

# My response to mccloskey's "on being an atheist"



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The paper written by McCloskey is nothing more than an Atheists attempt to justify his atheistic ideas and at no time should ever be taken by any other person as anything more than one man's opinions which are based completely upon speculative ideas.

Throughout this paper, I read statements like, " theists feel..."," Most theists believe...", " They do not think...", and " Most theists conclude..."; however, the person giving these tidbits is only one person, as opposed to the " most" which he seems to speak for, and he is no more a " theist", than the " man in the moon".

I would be more inclined to over look his made-up statistics, had a single one of his claims lined up with my theistic ideas; however, every time he claimed to know how the " theists" think or feel, it turned out to be the opposite of my theistic point of view.

The very basis for this fallacy can be tied to a statement in McCloskey's opening sentence: "...the grounds upon which theists base their belief in God..." In this statement, McCloskey claims to know why theists believe in God.

My next claim is pure speculation; however, if I were to ask every person in my church congregation, " why do you believe in God", I seriously doubt anyone would respond with the cosmological argument or the teleological argument.

Another problem I found in his philosophy was, throughout his writing, McCloskey talks about how Christians use arguments as " proofs"; however, they are not proofs but merely ideas and arguments that when looked at as

a whole, seem to give support to a claim. Since they do not definitively establish a case for God, McCloskey says these arguments should be abandoned.

Again, McCloskey seems to think that he knows the inner mind of "most" theistic people and claims that we hold certain ideas or theories as proof. I know quite a few theists; however, I can't recall ever hearing a single one saying that they have definitive proof of God's existence. I have heard many theistic people use certain arguments as evidence which offers support of their theistic beliefs.

If people abandoned every idea that could not offer definite proof of their claim, we would not have any ideas at all. Every idea we hold is held on these same principles. There are many laws in existence today, which remained only a theory for many years.

Having a scientific background in Mechanical Engineering has taught me that we are not to abandon our ideas and theories; we are to hold on to these ideas and develop these ideas. To use McCloskey's argument against him, none of his ideas offer definitive proof against the existence of a creator, so he should abandon all of his ideas as well, Right? Wrong!

As stated by Evans and Manis, "The rejection of the Cosmological argument implicitly carries with it a commitment to a rival metaphysical view such as pantheism or naturalism." (76) Since the original position of McCloskey is Atheism, that would mean he would be forced to abandon his first point of view for an alternate point of view, which could still be refuted by the same argument.

When all is said and done, there still is no "proof" that will cause us to have a definite conclusive evidence of the existence of God. Because of this, we will ultimately be forced to abandon any quest for proof of the existence of God and be forced to ask, which argument offers the best support of our claim or idea. When the question is asked this way, we are able to examine each idea for the support that it offers our claim.

This is also true when McCloskey talks about the teleological argument. He begins by saying, "to get the proof going, genuine indisputable examples of design and purpose are needed." He begins with this because he is aware of the fact that there is no "indisputable" evidence to offer proof of design.

Any example given could ultimately be argued against. If this were a legitimate argument against using the teleological argument to support design, then this method could also be used for the other side of the argument. For example, I could argue "in order to get the proof going, genuine and indisputable examples of causation would be needed to show that the universe was caused and not created.

Although there are no "indisputable" examples, there are several good examples found in nature that give support to the theory of intelligent design. One example that comes to my mind is the order of the seasonal change.

There is a distinct and predictable pattern found in the order of the season and without this order, it would be very difficult for most plants and animals to live. In the spring, plants begin to grow, trees begin to bud, flowers are blooming, a majority of animals give birth to their young in the spring and it is all based on this predictable cycle of seasonal change. To support all of the <https://assignbuster.com/my-response-to-mccloskeys-on-being-an-atheist/>

plant growth that is taking place in the spring, we have the spring rains, which count for a major portion of the yearly total rainfall.

Then we move into the summer season. A lot of the plants could not mature in the spring, because of the cool nights and cool, wet mornings; however, at just the right time, summer sets in giving us long, hot, dry days which offer the perfect environment for warm climate vegetation to mature.

If winter had been the next season, these young plants would have never survived long enough to produce fruit and seeds needed for reproduction, nor would the new-born wild life be able to survive the harsh winter conditions. After summer, we move into the fall season, which gives the wildlife time to prepare for the coming winter. They gather and harvest all of the mature fruits and nuts.

One problem we generally find in the fall months is large populations of insects and pest, but just like clock-work, God has designed the seasons to deal with this problem as well. Winter sets in and a great majority of the insect populations are killed by the cold winter.

Most of the wildlife has stored food for the winter and they barricade themselves in their homes while they await the spring. In the meantime, all of the tender vegetation dies out from the cold air and falls to the ground. This is a very important part of the process because this is how the seed is planted.

The rest of the plant will lie on the ground until spring, when the temperature warms back up. Then the warm air and wet climate will decompose the dead

plant into a nitrogen rich compost/ fertilizer to help the small seeds that fell during winter.

Thus the cycle begins again. I believe this cycle shows intelligent design. Different parts of the world have different climates and the seasons are not exactly like the one I described; however, every climate has its own plant and animal life that relies upon the climate it is in to have a distinct and predictable order.