

Religion and Ethics:

I always assumed that:

0 What and how knowledge is possible is an individual and personality-dependent decision that should be reasonably justifiable, but can only be accepted, not criticized. Even before starting my wage-earning work, I opted for critical rationalism as a world view and rejected idealism, Platonism, transcendental philosophy, empiricism, positivism and constructivism

I therefore think that:

1 No compelling rational statements can be derived on metaphysics, religion and ethics,  
because:

1 a) The initial conditions, boundary conditions cannot necessarily be defined

(neither operational for experimental verification nor axiomatic),

1 b) No language (starting characters, alphabet, syntax) allows the complete deduction of the world in finite time,

1 c) statements about what should be cannot necessarily be derived from statements about what is,

2 Therefore no text (well-formed character strings) can necessarily derive religious or ethical statements,

3 Therefore no metaphysical, religious or ethical authority is binding

(Personally, I stick to Karl Popper's open society, majority voting, patchwork technology, freedom of expression, welfare state and the sentence: "If you can't help then stop increasing suffering")

4 Therefore, metaphysics must always be based on personal revelation. This is a gift and cannot be enforced.

(A revelation can be recognized by the fact that it cannot be put into words, see 1a,1b,1c and, loosely based on Wittgenstein, one has to be silent about what one cannot say)

5 I would never argue about metaphysics.

6 Life is suffering, we all have to die and it would be good if we are then calm and have practiced serenity (cf. Tenzin Gyatso: The Four Noble Truths, The Foundation of Buddhist Practice).