



Religion, Rationality and Justice – A Cause for Critical Reflection in the Contemporary Society

Joseph Munyoki Mwinzi¹

¹University of Nairobi, Kenya
Email: joemwinzi@live.com

DOI: 10.53103/cjess.v2i4.51

Abstract

In the contemporary society, religion is catalogued as the maxim that is used to judge human morality. It is assumed by religious executives and religious proponents that religion is the substratum of the 'absolute truth'. The assumption that religion has the absolute truth perpetuates illusive tolerance in form of 'ecumenism' which rebuts justice, and undermines the primacy of rationality in human beings. In addition, there is the idea that ecumenism is fundamental provided that the essence of religion and religious beliefs are not subjected to the process of substantiation regarding the realms of disparity. Therefore, a logical inference ensue that religion and religious tolerance tend to restrain rational equilibrium in terms of withheld justice and rational constancy. This erroneous perception culminates at the factor of controversy regarding religion and religious beliefs against tolerance, justice and rationality.

Keywords: Religion, Tolerance, Justice, Rational

Introduction

In the entire human system, a diversity of controversial issues has been delineated (Starkloff, 2007, p.287). However, the concepts of religion and religious beliefs obtrude as the most controversial issues in the human society. A critical reason that religion and religious beliefs protrude as contentious issues is because it arouses feelings such that its enormity influences humanity in terms of political affairs, social, and individual concerns (Ryan, 2010, p.48). Therefore, it is probable that religion and religious beliefs as the subject matter is deemed controversial. However, some issues that are described as controversial elsewhere such as war and conflict, human rights, abortion, euthanasia, and stem cell research to name but a few, will not form the central facet of this treatise, instead attention is drawn towards perceive religious tolerance as the furtive cause of denied justice and confined rationality (Ryan, 2010, p.303). This discourse accentuates that imprecise commitment, superficial ecumenism, and moot indoctrination in the name of religion explain subjectivity in religion and religious beliefs. The fate of imprecise commitment, superficial ecumenism, and moot indoctrination is to refute justice and subvert human

rationality.

As a human factor, religion and religious beliefs tend to expose human beings to a state of fate. The upshot of fate is to confute tolerance, justice, and rationality, and therefore human beings strive to eradicate such fate and replace it with a better destiny. An extant of vague or contrived ecumenism and the factor of religious tolerance proliferate the rebutted and confuted justice. As such, ecumenism which is an implicit tolerance in form of religious dialogue is indistinct because it focuses on the aspects agreed upon contrary to the subject of disparity. The subject of disparity is however critical because it explains the cause of antagonism in religion and religious beliefs. The implication being that religious perspectives on contemporary world issues jut as critical factor in the human society. Thus, its inference is to escalate further tension and suspicion while the essence of human beings, 'intellect' is exposed to low ebb. An increasing inclination to religion and religious beliefs translates to a state of withholding justice and rational balance. Therefore, the value of analyzing and investigating religion and religious beliefs and perspectives jut as a problematic facet such that human beings do not acquire an incisive comprehension and thus decision-making is often distorted.

An essence of human beings is an existence of the reality of intellect and thus, intellectual abstraction is indispensable among humanity. It is palpable that the concepts of religion, religious beliefs and experiences cannot be validated by social consensus either through deductive inference or consistently reliable induction from observation and experience. A rational validation can only occur by a logical analysis of the intrinsic emotions that motivate religion, religious beliefs, and experiences. This is what rational abstraction is envisaged to accomplish in religion, and religious beliefs. However, since religion and religious beliefs tend to display a coordination of individual minds to establish convergent expressions of public sentiment, then the essence of rationality is abrogated. An attempt to realize fixated sense of stability, well-being, and avoid existential anxiety draws attention to religion, and thus undermines rationality. Therefore, this discourse is envisaged to divulge that religion and religious beliefs are shaped directed by the following objectives:

Objectives

The grand objective of this discourse is to formulate a decisive reflection divulging that religion and religious beliefs cause religious intolerance, withheld justice and rational equilibrium. In this regard, the following objectives ensue.

1. to examine the controversial factor in religious tolerance.
2. to evaluate how religious tolerance factor proliferates latent justice.
3. to analyze how religious tolerance can restrain rational equilibrium.

Theory of Eliminative Materialism

This expose is wrought by the theory of eliminative materialism which is a selfish position in the philosophy of mind. Its primary claim is that the common-sense view of an understanding of human beings is false and thus certain mental states that most human beings believe in do not exist (Audi, 2006, p.686). In a parallel perspective, the mental and the physical are two distinct realities or modes of existence but established in the same substance. In this regard, the problem of religion and religious tolerance based on the concepts of commitment, ecumenism and indoctrination is indefinite. The relativity of this theory is that justice and reason are rendered desolate by religious commitment, ecumenism and indoctrination. In this treatise, the role of the theory of eliminative materialism is to portray that religion and religious beliefs have averted allegiance from the deity to avarice and cupidity. Therefore, religion and religious executive have highlighted on substance gain with little or no reasonable accountability. An attempt to pose questions regarding accountability from religious executive about religion and religious beliefs culminates at further tension and suspicion. Thus, the value of rational equilibrium is confuted.

The Controversy of Religious Ostensible Tolerance

Accordingly, religion is comprised of systematic beliefs and practices. This is closely linked to the origin of the term religion, which emanates from the Latin ‘religare’ which refers to ‘to bind together against that which was once bound but has since been torn apart or broken’. The essence of religion is that human beings are naturally anxious because the life they once lived conformably is constantly defied, exposed, disputed, and concurrently restructured – such that everything is in motion. Therefore, human beings use religious items, readings and teachings that provide a vision about how they can be bound to a ‘meaningful and absolute world’, as opposed to a prompt mutable world of time and space. However, analysis of religion and religious beliefs does not mean leveling out its convictions, but rational dialogue and genuine encounter (Koch, 2012, p.629).

As religion strives to ensconce itself, it formulates some facets to define its precincts and such dynamics of include religious commitment, ecumenism, and indoctrination. Thus, a negation of these facets in religion is proportional to declaring such religion as obsolete, irrelevant and unnecessary. The upshot is that these dynamics are envisaged to spawn new and better prospects and potency for the exponents who profess precise religious beliefs. It follows necessarily that religion takes advantage of certain realities and exerts critical resistance by initiating a haven for those standing in opposition to its power. Therefore, the relativity of religion, religious tolerance, remote justice, and restrained rationality is highly reflected in the name of the deity. This is parallel to the theory of eliminative materialism whose stance underlines the negation of an apt understanding of human beings and as such human beings drift attention towards false and

erroneous perception of existence (Audi, 2006, p.686).

As seen in the previous sections of this treatise, religion and religious beliefs tend to devise rules and regulations that provide answers to questions concerning self-identity. In such a situation, religion and religious beliefs institute a notion of ‘truth’ which implies an automatic exclusion of the one—called an ‘abject’, any non-exponent of such ‘truth’. Thus, during the times of ambiguity collective identity is reduced to a number of religious beliefs directed towards religion as such and fabricated deity where the abject is perceived as a potential threat.

Indistinct Ecumenism

The concept of ‘ecumenism’ has been highly endorsed by religion and diverse religious beliefs. However, it is flagrant that religion and religious beliefs ignore the facets that separate them, and thus tend to settle only on what they agree on. In addition, it is obvious that religion endorses the idea of Golden Rule: ‘never do to others what you would not want done to you’ which is closely skewed to favour specific religious exponents. This explains why ecumenism and religious values ensues artificial religious tolerance which is not substantive (Osunwokeh, 2014, p.97). An indenture of this nature in the name of religious dialogue is only restricted on the superficial level. This being the base of ecumenism, it is obtrusive to explain why this treatise considers the concept of religious tolerance as artificial (Starkloff, 2007, p.317). It is within the same vein that the theory of eliminative materialism is relevant because the basis of ecumenism is false and thus what creates diversity is abrogated in religious dialogue. Therefore, it follows necessarily that ecumenism or religious dialogue is erroneous and illusive. A functional ecumenism must focus on the issues that split religion and religious beliefs (Ryan, 2010, p.78). However, such divides are the nub that defines religion and religious beliefs. The upshot is that ecumenism is indistinct, and thus justice is withheld while the practice of rationality is abated.

There are diverse manifestations of religion in the world that tend to embrace the concept of ecumenism as an endeavor of rectifying the impasse of intolerance. According to Osunwokeh (2014, p.91), the term ecumenism has been diversely used to denote, delineate and describe a multiplicity of valences. In the religious realm, the word ecumenism is relatively used to imply religious dialogue affixed to religious tolerance. In such context, ecumenism attempts to enhance a balance in conflicting divides of religion and religious beliefs. Nevertheless, with or without ecumenism, religion and religious beliefs have failed to profile and advance unity in diversity or sustain continuity in variety in the world (Ryan, 2010, p.52). Thus, it is an indistinct ecumenism. A prime cause of this diversity is that religion and religious beliefs do not focus on the constant time and space-bounded identities, instead the greater attention is on indirect-coercion to uphold specific

identity of religion (Baron, 2013, p.173).

In essence, religion, religious beliefs and traditions tend to teach values such as human dignity, equality, freedom, peace, and solidarity but with a full measure to the religious executive and religious exponents. Thus, the concept of ecumenism is purported to bring about a culture of pluralism whereby religion and religious beliefs are perceived to overlap but sustain a parallel interaction with each other (Osunwokeh, 2014, p.93). However, it is palpable that what religion refers to as tolerance is indistinct because it refutes the essence of justice and detests the logic of rational symmetry. In totality, religion and religious beliefs are manifested through actions that silently define the existence of religious intolerance expressed through proscribed commitment leading to isolated justice in humanity (Baron, 2013, p.351).

As part of religious indifference and intolerance, there are diversities ingrained on ideologies that tend to divide the world in general and individuals in particular (Koch, 2012, p.630). An aspect of such division occurs when 'evil' is perceived as critical provided it involves exponents of other religious beliefs or religious divide. It is the view of Koch (2012, p.630) that ecumenical dialogue resembles a tightrope walk between extremes: on the one hand, a 'dialogue' which is not interested in the truth and allows any arbitrary point of view to stand unquestioned and leads to the boredom of indifference. Thus, religion endorses double standards when the idea of religious diversity comes to the fore. Further, based on religious diversity, religion tend to commit to the idea of human dignity, equality, and conflict resolution, negotiation, mediation, and diplomacy provided it is not against their doctrines and beliefs, and this is an approval of ruinous indoctrination and an injurious contradiction of the idea of interreligious dialogue.

The conflict of religious dialogue ensues once priority is leveled within the interests of religion itself. In view of that, Koch (2012, p.628) denominations draw hard lines on the correlation between ecumenism and freedom of religion that there is no true ecumenical dialogue without 'freedom' of religion as indispensable condition for 'positive' ecumenical activity. Thus collective thinking within the precincts of religion tends to be the driving force. In such context, religious exponents are identified by collective thinking whereby they are notable by a coherence observance of traditions, policies, and authority handed down from generation to the next. This explains why Koch (2012, p.629) assents that the broad spectrum of questions arises but only a few on central aspects of ecumenism and religious beliefs can be touched on in the current context. In this case, the task of religious executive is to enforce such observances and terrific observation is conveyed with further inclusion and acceptance. Therefore, the egoistic stance of the theory of eliminative materialism is practically obtrusive in religion and religious beliefs.

Proscribed Commitment

The aspect of commitment in religion and religious beliefs focuses of different facets of religion (Paulsen, 2014, p.1043). This treatise accentuates that the concept of religious commitment is defined as the state of overall and definitive submission and assent of religious exponents to the demands of religion. As such, religious commitment is the totality of a complete surrender to deliberations of the deity through the religious executive. This explains why religion, religious beliefs, experiences, and practices exist. In relation to the proliferation of religious beliefs, religion tends to strive to convert the 'heathens' (Paulsen, 2014, p.1060). An underlying essence of religion is the drive to ensconce religious commitment. Further, it may refer to the total allegiance despite of what is expected of the exponents in the name of devotion whether in the conscious or the unconscious realm of humanity. The necessity of religious commitment emanates once religious exponents realize that they are part of the infinite but they are cannot control or possess that realm of infinity.

A religious commitment involves the definite and specific aspects necessary to be used by the religious executive to measure the allegiance of the exponents. Thus, religious commitment is used to determine the level of religiosity based on how an exponent is dedicated (Hellstrom, 2007, p.19). In this regard, submission to the religion and religious beliefs is justified by the idea of judgment ratified by the deity. The religious executives and religious exponents require being committed through internal association, to acquire special knowledge which is reserved. As part of commitment, the essence of submission is to augment complete and almost unquestioned trust in the religion, religious beliefs, and religious executive. Thus, religious executive is perceived as deputies to the duty and their task is to enhance with unusual connections to the deity (Hellstrom, 2007, p.32).

On the other hand, religious exponents are psychologically expected to trust the executives for their spiritual welfare. The issue of submission to the religious executive is rewarded with additional errands and tasks that translate to adulation in terms of importance among the entire group of religious exponents. Mwinzi (2018, p.325) argues explicate that many religious exponents hold that there is some reward for devotion to the deity, and as such, some of the rewards are irrational, irrelevant, erroneous, and out-rightly unnecessary. Thus, religious commitment serves as the total and central act of dedication of religious exponents, the act of absolute, infinite and ultimate concern. Therefore, religious commitment comprises of religious involvement, religious affiliation, the activities of religious organization, and importance of religious beliefs involving intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences.

The component of religious commitment is subject to exclusivity whereby executive and exponents tend to convince themselves that the religion and religious beliefs is the only true divine system and they are the few true remnants of the deity. Thus, this

exclusivity translates to isolation where there is minimal contact between religious executive, religious exponents and the probable opponents. This isolation is necessary to facilitate additional control over the thinking and practices of the religious exponents. Mwinzi (2018, p.326) concur that religion has been the permanent instrument of control right from the start. In such situation, reason is isolated and religion is erroneously perceived to respond to any form of reservation based on the decision behind the complex authority.

The reverse is that the external dedication to religion and religious beliefs is a complex reality, and it is unfeasible to ascertain an estimate of the internal dedication. An inability to estimate the level of internal dedication synchronizes with the theory of eliminative materialism whereby the dedication level is implicit, perhaps false and thus may not exist. Therefore, a prime indicator of religious commitment is the external religiosity which is assumed to be intrinsically motivated. In that strand, Mwinzi (2018, p.334), religion and religious beliefs strive to enhance commitment which is depicted in revivalism of inferred universal truths, but with fear of being overtaken by the opposing trends. In this case, it can be a simulation which translates to disaster.

The elemental characteristics of commitment in religion and religious beliefs consists of a model that looks more closely at how religion affects religious exponents both positively and negatively, physically and psychologically, and under what conditions (Mwinzi, 2018, p.334). It is hypothesized that the extent to which religious exponents are positively affected by religion depends on how committed they are to the religion. Therefore, the variables measuring religious commitment include:

1. membership.
2. participation in religious activities.
3. adherence to religious creed.

The above variables of religious commitment are manifested in the four dimensions pertinent in a dogma or religious doctrine:

1. content, refers to the elements of exponent's religious repertoire.
2. frequency, refers to the 'quantity' of involvement of an exponent in religious beliefs and practices.
3. intensity, refers to the level of determination and consistency in relation to an exponent's position towards religion and religious beliefs. The concept of religious intensity continues to be a major interpreter of religion and its identification in addition to an adherence to the religious teachings, commitment to religious observances,
4. centrality, refers to the importance that a person attributes to religious tenets, rituals and sentiments.

In the contrary, all the elements that define religious commitment are skewed towards religion itself, its exponents, and its proliferation (Idleman, 2005, p.521). Thus, the crucial aspects of justice and rationality in the process of making decisions are vilified. In totality,

religion and religious beliefs are manifested through actions that silently define the existence of intolerance as reflected in ruinous indoctrination which restrains rationality (Koch, 2012, p.630).

Ruinous Indoctrination

The term indoctrination comprises of instructional technique comprising of severe threat on rational and reflective assessment which contrasts the logical and coherent criteria which authentically evaluates reality (Osunwokeh, 2014, p.97). The paradox of dire indoctrination is parallel to the theory of eliminative materialism. The theory has a selfish pose based on primal claim that what appears to be an essential facet defining the common-sense of human understanding is false and some beliefs cannot be substantiated (Audi, 2006, p.686). Ruinous indoctrination is founded on specious and defense of moot beliefs. A causal essence of this drive is to ensconce religious coaching whereby indoctrination upholds an idealization of some past era combined with the belief that the world has gone awry and as such, there is an incessant unwillingness to compromise with those who disagree with this alleged precision of religion and religious beliefs (Campbell, 2013, p.1033).

The term indoctrination can further be perceived as a process of ‘formatting, configuring or encrypting’ the mind of a religious exponent to endorse and internalize the religious beliefs of religion (Baron, 2013, p.161). The process of indoctrination decrypts and encrypts the mind in order to format a religious exponent for the benefit of endorsed religion. Once encoded, an exponent internalizes the religious ideas, teachings and practices and pledges to recruit more exponents in the name of proliferating religion and religious beliefs (Baron, 2013, p.218).

A similar meaning of indoctrination is an acceptance of divisive, indefinite and litigious premises as the base of religion (Gearon, 2014, p.70). Indoctrination comprises of the acquiescence to authority and suspension of doubt, an acceptance of the absolute certainty of the beliefs, indubitable endorsement of doctrines, self-assertion as a ‘true believer’ of indoctrinated faith in alleged deity as the ‘ultimate objective’ reality (Baron, 2013, p.140). As a notion, indoctrination is established on the theories that define its aim, method, and the content of belief. Thus, indoctrination is either: (i) any sort of coaching aimed at getting an exponent to adopt beliefs irrespective of fallacious evidence ascribed to such beliefs; (ii) indoctrination infuses information and daunts any form of questions necessary to estimate those beliefs; and (iii) indoctrination does not endorse any search for authentication or clarification regarding what an exponent is compelled to accept. Therefore, objections raised focus on imposition and indoctrination of a particular set of attitudes and behaviors (Baron, 2013, p.161).

The concepts of indoctrination and propaganda are often convertible, and as such variously connote systematic mass suggestion or the manipulation of an individual through

logical deception, emotional exploitation, or both. In this case, an intriguing maneuver among the tactics and delusion is to discard the power of reason from being applied on the component of indoctrination and propaganda (Baron, 2013, p.218). Therefore, the painted picture of indoctrination is to preclude rational equilibrium which requires subjection to rational scrutiny or critical thinking to evaluate religion and religious beliefs. Thus, indoctrination is coercive, violent, and a converse to liberty. In relation to religion and religious beliefs, indoctrination acquiesce self-deception denial, and self-delusion which dissuades religious exponents from identifying the intrinsic signals of religious cults and exotic sects (Deneulin & Rakodi, 2011, p.47). Thus, incipient deceptions and emotional exploitations are difficult to recognize as subterfuge. It follows necessarily that religious indoctrination is easily internalized and succeed through deception and delusion which is deprived of immunity of intellectuals.

An analytic inference of the concept of indoctrination resides in one of three categories: precluding or deluding exponents to adopt religious beliefs without questioning for or quest for corroboration; the methods of indoctrination divert religious exponents from critiquing or searching for reasons that sustain the religious beliefs; endorsing that the content of the imparted beliefs does not admit any rational estimate (Paulsen, 2014, p.1043). In the case of religious indoctrination, the contrary deserves persecution (Toft, 2007, p.128). After examining some of the signals of indoctrination, there occurs a necessity to initiate a rational discourse to verify why tolerance, justice and reason are indispensable in assessing the prospects that indoctrination poses as high-profile religious notion that translate to delusion of the exponents. This ensues because religion and religious beliefs possess categorical commands not warranted on the basis of reason or evidence (Paulsen, 2014, p.1047). It is necessary to delineate that in its entirety, the deception of indoctrination penetrates into the most cherished and profound religious beliefs verging on the improbable. As an upshot, a tendency of excessive certitude emerges and its function is to provide defense mechanism of evading rational abstraction and justice in favour of deceptive tolerance (Campbell, 2013, p.1020). In its basic confusion and decisiveness indoctrination is incompatible with previous doubt, and religious executive declare it as infallible facet of religion.

It is necessary that the cognitive capacities should be initiated in order to challenge, evaluate, or critically examine religion and religious beliefs. This explains why this expose articulates that indoctrination assents to the tenets of the theory of eliminative materialism by approving that human beings are deprived of common-sense view in order to adopt false convictions and adapt religious beliefs that may not exist (Audi, 2006, p.686). Thus, in religion and religious beliefs, indoctrination can be avoided—and if it cannot, it is necessary to eschew from it. The most sublime means to disdain from indoctrination is to identify the distinction between indoctrination and non-indoctrinating religious belief inculcation, but such a distinction is hard to draw and often translates to being controversial

(Toft, 2007, p.122). Therefore, unbridled deception of indoctrination reflected in the tendencies to excessive certitude transforms religious beliefs into intransigent, obstinate, and terrific ideology which does not endorse tolerance, justice and reason.

As such, indoctrination adopts the features and traits of cults including persecution complex (Niculescu & Norel, 2012, p.340). The factor of persecution complex is interpreted as validation. In principle, indoctrination culminates at controlling the actions and thinking of religious exponents. The concept of mass destruction through bombing is common in the case of indoctrination and it is considered as a strategy of appeasing the deity (Simkins & Smith, 2017, p.71). Another component of indoctrination is the assumption of 'special knowledge' obtained from perceptions, interpretations and reticent coaching (Baron, 2013, p.225). The religious exponents are drilled to believe that there are reserved ideas not known by the exponents but the religious executives. Thus, any form of contradiction culminates at disdain of opponents and that means being shunned or debarred as despondent.

The Controversy of Religion and Religious Beliefs

In its entirety, religion is controversial, whilst, the cause of religious intolerance poses as a contentious issue that averts religious tolerance, justice, and rationality (Rahman, 2013, p.85). As a critical element, religious intolerance can align with the theory of eliminative materialism that the common-sense view of understanding that is espoused by religious exponents is false and some facets of religion and religious beliefs are deficit of objectivity (Toft, 2007, p.99). Therefore, the controversy ensuing from religion and religious beliefs manifests itself through proscribed religious commitment, ecumenism, and indoctrination. These are critical and furtive factors that present a negative frontage of religion and religious beliefs. Thus, such factors construe as the controversies of religious tolerance, intolerance and remote justice, and intolerance and restrained rationality.

The Controversial Factor of Religious Tolerance

As an artificial ecumenism, religious tolerance focuses on the realms of religious agreement and ignores the critical aspects of isolation whose repercussions are devastating. According to Koch (2012, p.630) ecumenism thrives under the false assumption that convictions presented with the certainty of truth would endanger peace. In this case, the parallel aspects tend to condition religion and religious beliefs to meet regularly to control the possibility of isolation by averting the objectivity of truth. These frequent meetings are equally necessary to counteract existential tension in order to safeguard religious parochialism (Koch, 2012, p.629). The purported ecumenism is perturbed by the rudimental features in religion and all religious beliefs such as commitment and indoctrination which prevent rational equilibrium. The nature and purpose of religious

tolerance is to endorse that there is diversity of religious beliefs, perspectives, and expressions such that what is true of dialogue is relevant for ecumenical discourse, where questions of religious beliefs are involved (Koch, 2012, p.630). This explains why religion is obliged to endorse that the essence of unity in diversity and continuity in variety is indispensable (Mwinzi, 2016, p.380).

It is obtrusive that religion and religious beliefs are shaped by common features such as christen, creed, code, denomination, and change. These are the elements that define religion and religious beliefs, and an adherence to such prescribed features is compulsory. Koch (2012, p.630) concur that there is an essential features of distinction facing formal tolerance which prevails and accuses all differences as discrimination. However, it is obtrusive that despite that these features are common, they are equally skewed towards the specific religious beliefs, and thus, it implies that the facet of religious tolerance is only extrinsic while it is decisively imprecise. Here comes the theory of eliminative materialism that religion and religious beliefs divert religious exponents commit to falsity and none existing forces (Audi, 2006, p.686).

The Controversy of Religious Intolerance and Remote Justice

Therefore, the influence of religion and religious beliefs tend to influence the significance of justice and its relevance to all human beings. Thus, justice is destabilized since the claims are not established on substantive tolerance (Koch, 2012, p.630). In totality, religion and religious beliefs are manifested through actions that silently define the existence of religious intolerance as perceived in the case of indistinct ecumenism which magnifies the subsistence of religious diversity as opposed to religious unity. Koch (2012, p.630) contrasts that substantive tolerance respects existing differences and strives towards unity while recognizing those differences. Therefore, religion and religious beliefs subsist on three controversial facets of ostensible religious tolerance which is the epithet of ecumenism, commitment, and indoctrination. These controversial facets endorse the task of the theory of eliminative materialism in this treatise which avers that some views certified by religious exponents are false because they explain what does not exist (Audi, 2006, p.686).

The Controversy of Religious Intolerance and Restrained Rationality

It is obtrusive that religion enters into a circle of conflict by becoming 'more self-conceited as being the world religion'. The upshot of deceptive religious tolerance is religious isolation and parochialism which contradicts the task of intellect and reason as the discrete individuation cipher of human beings (Frances, 2015, p.112). Human beings use religion to replace the reality of being unable to use the intellect and rationality to the full (Paulsen, 2014, p.1043). Thus religion and religious beliefs tend to be used to fix and

vindicate a series of conflicts that reinforces their specific identities. The implication is that fixing identities do not represent any clear standpoint and such indifferent does not deserve approval as religious tolerance (Koch, 2012, p.630).

In relation to religious tolerance, Simkins & Smith (2017, p.58) underline that justice and individualism are fundamentally irreconcilable. In this context, religious executives and exponents use religious beliefs to shroud the negation of justice in religion and in a similar fiber, to snip the concepts of tolerance and rationality in an analogous measure to the issues of diversities (Bobbert, 2017, p.2). The superior abilities in logic and rational assessments of data serves as the apt strategy of purging the indistinct ecumenism, proscribed commitment, and ruinous indoctrination in order to situate the compromised religious tolerance, justice, and rationality.

As part of its central tenets, rationality poses as means of eliminating the confusion of the trivial accidents from the substance of religion and religious beliefs (Idleman, 2005, p.520). In this case, the estimable values of praxes serve as means of safeguarding religious exponents from being both casualties and agents of indoctrination and deception. In this framework, the pursuit for core rudiments using reason decimates the possibility of literalism. Thus, according to the theory of eliminative materialism, the falsity of human understanding and the beliefs about non-existence requires a serious rational scrutiny (Audi, 2006, p.686). This is where the intellectual realm of ideas evaluates the territory of propaganda and indoctrination, and thus exceeds both realms of ideas and terrains. The implication is the pliant maladies of indistinct ecumenism, proscribed commitment, and ruinous indoctrination entails an aggressive quest for logical coherence, honesty of thoughts and assumptions, and fairness about listening to opposing viewpoints.

Philosophical Analysis of Religion and Religious Beliefs

In the relationship between philosophy and religion, there are two discrete tactics doxastic and axiological. The doxastic perspective focuses on propositional beliefs, interpretation, coherence, and justification, while an axiological inquiry focuses on what is perceived to be valuable and desirable (Idleman, 2005, p.531). These concerns draw attention on how the deity is conceived, but with different ends in mind. Thus a doxastic inquiry asks what sort of deity is being accepted or rejected, while axiology questions if the existence of such deity, conceived in a particular way, is good or bad, tolerable or deplorable. An attempt to estimate such morality drifts attention to the philosophical theory of eliminative materialism which emanates from the philosophy of mind, and espouses that some postulates of perception of human beings is false and thus some beliefs of human beings do not exist (Audi, 2006, p.686).

A philosophical estimate about religion and religious beliefs explain that the probable doxastic attitudes toward the existence of deity comprise of theism, atheism, and agnosticism, whilst the parallel axiological attitudes embrace axiological theism which

focuses on thinking about an existence of the deity to be either a good or bad thing, while axiological agnosticism draws attention towards indifference about an existence of the deity (Makolkin, 2015, p.71). In either way the affirmative side is required to offer reasons or evidence which culminates at demonstrative, experiential, inductive, and claim to revelation.

In the light of the philosophical theory of eliminative materialism, this treatise postulates that the critical issue is not focused on true justified belief in religion and religious beliefs, but how such can aggravate the maladies of indistinct ecumenism, proscribed commitment, and ruinous indoctrination. In a similar strand, such maladies culminate at compromised religious tolerance, justice, and rationality (Makolkin, 2015, p.71). Another facade is to explore if religion and religious beliefs can truly fulfill and satisfy the intrinsic necessities of religious executives and exponents. Thus, tolerance is only possible and practicable when the search for truth is suspended (Koch, 2012, p.630). In this case, truth is espoused as conformity between what is in the abstract intensity and what happens in the corporeal reality. In this case, axiological theism is clearly preferable to either axiological atheism or an attitude of indifference toward theism.

The possibility of the idea of deity as a supreme being is shaped by exponents based on indistinct ecumenism, proscribed commitment, and ruinous indoctrination (Deneulin & Rakod, 2010, p.47). In a similar strand, such maladies culminate at compromised religious tolerance, justice, and rationality. If someone wants an existence of a definite sort of deity that matches the perception of an exponent, then definitely there will be one (Makolkin, 2015, p.77). This will occur by following religion and certain religious beliefs but will not be justified by reason, though its effects emanate from the emotional rather than the intellectual realm. Thus, the implication is that intellectual considerations do not emanate from rational arguments, but perceptions (Makolkin, 2015, p.71). When there is convincing evidence either for or against the existence of deity, then philosophical deliberation is necessary to supply a rational stance of religion and religious beliefs.

Tolerance

The concept of religion and religious beliefs comprises of convictions in a pluralistic society. The element of conflict that is contiguous to religion and religious beliefs comprise of diversity in what is believed whilst the nature of worship presents the pluralistic facet of religion and religious beliefs (Toft, 2007, p.128). In such case, there is a staid dehumanizing imagery of opponents. It is a philosophical contradiction that religion and religious beliefs occupy a mindset of a religious exponent and thus translate to considerable reason for concern (Paulsen, 2014, p.1057). In a similar stratum, a powerful denunciation of opponents with different thinking and devaluation of events in the world is perceptible. The present rise of religion and religious beliefs leads to weakened immunity of the human pensiveness, undermined tolerance of otherness and the abandonment of the

value of reason (Makolkin, 2015, p.78). Thus, 'ecumenism' and tolerance tends to adopt defensive mechanisms in order to circumvent staid encounter with conflicting systems of religion, religious beliefs and religious exponents. It is equally blatant that there is assumption of deity's 'hit man', defined by defending the deity against all perceived incongruity and invective.

It follows necessarily that the content of religion, how it is delivered, who deliverers it, and its utilitarian epitome culminate at intolerance in the society. Thus, the belief-causing signs invade and exploit human rationality which is harmful for society (Makolkin, 2015, p.78). Further, it is notable that religion and religious beliefs are not proliferated through an open system but through indoctrination. An indoctrination system endorses a routine acceptance of erroneous ends as justification for unsavory means. This explains why Koch (2012, p.629) assent that true dialogue presupposes an elementary reciprocal liaison and once it is compromised, it becomes clear that a real dialogue is hardly feasible. In a similar stratum, indoctrination subsists on extreme reverence of religious executive as well as disconcerting the negation of evidence beside what is sanctioned by the religion and religious belief system. According to Paulsen (2014, p.1044), religion and religious belief is, by definition, a set of irrational ultimate commitments. Therefore, religion and religious beliefs are more subjectively slanting and the prospect of objectivity is not definite.

Justice

A philosophical perception of religion and religious beliefs is to augment equality, impartiality and integrity elucidated by reason. However, it is obvious that religion has compromised justice to safeguard its beliefs held by exponents against any probable opponents. This treatise echoes Grümme (2017, p.8) that religion and religious beliefs has its orientation on embodiment from deity but can only be justified philosophically. Conversely, religion and religious beliefs pay attention to the concept of justice ultimately as a justice which is opened and 'donated' by the deity! Thus, in religion and religious beliefs, justice is not doable but is donated (Grümme, 2017, p.8). Therefore, the decisive intent of religion is to bring stability in the society in terms of morals, culture, social, etc, but cannot serves such a purpose. As such, religion and religious beliefs tend to deprive justice and outfox democratic ideals (Bobbert, 2017, p.2). In this case, religion and religious beliefs is illusive in promoting a reasonably democratic scene.

An intolerant facade of religion and religious beliefs tend to undermine harmonious co-existence and thus justice is emasculated. As an intricate idea, justice poses diverse conflicts, and thus reason is used to analyze probable injustice and to argue for a definite idea of justice. As such, religion and its religious beliefs can only give internal reasons which are not sufficient to answer questions of justice involving all human beings

and not only religious executive and exponents (Bobbert, 2017, p.2). In a similar vein, religion and religious beliefs envisage a consistent bond relating to humanity, but at the base, it is only on the superficial level. Thus, assuming standard prevents justice by discriminating against some racial, cultural, religious or ethnic attachment whose specific questions and assumptions upheld by exponents may not understand or accept. As justice can be diversely perceived, a philosophical perspective presents it as an open question as to what kind of justice – subjective or objective? Thus, subjective facet of justice is slanted and that is what religion and religious beliefs uphold (Bobbert, 2017, p.13). The factor of indoctrination as caused by religion and religious beliefs undermines justice because exponents are forced to act against their will and the same measure is elongated to affect potential opponents. Therefore, according to religion and religious beliefs, indoctrination inevitable, but its results are debasing to equity and equality.

It is notable that religion and religious beliefs tend to support atrocities that culminate in battles and wars. An upshot is that wars and battles have been fought in the name of religion and religious beliefs have caused destruction and loss of life. Thus, in the name of religion and religious beliefs there is mutual enmity, communal bitterness and intolerance. Any reference to justice without making explicit to its theoretical base translates to a subjective idea of justice which is intuitional or eclectic. In contrast, philosophy has to profile a rational reflection of the concept of justice and give sufficient reasons for the judgments which religion and religious beliefs cannot provide (Bobbert, 2017, p.12). Under such a situation, to isolate rationality from religion and religious beliefs will amount to encouraging intolerance and injustice. Therefore, religious narrowness and blindness plummet towards mounting cases of torture and oppression.

Rationality

The essence and task of critical thinking in the process of evaluating of religion and religious beliefs is indispensable. Thus, religion and religious beliefs should consent to critical thinking, reflection, and abstraction. As a rational treatise, philosophy offers a great diversity of the concept of justice as opposed to religion and religious beliefs (Bobbert, 2017, p.2). Moreover, rationality abets religious exponents to refrain from being subjects of unexamined religion and religious beliefs that fail the test of critical scrutiny. When a philosophical stratagem is inserted on religion and religious beliefs, the upshot is to augment the indelible truth which is the conformity between the mind and reality. It is apt that matters and issues of truth are marginal in religion and religious beliefs. Therefore, this discrepancy attracts rational abstraction into religion and religious beliefs (Frances, 2015, p.6). Another task of rationality which is detested by religion and religious beliefs is the endorsement of inference. Thus, this treatise augments inference is the prime means towards realizing of ideals. The import of ideals is to ensure the independence of religious exponents as a crucial facet of valuating the universality of religion and religious beliefs.

A philosophical discourse articulates that justification is indispensable in religion and religious beliefs. There is need to justify what is in religion and religious beliefs in terms of scope and content areas. In addition, religion and religious beliefs should be instituted in a philosophical base. In relation to religion and religious beliefs, rationality restrains and abates the absolutes since religion and religious beliefs thrive in absolutism which philosophy may object. Thus, in regard to reason, Paulsen (2014, p.1044) resolute that there are some religious beliefs are intrinsically false and irrational and its upshot is a set of irrational ultimate commitments. The task of philosophy is to analyze religion and religious beliefs in order to formulate a valid argument.

When rationality is reticent in religion and religious beliefs, there is a drift from provision of objective knowledge and correlation between knowledge and religion and religious beliefs cannot subsist. A philosophical and rational argument for crediting religious beliefs can be discarded. Thus, the rationality of religious conviction and its consistency with knowledge systems is deranged. This knowledge is deranged because the religious exponents are 'uniformly religious' and as such they strive to vindicate 'irrational and long-discredited positions without any actual argument or evidence' (Paulsen, 2014, p.1051). Therefore, the stability of religion and religious beliefs requires philosophical abstraction powered by reason. Thus reasoning power is necessary to understand the subtle meaning of religion and various religious beliefs.

The most critical aspect that religion and religious beliefs cause intolerance, injustice and deprived rationality is the issue of cognitive dissonance. In this case, avoidance of critical thinking whereby there is no logical consistency is used to explain religion and religious beliefs.

The mere fact that there is cognitive dissonance is adequate to shrink religious tolerance, escalate injustice and lead towards deprived rationality (Campbell, 2013, p.1020). An upshot of religious intolerance is itself a threat that has antagonistic implications. In this case, such the risk is greater if that antagonism aligns with religious executive and exponents against potential opponents. Thus, there is inconsistent based on avoidance of and/or denial of any facts that might contradict the religion, religious beliefs and its existing system. Therefore, religion and religious beliefs tend to pose an appearance standard which is required and maintained. However, such appearance standard may not be explained under the perimeters of rational abstraction.

As such, religion and religious beliefs must be defined by evidential support whereby engaging in critical thinking and the demand of reasons for any religious claim. The value of reason and critical thinking is to eliminate indoctrination.

Conclusion

The subject matter of religion and religious beliefs is absolutely controversial because there are some of its tenets that tend to be devoid of rationality and justice.

However, religion alleges to uphold tolerance in form of ecumenism. This discourse is envisaged to explore the controversy in religious tolerance, how it religion can defer justice, and restrain rational equilibrium. This discourse is delineated by the theory of eliminative materialism, whose claim is that the common-sense view of an understanding of human beings is false and thus certain mental states that most human beings believe in do not exist (Audi, 2006, p.686). In the light of the theory of eliminative materialism this treatise, divulges that religion and religious beliefs are fundamental causes accountable for withheld justice which ebbs the primacy of rational symmetry. Thus, anything that is contradictory to the espoused religion and religious beliefs is discarded at the expense of dialogue through mutual encounter.

A critical analysis of religion and religious beliefs spawns to the controversies of religious ostensible tolerance, remote justice, and restrained rationality. This philosophical expose underscore that the concept of ecumenism is indistinct and tolerance is superficial. It is also established that the notion of commitment is proscribed and justice is remote while the factor of indoctrination is ruinous and rationality is restrained. A philosophical estimate which is crucial in every human task is deprived in religion and religious beliefs, and as an upshot, religion and religious beliefs can translate to a precarious and egocentric enterprise.

References

- Audi, R. (2006). *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baron, D. (2013). Social and emotional learning: An argument for religious pluralism. Dissertations - Paper 499. Loyola eCommons, Loyola University Chicago.
- Basharat, T., Iqbal, H., & Bibi, F. (2011). The Confucius philosophy and islamic teachings of lifelong learning: Implications for professional development of teachers. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 33(1), 31-46.
- Bobbert, M. (2017). Religious education towards justice: What kind of justice is to be taught in a Christian context? *Education Sciences*, 7(30), 1-16.
- Campbell, D. (2013). Religious tolerance in contemporary America. *DePaul Law Review*, 62(4), 1009-1034.
- Deneulin, V. & Rakodi, C. (2011). Revisiting religion: Development studies thirty years on. *World Development*, 39(1), 45-54.
- Frances, B. (2014). The rationality of religious beliefs. *Think*, 14(1), 109-117.
- Gearon, L. (2014). The paradigms of contemporary religious education. *Journal for the Study of Religion*, 27(1), 52-81.
- Grümme, B. (2017). Educational justice due to more education? Requests for a Solution Strategy. *Education Sciences*, 7(21), 1-11.
- Hellstrom, I. (2007). Eschatological thought and religiosity among Christians: Patterns and relationships. *Electronic Theses & Dissertations*, 429.
- Idleman, S. (2005). The concealment of religious values in judicial decision-making. *Virginia Law Review*, 91(1), 515-534.

- Koch, K. (2012). Ecumenism and freedom of religion. Universal rights in a world of diversity. *The Case of Religious Freedom Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences, Acta, 17*(1), 628-636.
- Makolkin, A. (2015). Aristotle's views on religion and his idea of secularism. *E-Logos-Electronic Journal for Philosophy, 22*(2), 71-79.
- Mwinzi, J. (2018). Religion escalates social and ethical diversity in Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies, 4*(1), 323-343.
- Mwinzi, J. M. (2016). Towards the Africanization of teacher education: A critical reflection. *International Journal of Education and Research, 4*(9), 377-386.
- Niculescu, R. & Norel, M. (2012). Religious education an important dimension of human's education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*(1), 338-342.
- Osunwokeh, C. (2014). Ecumenism and Biblical interpretation: Nigerian experience in the operation of the Christian association of Nigeria (CAN). *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (AJHSS), 2*(3), 90-104.
- Paulsen, M. (2014). Is religious freedom irrational? *Michigan Law Review, 112*(6), 1042-170.
- Rahman, A. (2013). Religious tolerance in Malaysia: Problems and challenges. *International Journal of Islamic Thought, 3*(1), 81-91.
- Ryan, P. (ed) (2010). The theological challenges of religious pluralism: Towards a Christian theology of other faiths. *Tangaza Journal of Theology and Mission, 1*(1), 9-30.
- Simkins, R., & Smith, Z. (2017). Religion and politics. *Journal of Religion and Society – Supplement Series, 14*(1), 58-79.
- Starkloff, C. (2007). Theology and aboriginal religion: Continuing - the wider ecumenism. *Theological Studies, 68*(1), 287-319.
- Toft, M. (2007). Getting religion? The puzzling case of Islam and civil war. *International Security, 31*(4), 97-131.