

Who has a secular viewpoint?

#### Agenda item 1: Religious Dress

- Councillor Scarlet's viewpoint could be seen as secularist as they are not arguing on religious grounds but are making a majoritarian argument. However, it isn't very secularist to argue that just because a big religion says something it should get its way, we don't know that all members of the Church support this belief, and we don't know what effect it will have on other people's rights.
- Councillor Mustard is making a secularist argument because they are saying the decision should be based on the evidence, not on the religious beliefs or identities of different people.
- Councillor White is definitely not making a secularist argument because their argument is based just on their religious beliefs. These may be okay for them, but what about others who don't share these beliefs?
- Councillor Green seems to be making a secularist argument; they have their beliefs but draw a line between religious rules they follow and rules that everyone should follow. Our personal beliefs inform our morality and how we look at all sorts of questions. But can we always look beyond our own personal views?
- Councillor Peacock is making a secularist argument very similar to Councillor Mustard's. But they disagree over whether the evidence really does justify enforced onsie wearing, or whether the evidence is being twisted to suit someone's pre-existing belief.
- Councillor Plum's argument doesn't seem very secularist; they are making their view of the religion the core of the argument. Should the town council be in the business of arguing about religious beliefs? Is arguing that a religious belief is wrong different from saying that it should be set aside to focus on secular (not related to religion) arguments?

## Agenda item 2: School teaching

- Councillor Scarlet's view isn't very secular. Secularists seek to include all groups including marginalised groups by making sure they have the same rights, not by treating their beliefs as special. If the Temple's view was being excluded because it was religious that wouldn't be secularist, but in reality, it is being excluded from a science class because it isn't scientific, and those arguing for its inclusion are doing so simply because it is religious.
- Councillor Mustard seems to be making a secular argument claiming to be based on science, not religion. But is this really the case, or are they twisting the science to suit their beliefs
- Councillor White isn't making a secularist argument as their opposition to the cheese theory being taught is based on who is proposing it and their religious identity.
- Councillor Green isn't making a very secular argument as they're saying religious views should be taught because they are religious. Green's view also assumes that members of the Temple and children from Temple backgrounds will share the same views.
- Councillor Peacock is making a secular argument as they are treating different religious ideas equally but saying they shouldn't be given any special weight, such as being equated with scientific ideas.
- Councillor Plum's views are complicated; they don't want a false belief being taught in science classes, but should schools actively challenge religious beliefs, and what about religious organisations teaching about their own beliefs?

## Agenda item 3: Birthdays

- Councillor Scarlet is making a secularist argument. When the demands of religious leaders are privileged it can shut down debate and disagreement within that religion.
- Councillor Mustard's argument is mixed. Not wanting a religion forced on you is very secularist but wanting religious practices that don't harm you or others banned, isn't.

- Councillor White's argument is also complicated; different secularists might disagree over the extent to which accommodations need to be made to balance freedom of and from religion, but they don't acknowledge the difference between an optional accommodation and the compulsory uniform.
- Councillor Green is making a classic secularist argument based on the idea that groups should be able to set their own internal rules but not force them on others.
- Councillor Peacock's argument is complicated; it seems to be secularist in that it seems to apply to everyone equally regardless of their religious belief, but they don't provide any detail to justify this.
- Councillor Plum's argument is complicated; it isn't based on religion, but they seem to be arguing on the basis of what they'd personally like, rather than why this should apply to everyone else.