

# God delusion

[Religion](#), [God](#)



Proof Adkins stated that " Faith is blind, science is evidence-based", and added that religion tells that there is no understanding in things but just be persuaded that God did it. However, Dry Lennox opposed by saying that science cannot tell what is morally right or wrong, and science also cannot explain the purpose of the existence of a child. Therefore, he believed that Proof Hawkins has contrasted the meaning between science and religion that religion is just being contemplated but science is unraveling the understanding of the universe.

Another strength that Dry John Lennox has is that his reasoning was logical even though it was not fully based on evidence or facts, but instead with human intellectual and good sense. Although there were a few facts that Proof Hawkins could not explain based on science, for example, that what is the origin of life, or the origin of the universe; but Dry John Lennox managed his reasoning well and affirmed that faith is also evidence-based, which he based it from a scripture in the Bible.

It might be clear that science is at most what you see upon sight, which is tangible, but Proof Hawkins did not manage to be convincing enough in that, whereas Dry Lennox has demonstrated his points well with persuasiveness. However, one of few weaknesses that Dry Lennox has is that although he is very confident in his own justifications, but he could not fully prove that there is a God that exists. It is neither possible nor impossible that God may exist, but Dry Lennox has strongly opposed Proof Hawkins' view that the existence of God is very unlikely.

The existence of God is arguably one of the most critical questions today that science has yet to prove the origin of it, but Dry Lennox only has to point out that God is the Ruth and referred towards the Bible of Jesus saying that " I am the truth. " The reference from the Bible is not fully evident that God exist and therefore, it is still possible that God may not exist. Another weakness that Dry Lennox has was that he was very critical and even sarcastic towards both Proof Hawkins and the book that Proof Hawkins wrote, The God Delusion.

Dry Lennox mentioned that he felt very sympathetic towards Proof Hawkins because of a few statements that is written inside the book and even mocked him for not understanding how he does not understand how Proof Hawkins could make those statements. In another case, Dry Lennox has also made things very personal Dye slang Poor Hawkins winner en Ana Talent In Nils welt or not, this can be seen as not really professional in the sense that it could be seen as being provocative and insulting.

Question 1 I decided to study Richard Adkins because I felt that it was more of a challenge, he seemed to be the underdog in the debate, and I figured it would help me open up and see Atheism from his point of view. Growing up in a Christian family, I have heard it all about Christianity, so this exposes me to a different way of thinking and engine things. Adkins first strength which what I was really impressed with was the fact that he makes very remarkable efforts to support his arguments. It is amazing to see him think on the spot and refute John Lennox on several occasions.

His method of elaborating what is read from the book I think is also very good, because it helps with the way he supports his arguments, he first provides the context to a text, an example would be from book where Adkins quotes the Chicago geneticist Jerry Cone, Adkins provided necessary context so that everyone in the crowd and on the panel of the debate could understand what that quote was referring to, which is important because without the context, the text can be taken out of context and misused.

The second strength that I think Richard Adkins possess is that he makes a very good point when it comes to the rationality of people who also have religion. We can see this in the video. He argues very well that there is no rational person that will cause violence in the name of Atheism, although there may have been some cases where mass murderers were Atheists, he says that this is completely a coincidence, and Rutherford, their reasons for these mass murders were not based on Atheistic teachings.

He also makes a comparison to how Italian's cause violence in the name of Islamic principles and teachings, and how they are completely rational people but because of the false teachings that religion gives, and the lies that religion tells, that these rational people then become " brain-washed" to a certain extent by these lies and false teachings from the religion. He moves on to saying that he is not saying that all religion is the same, but the minorities that do these things have been the asses for the largest wars and the most devastating crimes committed against humanity.

I think that at the end of the day, Richard Disdain's quote from John Lennox about imagine a world with no religion and is a pretty accurate description of

what Adkins is really trying to say about religion. To a certain extent I feel he feels that religion has done more bad than it has good, because from completely rational men, throw in religion and we get lunatics and fanatics of violence and destruction. Of course this is only in special cases, but the fact remains, that the amount of wars and death that has occurred in the name of religion is still astonishing.

The first weakness that I find that Richard Adkins has is that on 2 occasions, he never really answered John Lennox properly, he did not address the issue; rather he just swept it under the rug. The first occasion, is when John Lennox asked him if he had faith in his wife, although he did answer the question, after John Lennox said that it is a form of faith, he then proceeded to say that they are just arguing about semantics.

I felt that he should have explained what he meant that there is evidence for that faith. Not in NAS in Nils welt, Ana not just Aviva ten Issue Dye sallying It is politeness to argue about semantics. The second occasion was when Lennox said that Atheism is a form of faith, although Adkins did say that it is not, after Lennox explained why he thought it was, Adkins just said it is not and hung his head. Again I feel that he should have been more elaborative, instead of using the example about how Lennox is an Atheist when it comes to Zeus and other gods.

The second weakness that Adkins has is a contradictory side. On a couple of occasions, Adkins seems to contradict what he says. For one example, he says asks who designed the designer? But later on when they further discuss the issue of this, he then says that God cannot be created, thus contradicting

himself. The second contradiction that I think is made by Adkins is that he says that progressively, science will be able to close the all gaps of the human understanding and intellect.

For example, he said that in the early days, nobody knew how life came about and what the science and evidence was for life, but after years and years of progress in science, we finally knew roughly about the stages of life and about life itself. But he later on agrees with Lennox that science cannot tell whether a painting or a piece of a song is a good piece of art or music. It is somewhat contradictory in the sense that I may not understand how a piece of art is nice for one person but ugly for me, but science will never be able to close my gap of understanding as to what about it makes it bad for me and good for somebody else.

In the same way, science will never be able to close the gap on decisions of morality that people face every day. Question 2: We both feel that Dry. John Lennox in a sense won the debate. The first reason and the biggest reason is when Lennox quoted what is called the Whitehead Thesis' that states that humans became scientific because they expected law and nature, and they expected law and nature because they believed in a law giver.

We feel that this is the point that John Lennox made the won him the debate because if you are a believer in Darning's theory of evolution, then you must take into account what is human nature, Adkins said that even he felt that there was an easy way out of understanding the purpose and reason for him being on earth, and that easy way could be to just say that the answer to any hard question was God.

Therefore, there is that human nature side that already expects law and nature and intuitively knows that there is a law giver, so how can someone who believes in Darning's theory of evolution overlook the fact that there is an innate and natural side of humans that seeks out a supernatural authority. The second point that John Lennox made was just because science is based on evidence and observable results that provide reasonable doubt, it does not mean that whatever cannot be explained by science is then not natural and therefore does not exist.

This is a very flawed statement as John Lennox says that whatever cannot be understood using scientific method then points towards evidence of there being a supernatural aspect to life that sets the limitations of science in place. In short, just because there is no sciences that can prove the existence of God, does that then mean that there is no God? We feel that John Lennox has a stronger case to say that there is a God because there are several instances such as miracles and personal experiences Tanat can vouch Tort tenets. Nerves Dawson just says Tanat tanner cannot be a God because there is no evidence to prove otherwise. The third point that Lennox made that pointed towards the flaw in Adkins theory is that if you assume that there is a God, then it must have been created. What Adkins does not realize is that God nears that he was not created, and that if he was created than he would be a delusion, because a God is eternal and out of this universe, God already existed, whereas the universe came to exist.

Therefore, how can we deduce that there is no God, because our minds cannot comprehend how it is that God has just existed since always. The

fourth point that we would like to make is that what Richard Adkins says in his book that what is really harmful in Christianity and Islam is the practice of teaching children that faith itself is a virtue. Faith is an evil because it requires no justification and allows no arguments.

John Lennox then goes on to disprove this statement by saying that in the Bible, Jesus did not allow his disciples to use physical weapons against others. He also then goes on to say that the minority of people who do bad things with the justification of the Christian religion are not truly of the Christian religion because they are not following what Christ said. He also says that even Christ was being charged as a fanatical terrorist, and he was publicly exonerated by Pilate because Christ was not found to have been guilty of this charge.

What this means is the truth of what Christ's teachings are about was unable to be imposed by the violence of the guards, that his teachings are of those that are nonviolent. The final point that we would like to make is that, Adkins was nervous and unsteady in the way that he countered to some of the more strong statements that Lennox made, it was pretty clear that there were several times when he was caught off guard and then sort of stammered because he was not too sure how to reply to Lennox.

This can be very confusing for the audience as they may be wondering how someone of his stature can be caught off guard with the most simplest of questions such as, Atheism being a faith. When Lennox said that Atheism is a faith, the only reply that Adkins gave was that it was not a faith, and when Lennox further explained what he meant by it being a faith, he just put his



head down and shook it. We think that this lack of confidence maybe to answer the questions put forward by Lennox is another reason why Lennox has won the debate.