

Philosophy and Religion:  
My view on Religion - III

Jaimin L.S.P.

July 22, 2020

# 1 Introduction

Now I have, in the second entry, outlined the possible implications in adopting my conclusion of religion upon the theology within religion. For convenience I have included this conclusion, or new foundation below:

“There is an innate element of human existence that is ultimately missing. That is to say, there is a sense of a void in human existence, that by living life we see and think that there is something not present in human existence. And so it is the purpose of religion, in this context and from this perspective, to provide a conceptualisation of human existence such that the void is filled and human existence is, and feels, whole.”

It is my aim in this entry to look at the implications of this view of religion, on religious organisations and society as a whole. I will also, as a consequence, look a bit at secularism and its possible effectiveness, or rather, its possible lack of it in the long run.

The structure of this entry is as follows:

- What my Conclusion Holds with Regards to Society and World Religions
- How my Conclusion Might Affect the Coordination of Society and World Religions
- How my Conclusion Might Fix the Failings of Secularism
- Final Remarks on my Conclusion of Religion

## 2 What my Conclusion Holds with Regards to Society and World Religions

As it has been reasoned, hopefully to an adequate degree, in the previous entry, by adopting my conclusion, it is apparent that there is no wrong theology, nor right theology, simply because theology, like the 'Void' concept in my conclusion, is void of correctness as a concept itself. Therefore, my conclusion ultimately brings forth the idea in that no religion, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, Shintoism, or any other, is right. Neither are any wrong. Using my conclusion, every single world religion is much like a sentinel that points to the 'truth', or rather, points to the 'true' way in which the void in existence can be filled, yet is never that 'true' way itself.

Thus, the only purpose that religions serve in being highly varied, is that the way in which they point to the 'truth' is different due to this variation. Only then can these religions be suited to serve people of different cultures, experiences and insights. So it is as if religions, in their huge variety, provide multiple channels to access the way in which one can 'fill the void in their existence', depending on the suitability and ability of that individual to understand the tangible theology within that religion. For example, for one, whose culture has included the concept of Gods for generations, we can say they might be better suited to understand the theology of Christianity, Islam or Judaism since these religions have the concept of a God. However, compared to another, whose culture has never included the concept of God or Gods, we can say they might be better suited to understand the theology of Buddhism since Buddhist practice is irrespective of Gods. Of course when I say better suited, I only mean to imply that they would most likely understand said religions in a way that requires less strain compared to others.

What has been pointed out in the last two paragraphs are the main implications upon world religions and society. No world religion holds more correctness above another, neither is any one more incorrect than another, and also, by adopting my conclusion, religions serve as a selection of ways to attain a 'whole existence'. Therefore, since correctness of religion is void, all religions serve different paths towards the same 'fullness', but offer such variety of paths because of the differences of people's culture, experiences, and insights, so as to offer a more suitable path for certain people without too much strain in their adjustment to those paths.

### **3 How my Conclusion Might Affect the Co-ordination of Society and World Religions**

So, in the previous section I have outlined what my conclusion holds for society and world religions. Now I will explore what affects it might have, if the world actually adopts my conclusion. Of course, this will be a hypothetical exploration.

Firstly, conflict. There are several conflicts that are presently going on between religious organisations. Whether those conflicts are conducted with penned letters, guns, or with far more deadly mediums. Now, it must be said that these conflicts serve no good at all, even before I bring in the implications of my conclusion. Not only will there always be differences between religions, but these conflicts ultimately will never solve these differences. Thus the result of conflict is, always, more conflict. The only implication my conclusion has here, is in the justification of these conflicts. If all were to adopt my conclusion, there would be no justification to fight for religious causes, since correctness of them is voided. Not to mention that there is every human justification present, to deter the harming of a fellow human being. Presently, in the real world, there is enough reason of course to support the latter point, but there is no sound reason to support the former point, that being the nonsense in asserting religious correctness through conflict. Therefore, it is my hope that my conclusion provides the foundation to support the futility, and unreasonable action that is, to uptake conflict for religious causes, even from the perspective of those who are religious.

Of course, physical conflict due to differences between humans is a repeating pattern in human history, such that it might even be called a product of human outlook. Thus, in the area of human conflict, which is always extremely more complication than it should be, I do not expect my conclusion to be adopted that simply. However, in the area of religious debate, I do hope and believe that a conclusion such as mine might serve as a foundational, and solid common ground for constructive discussion. The main reason being that my conclusion, from the start, makes clear that neither side can claim correctness, nor assert the incorrectness of the other side. Furthermore, as it has been reasoned in the previous entries, it is my hope that these implications of my conclusion may be seen also from the perspective of those who are religious, not on the basis of their religion, but on the basis of human existence, of which no one can be said to have no relation to.

Thus, the main affect of my conclusion in society is that it renders justification for religious conflict well and truly void, but in a manner that can be reasoned from a foundation of human existence, not just in a manner that is to assume it is only wrong to conduct such conflict, which of course is also true.

## 4 How my Conclusion Might Fix the Failings of Secularism

So here, let us first go through what secularism might be. For the sake of clarity, here are the principles outlined, at least in the UK, by the National Secular Society:

1. “*Separation* of religious institutions from state institutions and a public sphere where religion may participate, but not dominate.”
2. “*Freedom* to practice one’s faith or belief without harming others, or to change it or not have one, according to one’s own conscience.”
3. “*Equality* so that our religious beliefs or lack of them doesn’t put any of us at an advantage or a disadvantage.”

It must be said that before I explore this, that I completely understand the aims of secularism. Those aims mainly being to have fair, and effective state administration where overly subjective rule, such as that which is religious, is not unfair to the people. These aims are admirable, but there are a few shortcomings, I think, on how secularism tries to achieve these aims, which I will dissect in this section.

My main problem with secularism is the division of religion from state administration. Don’t get me wrong, there are plenty of religious rulings that would not go down well in state administration. My problem is most certainly not in the state considering rules of religious organisations impractical, to say the least. My problem is precisely in the effectiveness of the action of division.

If it is the aim of the state to make sure that religious affairs do not interfere with the freedom and equality of people, then simply cutting off religious organisations does solve the problem, because then these organisations have no hand to play in administration. But what of the concepts that were deemed impractical by the state? What of the will of those, in religious organisations, wishing to impose these concepts upon the people? I hope you might be able to see that whilst division takes away power from religious organisations, it gives them a degree of autonomy. With a secular system, there is no administrator linked with the state to oversee affairs within religious organisations.

This can pose a problem if, and only if, said religious organisations wish to have a hand in state administration since now there is less of a mediator between the state and the religious organisations, and so there is far less of a system to stop these religious organisations, should they be imposing rules that are not fair to the people.

With the act of division, there is also implied a sense of superiority in the separator compared to the separated. In other words, the power which the state uses to separate religious organisations is implicitly said to be greater. No matter whether this implication is true or knowingly implied, this automatically would create tension. Another cause of tension in that the state, by cutting off religious organisation from administration, implicitly suggests that the religious views held by those organisations are false. With my conclusion adopted, we can say that those views are neither true nor false, but with my conclusion aside, whether those views are true or not, this implication will cause tension. And so who knows what this tension might lead to. Currently that tension is very minimal, at least in the UK having little more form than exchanges on social media and in the press. I would say that the secularism present in the UK is exercised to a lesser degree than, say, in the USA for example where you can probably see a much higher degree of tension.

The other problem with division is not just tension between the state and the religious organisations. In the UK today there are several religions practised, Christianity, Islam and Hinduism to name a few of the larger ones. Division of the Church from state administration was the main aim of secularism in the West historically, however now there are most certainly more religious organisations present than just the Church. In the UK, by exercising secularism, everyone is now free to practise these religions without the Church trying to stop you or exclude you in state affairs because of this. This is of course a good thing, I do not dispute it. However, the problem now faced is that the tensions between the people in different religious organisations is also divided from the state. Yet, I would ask, whose responsibility is it to ensure the safety of the people within such tensions? It is of course the state administration, and so the problem in dividing all of these current religions from state administration is that the activities between those religions is also made to be less and less the responsibility of the state, creating unsolvable tensions.

And so it is the aims of secularism that I can support, however I see problems in how it uses division to meet these aims. I have not fully studied secularism

on a philosophical basis and neither have I studied it on a practical basis, so my problems with it may very well be unfounded.

It is my thinking that the administration of state should not be lacking concern for any aspect of society. Division, on any level, between state administration and any other parties, in my mind, serves no practical purpose beyond a short term solution. Administration of the state should concern nothing less than all of society, otherwise I think any judgement made by the state is at risk of being incomplete. The bottom line is that both religious organisations and state administrations are organisations of people. What the state is opposed to is not the people of course, but the policy imposed by the religious organisations. Such policy is no less than at the mercy of the people who put it in place, whether those people are part of religious or state organisations. And so it is my thinking that it is more effective to join religious organisation and state administration, simply because they both effect the people of society. What I propose is that the state and the religious organisations are to constructively talk to each other, resolve policy, resolve their reasons behind said policy, and work together. But the only way this can happen without inherent tensions is if my conclusion, or something like it, is adopted by every religious and state organisation within the forums for constructive discussion. That way, religious doctrinal differences can be ignored without tension, and no one party can claim superiority in correctness. This way there is no division, and there is an actual structured medium for resolving any existing tensions. My conclusion allows for people to practise whatever religion they wish since, by my conclusion, no religion can claim correctness over another with regards to doctrine or theology. Equality is held simply by the fact that my conclusion works from the basis of human existence, from which none of us are exempt. What is more is that my conclusion has been reasoned, I hope adequately enough, in such a way that even those in religious organisations might be able to easily adopt.

It is like keeping two toddlers in a room. One sees the other and thinks that whatever they do seems to be misjudged, odd, and harmful. Of course they fight. Now, would it be good to ship one toddler off to the other side of the world so that the fighting stops? Yes, maybe for a time. But who is to say that the toddlers, in this separated state, will not grow up and also breed their hatred of each other further, meaning that when they *inevitably* meet again, they will most certainly cause chaos. And so, I would say, the state and religious organisations are like the toddlers. Fights are not resolved in the long term by separation alone. Tensions must be addressed by both parties, and mended by both parties, so that they can work together.

Ultimately I would think that certain sections of religious organisations, as part of the state administration, would be more effective for overall administration, since there is far less implied division to cause possible tension. The one thing that must be carefully planned is where the power in policy making lies. What the religious organisations would be given is a stage to constructively speak their views, but they will be granted very limited power themselves. Of course, if things were to move in this direction, much more planning would need to be done. But I would say that such a move might be in the right direction, since the state administration is made more universal, more encompassing, more complete and ignoring as little as possible.

It is highly possible that I will talk more on secularism in some other entry and in more concrete detail since that is not the aim of this entry. The main point here is that my conclusion could serve as another way to resolve the aims sought out by secularism.

## 5 Final Remarks

And so here ends, for the near future, my discussion on my view of religion, as a collective of all the world religions. It my utmost hope that I have looked at things in an objective view without bias, and that I have reasoned my conclusions in such a way that is understandable. I will repeat what I said in the first entry because I do think it is important: your agreement, whilst welcomed, is secondary to your understanding of what I have written. After all, even those who say they agree with me might not actually have understood what it is I have meant, and I would add that if this were to be the case, the fault would be mine in not having explained my reasoning well enough. And so I hope that my explanations have been adequate indeed, for then my writing would have actual value.

It highly possible that the view I have proposed in these three first entries, might change in the future. My view aside, I would finally hope that what I have written is of at least some interest to the people reading. I would say that it is nothing less than a success if you, by mulling over my words, build up your own conclusions, that might even be more reasonable than my own.

Within this entry especially, it seems that many things of a political nature have been introduced. I would like to simply say that I wish to address these topics in more detail in future entries, and on a basis that is less philosophical and more political.

Thank you for reading.

*END*