**Science vs. Religion**

The current movement among the conservatives in the United States tends to discount science in the favor of religious explanations. Conservative Americans are more likely to endorse denialist views on climate change. It is evident that the special views the conservatives in the U.S contribute to the extremely high levels of climate change denial in the U.S.  The relationship that exists between religion and science is at partial cross purpose. Sometimes, there is a great disagreement between religion and science (Glanz, 2015). For instance, during the early nineteenth century, liberal Protestants who held on to the concepts of miraculous winds, floods, and other catastrophes found it hard to accept the notion of geological uniformitarianism. Although the conservationists tend to disagree with the other group of people with strong beliefs in science, the movement does not represent a change in the paradigm set forth by the Vienna circle.

Members of the Vienna Circle sought to conceptualize empiricism by interpreting any recent findings in the physical as well as the formal sciences. They also denied that any claim or principle was synthetic. On top of that, they intended to account for the presuppositions of any theories by taking a close analysis of such theories by looking at it within a logical framework. Evidently, the early form of empiricism suggested by the circle is inexistent today and recent research has led to the discovery of doctrines that were previously neglected by the protagonists of the circle. An in-depth knowledge of the pattern set forth by the Vienna circle shows that conservationists have no intention whatsoever of changing the set paradigm.
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