physical phenomena: it has no right to make any statements about non-physical areas. I take exception to the "scientist" making pronouncements for which he has absolutely no qualifications whatsoever."

Do you have the same problem with preachers and religions which think their theologians and prophets and Popes (and religious scientists who do think they verify the supernatural) pronouncing on the unknown or is it just scientists you have a problem with?

The Church says the resurrection was done by non-natural forces which is why there is no scientific aspect. Science only looks at the natural. But natural is there until the moment of resurrection. It is still there in the context. Science can look at all that in principle and then you have a hole or gap where the supernatural is. The argument leads to a magic or supernatural or God of the gap. So the argument that science must keep out is nonsense. Religion has something to hide. Science cannot look at a miracle directly does not mean it has to keep out for the miracle is surrounded by nature. Nature relates to it.

Religion says science should stay out of the supernatural but religion does not take its own advice. Oh the hypocrisy! If something outside of nature brought Jesus back what if it in fact made it look like he came back or caused a miraculous hallucination? And there is only opinion about what the force is and what it is like and if it is really a force for good or neutral or bad. Religion is not faith but opinion and habit masquerading as faith which is why Christians are habitually disobedient to their religion. We conclude the resurrection is an attempted threat to those who know that if the supernatural exists then it is a FACT that nobody should speculate about what exactly it is like. And that is not to mention how religion upbraids scientists who allegedly speculate when it does worse itself. It is a personal insult to scientists. It would be fatal to a religion if it claims to be giving beautiful good doctrines if there is a nasty sting like that these beautiful doctrines! If science does not comment on the supernatural because it cannot then science must be bad if the supernatural as in God comes first or alone matters. It is not for bringing you to God.

If it is bad for religion or science to comment on the unknown I'd still rather have a discipline that was open in principle to testing. Better science than to stick its nose in than religion!

Science is about questions and these questions are invariably sceptical. It is like, "I will not believe this unless I have to on account of the evidence." Science is not belief in the normal sense but critical belief that it continually tests and challenges. Believers expect loyalty to a belief instead of loyalty to using a belief in a critical way that is more than happy to discard the belief should it be wrong. Science has loyalty to testing not belief and belief is honoured only if it is testable and being tested.

Some say you can have a religious or science faith and be open to revising and questioning and checking that faith. But if religionists were frequently changing religions for they had to update their worldview I would agree. They are not. And why are the systems not collapsing and changing? Why is science faith so much more straightforward? In fact science tries to avoid faith and how it does that is it keeps challenging it.

Religion rejects some things as valid science such as astrology and witchcraft

What if science verified astrology as true when religion says it is superstitious nonsense? Religion and science are not unrelated for religion itself makes pronouncements on what says it is science such as astrology.