

Analysis of michael peterson's science, evolution, and religion: a debate about a...

[Religion](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The book *Science, Evolution, and Religion: A Debate about Atheism and Theism*, presents an attentive and controversy between two talented and cordial philosophers. Michael Peterson was a theist, whereas Michael Ruse was an atheist. Both philosophers were able to exchange each other's ideas with simplicity and in a respectful manner. With the contributions that were given by both author's, many can gain knowledge of the debate. On the other hand, the theist will be more engaged than an atheist in the reading. Michael Ruse did not put up a debate in many different chapters when Michael Peterson did not have strong points or evidence to support them. Michael Ruse then left what some refer to as a "fig leave" that was offered to the audience by Peterson (Theist who believe that their belief in religion is consistent and rational with science).

Ruse's acknowledgment to his theist candidate in this book has many aspects. The most recognized gift to theism is in the beginning when Ruse decides to volunteer questions concerning "why" of existence, the confirmation of morality, the nature and participation of growth, and "basic explanation" are past the territory of science to question or answer, but are acceptable points for religion to discuss. Ruse declines to proclaim that there is not a reason to believe that the questions have responses past those that are found within the empirical world or in human nature. Therefore, they are reasonable topics for scientific study, but the theological opinion will prove to be uncertain and ineffective. Equally important, a less noticeable acknowledgment is that Ruse contributed a lower percentage to the content to the volume as a whole. For example, Ruse produced ninety-three pages compared to Peterson producing one hundred twenty-four pages.

Nevertheless, even though Ruse has a significant amount of knowledge and is able to write well, he rambles a lot, even so, he sometimes will repeat what was stated by Peterson. This is suggesting that Ruse will use theological terminology and quote Christians writers to a measure that the reader will have to double check they are still reading Ruse's section.

Peterson was able to write in a more persuasive and more organized fashion. One way Peterson was able to prove this was how he would repeat the most important debate points and boldly attempting to disprove Ruse's point. On the other hand, Peterson left himself open to be exploited by Ruse, but Ruse did not attempt to make Peterson prove the many unprovable theories (teleology, etc.) resulting in Peterson being able to engage in arguments that are about "believing theism" instead of "believing naturalism" without having to explain the highly problematic epistemological start of theism. A better example of this situation can be related to the chapter of morality. This is suggesting that in the chapter morality Peterson makes the Christian apologist move believe that "objective" morality does exist. Peterson then goes to form the idea that a syllogism which contains the belief of objective morality as an assumption to be able to argue against naturalism.

Amazingly, Peterson's proof for the presence of objective morality is the demand that, historically, that humankind has the thoughtful conviction that individuals have true moral beliefs.

To put it differently, mass belief is what is being held onto for evidence when it comes to absolute, objective truth. Furthermore, a major point in which both authors agree is the acceptance that evolution occurred because of natural selection within billions of years. Peterson attempts to include

<https://assignbuster.com/analysis-of-michael-petersons-science-evolution-and-religion-a-debate-about-atheism-and-theism/>

evolution in his theistic view by believing that God made the initial circumstances of evolution to make the world he wanted, even human beings. This is suggesting Peterson's God is capable of meticulously setting up the first circumstances of a large and staggeringly difficult evolutionary development spanning three point five billion years which produced the same type of human beings that God wanted. For some, it gets worse when the agreed-upon details are considered for the process of evolution in relation to natural selection. Natural selection depends greatly on random genetic alterations to produce vulnerability within different species, some of these vulnerabilities could have different survival values which can result in being naturally selected and transferred to future generations.

When considering that humans beings had become anatomically modern nearly one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand years ago; the existing thousands of generations of different types of ill-fated hominids did not receive the blessing of being able to be in God's homo sapiens group, but you can almost guarantee they suffered during their short, brutal lives. Nevertheless, any religion is a base from which to structure your life in this time and space that you find yourself from which to structure and orient your life, therefore, rendering your life with value in relation to your beliefs.