

Theism, atheism, deism assignment

[History](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Philosophical theism is the belief that God exists (or must exist) Independent of the teaching or revelation of any particular religion. It represents belief In a personal God entirely without doctrine. Some philosophical theists are persuaded of God's existence by philosophical arguments, while others consider themselves to have a religious faith that need not be, or could not be, supported by rational argument. Philosophical theism has parallels with the 18th century philosophical view called Deism. Philosophical theism" Is sometimes also used as a synonym for classical theism. Relationship to organized religion philosophical theism conceives of nature (science), humanity (logic and rational thought (reason), although possibly never completely understandable. It Implies the belief that nature is ordered according to some sort of dual relations to existence and the ever changing matter in motion, however incomprehensible or inexplicable. However, philosophical theists do not endorse or adhere to the theology or doctrines of any organized religion or church.

They may accept arguments or observations about the existence of God advanced by theologians working in some religious radiation, but reject the tradition itself. (For example, a philosophical theist might believe certain Christian arguments about God while nevertheless rejecting Christianity.)

http:" en. Wisped. Org/wick/philosophical_theism The Pragmatic Working of the Theistic Belief It is not very long since there was current in America a system of philosophy called pragmatism. It was in very great vogue about thirty years ago, and it left a great Impress upon our thinking.

One of the great progenitors of that vogue was William James, the psychologist. Surely he has a right to think in this realm of metaphysics,

<https://assignbuster.com/theism-atheism-deism-assignment/>

cause he is a scientist of a psychological turn, as Mr.. Barnes is. Then It was carried on by Professor George Barman Foster of the University of Chicago, very able In philosophy. Pragmatism was this: that Is true which functions serviceable for humanity; that proposition is likely to be correct which works well In human life. Now, I recognize the limitations of that philosophy.

I know that It has been tried through a generation and has not been established as Infallible and absolutely true In all particulars. Nevertheless, there Is a modicum of truth In It, that that thing Is likely to be true which works well In human life. If It functions serviceable for humanity, then the Inference Is that more than likely It Is In harmony with the logic of affairs and of events. Now, the theistic philosophy Is the only thing that has worked In human society at all. There never has been any other philosophy tried out among men, belief.

Well, you say, there is an experiment going on right now over in Russia, in establishing an atheistic society. Once again, the actions of the Russians speak louder than their words, over and over. We all know of a Lenin cult. They are not very far from worshiping as their Messiah the founder of their republic, the Soviet Union, Lenin. And he is well worth believing in, for he was a very great and fearless man. But Russia, better than almost anybody else, is showing up the impossibility of the human mind resting in atheism.

In Russia today there is an enthusiasm for the social program, for the communistic regime, that is nothing less than a worship, a devotion to the cause, that is profoundly theistic in its very spirit, a sacrificial devotion that amounts to worship. Now, we see men acting as if they were theists, even

while with their lives they express agnosticism and occasionally atheism; not often atheism, but usually agnosticism. My young son, fifteen years old, came home from high school one day he was then a sophomore and said, “ I have got through with all this old stuff, I am an atheist. I didn’t say anything then. Days passed on and weeks; when a favorable opportunity came and we were having a good chin-chin, I talked things all out with him. He said, “ Maybe I am not an atheist after all. Maybe I am an agnostic. ” I said, “ That indicates that you are growing, that you don’t think you know it all. I thought you thought you knew it all; but if you have reached a position where you are doubtful about things, or you have reached a position where you call yourself an Gnostic an honorable term you are growing. He has got over being a sophomore, and still he is an agnostic. I see in people who claim agnosticism a great many who would like to see if there is any purpose behind the world, if life is going anywhere; and yet they all act all the time as though there were a purpose, as though law does reign and not chaos, as though something can be done to affect the machine for the good of the human being; so they set to work very vigorously and determinedly to make the machine work for their benefit.

Faith in a God Through Nature I often travel out in the country in an automobile and I have seen some of the days of this springtime when the world is white with April, if not with May, and I have seen the works of the farming people. They act as if they believe in the procession of the equinoxes, in the return of spring, of summer, of harvest and fruiting. They go on that basis. They consider that there is logic in the events of the world in which they are a part.

They may not be able to explain it; don't stop to think, perhaps, that there is a lawgiver behind the law; but they act just as if they thought the law was working just the same. How do I know? Because I see it. They make careful preparation. There I see the hillside dotted with white leghorns like great flower petals; I see the fuzzy balls as big as my hand, chasing around on toothpicks after their fussy old mothers, the hens; and I think maybe I can get an invitation later down to Gerard or in that neighborhood.

And then I see little calves, fresh born I saw one lying one day under a hedge-row; it must have been born that morning, its sides still wet and the old mother standing licking them; I see little mule colts, even out in Kansas I see queer and wobbly mule colts, with bodies about as big as a hobby-horse, and ears and legs append-so? I see the corn come up, as big as my hand, and the wheat in head and the oats ready to cut, along early in June, Those farmers, because they have believed that the harvest was coming, that they could get something out of their fields, have prepared this land for the resurgence of fresh, new life in the spring.

They are putting their trust in the creative power that is back of it all. Then I see men and women bearing life when it is scarcely to be borne. In the midst of weariness, pain, suffering, disillusionment, and lives wrecked and broken, I see them pulling their belts tighter and saying, " It is going to be better tomorrow. I will be better tomorrow. Things are going to be better with me after a little while. " And they thrust out their jaws and clench their teeth and go ahead. I take off my hat to the courage of humanity that can endure so bravely and so well.

They act as if they believe that there is an order in it all; that it is not a machine grinding us to powder, wrecking and destroying our poor, little lives; that nature is something else than red in tooth and claw; they anticipate something better to come tomorrow, and tomorrow. Last night I saw Otis Skinner playing the part of a one- hundred-year-old man, and the most dutiful part in the play is when he sits and looks out musingly and says, “ I have lived here so long because I liked it. Ahead of me was a little light burning.

I looked forward to this day when my children and my grandchildren and my great- grandchildren would be coming to celebrate my one- hundredth birthday. ” And then he says, “ As this light has come, I look forward to another light, dimmer and farther off, that will keep me. ” He adds, “ I want to see my great great grandchildren! ” Here it is, human life looking forward, always something tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow, and it is going to be better and better. We believe in life, even when we think we do not. We believe in its logicity, in the reign of laws; we believe in its purpose, that it is going somewhere and getting somewhere.

We would not be able to lie down and sleep at night if we did not believe that there were an over-arching power, something I cannot define. I don't know what you call it. Call it the Over- soul, with Emerson, if you like; call it Father, as Jesus called it, and as most other nations and religions have called it; call it what you please, we could not sleep if we did not have an unconscious dependence upon that power. Suppose you did not believe that the sun would rise tomorrow morning; or suppose that you had grave doubts of it, or

agreed that the probabilities were against its coming up tomorrow, or that there would be any tomorrow.

You could not sleep any more than a man that was going to face the electric chair at seven o'clock in the morning; you would pace up and down your bedroom all night long, unable to rest. If you didn't believe that some-how some power would bring the sun back again over the eastern horizon I know that is not scientific; no, that the world would turn during the night toward the sun over on the east you could not sleep. [https://www. Laredo.](https://www.Laredo.Deed/philosophy/vestiges/how.HTML)

Deed/philosophy/vestiges/how. HTML How to Answer Theist Arguments “ A seminar series for atheists and freethinkers” I will not present the arguments and responses in a formal way.

Rather, I will envisage analogues between a theist (T) and antithesis (A) which summarizes in a few but present his arguments as they are efficiently heard. During the seminar sessions we will analyze and expand upon these dialogues. If new arguments arise, or better responses to these arguments are generated, these will be incorporated on this Web page. Seminar I.

Design in the Cosmos T: Where did the universe come from? A: Why did it have to come from anything? T: Everything has to come from something. A: Then, you tell me. Where did the universe came from? T: The universe came from God. A: Where did God come from?

T: God did not have to come from anything. He always was. A: Then everything does not have to come from something after all. Perhaps the universe always was. T: Philosopher William Lane Craig has argued that the universe had a beginning, therefore it must have had a cause. That cause is

<https://assignbuster.com/theism-atheism-deism-assignment/>

God. A: Quantum events can happen without cause. Perhaps our universe was a quantum event in a larger universe that always was. T: You have no evidence for this. A: You have no evidence against it. Current physics and cosmology allow for such a scenario. T: How could this happen? Where did the matter and energy of the universe come from?

A: Matter was created from energy in the early universe. Observations indicate that the positive energy of matter is exactly balanced by negative gravitational potential energy. Thus, the total energy of the universe is zero and no energy (or very little—just the amount allowed by quantum mechanics) was required to produce the universe. T: Where did the order of the universe come from? A: It could have been produced spontaneously by natural processes of a type that are now beginning to be understood in physics. One such process is called “spontaneous symmetry breaking.” It’s like the formation of a snowflake.

T: Still, the second law of thermodynamics says that disorder, or entropy, must increase with time. It must have started out more orderly than it is now, as created by God. A: An expanding universe allows increasing room for order to form. The universe could have started as a tiny black hole with maximum entropy, produced by a quantum fluctuation, and then exploded in the big bang. T: You can’t prove that. No one was there to see it. A: You can’t disprove it. Such a scenario is allowed by current scientific knowledge. T: Many prominent scientists don’t think the big bang happened. What does that do to your scenario?

A: The data from cosmological observe actions, which has improved enormously in just the last few years, has left no doubt among current working cosmologists that the big bang happened. The remaining holdouts are a few older astronomers who are gradually dying out. They are like some nineteenth century chemists and physicists who refused to accept the atomic theory to their dying days. Furthermore, the big bang is used by theists such as Craig and Hugh Ross to support their theologies. It does not, but I caution atheists not to argue against theism by saying the big bang did not occur.

It very definitely did. T: But isn't the universe fine tuned for life? Isn't it true that the slightest change of any one of a number of physics constants would make life impossible? Is this not evidence for a universe intelligently universe. If we had a universe with different constants, we might have a different kind of life. T : Doesn't life require carbon, which would not exist without a delicate balance of nuclear parameters? A: Our kind of life, yes. We do not know about other kinds of life. T: You can't prove that life is possible without carbon. A: I do not have the burden of proof here.

You are making the claim that only one kind of life is possible, carbon-based life. You have to prove that. I am simply saying that we do not know and so cannot say the universe is designed for life as we know it. It could have been an accident. Nothing in current science says that is impossible, T: So, even if everything that happens is natural, as you claim, where did the laws of nature come from? A: The laws of nature are misnamed. They are not necessarily laws that govern the universe, that sit out there in some kind of

Platonic reality. They could just as well simply be human inventions, descriptions we have made of observations.

T: Then they are subjective. We can all make our own laws. A: Not quite. We can make up different laws if we want, but they are not scientific unless they agree with observations. The laws of physics can be written in many different ways, but they agree so well with the data that we are confident they describe aspects of reality. T: Well, then where did those aspects of reality come from, if not from God? A: Why did they have to come from anything? But, that's how we started this discussion. T: Still, you have to explain why there is something rather than nothing. A: Define nothing. T: Nothing. No thing.

No matter, no energy, no space, no time, no laws of physics. A: NO God? T: God is a separate entity who created matter, energy, space, time and the laws of physics from nothing. A: I won't ask you again who created God. Rather, why was it necessary for the universe to have come from nothing? T: It had to come from something. A: But you just said it came from nothing!

Seminar II. Design on Earth T: Do you really believe that you are descended from a monkey? A: No. I believe the evidence indicates that monkeys, humans, elephants, worms, peas, and all other known forms of life on earth descended from a common ancestor.

T: You can't prove that. No one saw it happen. A: We cannot see everything with our eyes. Scientific data is accumulated in many other ways than visual observation. The existence of many identical DNA sections in all living things is very strong evidence for common descent. T: What about all the scientists

who don't believe in evolution? A: All believe in some kind of change in the development of life on earth. Disagreements on details exist, and the theory has panned enormously since Darwin, so don't expect every detail to be unchanged from Darwin's time.

The overwhelming majority of biologists regard the basic mechanism of evolution by natural selection as confirmed to a very high probability. T: But, still, evolution is just a theory, not a fact. A: It is both theory and, to a high degree of confidence, a fact as well. In science, and deductions drawn from those hypotheses that are strongly supported by empirical evidence. Evolution by natural selection is as much a fact as gravity. Indeed, it is observed in nature and the laboratory. In a beautiful recent example, African elephants are evolving without tusks as those with tusks are killed for their ivory.

T: But only microevolution is observed. Macro evolution is not. A: Define macro evolution. I would call elephant evolution macro! T: Macro evolution is evolution of one species to another. A: The evolution of species has been observed. See www.talkings.org/FAQ/FAQ-speciation.html. T: But no transitional forms have ever been found in fossils. A: Transitional forms have been observed. See www.talkings.org/FAQ/FAQ-transitional.html. Actually, every species is, in a sense, a transitional form. T: If I find a watch, I can tell by looking at it that it was designed by an intelligent being.

When I look at a human organ, such as the eye, it also shows evidence for design. A: True, the watch was intelligently designed. Human organs, on the other hand, are not like watches. They show definite signs that they evolved

with a large element of chance. For example, the light receptors of the human eye point backwards! See *The Blind Watchmaker* by Richard Adkins for details on the evolution of the eye, which apparently occurred several times independently. Furthermore, what competent engineer would place waste disposal yester in a recreation area?

T: Didn't the famous astronomer (and atheist) Fred Hole compute a very tiny probability for a bacterium to be assembled by chance? He said it is as if a tornado swept through a Junkyard and assembled a 747. A: Yes. His estimate was one part in ten raised to the 40, 000 power. But bacteria did not evolve by chance processes alone but by chance and natural selection. Hawkins's books show how natural selection greatly improves the odds for functioning organisms to evolve. T: Biochemist Michael Beth has shown that certain biochemical systems are irreducibly complex and so could not have evolved.

In these systems, if you take away one part they no longer function, so the parts could not have evolved separately. One example is the bacterial flagellum. A: Evolutionists have shown the errors in Bethel's reasoning. He neglected to account for the well-known fact that the functions of biological parts can change as evolution proceeds. Thus a part can evolve having one function, and then develop a new one as it becomes part of another system. For critiques of Beth, see *Finding Darning's God* by Kenneth Miller (a Christian). Also, look at the website. Talking's. Org/FAQ/Beebe. HTML.

This has inks to much more. T: Darwinian evolution is only one scientific theory for the development of life on Earth. An alternative theory called intelligent design is equally good at explaining the data. Furthermore, this

theory is superior to evolution because it shows mathematically that complex, specified information, such as contained in biological structures, cannot be generated by material processes alone. A: The most prominent design theorist is theologian William Lambkins. Lambkins has a degree in mathematics but has published only one paper in a mathematical Journal, not about intelligent design.

Neither Lambkins nor others promoting intelligent design have published their theory in a scientific Journal. From what has appeared in the lay media, intelligent design is not a theory on the par with evolution. It offers no alternative to evolution other than “ Some powerful intelligent being did it. ” Design book Intelligent Design is mostly theology, suggesting that his motive is to promote his religious beliefs rather than develop a scientific theory. Of course, he protests otherwise. Read the book for yourself and decide. In any case, Demised makes fundamental technical errors in information theory and physics.

His definition of information is not conventional. His definition of complex specified information is ambiguous. His “ law of conservation of information” is provably incorrect. In his latest effort, No Free Lunch, he again misappropriates scientific results. As with his colleague Beebe, many critiques can be found of Demise’s work. The following site contain links to essays on both sides of the subject: [www. Forethought-web. Org/CTR/ intelligent-design. HTML](http://www.Forethought-web.Org/CTR/intelligent-design.HTML). More material can be found in the links below. T: The fact that intelligent design theory is not published in the scientific literature does not mean it is not science.

The editors of scientific Journals could be biased against it. In fact, Demise's theory classifies as science because it is testable. He has proposed a filter that successfully picks out objects that we know are designed. Applying that filter to biological organisms, he shows that they are designed. A: I am willing to allow for the sake of argument that intelligent design, in some aspects, is science. However, as I have indicated, it is bad science, indeed, provably wrong science in some instances. As for Demise's filter, a scientific theory is not regarded as successfully tested when it simply agrees with already known empirical facts.

When the filter tells us that a watch is designed and a rock is not, it is telling us nothing we did not already know. When the filter tells us that a mouse is designed, we cannot say whether this is correct or not based on other observations. Thus, it is incorrect to say that Demise's filter is tested. The only way this can happen is if the filter makes some prediction that is later empirically verified. For example, suppose the filter is applied to Moon rocks and identifies some structure within one as designed. Geologists looking at the same structure say it was produced by natural processes.

Then, sometime later after all all independent analyses have been published, we are visited by aliens who inform us that they had designed that particular Moon rock. Then Demise's filter would pass the test. T: Still, it is hard for me to imagine how the complexity of life could be all the result of purely material processes. A: Perhaps that is just a failure of imagination. Let me ask you a question: Why do you object to evolution? T: Actually, it is Darwinism I object to, which I take to mean the notion that all life evolved

from its origin by purely material processes including a large element of chance.

If that is the case, then humanity is an accident. This deeply conflicts with my religious faith which teaches that humans were put on Earth for a divine purpose. A: You make several good points here. Many theists accept evolution as scientifically sound and compatible with their faith—the Catholic church, for example. But this does not mean they accept Darwinism as you have defined it—a definition, by the way, with which I agree. Evolution-theists still believe in some kind of God-guided evolution. For example, God had to step in a million years or so ago to make sure homo sapiens sapiens evolved the way he wanted.

This is not Darwinism; it is a form of intelligent design. You are absolutely right that Darwinism conflicts with the belief that humanity is special. Some theologians have argued that humanity is just one of many different ways that God may fulfill his purposes. That cannot be ruled out, but to invoke God as a “scientific explanation.” This is not the way I view God. To me, God is continually sustaining the universe. A: Yes, I understand the theology and am not saying that such a God is logically impossible.

I am simply pointing out that whether God acts continually or lets things run along and just occasionally pokes in his finger, such actions are incompatible with Darwinism. Any God who plays an important role in the universe must produce observable effects, and observations fall in the realm of science.

[https://www. Colorado. Deed/philosophy/vestigis/how](https://www.Colorado.Deed/philosophy/vestigis/how). HTML ATHEISM

Atheism is, in a broad sense, the rejection of belief in the existence of

<https://assignbuster.com/theism-atheism-deism-assignment/>

deities. In a narrower sense, atheism is specifically the position that there are no deities. Most inclusively, atheism is simply the absence of belief that any deities exist.

Atheism is contrasted with theism, which in its most general form is the belief that at least one deity exists. The term atheism originated from the Greek ἄθεος (atheos), meaning “without god(s)”, used as a pejorative term applied to those thought to reject theists worshipped by the larger society. With the spread of Forethought, skeptical inquiry, and subsequent increase in criticism of religion, application of the term narrowed in scope. The first individuals to identify themselves using the word “atheist” lived in the 18th century. [11] Arguments for atheism range from the philosophical to social and historical approaches.

Rationales for not believing in any supernatural deity include the lack of empirical evidence,[12][13] the problem of evil, the argument from inconsistent revelations, and the argument from unbelief. Although some atheists have adopted secular philosophies,[1] there is no one ideology or set of behaviors to which all atheists adhere. [17] Many atheists hold that atheism is a more parsimonious worldview than theism, and therefore the burden of proof lies not on the atheist to disprove the existence of God, but on the theist to provide a rationale for theism. [18] Atheism is accepted within some religious and spiritual belief systems, including Hinduism, Jansenism, Buddhism, Realism, Monoplane movement's as Which, and monotheistic religions. Jansenism and some forms of Buddhism do not advocate belief in gods,[21] whereas Hinduism holds atheism to be valid, but some schools view the path of an atheist to be difficult to follow in matters of

<https://assignbuster.com/theism-atheism-deism-assignment/>

spirituality. Since conceptions of atheism vary, determining how many atheists exist in the world today is difficult. According to one estimate, atheists make up about 2.3% of the world's population, while a further 11.1% are nonreligious. According to another, rates of self-reported atheism are among the highest in Western nations, again to varying degrees: United States (4%), Italy (7%), Spain (11%), Great Britain (17%), Germany (20%), and France (32%). [25] According to a 2012 report by the Pew Research Center, people describing themselves as “atheist” were 2% of the total population in the US, and within the religiously unaffiliated (or “no religion”) demographic, atheists made up 13%. According to a 2012 global poll conducted by YouGov, 13% of the participants say they are atheists.

Writers disagree how best to define and classify atheism, contesting what supernatural entities it applies to, whether it is an assertion in its own right or merely the absence of one, and whether with agnosticism, and has also been contrasted with it. A variety of categories have been used to distinguish the different forms of atheism. Some of the ambiguity and controversy involved in defining atheism arises from difficulty in reaching a consensus for the definitions of words like deity. The plurality of wildly different conceptions of god and deities leads to differing ideas regarding atheism's applicability.

The ancient Romans accused Christians of being atheists for not worshiping the pagan deities. Gradually, this view fell into disavow as theism came to be understood as encompassing belief in any divinity. With respect to the range of phenomena being rejected, atheism may counter anything from the existence of a deity, to the existence of any spiritual, supernatural, or

<https://assignbuster.com/theism-atheism-deism-assignment/>

transcendental concepts, such as those of Buddhism, Hinduism, Jansenism and Taoism. Implicit vs.. Explicit Definitions of atheism also vary in the degree of consideration a person must put to the idea of gods to be considered an atheist.

Atheism has sometimes been defined to include the simple absence of belief that any deities exist. This broad definition would include newborns and other people who have not been exposed to theistic ideas. As far back as 1772, Baron ayatollah said that “ All children are born Atheists; they have no idea of God. Similarly, George H. Smith (1979) suggested that: “ The man who is unacquainted with theism is an atheist because he does not believe in a god. This category would also include the child with the conceptual capacity to grasp the issues involved, but who is still unaware of those issues.

The fact that this child does not believe in god qualifies him as an atheist. ” Smith coined the term implicit atheism to refer to “ the absence of theistic belief without a conscious rejection of it” and explicit atheism to refer to the more common definition of conscious disbelief. Ernest Angel contradicts Smith’s definition of atheism as merely “ absence f theism”, acknowledging only explicit atheism as true “ atheism”. Positive vs.. Negative Philosophers such as Antonym Flew[44] and Michael Martin have contrasted positive (strong/hard) atheism with negative (weak/soft) atheism.

Positive atheism is the explicit affirmation that gods do not exist. Negative atheism includes all other forms of non-theism. According to this categorization, anyone who is not a theist is either a negative or a positive

atheist. The terms weak androgen are relatively recent, while the terms negative and positive atheism are of older origin, having been used (in slightly different ways) in the philosophical literature and in Catholic apologetics. Under this demarcation of atheism, most agnostics qualify as negative atheists.

While Martin, for example, asserts that agnosticism entails negative atheism, most agnostics see their view as distinct from atheism, which they may consider no more justified than theism or requiring an equal conviction. The assertion of maintainability of knowledge for or against the existence of gods is sometimes seen as indication that atheism requires a leap of faith.

Common atheist responses to this argument include that unproven religious propositions deserve as much disbelief as all other unproven propositions and that the inviolability of a god's existence does not imply equal probability of either possibility.

Scottish philosopher J. J. C. Herself, even passionately, as an agnostic because of unreasonable generalized philosophical skepticism which would preclude us from saying that we know anything whatever, except perhaps the truths of mathematics and formal logic. Consequently, some atheist authors such as Richard Adkins prefer distinguishing theist, agnostic and atheist positions along a spectrum of theistic arability-?? the likelihood that each assigns to the statement " God exists".

Definition as impossible or impermanent Before the 18th century, the existence of God was so universally accepted in the western world that even the possibility of true atheism was questioned. This is called theistic

maintains-?? the notion that all people believe in God from birth; within this view was the connotation that atheists are simply in denial. There is also a position claiming that atheists are quick to believe in God in times of crisis, that atheists make deathbed conversions, or that “ there are no atheists in exhailes. ” There have however been examples to the contrary, among them examples of literal “ atheists in foxholes. Some atheists have doubted the very need for the term “ atheism”. In his book Letter too Christian Nation, Sam Harris wrote: In fact, “ atheism” is a term that should not even exist. No one ever needs to identify himself as a “ non-astrologer” or a “ non-alchemist. ” We do not have words for people who doubt that Elvis is still alive or that aliens have traversed the galaxy only to molest ranchers and their cattle. Atheism is nothing more than the noises reasonable people make in the presence of unjustified religious beliefs. [https://en. Wisped. Rug/ wick/Atheism](https://en.Wisped.Rug/wick/Atheism) Are the Difficulties of Atheism Insuperable? An atheist is one who rejects the assumptions of theism. The atheist says he has good reasons for rejecting theism. It is an explanation, so called, that does not satisfy his mind. He finds that the difficulties of theism are insuperable. He analyzes the First Cause argument, the argument for God from Design, from Purpose, from Law implying a Lawgiver, the argument from Justice and Moral Reasons. He finds them, each and all, a tissue of assumptions and inconsistencies. He rejects them on the score of logic and reason.

It is for theism to bring out its proofs for a God, not for the atheist to prove that there is no God. If the theist has no valid arguments, the atheist rests his case. To illustrate this: Some man says that the earth is a hollow sphere and that at its heart is a strange world, which he may fantastically describe. I

say that there are conclusive evidences in science that the center of the earth is solid. He then says: “ Prove to me that the earth’s center is not hollow and inhabited. ” And there you are. Proof disproof is a question of reason and evidence. Dry.

Jenkins is an evolutionary creationist, as I understand his argument. He believes with Descartes that God gave the universe a push and set it in motion, leaving it to finish itself and go eternally on its way. That, I claim, is a bold assumption. There is no evidence for that position. But you say: “ Who made the world? ” I answer: Prove your statement that the world was “ made. ” Doubtless you will say: “ Ah, it stands to reason it had to be made. ” But that is an assumption. Science does not know the meaning of the word “ made. ” We know of things being fabricated, but not “ made. ” And to trace the