

Religious Naturalism

By

Miguel A. Sanchez-Rey

There is never the ignorance that the atheist lives within a cave striving to reach the light that reveals the form which is the world-of-truth. The Platonic realm that is ever so often the guiding force that fights against the ignorance of the shadows that permeate at the other end which is the fire.

The world of today is a complex system with a fragile eco-system and nearly 8 billion of human inhabitants that walk across planet Earth striving to live their lives, however, their turmoil and suffering may inhibit the happy life.

Since the dawn of the Enlightenment, in Continental Western Europe, philosophers were ever more intrigued by the laws of nature and mathematical certainty of Euclidean geometry and the Cartesian methodology.

Those, then, felt that reason can propel progress and rid the civilized societies of the tyranny of monarchy and oppression. Set the stage for parliamentary democracy and topple the depravity of poverty, starvation, illiteracy, and damnation. All human beings, born with natural rights, are not subjects but participants, or citizens, of a democratic society.

The project of the Enlightenment set forth the emancipation of human beings from monarchy and unreason. It gave way, at the peak of American realization, independence from the British aristocracy.

How then should the atheist today live in a world ever more religiously attached and secularly suspicious? Atheist then and now are proponents of progress and sciences. They are the architects, as they say, of freedom of speech and the right to live their lives freely as long as they oblige by the standards of government and laws of civil society. But yet, like the emancipation that usher the American independence, they are oppose tyranny and oppression. They are, nevertheless, motivated to spread the atheist world-view of the truth of superstitious and religious fundamentalist ideology.

There are many variants of atheism: Naturalistic Humanism, Secular Humanism, New Atheism, and Militant Atheism, and etc. All very similar to each other besides their tactical mechanisms. Mechanisms that, similarly, on both ends, express the freedom to practice atheism and the right to advocate atheist thought as to delegitimize superstitious non-sense, creationism, and unquestionable ideology.

Today the planet seems rather strange. A planet in which progress, seems, though true, to be making progress but in which progress is meld with fundamentalist ideology and state worship. Various creeds are ever more reluctant, or more fundamentally, hesitant to question their life-world. Their life-world, unique in many ways, is a phenomenological conundrum:

they observe the same reality; or the same epistemology that is foundationalist in nature. Whether it be the word-of-god, logo-centrism, truth, or sense, they see a world that is inherently progressive, messianic, frightening, accelerating and chaotic.

The world-of-today and the world-of-tomorrow are contrasting binary oppositions. How then do they make sense of such vast worldliness? Scientists apply the scientific method to gather principles and natural laws, mathematicians apply axiomatic set theory to understand the language of nature, philosophers study the edges of human knowledge and all others live their lives day by day without any thought of what is out beyond our senses and reason.

Atheist, of today, are fundamentally oppose to such uncertainties which has fed into superstitious feelings and flame the fire of bitterness and animosity. Some atheist, like New Atheism, in conjunction with Militant Atheism, have develop the strategy of spreading atheism through radicalized tactics. Humanist spread atheist thought by using a more diplomatic approach. And other atheists are scientific in nature and academically withdrawn from atheistic activism.

Militant Atheisms founding, in which a crisis emerged within the Atheist community as to the legitimacy of atheistic thinking, scientific progress, and state secularism, in a world of intolerance towards atheist and free-thinkers, was a desperate attempt to rely on extremism and violent opposition against fundamentalism in general. Their intolerance spread like wild-

fire but their ideology remained ever more questionable to leading and reputable scholars. They, inevitably, became a threat to the establishment and political reformers.

The extremity, in which New Atheist propelled their devotional belief in social Darwinism, hid itself in justifiable practices of advocacy and integrity, but in the end, proved to be a catastrophically genocidal movement that ever more brought in new followers ignorant of the larger implications of New Atheisms controversial nuisances.

It only dawn that the New Atheists tactical approach was to take advantage of the economic crisis as though a crisis of conscience in religious fundamentalist thought is the root behind in which bad-decision making that led to austerity, is, in nature, the bad-decisions of religious economists and war-worshippers.

New Atheism, ever more progressive and scientific, became, yet again, a victim of ideological and extremist fundamentalism.

However how should fundamentalism be interpreted, and is the intolerance of New Atheisms anarcho-capitalism and social Darwinism a product of such fundamentalist mind-set? For New Atheist are free-thinkers, proponents of progressivism, in opposition against barbarism and the Hobbesian state-of-nature [from a superficial sense]. But they are also militants; in opposition of the diplomatic approach. They are nevertheless, in contradiction, fundamentalist in practice and in thought.

Religious Naturalism is in, general, a new type of advance atheism. A new type of advance atheism that is phenomenologically restrictive and skeptical of a deity's importance to atheism and theism. That paradox is to ensue, within the natural world, if both sides ideological beliefs is to be, either/or, the dominant paradigm. And yet, even then skepticism toward theistic ideology, today call agnosticism remains more of a skeptical truth. But how so would an agnostic ask? It's only that the thought of god's existence could drive the human being into the depth of ambiguity.

So the resolution between tolerance and bigotry becomes the project of Religious Naturalism in the scientific state. Which is a harmonious planetary society that is ever more quiet and prosperous. Celebratory, as an umbrella theology, of global and natural history. Fundamentally tolerant and respectful of religious differences and diplomatically center. Not giving way to the religious state but strives to be anarcho-syndicalists as to drive out power structures that induce racial and class indifferences and replace them with self-management and the democratic system of workers' councils and trade groups in a federalized and advance industrial society.

So only then the dismantling of the state machine would give way to a new form of religious society. One in which the religious state is no longer operative but only in which the ignorance of a god's existence is universal and in which natural history becomes the substitute. How should a religious naturalist society coincide, and co-exist, with the inevitable outcome of

Anarcho-Syndicalism. Only that god doubts himself as much as wild strength becomes self-determined and incalculable; without racial borders and neither careless in its sexuality or indifference to experimentation and skepticism.