

PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY

SUPRA/SUPER/IN EXCELSIS SCIENCE

12.01.2010

Yes, again some thoughts about the limits of science and the horizon of religion, triggered by [The Mermaid](#) who writes about cause and effect and is itself

triggered in part by watching a video of a BBC television series called The Impressionists. It is a very fine dramatization of the 19th century French impressionism movement in art: Degas, Manet, Monet, Cezanne and others. At the same time these painters were working, realist painters were working as well (and there was conflict between the two groups, of course). So why did impressionism arise? Why is impressionist art so impressive (to some, at least)?

There are different ways to describe reality – and clearly the impressionist's painters have developed their own way – neither better nor worse, just different.

But why are there so many materialistic scientists who want us to show that all religion is either caused by genes ([VMAT2 – the “god gene”](#)), by neuro-anatomy ([Ramachandran's god modul](#)) by psychology (Freud's [“phantasy structure”](#)) or just politics ([“Opium des Volkes”](#)). Why is it unacceptable that religion may be just the “impressionistic” way that may be even advantageous in some if not many situations?