

What is Philosophy?

The philosophy of India has a long history. It has originated in about 1500 BC with *Vedic* philosophy. Eastern philosophy refers to both traditions that were popular in India, Persia, China, Japan and Korea. Eastern philosophy used the term *dassana* for philosophy, *Dassana* means to see not by naked eyes but by the eyes of mind.

Indian philosophy purposes were to reveal the reality of man and universe. The word philosophy in English comes from Greek language. It is combination of '*phileo*' and '*sophia*' - *phileo* means lover and *sophia* means wisdom. Therefore, philosophy means love of wisdom which the philosophers tried to gain. Philosophy is discipline concerned with questions:

1. How we should live? - leads to development of study of ethics
 2. What sort of things exists and what are their essential natures? => study of metaphysics
 3. What count as genuine knowledge? => study of epistemology
 4. What is the correct reasoning? => study of logic
- Ethics or 'moral philosophy' is concerned with question: "How should we behave?"
 - Metaphysics - according to **Aristotle** it is the first philosophy. He said it is a subject that deals with first cause and principle.
 - Epistemology is concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge and even whether knowledge itself is possible.
 - Logic has two broad divisions - 'mathematical logic' and 'philosophical logic'.

The history of western philosophy is divided into three periods:

1. Ancient or the Greek period
2. Medieval or the Christian philosophy
3. Modern Philosophy

In the ancient (Greek) period, in the Western world, philosophy is regarded as a scientific investigation or cosmological explanation. According to **Thales**, the father of western philosophy in Greece, cosmological explanation or scientific investigation may be regarded as philosophy. Therefore, the ancient philosophers investigated how universe was originated. During 2500 years many philosophers put forward their views on philosophy. But **Thales** for the first time used philosophical explanation about the universe. Before that everyone said that the universe was made by the God. But he totally rejected that idea and introduced the explanation of universe by (that what is today called) philosophy of the western world.

In the Medieval period, philosophy was regarded as explanation of God. This tendency developed during the medieval period of European history. In this period dominated Catholic fathers, who thought according to the Bible philosophy, depending on the God. Philosophy explained the law of God. Thus they talked explaining their reasons, as the most important function of the then philosophy. But this tradition changed after several Medieval Catholic fathers, especially in Europe, introduced a new way of thinking. Without dealing with mysterious things, reasoning started new approach to philosophy. Reasoning became very important. Thus this historical development helped philosophy to provide new definition of philosophy.

In the case of modern philosophers, they explain philosophy using different terminology. According to modern philosophers clear view is important. In ancient time philosophy was regarded as complicated one. But modern philosophy disagrees with this view and says that the main aim of philosophy is clarifying more complicated concept in order to make it a clear concept. With clear concept of philosophy, modern philosophy disagreed with the view that philosophy is a complicated subject.

Definitions of Philosophy

1. **Plato** = “Philosophy is a way of living and dying.”
2. **Aristotle** = “Philosophy is the science which considers the truth.”
3. **Herbert Spencer** = “Philosophy is concerned with everything as a universal science.”
4. **Karl Max** = “So far philosophers have interpreted the world but the thing is to change it.”
5. **Cicero** = “Philosophy is directed of our leaves, friends of verse enemy to vice.”(?)

Main Areas of Philosophy

The field of philosophy is vast. It includes everything, but no philosophy can catch everything at once in order to make progress. It must rather obey the tradition than philosophy.¹ The philosophers deal with the fields of methodology, epistemology, metaphysics, ethic and especially practical topics such as philosophy of science, history, law and social philosophy.

Fields of philosophy:

<p>a) Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Problem2. Hypothesis3. Test (research = exquisitement, observation, collecting data).4. Conclusion (Positive and negative) <p>b) Epistemology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Human knowledge2. Means of knowledge3. Truth and beliefs4. Rationality5. Empiricism	<p>c) Metaphysic</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. God2. Heaven3. Hell4. Soul5. Spirit6. Destiny7. Brahman <p>d) Social Philosophy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Philosophy of science2. Political philosophy3. Philosophy of Religion
--	--

Relation between Religion and Philosophy

Although different definitions were given to explain philosophy and religion, basically they do not contradict each, rather they are complement to each other:

1. Religion depends on philosophy
2. Philosophy depends on religion
3. Religion includes philosophy aspects
4. Philosophy includes religion aspects

Philosophy and religion may differ to some extend but in fact they are complementary to each other. Both religion and philosophy rise the life of human society to a higher level. a man meets a billet(?) philosophy and a billet(?) religion. Philosophy and religion have only one purpose, that is seeking duty, though in philosophy purpose is to remove attachment and salvation.² Philosophy and religion have similar

1 Original was: “It must obey the tradition expect of philosophy.” - However, the original and the correction are both not correct. Philosophy goes strictly against tradition and as much as possible tries to concentrate on search for wisdom.

ideas, such as about existence of soul, its origin and destiny, god and creation etc. At all levels we see that the relation between religion and philosophy are most intimated.

The term philosophy of religion has persisted in our language as the name for scientific study of religion. It is an intellectual and logical interpretation of religious experience and antidote to all dogmatism, irrationalness and superstitions in religion. The philosophy of religion merged in philosophy so far as its philosophical thinking about religion is concerned. Philosophical thought is always personal and very deeply intellectual. This is a rationalism of religious experience, God, faith, worship, prayer, tradition and immortality. Other determining factors of religious experience cannot be explained intellectually with the use of figurative ample analogy.

The philosophy of religion is not an organ of religious teaching. Religious practice, rituals worship, prayer etc. need not to be undertaken. From the atheist point of view the philosophy of religion are studying those activities of religion and religious teaching but in philosophy of religion we have to observe the philosophical aspects of all these organs of religion. Not only the theist, atheist and agnostic can philosophize about religion. The philosophy of religion is not necessary a breach of theology. The theory of religious belief may lead to breach of philosophy. However, it study a concept of proposition and argument pertains also to a theologian.

Religion is as old as human civilization. It is hardly possible to imagine a time when man lived without a religion. Religion is, perhaps, the result of man's attempt to establish a relationship between universe and man himself. Religion manifests through the activities of man performed to give expression to this relationship. These activities consist of rites, rituals, observances, ceremonies etc. performed to appease and win the goodwill of some superior power, either God or some such being. Through these rites and rituals man attempts to strengthen this relationship, obtain favor and help, make himself successful and avoid all disasters etc.

The word philosophy is from the Greek words *phileo+sophia* meaning 'love of wisdom'. Thus a lover of wisdom is called a philosopher. In India this kind of philosophy is referred to as *darśana* meaning vision or penetrative seeing. Thus seeing in very sharp way is important in philosophy. Therefore, philosophers mainly depend on logic and reasoning. They reject tradition, hearsay and other authorities. This is specially so with materialist philosophers.

While religion is more like an attempt to make the superior power happy and win his favor, philosophy is an attempt to understand the reality behind what appears to the normal perception. This could be done only through penetrative, intuitive knowledge. Religion therefore is an extroversive expression of man's understanding of what he thinks is the relationship between himself and the universe and philosophy. There have been attempts to go deeper into reality and understand what is behind that what we normally perceive with our sense faculties. In brief, religion is what we see on the surface, and philosophy what we intuitively understand as lying behind the surface.

The main function of the philosophy of religion is to verify the views and propositions put forward by religions. And for this is used philosophical method of logic, reasoning, investigation, examination and analyzes of these propositions. In doing so it does not evaluate these propositions, reject or accept them. This analysis is done in a very objective manner merely to verify them. Such verifications give strength to these propositions. In this philosophy of religion serves as the establishment of religious propositions.

2 The original was not 'remove' but 'a pieces'. It is difficult to think what was the teacher's words, however, it must be noted, that not all religions want to remove attachment, e.g., Christianity, Islam and other; not all religions expect salvation (liberation of bad deeds done by someone else) – e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism and other. However, all religions try to lead their followers to peace.

The Problem of God

1. Theist = belief in God or gods
2. Pantheism = belief that God is present in everything
3. Deism = belief in God but not as a divinity
4. Panetheism = (?)
5. Monotheism = belief only in one God
6. Polytheism = belief in many gods and goddesses
7. Atheism = rejection of existence of Gods
8. Agnosticism = rejecting belief and rejecting non-belief in God or gods explaining that we cannot prove any of the two ways.
9. Retreism(?) =
10. Dualism = belief in two aspects that ought to be the principal features of the world
11. Monism = belief in one aspect that ought to be the principal feature of the world

The question “what is God?”

It is a philosophical question. Most philosophers expect some sort of definition as an answer to this question. Western philosophers are typically concerned with the God of monotheist religion but they are sometimes also concerned with other concepts of divine. Among those people who believed in supernatural being, some people believed that there is just one God, while others such as Hindus believe in many different deities.³ Hindus also have a monotheistic philosophy that can be neither Monotheistic nor polytheistic.⁴ Buddhists generally do not believe in the existence of a creator God but accept different kinds of heavenly realms.

According to monotheistic religions, God’s attributes should be absolute. They are called ‘*omni*’ - attributes this are defined as totally unlimited. The attributes concerned with God are: omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, omnibenevolence and eternity.

There are many other English names for this deity which always start with a capital letter, for example: Lord, Holy Father, The Sacred, **Yahweh**. The capitalization of the names distinguished this Christian God from the gods of other religions even though some of them are referred to in English by native name - **Viśnu**, **Śiva**, **Allāh**, **Brahma** and other, rather than 'God' which is understood as the Christian God.

Arguments for existence of God.

The ways used to prove God's existence are of two kinds:

1. Independent Logical exercise
2. Practical conclusion

3 It is important to mention, that Hinduism is very often wrongly interpreted as a polytheism. Hinduism, though it may seem to be polytheism, it is actually mostly monotheism believing in one God – **Brahma**, who has various aspects, such as *Viśnu* and *Śiva* which are sometimes personified into **Viśnu** and **Śiva**. There are many kinds of Hindus, therefore it is important to understand, that some may be polytheists and some monotheists. Some may be even atheists.

4 This is called 'henotheism', a term coined by **Mr. Max Müller**. It means, that among a multitude of gods one is selected and worshiped as the main God.

A practical argument recommend as way of speaking about what the disclosure discloses. }<] The existence of an absolute or supreme value has never been concluded as a result of an isolate logical explanation. The followings are some traditional arguments for the existence of God:

a) The Ontological⁵

The ontological argument of **St. Anselm** takes fresh(?) (that nothing greater can be conceived) and uses it as technique for disclosures⁶ directing one without limit to an ever increasing perfective. Therefore the fresh(?), necessary view would be used for development to talk about God.

b) The Cosmological⁷

The cosmological argument uses as technique for the disclosure such question as “why is this done?” or “why is there anything at all?” In receiving reply to this question in causal term the cosmological argument built an ever increasing causal spread until disclosure occurs. The fresh(?) was first cause specifying what is disclosure and at(?) vacated(?) third(?) way of talking.(?)

This argument is called the first cause Theology

1. Everything has a cause
2. The cause is God
3. God has no cause

The argument from design takes a story(?) with probability, for example the interrelated path of watch(?) and uses this analogy as proof for the existence of the God in relation to which one speaks of God in term for example of external purpose.(?)

Theological⁸

Here method clean of a cosmic designer is required to explain the design we find in the world. According to **Aquinas** in terms of theological concept in which all physical processes were explained by irritation(?) to goal(?) state.(?) For example, each time of as seeking(?) or proper plane(?) in the universe it is called the argument from design of patience(?). For example interrelated path of a watch of the eyes of man. The argument from religious experience for existence of God can't be disproved because it is a subjective knowledge. Some theologians have claimed that they have experienced God, have seen God, have talked with God. This claim can't be proved, because it is not empirical. However, still it is valuable, because it is considered to be a kind of knowledge of human being.

Nature of Religious Experience

Philosophy is interested in religious experience as a possible source of knowledge of the existence, nature and doing of God. Many philosophers think that such experiences are never what the particular people have seen. These experiences are unnecessary until proved and shown⁹.

5 Ontological argument simply says, that the world had to be created in some way, and that it could not be just by chance. Thus there had to be a creator to create this world.

6 'Disclosure' here can be understood as 'logical proof'.

7 Cosmological argument teaches that the universe works according to various rules which are perfect, that there is life and other things which definitely are caused by the God.

8 Theological argument tries to show, that because God can be felt subjectively, must exist.

9 The original was 'guilty'.

There are critics who think that they have sufficient reason to the contrary. In the case of religious experience, the term religious experience is properly used for any experience one has unconnected with one's religious life including a sense of guilt(?) or realize, joy, fears, a sense and so on, but the consensus, philosophical with religious experience has a much narrow(?) over(?). It is concerned with the experience taken by the subject to be ending experience and awareness of God. Firstly, the awareness of God is experience. Secondly, this experience directs(?). Then thirdly, this experience is completely lacking(?) insecurely contained, finally this is focused experience.

As for many people in the eastern and western religious traditions, for example, many religious people believe in God because they claim to have experienced God in some way. Our attitude toward the reasonableness or rationality of belief in God can be shaped by our understanding of the character of religious experience. In other words, we can assess the quality, credibility, or intellectual status of religious beliefs by considering the nature of the experiences that ground them.

It may be that religious experience provides the necessary background for arguments for the existence of God to carry their desired force. Perhaps theistic arguments fill out details and extend the knowledge of God given by way of religious experience. Unless there is already some knowledge of God present to us by way of encountering God, reasoning about God will get us nowhere.

Alternatively, we might suppose that traditional arguments for the existence and nature of God are strengthened if we add to them the facts of religious experience. Religious experience might combine with other sorts of theistic arguments for a cumulative case for theism. What shows us is that an analysis of religious experience can assist us in a broader evaluation of the intellectual merits of belief in God. If religious experience plays an important role in the formation and sustenance of religious belief, then our understanding of the character of a religious way of life is affected by our understanding of religious experience.

Understanding of religious experience may also explain the problem of evil as it is experienced by a religious person. Non religious people frequently appeal to the fact that the World contains much suffering as a reason of not-believing in the existence of God. If there is a God, He would not allow such and such things to happen. For someone who already believes in God because the person has experienced God this problem must take on a profoundly different character. Some religious people find themselves drawn closer to God through suffering, for they find a greater reliance on God because of their suffering. Other religious people are angry at God because of their suffering. The problem of evil for them is not a reason to doubt God's existence but a reason to doubt God's love or providence, or to suppose that one is being punished for some wrong doing.

Mystical Experience

The chief philosophy is interested in mystical experience and it concerns the possibility that it would serve as a source of knowledge or justify belief in God.

Those who have such experience, difficulty is, that one has to learn both from such ones as well as receive additional confirmation of the belief already held. Usually, there is supposed only a limited set of belief to be justified in this way. The mystical experience is subjective, therefore, they can't verify it. This includes the belief that God exists, certain belief of the followers at the moment, confirming or condemning receiving or sending a certain message.

The fact is, that subject takes oneself to acquire knowledge of God - but mystical perception doesn't guarantee that they actually do so. One can be misled even by sense experience, one can suppose that one shows at dusk that there was a car in the distance when it was actually a cow. With both sense experience and mystical experience contradiction between reports prevent us from taking all of them to be verified as

valuable mystical experience. We need look no further than to the many cases in which someone supposes that God commanded the murder of many people of certain sort.

Reasons for the positive answer can be divided into theological and philosophical ones. The former comprises of any component of the belief system of given religion that gives us reason for thinking either that God is in principle accessible to human experience or that particular persons have experienced God's presence on one or other occasion. Theological considerations are out of bond(?) here. The most important one perhaps, the only important one goes as following: any suppositions that one perceives something to be the case can be justified, example - there is an elephant in front of you and God is forgiving.(?)

The first reason for negative assessment concerns certain differences between sense experience and mystical experience. Sense experience is common possession of all human beings whereas mystical experience is not. A second common charge is that the mystic is simply moving belief into an indifferent experience. A third reason, though partially, is the supposition that mystical experience can be explained in purely naturalistic terms. A fourth importance difference between sensory and mystical perception is that there are effecting(?) texts(?) for accuracy in the case of former but not the latter. Still it must be admitted that there is unresolved problem regarding mystical perception. Therefore, mystical experience is still under investigation.

Marxist Approaches to Religion

Karl Marx together with **Friedrich Engels** presented a materialistic philosophy. In materialism is no belief in the supernatural realm. **Karl Marx** asserts that:

“Man makes religion, religion doesn't make man, religion is the self-consciousness or has self-esteem of man who has either not yet found himself or has already lost himself in it.”

This is the nature of religious alienation. In short, what **Marx** proposed is that religion doesn't reflect man through consciousness. Religion, as **Marx** sees, is a false consciousness. Religion is the product of man, the product of those in power, of those who control the productive process.

Marx's theory of religion is a criticism on religion. **Marx** and **Engels** must be viewed as an aspect of the general theory of society like many others in this area. **Marx** was most critical of religion. Unlike others, **Marx** didn't try to criticize the logic of religion as a set of belief. Rather he proposed that religion reflects society. Therefore, any criticism of society itself is a criticism of religion.

Marx and **Engels** wrote a book entitled “*On religion.*” Here they give a definition for religion. In this way it says:

“Religious distress is at the same time the expression of real distress and also the protest against real distress. religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of heartless world, it is the spirit of a spiritless condition. It is opium of the people”.

Here **Marx** and **Engels** clearly show the function of religion in the practical world. Therefore, they had a pragmatic view on religion. **Marx's** argument that the religion was a way of ruling and that it was an ideology has a considerable influence. His view that religion mirrors economical circumstance provides a helpful a starting point for social scientific analysis. People need food more than belief or religion; similarly it is with education arts etc.

Marx saw how religion was institutional in the service of powerful economic and political elites. If the poor accept their lord in return for a better hereafter, they will stop seeking social justifies here on earth. They will be free. **Marxist** perspective shows the preference of spiritual gain instead of putting food on the table.

A belief in better hereafter also serves as comfort to the poor and oppressed people. Religion thereby functions as a portent-form of social control by keeping the poor in their place. **Marx** did his best to drive away what he regarded as the illusory nature of religion and to expose it as an ideological tool of the ruling classes.

Marx's main objective was to liberate the working classes from the oppression of capitalism. Anything that severs capitalism is interested in getting the social control. Functions of religion have to be critically demystified, contested and ultimately taken away from the hands of ruling classes (especially) if it legitimates a social order based on inequality, implied that this is ordered by divine will. **Marx** offers an alternative project, a humanist society based on socialism and ultimate communism.

Although an atheist, **Marx** was more against institutional religion than religion in its pure form. The clergy were usually members of ruling classes with interest to keep the poor in their place. He longed for the erosion of super-natural belief and was convinced that secularization would liberate people from mystified forms of social oppression. He and his co-writer and friend **Friedrich Engels** claim that the poor were not interested in any form of institutional religion, but some traditions of **Marx** and **Engels** prove to be fearing Marxism. On this point it was said: "religion has completed a multi-dimensional aspect to its relationship with society."

Post-Modernist Approaches to Religion

Post-modernism has been defined in a number of different ways. These definitions depend on completing contest(?) of definitions.(?) Post-modernists argue that modernists use reason to exclude(?) people, when people apply reason to religion someone's reality is been branded false.(?) This is not including first question.(?) Other's belief implies that we can refer to an external objective reality by trying to apply rationality to religion. We are trying to impose European enlightenment on to others by challenging the 'true claims' of other religions, we devalue the person who is the source of his own truth.¹⁰

Therefore, under inclusiveness post-modern thinkers include all one group. According to post-modernist fundamentalists, those who believe in religious teachings may be correct or false, not just within their own feeling, but over all feeling.

Modernism	Post-modernism
1. Accepting master(?) narrations and Meta(?) narrations	1. Rejection of master(?) narrations and Meta(?) narrations
2. Faith in Grand(?) theory	2. Rejection of totalizing theory
3. Hierarchies of social classes and ethnic values	3. Social and cultural pluralism
4. Idea of the family	4. Alternative family unit
5. Sense of individualism	5. Sense of generalization
6. Mass culture and marketing	6. Smaller group identities
7. Art is unique	7. Art is a process

¹⁰ This is a daring statement. I wonder whether the lecturer can give any example of 'truth' of which a person is source. As far as I know, knowledge of people is always taken from other source. Thus person rarely has any own knowledge as mostly all what we know is what we have been taught. This comment applies especially for religious beliefs.

One of essential elements of post-modernism is that it constituted an attack against theory and methodology. It substitutes an anti-rules partner-disperse disclaim. However, there are two methodologies characteristic of post-modernism. There is an inter-dependence in that interpretation is inherent in deconstruction. Deconstruction embraces negative critical capacity and is in fact demystifying(?) attacks to reveal internal attributes by examining the magic(?) of attaining(?). The reference to deconstruction examines what is reflected and what is not. For post-modernism there is a number of interpretations. They argue that any interpretation does not have a final meaning for(?) any(?) protectual(?) sighness(?).

Religion has suspected(?) all the tensions(?) century(?) from modern.(?) Yet people are today interested in spiritual things as ever were. Reasonably, sociologists have shown that 95% of people believe in God or a universal spirit. While people are thus interested in spirituality, we can say that today the society is still spiritual, at least up to some extent. Commanding(?) spirit has changed according to reason, yet the literature of discovering(?) moment(?) teaches that it is inappropriate to question other persons' higher power, because discovering is tied to their belief in power of the God or their understanding of it whatever it may be. Post-modern thought also devoted(?) other figures(?) of religious consciousness the way consciousness can create or alter in new way.(?) Religion(?) mental(?) imagine(?) can create new reality not unlike the way of formative(?) Post-modernist hopes to create new reality although new realities have no demarcated against the political power thinking post-modern circum(?).(?) They also fear oppress(?) triple's(?) people as more opium than Western culture.(?)

Most religious leaders said that personal experience is the key to understand religion. Most of them called for disassociation(?) the prefix to the religious experience. It is a loss of conscious awareness of real world, specifically post-modernist ritualness(?) called for people to live all(?) reasonal(?) categories(?) behind(?).(?) Before assisting thus they see one thing - the supreme burial(?) to deep(?) religion reason and truth.(?) They all stress that we must first live by our senses before trying to know spiritual things.

We may observe religious awareness and intrinsic relativism in Eastern mystical traditions as Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism. These religions teach that is everything part one sense.(?) All these traditions not only reject reason as tool for discovering truth, they even duty(?) life construction on reasonal(?) level to try learner(?) deeply understanding either(?) Eastern.(?) No post-modernist accepted the reality of the world we observe in an objective sense. Therefore, post-modernism has a relationship with Eastern thought. Anyhow, with their methodology, post-modernism criticized the traditional religion it(?) text(?) tool(?) and religious founder.

Religion and Modern World

Today society lives more industrial and global life. Therefore, the religion holds less social sanctification(?) over culture where they differ in their interpretations(?) of what happens next.(?) in modern society a scholar knew this advance of the 'pluralistic religious marketplace'. There are a lot of religions to choose from these days. Still, the world religions such as Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism and Sikhism haven't unified as they would like it, but(?) their devotees are still religious. Modernism has a spirit of a universal church into denomination(?).

Sikhs moved into the social sphere thus created and developed religious sub-culture. Some of these prosper and still do other create such a while(?) gulls(?) between their views and main-stream culture that

¹¹ Some digital media may be a kind of broadcast media. It is not clear what the lecturer meant.

they attacked(?) few converts.(?) Their survival is dependent on society of their own children. Regarding the faith, new trends in religious pluralism have been named as NRM (New religious movements), but this term can be confusing because certain cancel(?) kinds(?) are old and certain kinds are new.

Religion and Morality

Morality is literally the science of customs or habits of man. It is the science of higher good. Religion is based in some measure on the idea that God reveals insights about life and its true meaning. However, one should know how to distinguish religion from morality stating that religion is dogmatic and irrational, whereas morality is progressive and rational.

Indeed, the Ten Commandments are moral commandments. Much of the life and teaching of **Jesus Christ** are concerned with the standards of conduct by which men ought to live. At the very core of religion is the message that man must live according to the moral standards of God in order to achieve ultimate salvation. Many of the classical Greek tragedies had a religious and moral significance in that they portrayed to the audience what happens if man transgresses the laws of the gods, however incomprehensible those laws might be to human understanding. Thus, **Oedipus** is doomed to expiate someones unknown sin, even before his birth.(?)

Early philosophers, among them **Socrates, Plato** and **Aristotle**, were concerned with religion and morality. The earliest dramas of medieval Europe and England were miracles and morality plays. Biblical pageants intended to instruct and guide the people. These medieval drama morality plays were first performed inside the church but soon moved into the towns during religious festivals for the edification of the people. Perhaps the most famous of the moral plays in English is *Everyman*, a simple allegory in which **Everyman** is called to account for his life by God.

In **Mathew Arnold's** opinion, religion is nothing but morality touched with emotion. And a man of religion can easily become moral. Religion and morality make an important contribution to the development of human personality. Religion is incomplete without morality.

In this manner, from the beginning of Western thought, religion and morality have been closely intertwined. This is true whether we go back to Greek philosophy or to Christianity and Judaism. Regarding the Eastern thought, it mentions that religion and morality have occurred historically to substantiate the claim that morality and religion have been inseparable until very recently.

From the above mentioned, it may be concluded here that religion and morality are intertwined. Without morality religion is incomplete. Thus religion and morality are interchangeable.

Religion and Science

Science and religion are two different things. Their aims and functions are dissimilar. Science is interested in the precise analysis and study of the material world. It has no heart. It knows nothing about love or compassion, righteousness or purity of mind. It is not concerned with moral, ethical or spiritual values.

On the contrary, religion, particularly Buddhism, aims at the discovery and study of man's inner world; ethical, spiritual, psychological and intellectual world. Buddhism is a spiritual and psychological discipline that deals with man himself. It is a way of life; it is a path to follow and practice. It teaches man how to develop his moral and ethical character (*sīla*), how to discipline and cultivate his mind (*samādhi*) and how to obtain wisdom (*paññā*) to realize the Ultimate Truth called *Nibbāna*. It teaches man to abstain from evil, practice good, and to purify his mind.

Buddhism consists not only of study and knowledge (*pariyatti*), but also of practice (*paṭipatti*), and the realization of the Truth (*paṭivedha*). These are the three pillars on which the edifice of Buddhism stands. Knowledge without practice is condemned as useless and profitless. Physical science is not concerned about these spiritual matters and does not claim to be so.

Scientists have rendered a tremendous service to the material progress of mankind, which is very important. But what **the Buddha** and other religious teachers like **Jesus Christ** have done for humanity is far deeper and nobler. It is their teachings that has given human dignity to man.

It is not science that can save humanity. It is these moral teachings that can influence the use of science and technology not for destruction but for construction. If this moral path is forgotten and if humanity is left in the care of science, science which has no heart, no compassion or moral values, will destroy humanity. A large fraction of today's scientists and engineers are financed by military funding and are working for military objectives often unaware of this. They are employing the potential of their creativity to devise weapons of greater and greater power of destruction.

To seek support from science to prove religious truth and to say that religion must be scientific is out of the point. Religion is about and beyond science, and the two are on two different levels and spheres. A fusion between religion and science is essentially and intrinsically inconceivable.¹²

¹² But this is the idea of the teacher. The teacher believes, that religion cannot tally with science, because he can see, that many religious would have difficulties with that. But true is, that if "religion" is true, and "science" is true, then they MUST be compatible. If "science" is true and religion is incompatible with science, then religion is not true. The teacher here, I am afraid, is seriously wrong.