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**Thesis:**

Because the so called ‘logical’ actions made and ‘rational’ beliefs held on a day by day basis by men who like to think of their rationality as being higher than those who believe in religion cannot be expressly explained by these ‘rational’ men, it is unfair and hypocritical for these men to think of their sense of rationality any higher than those of religious sects who cannot explain the roots of their beliefs.

**Outline:**

1. **Introduction**
   1. *Explain the question at hand*: Is it irrational to believe in a religion (or higher power)?
   2. *Define*: I will explain what I will be defining as irrational.
   3. *Conclusion*: I will state my position on the problem and I will explain why I think everyone is entitled to believe in religion and still be rational.
2. **A Faulty Description of Rationality.**
   1. Show how the view of rationality held by some of the proponents against religion is not sound and is hypocritical at best.
      1. Properly basic beliefs
      2. The need to explain what you take to be true
      3. The contradictions between what is said and how people think
   2. Show how the faults in this argument support my claims.
3. **A View on Religion Being Properly Basic (support by Plantinga).**
   1. Show how Plantinga’s view of religion being properly basic is sound, therefore making believing in religion or a higher power completely rational.
      1. Show how all people take things on faith.
      2. Explain the idea of someone’s own personal perception.
      3. Explain why basic beliefs don’t need to be inferential
   2. Show how this view of this argument supports my claims.
4. **Counter Arguments.**
   1. Relativism
   2. The thought that anything can now be properly basic.
   3. Unprovable claims and thoughts.
   4. Necessary qualifiers.
5. **Re-defending My Original Position in Light of These Counter Arguments.**