

## 1: Edward Feser: Religion and the Social Sciences

*Religion and the Social Sciences: Conversations with Robert Bellah and Christian Smith [R. R. Reno, Barbara McClay] on [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. More often than not it's a class in the social sciences that challenges the faith of students, not a class in biology.*

In Western Europe in the nineteenth century, a number of scholars no longer wanted to make blueprints of a future society but instead wanted to intervene in the actual operation of society to improve the quality of life of its participants. This development did not come out of the blue but was prepared by various philosophers, among whom the most well known are David Hume, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, Condorcet, and Montesquieu. In Scotland and in France in the previous century, these philosophers had made a successful breakaway from older, "natural law" thinking. The new thinking was more or less empiricist, that is, based on human experience, and positivist, that is, based on what was given by the senses. Consequently, the relationship between social science and religion was from its inception a precarious one. This is well reflected in the ideas of the French thinker Auguste Comte. According to him, progress in human knowledge knew of three stages: The pioneers of young social sciences such as ethnology, sociology, and psychology not only studied human religion, some also combated it. Evolutionism was the main paradigm to study culture and religion in early-nineteenth-century ethnology or anthropology. One of its pioneers, Lewis Henry Morgan, thought religion too irrational to subject it to an evolutionary scheme. For Edward Tylor, the origin of religion was to be found in the belief in spirits of early man, which he called animism, and from there on it had developed further till monotheism. Herbert Spencer had more or less similar ideas as Tylor. In the thinking of Karl Marx, religion was only a marginal issue, and as he grew older it became even more marginal. For him, religion was a reflection of the particular, historical phase of the structure of society. The religious mind was a product of society; it was self-alienation. To the founder of psychoanalysis, religion was nothing but a projection. It could persist only because of human helplessness. In the end, society celebrated itself in religion through its rituals and beliefs. The more consensus was achieved on religious dogmas, the more they steered human actions in society and the more morality was to be found in religion. Later on in life, Durkheim thought religious persuasions to be part of the collective consciousness. The stronger they are found to be in society and met by the individual, the more they will be practiced. According to Durkheim, religion enabled societal order, but how is order possible in a "disenchanted" world, that is, a world robbed of its divine shine by science? To Max Weber, religion formed a human answer to everything irrational in life. Only religion could render life meaningful by giving not only norms for everyday life but also answers to existential questions. These various positions continue to be found among social scientists. There are some who proclaim the end of religion in their scientific writings, while others observe in their research on religion a kind of "methodological agnosticism. Durkheim, *Suicide* New York: Oxford University Press, H. Oxford University Press, S. Freud, *Totem and Taboo* New York: Random House, [] S. Doubleday, [] M. Weber, *Economy and Society* Berkeley: University of California Press, [].

## 2: Religion and the Social Sciences by R.R. Reno

*In recent years, researchers across the social sciences have made important contributions to the study of religion. Thanks to their inquiry, we have greatly improved our understanding of how religion influences the vital dimensions of our lives, communities, and institutions.*

What are science and religion, and how do they interrelate? Science and religion is a recognized field of study with dedicated journals e. *Journal of Religion and Science* , academic chairs e. Most of its authors are either theologians e. The systematic study of science and religion started in the s, with authors such as Ian Barbour and Thomas F. Torrance who challenged the prevailing view that science and religion were either at war or indifferent to each other. *Zygon*, the first specialist journal on science and religion, was also founded in While the early study of science and religion focused on methodological issues, authors from the late s to the s developed contextual approaches, including detailed historical examinations of the relationship between science and religion e. Peter Harrison challenged the warfare model by arguing that Protestant theological conceptions of nature and humanity helped to give rise to science in the seventeenth century. Peter Bowler , drew attention to a broad movement of liberal Christians and evolutionists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who aimed to reconcile evolutionary theory with religious belief. It had contributors from philosophy and theology e. The aim of these conferences was to understand divine action in the light of contemporary sciences. Each of the five conferences, and each edited volume that arose from it, was devoted to an area of natural science and its interaction with religion, including quantum cosmology , Russell et al. See also Russell et al. The legal battles e. However, even if one were to focus on the reception of evolutionary theory, the relationship between religion and science is complex. For instance, in the United Kingdom, scientists, clergy, and popular writers, sought to reconcile science and religion during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, whereas the United States saw the rise of a fundamentalist opposition to evolutionary thinking, exemplified by the Scopes trial in Bowler , In recent decades, Church leaders have issued conciliatory public statements on evolutionary theory. Pope John Paul II affirmed evolutionary theory in his message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, but rejected it for the human soul, which he saw as the result of a separate, special creation. The Church of England publicly endorsed evolutionary theory e. Brown , including an apology to Charles Darwin for its initial rejection of his theory. For the past fifty years, science and religion has been de facto Western science and Christianityâ€™to what extent can Christian beliefs be brought in line with the results of western science? The field of science and religion has only recently turned to an examination of non-Christian traditions, such as Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, providing a richer picture of interaction. In order to understand the scope of science and religion and what interactions there are between them, we must at least get a rough sense of what science and religion are. Indeed, they are terms that were coined recently, with meanings that vary across times and cultures. Tylor , who systematically used the term for religions across the world. Philosophers of science have attempted to demarcate science from other knowledge-seeking endeavors, in particular religion. For instance, Karl Popper claimed that scientific hypotheses unlike religious ones are in principle falsifiable. They disagree, however, on how to precisely and across times and cultures demarcate the two domains. One way to distinguish between science and religion is the claim that science concerns the natural world, whereas religion concerns both the natural and the supernatural. Scientific explanations do not appeal to supernatural entities such as gods or angels fallen or not , or to non-natural forces like miracles, karma, or Qi. For example, neuroscientists typically explain our thoughts in terms of brain states, not by reference to an immaterial soul or spirit. Naturalists draw a distinction between methodological naturalism, an epistemological principle that limits scientific inquiry to natural entities and laws, and ontological or philosophical naturalism, a metaphysical principle that rejects the supernatural Forrest Since methodological naturalism is concerned with the practice of science in particular, with the kinds of entities and processes that are invoked , it does not make any statements about whether or not supernatural entities exist. They might exist, but lie outside of the scope of scientific investigation. However, these stronger conclusions are controversial. The view that science can be demarcated from religion

in its methodological naturalism is more commonly accepted. For instance, in the Kitzmiller versus Dover trial, the philosopher of science Robert Pennock was called to testify by the plaintiffs on whether Intelligent Design was a form of creationism, and therefore religion. Building on earlier work e. Still, overall there was a tendency to favor naturalistic explanations in natural philosophy. This preference for naturalistic causes may have been encouraged by past successes of naturalistic explanations, leading authors such as Paul Draper to argue that the success of methodological naturalism could be evidence for ontological naturalism. Explicit methodological naturalism arose in the nineteenth century with the X-club, a lobby group for the professionalization of science founded in by Thomas Huxley and friends, which aimed to promote a science that would be free from religious dogmas. The X-club may have been in part motivated by the desire to remove competition by amateur-clergymen scientists in the field of science, and thus to open up the field to full-time professionals Garwood For example, Kelly Clark argues that we can only sensibly inquire into the relationship between a widely accepted claim of science such as quantum mechanics or findings in neuroscience and a specific claim of a particular religion such as Islamic understandings of divine providence or Buddhist views of the no-self. For example, Mikael Stenmark distinguishes between three views: Subsequent authors, as well as Barbour himself, have refined and amended this taxonomy. For one thing, it focuses on the cognitive content of religions at the expense of other aspects, such as rituals and social structures. Moreover, there is no clear definition of what conflict means evidential or logical. Nevertheless, because of its enduring influence, it is still worthwhile to discuss this taxonomy in detail. The conflict model, which holds that science and religion are in perpetual and principal conflict, relies heavily on two historical narratives: The conflict model was developed and defended in the nineteenth century by the following two publications: Both authors argued that science and religion inevitably conflict as they essentially discuss the same domain. The vast majority of authors in the science and religion field is critical of the conflict model and believes it is based on a shallow and partisan reading of the historical record. Ironically, two views that otherwise have little in common, scientific materialism and extreme biblical literalism, both assume a conflict model: While the conflict model is at present a minority position, some have used philosophical argumentation e. Alvin Plantinga has argued that the conflict is not between science and religion, but between science and naturalism. The independence model holds that science and religion explore separate domains that ask distinct questions. The lack of conflict between science and religion arises from a lack of overlap between their respective domains of professional expertise. NOMA is both descriptive and normative: Gould held that there might be interactions at the borders of each magisterium, such as our responsibility toward other creatures. One obvious problem with the independence model is that if religion were barred from making any statement of fact it would be difficult to justify the claims of value and ethics, e. Moreover, religions do seem to make empirical claims, for example, that Jesus appeared after his death or that the early Hebrews passed through the parted waters of the Red Sea. The dialogue model proposes a mutualistic relationship between religion and science. Unlike independence, dialogue assumes that there is common ground between both fields, perhaps in their presuppositions, methods, and concepts. For example, the Christian doctrine of creation may have encouraged science by assuming that creation being the product of a designer is both intelligible and orderly, so one can expect there are laws that can be discovered. According to Barbour , both scientific and theological inquiry are theory-dependent or at least model-dependent, e. In dialogue, the fields remain separate but they talk to each other, using common methods, concepts, and presuppositions. Wentzel van Huyssteen has argued for a dialogue position, proposing that science and religion can be in a graceful duet, based on their epistemological overlaps. The integration model is more extensive in its unification of science and theology. Barbour identifies three forms of integration. The first is natural theology, which formulates arguments for the existence and attributes of God. It uses results of the natural sciences as premises in its arguments. For instance, the supposition that the universe has a temporal origin features in contemporary cosmological arguments for the existence of God, and the fact that the cosmological constants and laws of nature are life-permitting whereas many other combinations of constants and laws would not permit life is used in contemporary fine-tuning arguments. The second, theology of nature, starts not from science but from a religious framework, and examines how this can enrich or even revise findings of the sciences. For example,

McGrath developed a Christian theology of nature, examining how nature and scientific findings can be regarded through a Christian lens. While integration seems attractive especially to theologians, it is difficult to do justice to both the science and religion aspects of a given domain, especially given their complexities. For example, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, who was both knowledgeable in paleoanthropology and theology, ended up with an unconventional view of evolution as teleological which brought him into trouble with the scientific establishment, and with an unorthodox theology with an unconventional interpretation of original sin that brought him into trouble with the Roman Catholic Church. Theological heterodoxy, by itself, is no reason to doubt a model, but it points to difficulties for the integration model in becoming successful in the broader community of theologians and philosophers. Moreover, integration seems skewed towards theism as Barbour described arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate theism, but failed to discuss arguments based on scientific results that support but do not demonstrate the denial of theism. Natural historians attempted to provide naturalistic explanations for human behavior and culture, for domains such as religion, emotions, and morality. People often assert supernatural explanations when they lack an understanding of the natural causes underlying extraordinary events: It traces the origins of polytheism, which Hume thought was the earliest form of religious belief, to ignorance about natural causes combined with fear and apprehension about the environment. By deifying aspects of the environment, early humans tried to persuade or bribe the gods, thereby gaining a sense of control. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, authors from newly emerging scientific disciplines, such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology, examined the purported naturalistic roots of religious belief. They did so with a broad brush, trying to explain what unifies diverse religious beliefs across cultures, rather than accounting for cultural variations. In anthropology, the idea that all cultures evolve and progress along the same lines of cultural evolutionism was widespread. Cultures with differing religious views were explained as being in an early stage of development. For example, Tylor regarded animism, the belief that spirits animate the world, as the earliest form of religious belief. Comte proposed that all societies, in their attempts to make sense of the world, go through the same stages of development: The psychologist Sigmund Freud saw religious belief as an illusion, a childlike yearning for a fatherly figure. The full story Freud offers is quite bizarre: The sons felt guilty and started to idolize their murdered father. This, together with taboos on cannibalism and incest, generated the first religion. Authors such as Durkheim and Freud, together with social theorists such as Karl Marx and Max Weber, proposed versions of the secularization thesis, the view that religion would decline in the face of modern technology, science, and culture. Philosopher and psychologist William James was interested in the psychological roots and the phenomenology of religious experiences, which he believed were the ultimate source of institutional religions. From the 1920s onward, the scientific study of religion became less concerned with grand unifying narratives, and focused more on particular religious traditions and beliefs. Their ethnographies indicated that cultural evolutionism was mistaken and that religious beliefs were more diverse than was previously assumed. They argued that religious beliefs were not the result of ignorance of naturalistic mechanisms; for instance, Evans-Pritchard noted that the Azande were well aware that houses could collapse because termites ate away at their foundations, but they still appealed to witchcraft to explain why a particular house had collapsed. More recently, Cristine Legare et al.

## 3: Religion, spirituality and the social sciences: Challenging marginalisation, Spalek, Imtoul

*A growing number of people are claiming or reclaiming a religious or spiritual identity for themselves. Yet, in contemporary Western societies, the frameworks of understanding that have developed within the social science disciplines, and which are used to analyse data, are secular in nature, and so may be inappropriate for investigating some aspects of religion, spirituality and faith and how.*

Is it possible for a person to be both religious and to accept the findings of science at the same time? This appears to be a problem for those who participate or live within the domains and communities formed by the three principle Western Religions with their historical natures and the importance they place on historical events and their scriptures that appear to offer historical accounts of events. The answer from an empirical point of view based on ample evidence is that it would appear to be the case that it is possible to a certain extent for a person to be both a religious person and one who accepts science as the method for determining the accuracy of claims about the physical universe. It is possible to a certain extent because not all who are religious think that they need to accept the tales told in their sacred scriptures to be taken as literally accurate and true. Here is evidence to support that claim: Can a person believe in evolution and also believe in a God? The conflict will result from an insistence that the language of the Western Religions that appear to make empirical claims be treated literally as making claims about the physical universe and past events. There is a fundamental opposition between Science and Religion "There is a conflict between science and religion, and it is zero-sum. Surely it is time that scientists and other intellectuals stopped disguising this fact. Indeed, the incompatibility of reason and faith has been a self-evident feature of human cognition and public discourse for centuries. There is an alternative manner for dealing with religious language in which such claims are accepted as performing a different function. In this view religious language appearing to make empirical claims are not performing a cognitive function but instead such language is functioning to present and preserve non-cognitive ends such as representing what the speakers and believers hold to be most valuable in life and the basis for their having hope for life to have meaning, significance and value. Religious Language Conflict Does Exist: On their interpretation the entire universe is approximately 6, years from its origination from an action of a single deity. They attempt to contrast that "Theory" with Evolutionary Theory. In so doing they equivocate on the meaning of the word "theory" and in so doing undermine the epistemological foundation of empirical sciences. This confusion needs to be addressed and the mistaken commingling of the two ideas of "theory" identified. Conflict Does Not Exist: If the idea of the deity is changed then the conflict may be dissipated. Consider this manifestation of the reworking of the idea of the deity away from the traditional and toward the post modern by the Roman Catholic priest who is head of the Vatican Observatory is a trained scientist. Dr George Coyne has spoken and written about the relation of Religion to Science. He has expressed his view that there need not be a conflict of religious belief with scientific findings. In the controversy concerning Intelligent Design and Evolution Dr. Coyne has expressed these views concerning the nature of the deity. God should be seen more as a parent or one who speaks encouraging and sustaining words. Scripture is very rich in these thoughts. It presents a God who gets angry, who disciplines, a God who nurtures the universe. The universe has a certain vitality like a child does. It has the ability to respond to words of endearment and encouragement Words that give life are richer than mere commands of information. In such ways does God deal with the universe. It manifests itself in the attempt to arrive at a proof for the existence of a deity through the argument from Design or "Intelligent Design" argument. This is offered by those who hold that the best explanation of the origin of the universe to be its creation by an intelligent being. In order to accept the "Intelligent Design Theory" as the best explanation for the origin of species Evolutionary Theory would need to be shown to be inaccurate and in some fundamental manner flawed. There is no empirical evidence or program for scientific verification or falsification of the "Intelligent Design Theory". There are significant ways in which this "theory" is not at all the sort of "theory" as is known in science. As in the case of "creationist Theory" equivocating on the word "theory" so too does the "Intelligent Design Theory" commit the same sleight of hand sort of substitution of meaning. One of the most pernicious aspects of the



presentation of "Intelligent Design Theory" as if it were science or akin to science is the undermining of the public understanding of, respect for and valuation of science. The appearance of a debate or conflict of "Intelligent Design Theory" with Evolutionary Theory is the appearance that the two are of the same character when they are not. It is predominantly a political and cultural issue rather than a scientific issue. The public-political debate is attempting to redefine science as a belief system somewhat akin to others and in particular as an alternative belief system to religion. Evolutionary Theory The challenge posed by science with its empirical methods for determining the accuracy of empirical claims and historical claims about events on planet earth to religious faith based on literal readings of the creation stories in Genesis is the least of the conflict as it can be resolved and has been resolved by either accepting a non-literal interpretation of the sacred writings or to view religious language as functioning in a non-cognitive but axiological manner. Is the war between science and religion over? Hall and Lucia K. The essay by Dr. Norman Hall and Lucia Hall treats the religion vs. It was originally published in but preserves its relevance to present day debates related to the controversy in question. Has Science Found God?

## 4: Functionalist Definitions - Scientology, Social Science and the Definition of Religion

*Religion and the Social Sciences [R. R. Reno, Barbara McClay] on www.enganchecubano.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. More often than not it's a class in the social sciences that challenges the faith of students, not a class in biology.*

Page ranges should be limited to one or two pages when possible. You can help improve this article by introducing citations that are more precise. October Learn how and when to remove this template message

The concepts of "science" and "religion" are a recent invention: Furthermore, the phrase "religion and science" or "science and religion" emerged in the 19th century, not before, due to the reification of both concepts. It was in the 17th century that the concept of "religion" received its modern shape despite the fact that ancient texts like the Bible, the Quran, and other sacred texts did not have a concept of religion in the original languages and neither did the people or the cultures in which these sacred texts were written. Throughout classical South Asia, the study of law consisted of concepts such as penance through piety and ceremonial as well as practical traditions. Medieval Japan at first had a similar union between "imperial law" and universal or "Buddha law", but these later became independent sources of power. Christianity accepted reason within the ambit of faith. In Christendom, reason was considered subordinate to revelation, which contained the ultimate truth and this truth could not be challenged. Even though the medieval Christian had the urge to use their reason, they had little on which to exercise it. In medieval universities, the faculty for natural philosophy and theology were separate, and discussions pertaining to theological issues were often not allowed to be undertaken by the faculty of philosophy. It was an independent field, separated from theology, which enjoyed a good deal of intellectual freedom as long as it was restricted to the natural world. In general, there was religious support for natural science by the late Middle Ages and a recognition that it was an important element of learning. With significant developments taking place in science, mathematics, medicine and philosophy, the relationship between science and religion became one of curiosity and questioning. Renaissance humanism looked to classical Greek and Roman texts to change contemporary thought, allowing for a new mindset after the Middle Ages. Renaissance humanism was an "ethical theory and practice that emphasized reason, scientific inquiry and human fulfillment in the natural world," said Abernethy. With the sheer success of science and the steady advance of rationalism, the individual scientist gained prestige. This allowed more people to read and learn from the scripture, leading to the Evangelical movement. The people who spread this message, concentrated more on individual agency rather than the structures of the Church. It teaches people to be satisfied with trivial, supernatural non-explanations and blinds them to the wonderful real explanations that we have within our grasp. It teaches them to accept authority, revelation and faith instead of always insisting on evidence. Because of this both are incompatible as currently practiced and the debate of compatibility or incompatibility will be eternal. Carroll, since religion makes claims that are not compatible with science, such as supernatural events, therefore both are incompatible. According to Dawkins, religion "subverts science and saps the intellect". Ellis, Kenneth R. Miller, Katharine Hayhoe, George Coyne and Simon Conway Morris argue for compatibility since they do not agree that science is incompatible with religion and vice versa. They argue that science provides many opportunities to look for and find God in nature and to reflect on their beliefs. What he finds particularly odd and unjustified is in how atheists often come to invoke scientific authority on their non-scientific philosophical conclusions like there being no point or no meaning to the universe as the only viable option when the scientific method and science never have had any way of addressing questions of meaning or God in the first place. Furthermore, he notes that since evolution made the brain and since the brain can handle both religion and science, there is no natural incompatibility between the concepts at the biological level. He argues that leaders in science sometimes trump older scientific baggage and that leaders in theology do the same, so once theological intellectuals are taken into account, people who represent extreme positions like Ken Ham and Eugenie Scott will become irrelevant. It was in the 19th century that relationship between science and religion became an actual formal topic of discourse, while before this no one had pitted science against religion or vice versa, though occasional complex interactions had been expressed before the

19th century. If Galileo and the Scopes trial come to mind as examples of conflict, they were the exceptions rather than the rule. Galileo was found "vehemently suspect of heresy", namely of having held the opinions that the Sun lies motionless at the center of the universe, that the Earth is not at its centre and moves. He was required to "abjure, curse and detest" those opinions. The Church had merely sided with the scientific consensus of the time. Only the latter was fulfilled by Galileo. Although the preface of his book claims that the character is named after a famous Aristotelian philosopher Simplicius in Latin, Simplicio in Italian, the name "Simplicio" in Italian also has the connotation of "simpleton". Most historians agree Galileo did not act out of malice and felt blindsided by the reaction to his book. Galileo had alienated one of his biggest and most powerful supporters, the Pope, and was called to Rome to defend his writings. Grayling, still believes there is competition between science and religions and point to the origin of the universe, the nature of human beings and the possibility of miracles [65] Independence[ edit ] A modern view, described by Stephen Jay Gould as "non-overlapping magisteria" NOMA, is that science and religion deal with fundamentally separate aspects of human experience and so, when each stays within its own domain, they co-exist peacefully. Stace viewed independence from the perspective of the philosophy of religion. Stace felt that science and religion, when each is viewed in its own domain, are both consistent and complete. In science, explanations must be based on evidence drawn from examining the natural world. Scientifically based observations or experiments that conflict with an explanation eventually must lead to modification or even abandonment of that explanation. Religious faith, in contrast, does not depend on empirical evidence, is not necessarily modified in the face of conflicting evidence, and typically involves supernatural forces or entities. Because they are not a part of nature, supernatural entities cannot be investigated by science. In this sense, science and religion are separate and address aspects of human understanding in different ways. Attempts to put science and religion against each other create controversy where none needs to exist. He views science as descriptive and religion as prescriptive. He stated that if science and mathematics concentrate on what the world ought to be, in the way that religion does, it may lead to improperly ascribing properties to the natural world as happened among the followers of Pythagoras in the sixth century B. Habgood also stated that he believed that the reverse situation, where religion attempts to be descriptive, can also lead to inappropriately assigning properties to the natural world. A notable example is the now defunct belief in the Ptolemaic geocentric planetary model that held sway until changes in scientific and religious thinking were brought about by Galileo and proponents of his views. Kuhn asserted that science is made up of paradigms that arise from cultural traditions, which is similar to the secular perspective on religion. Polanyi further asserted that all knowledge is personal and therefore the scientist must be performing a very personal if not necessarily subjective role when doing science. Coulson and Harold K. Schilling, both claimed that "the methods of science and religion have much in common. Dialogue[ edit ] Clerks studying astronomy and geometry France, early 15th century. The religion and science community consists of those scholars who involve themselves with what has been called the "religion-and-science dialogue" or the "religion-and-science field. Journals addressing the relationship between science and religion include Theology and Science and Zygon. Eugenie Scott has written that the "science and religion" movement is, overall, composed mainly of theists who have a healthy respect for science and may be beneficial to the public understanding of science. She contends that the "Christian scholarship" movement is not a problem for science, but that the "Theistic science" movement, which proposes abandoning methodological materialism, does cause problems in understanding of the nature of science. This annual series continues and has included William James, John Dewey, Carl Sagan, and many other professors from various fields. Science, Religion, and Naturalism, heavily contests the linkage of naturalism with science, as conceived by Richard Dawkins, Daniel Dennett and like-minded thinkers; while Daniel Dennett thinks that Plantinga stretches science to an unacceptable extent. Scientific and theological perspectives often coexist peacefully. Christians and some non-Christian religions have historically integrated well with scientific ideas, as in the ancient Egyptian technological mastery applied to monotheistic ends, the flourishing of logic and mathematics under Hinduism and Buddhism, and the scientific advances made by Muslim scholars during the Ottoman empire. Even many 19th-century Christian communities welcomed scientists who claimed that science was not at all concerned with discovering the ultimate nature of reality.



Principe, the Johns Hopkins University Drew Professor of the Humanities, from a historical perspective this points out that much of the current-day clashes occur between limited extremists—both religious and scientific fundamentalists—over a very few topics, and that the movement of ideas back and forth between scientific and theological thought has been more usual. He also admonished that true religion must conform to the conclusions of science. Buddhism and science have been regarded as compatible by numerous authors. For example, Buddhism encourages the impartial investigation of nature an activity referred to as Dhamma-Vicaya in the Pali Canon—the principal object of study being oneself. Buddhism and science both show a strong emphasis on causality. In his book *The Universe in a Single Atom* he wrote, "My confidence in venturing into science lies in my basic belief that as in science, so in Buddhism, understanding the nature of reality is pursued by means of critical investigation. Christianity and science Science and Religion are portrayed to be in harmony in the Tiffany window Education Francis Collins, a scientist who happens to be a Christian, is the current director of the National Institutes of Health. Among early Christian teachers, Tertullian c. These ideas were significantly countered by later findings of universal patterns of biological cooperation. According to John Habgood, all man really knows here is that the universe seems to be a mix of good and evil, beauty and pain, and that suffering may somehow be part of the process of creation. Habgood holds that Christians should not be surprised that suffering may be used creatively by God, given their faith in the symbol of the Cross. The "Handmaiden" tradition, which saw secular studies of the universe as a very important and helpful part of arriving at a better understanding of scripture, was adopted throughout Christian history from early on. Heilbron, [99] Alistair Cameron Crombie, David Lindberg, [ ] Edward Grant, Thomas Goldstein, [ ] and Ted Davis have reviewed the popular notion that medieval Christianity was a negative influence in the development of civilization and science. In their views, not only did the monks save and cultivate the remnants of ancient civilization during the barbarian invasions, but the medieval church promoted learning and science through its sponsorship of many universities which, under its leadership, grew rapidly in Europe in the 11th and 12th centuries, St. He was not unlike other medieval theologians who sought out reason in the effort to defend his faith. Lindberg states that the widespread popular belief that the Middle Ages was a time of ignorance and superstition due to the Christian church is a "caricature". According to Lindberg, while there are some portions of the classical tradition which suggest this view, these were exceptional cases. It was common to tolerate and encourage critical thinking about the nature of the world. The relation between Christianity and science is complex and cannot be simplified to either harmony or conflict, according to Lindberg. There was no warfare between science and the church. A degree of concord between science and religion can be seen in religious belief and empirical science. The belief that God created the world and therefore humans, can lead to the view that he arranged for humans to know the world. This is underwritten by the doctrine of *imago dei*. In the words of Thomas Aquinas, "Since human beings are said to be in the image of God in virtue of their having a nature that includes an intellect, such a nature is most in the image of God in virtue of being most able to imitate God". As science advanced, acceptance of a literal version of the Bible became "increasingly untenable" and some in that period presented ways of interpreting scripture according to its spirit on its authority and truth. Later that year, a similar law was passed in Mississippi, and likewise, Arkansas in In, these "anti-monkey" laws were struck down by the Supreme Court of the United States as unconstitutional, "because they established a religious doctrine violating both the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution. In, the United States Supreme Court ruled that creationism is religion, not science, and cannot be advocated in public school classrooms. It includes a range of beliefs, including views described as evolutionary creationism, which accepts some findings of modern science but also upholds classical religious teachings about God and creation in Christian context. Bowler argues that in contrast to the conflicts between science and religion in the U. These attempts at reconciliation fell apart in the s due to increased social tensions, moves towards neo-orthodox theology and the acceptance of the modern evolutionary synthesis.

### 5: Definition of Religion for the Social-Scientific Study of Religion - Oxford Scholarship

*Religion and the Social Sciences [R. R. Reno] is 20% off every day at [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) More often than not it's a class in the social sciences that challenges the faith of students, not a class in biology.*

Theory of religious economy The rational choice theory has been applied to religions, among others by the sociologists Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge. They can be divided into specific compensators for the failure to achieve specific goals, and general compensators for failure to achieve any goal. As it becomes clear that the goals of the movement will not be achieved by natural means at least within their lifetimes, members of the movement will look to the supernatural to achieve what cannot be achieved naturally. The new religious beliefs are compensators for the failure to achieve the original goals. Examples of this include the counterculture movement in America: Most religions start out their lives as cults or sects, i. Over time, they tend to either die out, or become more established, mainstream and in less tension with society. Cults are new groups with a new novel theology, while sects are attempts to return mainstream religions to what the sect views as their original purity. Mainstream established groups are called denominations. The comments below about cult formation apply equally well to sect formation. There are four models of cult formation: The founder suffers from psychological problems, which they resolve through the founding of the religion. The development of the religion is for them a form of self-therapy, or self-medication. According to this model, most founders of new religions already have experience in several religious groups before they begin their own. They take ideas from the pre-existing religions, and try to improve on them to make them more popular. Members of the religious group spend less and less time with people outside the group, and more and more time with each other within it. The level of affection and emotional bonding between members of a group increases, and their emotional bonds to members outside the group diminish. According to the social model, when a social implosion occurs, the group will naturally develop a new theology and rituals to accompany it. Some religions are better described by one model than another, though all apply to differing degrees to all religions. Once a cult or sect has been founded, the next problem for the founder is to convert new members to it. Prime candidates for religious conversion are those with an openness to religion, but who do not belong or fit well in any existing religious group. Those with no religion or no interest in religion are difficult to convert, especially since the cult and sect beliefs are so extreme by the standards of the surrounding society. But those already happy members of a religious group are difficult to convert as well, since they have strong social links to their preexisting religion and are unlikely to want to sever them in order to join a new one. The best candidates for religious conversion are those who are members of or have been associated with religious groups thereby showing an interest or openness to religion, yet exist on the fringe of these groups, without strong social ties to prevent them from joining a new group. Potential converts vary in their level of social connection. New religions best spread through pre-existing friendship networks. Converts who are marginal with few friends are easy to convert, but having few friends to convert they cannot add much to the further growth of the organization. Converts with a large social network are harder to convert, since they tend to have more invested in mainstream society; but once converted they yield many new followers through their friendship network. Cults initially can have quite high growth rates; but as the social networks that initially feed them are exhausted, their growth rate falls quickly. On the other hand, the rate of growth is exponential ignoring the limited supply of potential converts: But nonetheless it can take a very long time for religions to grow to a large size by natural growth. This often leads to cult leaders giving up after several decades, and withdrawing the cult from the world. It is difficult for cults and sects to maintain their initial enthusiasm for more than about a generation. As children are born into the cult or sect, members begin to demand a more stable life. When this happens, cults tend to lose or de-emphasise many of their more radical beliefs, and become more open to the surrounding society; they then become denominations. The theory of religious economy sees different religious organizations competing for followers in a religious economy, much like the way businesses compete for consumers in a commercial economy. Theorists assert that a true religious economy is the result of religious pluralism, giving the

population a wider variety of choices in religion. According to the theory, the more religions there are, the more likely the population is to be religious and hereby contradicting the secularization thesis.

**6: Social Science and Religion Network » Sociology | Boston University**

*Religion and the Social Sciences has 0 ratings and 0 reviews. More often than not it's a class in the social sciences that challenges the faith of studen.*

Theories of modernization envision social change as entailing the rationalization of all spheres of existence. In a statement characterizing the classic modernization approach, Moore , p. With this approach, the secularization of religion is a given. For modernization theorists, although families remain significant as consumption units, the "decline" of the family Popenoe is, at minimum, a metaphor for its consignment to a peripheral societal role. The analogue of the notion of linear secularization of religion is the idea of the loss of family functions Vago , pp. Shaped in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, modernization views have continued to dominate public opinion and much of social scientific discourse. In general, according to modernization theories, both family and religion are relegated to the "private" sphere, set apart from the broader social processes and, thus, less significant than those broader processes. Despite this widespread orientation, a revolution in the social sciences has been gaining momentum over the last twenty years or so. The message of this revolution is that the modernization perspective is no longer an adequate vision for understanding the dynamics of modernity or the potentials of postmodernity for religion and family. In the sociology of religion, the paradigm shift moves social science away from a focus on religion as a disconnected phenomenon to a much more complex view of the nature of religious interinstitutional relations. Reflecting this shift, numerous scholars have begun to examine religion as an influence on and as an effect of varied social, political, and economic variables e. A market model of religion, based in rational choice propositions, has become the most strongly debated version of the new way of looking at the religious institution Hadden ; Warner ; Young Similarly for the family, there are many who now argue that, in spite of its changing forms and functions, the family as an institution remains crucially central to social processes and to the patterns of change determining the future of human societies cf. If not taken into consideration, family processes themselves are liable to torpedo efforts at planned social change and to deflect the vectors of unplanned change in unexpected directions Settles Attuned to the inter-institutional perspective, this article examines the linkage between family and religion. Then, after discussing social change processes, we make the point that the religion and family linkage today is important not only in the burgeoning private sphere but in the public realm as well. In spite of its importance, sociologists have given relatively little attention to family and religion together Thomas and Cornwall A few journal articles and four collected volumes have addressed this institutional linkage. As of , only one book Houseknecht and Pankhurst had taken an international comparative approach to the topic. An expanded discussion of some of the themes presented here can be found in the introduction of the latter volume. The inter-institutional relations between family and religion are strong and qualitatively different from other institutional relationships. Berger noted that in premodern societies kinship was permeated with religious meaning, and in modern societies religion remains closely connected to the family. Hargrove , in her systematization of the sociology of religion, argued that religion and family have had a close relationship throughout history in both Western and non-Western societies. Both the familial and religious institutions are characterized by what MacIver , p. In other words, associations within the religious and familial spheres pursue interests for their own sake, because they bring direct satisfaction, not because they are means to other interests, as in the case of economy and polity. Both family and religion are devoted to organizing primary group relations. They stand out as the only two institutions that deal with the person as a whole rather than just segmented aspects of individual lives. These various similarities that religion and family share serve to strengthen the inter-institutional ties between them. The interrelations between the institutions of religion and family are reciprocal Thomas and Henry ; Thornton Religion provides the symbolic legitimation for family patterns cf. Berger , and the family is a requisite for a vigorous religious system because it produces members and instills them with religious values. In fact, numerous familial events are marked in religious contexts e. The special affinity of religion and family as institutions takes varied forms. Almost everywhere, religion provides ritual support for family and kinship structures. This is the case even in

a highly secularized society such as Sweden Trost and Palm Such practices support family life and, at the same time, fulfill a central function for religion itself cf. In fact, Jarvis argues that the familism of Mormonism, expressed both ritually and in church values, is its greatest asset in the eroding environment for traditional families in France. Moreover, utopian experiments and new religious movements often take the family as their essential focus. According to Christiano , in the Unification Church "Moonies" , the family serves as more than the organizing metaphor for the group: Secularization can be seen as a special instance of institutional differentiation, and we discuss the concept and its use below, indicating the value of religious economy models over the conventional secularization approach. Underlying all the dimensions of social change is the notion of institutional differentiation. This phenomenon implies greater specialization. Although the paths and extent of institutional differentiation vary across societies, when differentiation does proceed, we see fundamental changes in inter-institutional relations cf. Alexander and Colomy ; Beckford Institutional differentiation affects all institutions, and we argue more broadly that one cannot assume inter-institutional isolation of religion and family in the private sphere, even in highly differentiated societies. The effects of these institutions are always felt across inter-institutional divisions in some measure. In this section, we examine the issue of differentiation of religion and family conceptually. Our previous description of the religion and family linkage as involving special affinity and reciprocity was not to say that religion and family always and everywhere are, or must be, equally intimately entangled. We can see a continuum in the level of differentiation of these institutions. On the one end of the continuum, Islam in Egypt Houseknecht displays a lack of differentiation, an elaborate interweaving of the two institutions that makes each strongly dependent on the other. And research on the Cameroonian Kedjom funerary rites Diduk and Maynard provides an example of religious practices that are hardly differentiated from the kinship context; they are precisely an affirmation of the kinship patterns of Kedjom society. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Sweden, a country in which the Lutheran Church is officially established and a large majority of the population are nominal members, is highly secular. Developments in the family there have widely diverged from the traditional model that Protestant Christianity had advocated. In Sweden, the two institutions are intertwined only in limited ways Trost and Palm It is primarily in regard to lifecycle rites that the two intersect. The individualized faith of many Americans also accompanies a highly differentiated system of institutional relationships Christiano Secularization is a special process of differentiation in which that which was previously under the "sacred canopy" Berger of religion is removed from that realm and placed in a nonreligious institutional context. Allegedly, education, the acceptance of science, urbanization, industrialized work-life, and the like take away the mystery of religion and strip it of its "plausibility" in many areas of concern. Thus, cure of disease, protection from misfortune, explanation of the universe, and so forth are made rational and thus not subject to religious intervention. In this approach, religion remains relevant only for very personal spiritual quests and solace in the private sphere, and most of its social institutional ramifications become, first, empty shells, and eventually vanish. The notion of a unilinear process of secularization has long troubled many sociologists cf. Hadden and Shupe ; Hadden ; Hammond Some have developed variants that see secularization as a cyclical process with long historical waves. Nisbet , for example, reminds us of the rationality of the eras of classical Greece and of the Renaissance and Age of Reason, with the period from first century Rome to the Renaissance having Christianity "virtually eliminating secular rationalism from the European continent for more than a thousand years" p. Though we are now in a rationalizing or secularizing age, "To argue permanence for this age would be, on the testimony of history, absurd" p. Recently, as we shall see, sociologists of religion have focused upon shorter waves of secularization and have viewed the process as self-limiting. The most prominent versions of this approach apply economic models to religious markets, putting aside the notion that religion must be irrational or otherwise antimodern. Some of these postsecularization theorists argue for a rational choice approach to religion Young , an approach that is largely alien to the mode of thought underlying secularization theory. In the long debate about the validity of notions of secularization within the sociology of religion, it has become clear that secularization cannot be understood in a simplistic way, if one wants to keep the concept at all. While certain evidence of secularization seems apparent, there are countermovements suggesting that religion is truly vital in the modern world cf. Marty and Appleby The



spread of Liberation Theology throughout Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s (Berryman ; Smith), followed by the more recent explosion of evangelical, fundamentalist, and pentecostal Protestantism in the same world region (Martin), suggest the power of the human concern regarding spiritual or nonempirical matters. Similarly, the tenacious attachment of Americans to belief in God (Greeley); cf. Wald, their high levels of religious activity, and the numerical growth and public voice of evangelical Protestantism indicate that religious sentiment of some sort is compatible even with a society that is highly developed socioeconomically. Going beyond the simple Marxist assertion that religion is illusion, even if religious claims are often masks for the interests of power or wealth, religion must be understood as a very real and consequential part of sociocultural life. Casanova carried out one of the most extensive recent cross-cultural analyses of religion, a close examination of the conditions of evangelical Protestantism and Catholicism in the United States and of Catholicism in Brazil, Spain, and Poland. He argued that the social scientific literature depicts secularization as having three correlated dimensions, but his research challenges this idea by convincingly showing that the three dimensions are not always present together. First, Casanova accepts the validity of claims that secularization entails a structural differentiation of the religious institution from other institutions as societal modernization takes place. This differentiation means, in particular, the "emancipation of the secular spheres from religious institutions and norms" (Casanova, p. 10). However, the second dynamic often subsumed under secularization—"the decline in religious beliefs and practices"—cannot be taken for granted, and it does not necessarily follow from the first. The third dynamic, which is the core of the privatization thesis, is that religion will sequester itself in the private sphere under modernity, and, according to some analysts, will be marginalized there. However, this process, too, cannot be assumed to be associated with secularizing institutional differentiation. The second and third dynamics are unwarranted correlates of the first. While Casanova would have us accept the first as the true essence of secularization, he argues that the second and third are not supported by empirical evidence and should not be seen as part of the secularization process. While there is no question that institutional differentiation is a sort of master process of the modern era, we cannot assume that it has progressed equally far everywhere. As already noted, cases like modern Egypt and Cameroon, though both experiencing significant pressures toward greater differentiation, evidence far less differentiation between family and religion, and between these two and other institutions, than does, for example, the United States or Sweden. Furthermore, even if there is great differentiation, one cannot presume that the influences of the religious and familial institutions end. As the debates on abortion policy illustrate, even in a highly differentiated society like the United States, there is plenty of room for religious assertions beyond the alleged parameters of secularized religion and into political life. This circumstance indicates that we cannot take for granted notions of the irrelevance of religion for social policy, as secularist analysts are prone to do. In addition, it also is possible for there to be de-differentiation in a highly differentiated society. Some of this has happened in Belarus during the post-Soviet period (Vardomatskii and Pankhurst). Better known to the U.S. are instances of seeming de-differentiation, where the gap between politics and religion is narrowed. Similarly, the debate in Indonesia over divorce law indicates efforts to reassert religious authority over a legal arena that had been under state control for several decades (Cammack et al.).

Religious and Familial Markets. The notion of unilinear secularization seems untenable, but there are certainly processes of decline and growth in religious phenomena that must be explained. The general inter-institutional perspective focuses attention on relationships that are important for these variations in the strength and character of religion. In addition, sociologists of religion have found market model approaches useful, within the general inter-institutional perspective, for generating testable hypotheses about several aspects of religion and family in various societies. Social differentiation approaches, including secularization theories, start from observations of society from the top down.

### 7: Religion and the Social Sciences: R. R. Reno, Barbara McClay: [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com): Books

*The pioneers of young social sciences such as ethnology, sociology, and psychology not only studied human religion, some also combated it. Evolutionism was the main paradigm to study culture and religion in early-nineteenth-century ethnology or anthropology.*

Instead the editors have focused on how religion is studied academically in the West through social scientific, anthropological, phenomenological, sociological, historical and humanistic studies. In some ways this dictionary is how religion can be look at non-religiously. However this dictionary is not written with the view that religion will eventually wither away in human experience but rather with a renewed appreciation of the traditional strengths and esoteric vigor of religious studies today and of the religions as they affect history and culture. These volumes act as a nearly encyclopedic overview of the pattern of religious studies in Europe and America. All in all, this dictionary will provide students of religious studies a healthy panorama of the way real religions are approached academically. The new and impressively comprehensive Brill Dictionary of Religion addresses religion as an element of daily life and public discourse. Richly illustrated and with more than entries, the dictionary is a multi-media reference source on the many and various forms of religious commitment. It is unusual in that it not only addresses the different theologies and doctrinal declarations of the official institutionalized religions but it also gives equal weight and consideration to a multiplicity of other religious phenomena. People perceive and express religious experiences in many different ways: Religions help determine how people form and perceive their identity as part of a social group. The diverse effects of religions can also be perceived in the environment, society and the public sphere. The Brill Dictionary of Religion helps map out and define the networks and connections created by various religions in contemporary societies, and provides models for understanding these complex phenomena. Religion in the Twenty-First Century Well into the twentieth century, it has been the expectation of the majority of scholars that religions will sooner or later disappear from the modern world. Scholars based their expectation on the assumption that in the wake of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment the rational and scientific world-view would ultimately lead to a decline of religious truth-claims. We have been told that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the rise of modern science, the separation of church and state, industrialization, and individualization have led to an inescapable secularization and a disenchantment of the world. Much to the surprise of sociologists and scholars of religion, the last thirty years have witnessed a remarkable revival of religious truth-claims. Religions entered the public spheres and became strong identity markers both for individuals and for communities. Often, these claims went hand in hand with violent action or even terrorism. Scholars of religion have responded to this surprising development by adjusting their older models of interpretation. Therefore, new strategies of interpretation have been put forward, strategies that reflect onâ€™ and often undermineâ€™ the basic assumptions and concepts of the older models. Scholars are themselves part of an ongoing cultural discourse of identity, which means that if they apply concepts and models of interpretation, they constantly have to be aware of the underlying biases that shape these models. On the one hand, this is an uncomfortable situation. Two consequences are particularly relevant here. Second, this understanding of religion fosters an interdisciplinary cross-fertilization. Locating religions in public spheres and communicational processes calls for the collaboration of many disciplines, among them history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, philosophy, theology, political sciences, literary studies, art, law, and parts of the natural sciences. The Brill Dictionary of Religion The Brill Dictionary of Religion explicitly reflects the transformation that the academic study of religion has undergone within the last twenty years. The rationale that underlies the selection of entries and their respective presentation is aimed at reflecting the many aspects of religious fields of discourse in modern societies. To succeed in this endeavor, two perspectives have to be combined: The large number of illustrations, sometimes tracing religion in unexpected places, likewise underscores this rationale. Second, the historical dimension is of crucial importance, because a proper understanding of modern religious discourses is impossible without knowledge of the past and a comparison with different periods and contexts. That is why the reader will also find historical overviews both of concepts and of religious traditions. As an overall

structure, the entries are organized in six thematic fields: While large entries provide an overview and orientation for the major aspects of all thematic fields, the more specified entries can be distinguished as follows: Historical entries present an overview of important religious and philosophical traditions with extended time tables ; in addition, they historically contextualize elements of religions and provide information of certain de-tails e. Biographical entries introduce important representatives of religious traditions Jesus, Muhammad, Hildegard of Bingen, Luther, Gandhi, etc. Epoch entries provide an overview of certain historical periods, at the same time reflecting on the difficulties involved in constructing these periods e. Gegenwart, Alltag, Medien 4 vols. Although I subscribe to the underlying rationale and the approach of the Metzler Lexikon Religion, substantial changes were necessary in order to compile a dictionary for an English-speaking audience. More important, however, are changes in the selection of entries, their focus, and their reference section. My overall policy here was to carefully remove the focus on Europe in general and on Germany in particular. Several entries were dropped, while other entries were added. When I had the impression that certain entries did not match international scholarly standards or were superfluous, I found new authors for these entries or left them out. For various reasons, only a minority of authors responded to these requests, which left me with the delicate task of providing the respective literature myself. On the one hand, the nature and theoretical background of the entries should be reflected in the reference section; on the other hand, the editor is also an advocate of the English-speaking reader and an international audience, which means that he has to make sure that the relevant English literature is mentioned. I hope that my handling of this dilemma works out for the benefit of the reader.

### 8: Religion and the Social Sciences Unit | PAPERS

*The "science" of human behavior, however, represents something else entirely. In the fields of psychology and sociology, social scientists have long sought to explain human behavior and.*

### 9: Religion and the Social Sciences | Jeff Levin, Ph.D.

*Religion Is a Social Science, so Why Isn't It Studied Like One? Researchers advanced the fields of social science by working together and peer reviewing the evidence.*

*Auden poems, Moore lithographs Business and bankruptcy law in the Netherlands Sexual adolescent The man who read me first A midwives tale Critical Realism and Marxism (Critical Realism-Interventions) Written Hazard Communication Program (A Practical Guide to Safety Compliance Standards for Medical Facili Assessment and remediation of petroleum contaminated sites Cherish hard nilani sighn Connecting home and school Concha Delgado Gaitan Narrowing the Health Perception Gap Mobility and employment in urban Southeast Asia History a very short introduction john h arnold Part V, Contemporary Readings Landholding, and the relation of landlord and tenant Sanctuary Elizabeth M. Kerr Ybor City chronicles Using popular software packages European Perspective On Drug Addicted People Rogawski calculus second edition Volos monster guide The high gate of assumption True Stories Of Our Village The electoral review, the Boundary Commissions draft proposals Were farmers, just like you by Laurie Kaniarz Intercession for the faithful departed The uneasy case for national ID cards A. Michael Froomkin Intraneural injections for rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis ; And, a reprint for physicians and la List of dams in india state wise Mainstream Mathematics for Key Stage 4 Sap hana cookbook Laugh It Up Fuzzball and the Gumbo Gang Declining support for sacrificing civil liberties Among the Wild Chimpanzees Classic Sharepoint 2016 tutorial for beginners Pedlars and Prices Light About God Man Death in Snake Creek. Obeying Gods will A B C of banks and banking*