

نظریه طراحی هوشمند و برآهین غایت شناختی

درس گفتارهای مقولات ویژه در فلسفه دین

دکتر سید حسن حسینی

گروه فلسفه علم

دانشگاه صنعتی شریف

پاییز و زمستان ۱۳۹۹

Teleological, Intelligent Design Arg.

درس
گفتارهای
مقولات ویژه
در فلسفه دین
دکتر سید
حسن حسینی
دانشگاه
صنعتی شریف

- Thomas Aquinas, (1225 – 1274) Summa Theological
- David Hume, (1711-1776), Dialogue Concerning Natural Religion
- William Paley,(1743-1805) Natural Theology
- Charles Darwin, (1809-1882) The Origin of Species
- Richard Dawkins, (1941-) the Blind Watchmaker
- Daniel Dennett (1942-) Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life
- Michael Behe,(1952-) Darwin's Black Box
- Alvin Plantinga, (1932-) Naturalism Defeated
- William Dembski, (1960-) The Design Inference
- Peter Inwagen, (1942-) The Compatibility of Darwinism and Design
- Micheal Ruse, (1940-) Modern Biologists and Design

Teleological Arguments

- 1. Teleological, Design, Intelligent, Fine Tuning,...
- 2. Cosmological and Teleological...
- 3. Evidence, goal-directedness; the observed facts
- 4. Revealed Theology...
- 5. Methods of Arguments...Deductive?
- 6. Cosmic Design or Local Design?
- 7. Designer, God or Mind?

Observation and God

- (1) The observations prove that God exists.
- (2) The observations show that God probably exists.
- (3) The observations are evidence that God exists.
- (4) The observations favor the hypothesis that God exists over a given alternative hypothesis.

What is “intelligent design”?

- “de-sign' (n) — The purposeful or inventive arrangement of parts or details
- Design is simply the **purposeful arrangement of parts**
- We infer design whenever parts appear arranged to accomplish a function
- "The theory of intelligent design holds that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause, not an undirected process such as natural selection."

Aquinas' Fourth Way

- The fourth way:
 - 1) Some things are good (noble and true).
 - 2) Some things are better (or more noble or truer) than other things.
 - 3) These better (more noble and truer) things have more good (are more noble and are truer) in accord with their distance from a maximum.
 - 4) if something that is maximally true, good and noble were not in existence then there would be no things possessing truth, goodness and nobility to a lesser degree.
 - 5) Thus, something is maximally good and causes everything else that is good (from 1 & 4)
 - 6) This maximally good thing we call GOD.

Aquinas' Fifth Way

We see that things which lack knowledge, such as natural bodies, act for an end, and this is evident from their acting always, or nearly always, in the same way, so as to obtain the best result. Hence it is plain that they achieve their end, not fortuitously, but designedly. Now whatever lacks knowledge cannot move towards an end, unless it be directed by some being endowed with knowledge and intelligence; as the arrow is directed by the archer. Therefore some intelligent being exists by whom all natural things are directed to their end; and this being we call God (Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Article 3, Question 2).

Aquinas' Fifth Way

1. We see that natural bodies work toward some goal, and do not do so by chance.
2. Most natural things lack knowledge.
3. But as an arrow reaches its target because it is directed by an archer, what lacks intelligence achieves goals by being directed by something intelligence.
4. Therefore some intelligent being exists by whom all natural things are directed to their end; and this being we call God.

Hume, Summary of the Argument

- Look round the world: contemplate the whole and every part of it: you will find it to be nothing but one great machine, subdivided into an infinite number of lesser machines, which again admit of subdivisions to a degree beyond what human senses and faculties can trace and explain. All these various machines, and even their most minute parts, are adjusted to each other with an accuracy which ravishes into admiration all men who have ever contemplated them. The curious adapting of means to ends, throughout all nature, resembles exactly, though it much exceeds, the productions of human contrivance; of human designs, thought, wisdom, and intelligence. Since, therefore, the effects resemble each other, we are led to infer, by all the rules of analogy, that the causes also resemble; and that the Author of Nature is somewhat similar to the mind of man, though possessed of much larger faculties, proportioned to the grandeur of the work which he has executed. By this argument a posteriori, and by this argument alone, do we prove at once the existence of a Deity, and his similarity to human mind and intelligence.

Hume

Hume's analogical argument

- (1) Nature is a great machine, composed of lesser machines, all of which exhibit order.
- (2) Machines caused to exist by human minds exhibit order.
- (3) Nature resembles machines caused to exist by human minds.
- (4) If effects resemble each other, the causes do as well.
- (5) So the cause of nature resembles human minds.
- (6) Greater effects require greater causes.
- (7) Nature is a much greater machine than the machines produced by human minds.
- (8) So the cause of nature resembles but is much greater than human minds.

Hume's Objections

- “wherever you depart in the least, from the similarity of the cases, you diminish proportionably the evidence; and may at last bring it to a very weak analogy, which is confessedly liable to error and uncertainty” (Hume, Dialogues, Part II).
- “If we see a house,... we conclude, with the greatest certainty, that it had an architect or builder because this is precisely that species of effect which we have experienced to proceed from that species of cause. But surely you will not affirm that the universe bears such a resemblance to a house that we can with the same certainty infer a similar cause, or that the analogy is here entire and perfect ”(Hume, Dialogues, Part II).
- : “what shadow of an argument... can you produce from your hypothesis to prove the unity of the Deity? A great number of men join in building a house or ship, in rearing a city, in framing a commonwealth; why may not several deities combine in contriving and framing a world” (Hume Dialogues, Part V)?

Paley's Watchmaker(1743-1805)

- Suppose I found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place, I should hardly think ... that, for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there. Yet why should not this answer serve for the watch as well as for [a] stone [that happened to be lying on the ground]?... when we come to inspect the watch we perceive (what we could not discover in the stone) that its several parts are firmed put together for a purpose....This mechanism being observed... the inference, we think, is inevitable, that the watch must have had a maker....who comprehended its construction, and designed its use. (Paley 1867, 1).

Paley...

- Every indicator of contrivance, every manifestation of design, which existed in the watch, exists in the works of nature; with the difference, on the side of nature, of being greater and more, and that in a degree which exceeds all computation. I mean that the contrivances of nature surpass the contrivances of art, in the complexity, subtlety, and curiosity of the mechanism; and still more, if possible, do they go beyond them in number and variety; yet in a multitude of cases, are not less evidently mechanical, not less evidently contrivances, not less evidently accommodated to their end, or suited to their office, than are the most perfect productions of human ingenuity (Paley 1867, 13).

Paley's Design Argument



- Chance?
or
- Intelligent Design?

A: Paley's Version of the Arg.

- 1.The material universe resembles the intelligent productions of human beings in that it exhibits design.
- 2.The design in any human artifact is the effect of having been made by an intelligent being.
- 3.Like effects have like causes.
- 4.Therefore, the design in the material universe is the effect of having been made by an intelligent creator.

B: Paley's Version of the Arg.

1. We observe in artifacts such as a watch order and regularity of parts.
2. We know that a watch could not have these features without a designer, a conscious being who creates intentionally.
3. Nature itself exhibits order and regularity of parts.
4. Therefore nature must have a designer, a conscious being who created nature intentionally.

C: Paley's Standard Version

1. Entity e within nature (or the cosmos, or nature itself) is like specified human artifact a (e.g., a machine) in relevant respects R .
2. a has R precisely because it is a product of deliberate design by intelligent human agency.
3. Like effects typically have like causes (or like explanations). Therefore:
4. It is (highly) probable that e has R precisely because it too is a product of deliberate design by intelligent, relevantly human-like agency

D: Paley's Deductive Version

1. Some things in nature (or nature itself, the cosmos) are design-like (exhibit a cognition-resonating, intention-shaped character R)
2. Design-like properties (R) are not producible by (unguided) natural means—i.e., any phenomenon exhibiting such Rs must be a product of intentional design. Therefore:
3. Some things in nature (or nature itself, the cosmos) are products of intentional design.

E: Paly's Deductive Argument...

- Object o has characteristic C.
All objects with characteristic C are intentionally caused to have that trait by an intelligent designer.

—————
An intelligent designer intentionally caused o to have

F: Paley' s IBE Version

1. Some things in nature (or nature itself, the cosmos) exhibit exquisite complexity, delicate adjustment of means to ends (and other relevant R characteristics).
2. The hypothesis that those characteristics are products of deliberate, intentional design (Design Hypothesis) would adequately explain them.
3. In fact, the hypothesis that those characteristics are products of deliberate, intentional design (Design Hypothesis) is the best available overall explanation of them, Therefore (probably)
4. Some things in nature (or nature itself, the cosmos) are products of deliberate, intentional design (i.e., the Design Hypothesis is likely true).