

Is Science Becoming New Religion Of Western Society

It would not be wrong to say everybody on this planet sticks on to different philosophic beliefs that are beyond the temporal, physical world. It's quite astonishing to note that both sciences and religions have been at war and there are instances where they have been working together. By and large both happen at the same time. A good and practical example of this would be the 'climate'. The sciences made us believe that it is getting colder because it is getting warmer. Well people who don't believe this are termed deniers. On the other side we have the doomsday scenario and it's all because of our sins. That for sure sounds more like a religion. It has been seen that the major population of the western society have either turned atheists or are in the brink of it so, is science becoming the new religion of western society? The famous Venus project can be quoted as good example .The planned equipment is amazing though I was wandering about the existence of soul in their project. It's a nice piece of machinery that is sophisticated, clean and automated, but where is the Forum? more importantly spirituality? Is humanity becoming just another ratchet in the machinery that is made of flesh and blood? Or is there a new god, the Artificial Intelligence that is encased amid the whole wiring? If that is true then who is the programmer?

Education and Myth

In technical sense: Education is the process by which society deliberately transmits its accumulated knowledge, skills and values from one generation to another [1]. Education introduces young people into the life i.e. helps them step into Society (the place where they are born) and also the physical boundary or area that surrounds the society. Science and religion both provide education in their own ways. The Educating methods often comprise of teaching basic myth in different versions. The advanced version that is taught with initiation rites penetrates deeper and implants into the tender brains. The grownups slowly use this to understand almost everything in this world. The understanding of nature and that of society is much better and learns how to interact with them actively. However he tends to be ignored about the myth that guided his understanding.

As Paul Feyerabend further mentions that presocratics aimed higher to master the understanding of the world. He says they not only tried to understand this world they also tried to understand, thus tried to become the masters of, the means of understanding the world. The approach they used was simple and effective; they developed so many other different myths which diminished the effect of a well-told myth had over minds of men. More such methods were introduced by sophists that increased the effect of coherent and interesting tales. The most important aspect that is kept in mind before teaching a myth is to increase the chances of believing and accepting the myth. Even the most dedicated instructor of Christianity cannot prevent his pupils from getting in touch with prophets, monks etc. But the scenario is quite different with science

as it is dominated mostly by believers so strengthening the minds of the young means strengthen them against an acceptance of different and complete views. In this case the education has to make people counter-suggestive and incapable of devoting themselves to a single view.

The above motive can be achieved by gaining control over the tremendous imagination power of children and also exploiting the spirit of contradiction that a child possesses. This brings to a perception and conclusion that children are cleverer than their teachers. But they are often bullied and teachers use emotional means to succumb the child which ultimately leads the child to give up their intelligence. Marvellous writers in all the known languages have used their writing skills to create amazing and interesting stories, which can be used to introduce various scientific accounts like the origin of world to the children. Later these stories would have been supplemented with “reasons” to support them .And obviously there would be counter reasons. Both these Supporting reasons and contrary reasons are shared down but the experts in that particular field. This is how younger generations learn and get acquainted with different types of preaching and adventures. This helps these young people to think and choose the path he wants to go. At this stage of life everyone knows about engineering, medical, law and different professions one can follow to gain respect and money. Some people may even aim to get Nobel Prize by becoming scientists. The free choice of the way to follow might help them to become scientists without having been taken the ideology of science.

The base for the progress of good science is based on novel ideas and intellectual freedom. History has seen that science has gained extensive advancement by outsiders (Einstein often referred to himself as an outsider). There is always a probability that many scientists may end up making wrong assumptions or choices which may lead to a Dead-end? Well that depends on the perspective of looking at the approach and also it depends on what you mean by the term Dead-end.

Galileo wanted his ideas to replace the existing cosmology, but he was forbidden to work towards that aim. Today the much more modest wish of creationists to have their view taught in schools side by side with other competing views runs into laws setting up a separation of church and state [2].

Devoid of ideas, fear of failure has lead many scientists produce only a contemptible result which might add very little knowledge to already available bunch of insane papers. If given a chance many people would choice science as it is run by free agents then but the present day science is run by slaves of big institutions and slaves of “reasons”. The present day scenario as quoted my Feyerabend

Financial arrangements can make or break a research programme and an entire profession. There are many ways to silence people apart from forbidding them to speak -- and all of them are being used today. The process of knowledge production and

knowledge distribution was never the free, 'objective', and purely intellectual exchange rationalists make it out to be [3].

We all have a strong belief and notion of preserving new findings and truths but the form of the society where science is never free will dilute the facts and might disappear the facts after a while. The absence of good contrary explanations are mainly lacking because of previous accidents. History has very good examples like: Scientific astronomy, Founded by Aristotle and Ptolemy one of finest brains of western world. Their well argued, empirically adequate and precisely formatted system was objected by antediluvian Pythagorean. Even our intuitions are backed by scientific training that was a part of my education. In the present day world situations where millions of people are starving, others homeless, downtrodden, some battling with diseases, freedom of choice is a sheer luxury under these circumstances. So in the modern world our selfish inclinations had to be given up and we need to dedicate our self for the freedom of oppressed people. Now the problem is what do we mean by selfish inclinations? They can easily be explained by individual interests for liberty of thoughts in the societies we reside in. Liberty can not only be of abstract kind, but it can also be of methods of teaching and institutions. So how does a layman correctly judge? Often complications, competences and successes of science are exaggerated. In short science is not a closed book which can be understood after some years of training but it is the intellectual discipline than can be opposed and criticised by experts and interested people in that field . It looks difficult and abstruse because of the secret campaign carried out by scientists.

The Religion of Modern Science

Modern science represents a strict organisation of the world in conformance with mechanistic principles. It is devoid of purpose principles of any kind, Gods, creators and designing forces that can be logically detectable.

Following are a few implications of modern science:

Absence of inherent moral and ethical laws.

Absence of principles guiding the human society.

Heredity and environmental factors become the primary means of guiding an human being ethically.

No life after death or concept of rebirth.

Life begins with birth and ends with death.

The enumerated data and previously recorded information of evolutionists or the people who believe in the theory of evolution of life but often obfuscate their names are caught

in some kind of vicious circle. The major factor or source that retards them from digging deep into their beliefs is the concept of "Modern Science". The education they received that was scientifically backed and the practicality of this modern science made them believe it to be a true religion and thus they wanted to propagate this idea to all humankind.

The above referred people use the scientific or in more definite terms "Experimental knowledge" to impose the systems of thoughts that help to shape mentality which acts as a unique guide to our humankind. The term experimental knowledge can be explained as a knowledge that can be verified with experiments.

E.g.: "Water evaporates at 100 °C"

To prove or disprove the above knowledge all we need to do is to take some water, boil it to the temperature of 100 °C. Now observe carefully to find if it really evaporates or not. This method of experimentation and observations of the surroundings that we live are the ways we learn more about the universe.

Science has tried to explain various patterns and behaviours of mankind through experiments. The evolutionists believed that experimental knowledge is the only guide to humankind. Even the abstract concepts like sorrow, hatred, love and other emotions were also observed and studied through various types of psychological experiments. The major flipside of this thought of experimental knowledge is being sceptical of things that cannot be proved through experiments and observations. This ideology was born with the 18th century Renaissance, formed the core of 19th century Positivism, and reflects all essential premises of materialism.

According to the mindset of science, all religious information would be considered as unreal, and would be open to doubt. This materialistic understanding abides with modern sciences and considers the existence of Allah and other religious heads questionable as their existence can neither be proved nor can they be observed through practical experiments.

The evolutionists view of explanation that religion evolved or originated where scientific approaches failed to provide explanations. This very fact claimed that ancient civilizations rationalized things which they could not explain through experiments with the "supernatural powers" - God: So this very fact leads to the decision that more the expansion of experiments and experimental knowledge lesser the religious information. According to the believers of this belief, the time will come when every aspect in the Universe will be explained through experimental knowledge and observation, and then mankind will not need religion. Vain beliefs or ignorance can be saved from principles of positive science and wisdom.

If the evolutionists were to accept the fact that nature is created and regulated by a Creator then they are bound to have accepted an explanation that cannot be explained

or proved through experimental knowledge. Fear of being regarded as "transgressor" from the bunch of people who believe in experimental facts will absolutely cause their excommunication from 'modern science' which they believe as their religion.

Why and how this Positivist is thought wrong?

One major aspect that needs to be understood before attempting to answer the above question is the difference between the cognitive science of the 20th century and the positivism from 19th century. The reason for that can be explained as fact that positivism has often been misunderstood and exaggerated. However the required balance was established by 20th century.

The above positivist thought of 19th century lost its popularity long back. Einstein's Theory of Relativity had a great impact that comprehended that science cannot be a complete guide that can explain everything. Various science-philosophers, especially Karl Popper, vindicates that science cannot explain everything, and that it has a "field" and there also exists other fields apart from this.

This naturally leads to the slogan:

"Science and religion have their different fields, and should not interfere with one another".

The idea of experimental knowledge should not try to explain the fields of "metaphysics" that is left to religion. (But any discovery that conflicts religious teachings, well in that case science should be preferred, and supported.)

The enlightened semi-positivism of the 20th century is influenced by various political and social consequences. The balance between science-religion excludes humanity from religion, citing the explanation of humanity with experimental knowledge and observation. These also include legal, political, social and economical aspects. Thus religion is leftover with personal ethics and belief.

In short, we can say that there exists no basic difference between 19th century positivism and 20th century semi-positivism, like there is no basic difference between Karl Popper and Auguste Comte. Both these ideologies are in favour and agreement that scientific experimental knowledge is more reliable and dependable than the religious knowledge. Both these consider science as an important guide and the only difference being the more realistic evaluation of 20th century semi positivism.

Well an important question to ask would be: what was wrong with positivism or semi-positivism?

The Real Meaning of Science

The answer to the above question would be better explained or clarified by checking out what science is and what is not science?

For the believers of science who consider science a guide, science is absolute, and independent from all the cultures, all ideologies and beliefs. Science can be explained as universal criteria differing from all other sources of knowledge. It is considered to be the centre of everything, and everything should be regulated accordingly. But the deception that arises at this juncture is the inexistence of any constant above religion. It is not a guide rather it is guided.

The concept can be clearly explained by the "paradigm" concept of American science philosopher Thomas Kuhn. According to Kuhn (who is not semi-positivist like Popper) all sciences are built on a series of some apriorism. The general theoretical conjectures, rules and techniques that are made up by the people in science and their applications constitute "paradigm". The validity of the paradigm depends on the invention of new scientific facts, but later it will definitely collapse.

For example Newton's scientific hypothesis is a scientific paradigm. The rise of Einstein's paradigm which is valid today led to the loss of validity of Newton's paradigm. This clearly explains that a new scientific crisis or revolution the present paradigm might lose its validity. The major drawback of these paradigms is that they cannot be stated as law; Paradigm is nothing but hypothesis that is accepted to be true for a certain period of time. The scientists considering science as a guide accept a certain paradigm as being the absolute truth; hence in fact they take a hypothesis as their guide. The Qur'an points out that the unbelievers:

"...follow nothing but conjecture and what their own souls desire!- Even though there has already come to them Guidance from their Lord!"[4]

According to Paul Feyerabend who went further than Thomas Kuhn and said that it is absolutely the result of one's subjective preference to consider science as being superior over other kinds of teachings and preaching the humankind has ever had. Therefore people and government should give up the education policy that regards science as the guide assuming it is superior over other teachings. We can put forward that

"Science is subjective", similar to any other ideologies and beliefs thus giving oneself the right to evaluate the discovered truth, thoughts and beliefs in accordance with science.

The deception behind modern science is "New Secular Order", a fixed paradigm of modern science that has its own ideology and tries to impose the produced science as a universal guideline i.e. Ideology with a science label.

"Atheism" in simple words is the basic concept behind the above paradigm of modern science. It is designed in such a way that it explains the universe in a non religious manner thus creating a society isolated from religion. Black Box can be a good example of above paradigm. Modern science understands that it is not possible to create life. This explains that people idolize facts which they have found. Modern science -idol-of – modern age.

For example: Some "renaissance men" who claim Islam as not scientific feel that miracles of prophet cannot be explained by the rules of nature of science. While some of them deny that thinking is not scientific..There are people who still blindly feel "Islam is in line with science"

The Guide of Modern Science

We clearly state that we are not against science, in terms of the aim of learning and discovering the universe that people live in, we are against what is called "modern science" which accepts the New Secular Order as the guide.

The information above explains that science cannot be a guide but contrarily, every belief and every ideology guides science in various ways. Science is neither a guide, nor an aim within itself, but only a tool - a tool that can be used in favour of an intention.

An interesting point worth mentioning would be the identity of modern science as guide. It was definitely the established support of modern science's war against religion .It is the social powers that established the New Secular Order. Moreover these social powers also act as "spiritual guide", real leader of modern science is this spiritual guide.

What's more, Kuhn, a relativist, is discordant with the fact that people who put forward a paradigm are either objective or impartial. Kuhn, strongly opposing to the ones who claim that there should be unique, universal and standard criteria for advancement of science (especially to ImreLakatos) states

"There is no standard higher than the ascent of the relevant community."[5]

Kuhn further states that scientific information, like a language, is the intrinsically common characteristic of a certain group, and nothing more. He says there is no urge to know the common characteristics of this groups that create and use it (scientific knowledge).

The important point mentioned here is the concept used as society is indeed the people concerned in science. So this concept can be a proof to prove that science cannot be accepted with certain bias. The very Newton's paradigm is not independent from prejudices and beliefs of people defending Newton's scientific findings. Thus, it is not possible to accept science as objective.

With his book *Against Method*, Feyerabend summarizes his views with two words: "All goes!" Feyerabend expresses his view by saying that the idea of science is unrealistic according to the universal and accepted rules. His claim regarding the human instincts and view which develops it is too simple. It is to be destroyed because the attitude to keep up the rules is due to the professional improvements in our humanity. Feyerabend says, the main reason behind liquidation of the idea of science is the complex physical and historical conditions influencing scientific change being neglected. Feyerabend asserts that this makes science less compatible, but more dogmatic [6]

Feyerabend agreement of Kuhn's relativity theory as determining criteria for science states that science has no edge over other branches. He mentions that Lacatos confronts other fields as if the structure of modern science is against magic and Aristotelian science. Though there is no argument in that direction. Intelligent approaches are regarded as basic scientific wisdom but there is no evidence to show higher wisdom than witches.

Feyerabend defend the view that government agencies should also include other types teachings in the education system since science has no superiority over other branches, he expresses that free societies with liberated living and thinking allow one the freedom of deciding what to believe in and what not to . He expresses this with an example: while an American citizen can believe in religion he agrees, the students are not allowed to learn magic instead of science at school. There is distinction between state and science but none exists between science and state.

I would like conclude by saying that both sciences and religion are continuously changing. The change comes from global politics, the constant being natural law when viewed under a short time span. Science calls the change paradigm shifts while religion calls it revelations. This change usually fits the scenarios and the agenda of the powers that be.