

Fort Bend Christian Academy – Honors Apologetics

Chris Henderson

A New Definition of Design

Katie Dibble

December 15, 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Historical Review.....	4
Anaxagoras of Clazomenae.....	4
Plato.....	6
Aristotle.....	9
Cicero.....	11
Saint Thomas Aquinas.....	12
William Paley.....	13
David Hume.....	16
Immanuel Kant.....	19
Problem with Design.....	21
Thesis Proof	23
Rebuttals.....	27
Conclusion.....	30
Bibliography.....	31

INTRODUCTION

The ever present argument of the existence of God has been discussed and debated for centuries. The Teleological Argument is an existence argument that traces all the way back to ancient Greek philosophy. While this argument is centered upon the attributes of design seen within the world, it has, since its beginning, lost its focus. Topics such as the existence of purpose and order found within designed objects have been heavily debated in the Teleological Argument as well. The argument has morphed, and now focuses on specifically for what purpose things were created rather than how things were designed. Focusing on the mathematically predictable patterns seen in design, instead of the vague idea of design, lends itself to a more definite conclusion regarding the existence of God.

Philosophers have attempted to both alter the idea of creation's purpose, and add to the central concept of the Teleological Argument. However, with each new alteration, the lack of a concrete definition for design remains. Because design is left to the eye of the beholder, the argument is destined to be weak. Modern interpretation has moved the argument further away from philosophy and on toward a focus on science. With this, the argument then shifts to a question of who or what created the world instead of whether or not God actually exists. The Teleological Argument is now at a standstill due to theologians' deviation from the original argument and an inconsistent definition of design. To reinforce the Teleological Argument, design must be defined as mathematically predictable patterns. Mathematically predictable patterns exist within the universe, these patterns cannot exist unless there is first a Patternner, which can be referred to as God.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, a Greek philosopher of the fifth century, is recognized as being the first person to present the idea of intelligent design. His scientific developments, as well as, his philosophical developments, became his method to understanding and explaining the cosmos. While he wrote only one book in his lifetime, it has become a collection of pieces that have been broken up and distributed. Much of his writing appears in the writings of other philosophers, including Plato's *Apology*¹. A collection of fragments of Anaxagoras' works have been made to form the, *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae Fragments and Testimonia*. Anaxagoras of Clazomenae discusses the *nous*, mind or intelligence, as having a major role in the cosmos. He provides a detailed description that thoroughly explains all that the *nous* is responsible for. Before explaining the role of the *nous*, Anaxagoras of Clazomenae first describes his own Metaphysics Principles. He believes that a full understanding of the world can be reached based on three basic principles: No Becoming or Passing Away, Everything-in-Everything, and No Smallest or Largest.²

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae's idea of No Becoming or Passing Away is an expansion of Parmenides', a Greek philosopher that dealt with Eleatic metaphysics, argument that coming to be and passing away is completely implausible, because what is in existence "is without start or stop, since coming to be and passing away have wandered very far away, and true trust drove them out."³ From this idea, Anaxagoras of Clazomenae developed a two-leveled metaphysics,

¹ Plato. *Complete Works*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Pub Co, 1997. , 17-36

² Curd, Patricia. "Anaxagoras." *Stanford University*, Stanford University, 22 Aug. 2007. Web. 03 Oct. 2014

³ Curd, P., 2004, *The Legacy of Parmenides: Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998; rev. edn. Las Vegas: Parmenides Press.

inspired from his idea of natural constructs. Constructs are dependent upon what ingredients they are made of, as well as, their specific pattern or structure for existence. These constructs are seen as natural because they form due to processes of nature. Essentially, natural constructs are not designed teleologically, nor to fulfill some purpose like manmade items.⁴ A few examples include: animals, plants, human beings, and heavenly bodies. With this view of natural constructs, Anaxagoras argued that what makes up objects is more real than what the object actually is.⁵ He did not believe that anything new was created; things are just arranged with more basic ingredients, like natural constructs. Anaxagoras' second metaphysics principle, Everything-in-Everything, states that all things are together and nothing can be separated into different sections. He used an example of hot and cold liquid. When the liquid is cold, hot is still in the liquid, it is just not expressed; the same principle applies for when the liquid is hot.⁶ This idea of everything being represented at all times in all things led to Anaxagoras's third metaphysics principle, No Smallest or Largest. This idea places no limit on the size of particles allowing the Everything-in-Everything principle to remain true. This allowed for extremes to still be plausible on both ends of the spectrum.

After developing his own metaphysics principles, Anaxagoras of Clazomenae introduced the idea of mind and intellect, *nous*. He said "the other things have a share of everything, but *nous* is unlimited and self-ruling and has been mixed with no thing, but is alone itself by itself."⁷ According to Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, *nous* is the ultimate being because it has the

⁴ Curd, Patricia. "Anaxagoras." *Stanford University*, Stanford University, 22 Aug. 2007. Web. 03 Oct. 2014

⁵ Anaxagoras, and Patricia Curd. *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae: Fragments and Testimonia : A Text and Translation with Notes and Essays*. (Toronto: U of Toronto, 2007.)

⁶ Curd, Patricia. "Anaxagoras." *Stanford University*, Stanford University, 22 Aug. 2007. Web. 03 Oct. 2014

⁷ Anaxagoras, and Patricia Curd. *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae: Fragments and Testimonia : A Text and Translation with Notes and Essays*. (Toronto: U of Toronto, 2007.)

greatest strength, is the finest and purest of all things, and has ultimate discernment and control. There is nothing greater than mind and intellect, therefore making it exist as the only concept in the cosmos that the Everything-in-Everything principle does not apply to. Anaxagoras further argued that *nous* has numerous roles. The *nous* starts rotation and movement of everything else in the cosmos, and continues to stay in control by managing afore stated rotation. The revolution progresses in stages, initially causing a small amount of things to rotate, then proceeds slowly by adding more and more rotation. From this rotation, parts of the original mass that formed the cosmos begin to separate and remove from the rest, but continue to stay organized and rotate because of *nous*.

Another role of *nous* is to preserve order in the cosmos. Since only fragments of Anaxagoras of Clazomenae's work are in existence, Aristotle clarified his statements by saying in Book I Chapter 3 of *Metaphysics*, "when someone said that *nous* is present — in nature just as it is in animals — as the cause of the cosmos and of all its order, he appeared as a sober man among the random chatterers who preceded him."⁸ According to Anaxagoras's definition, *nous* is believed to be the connection between the mind and the soul. Due to this idea, it is obvious that he viewed *nous* as an entirely different entity than everything else that makes up the cosmos. He believes that the mind and intellect are able to be in control of an entire being, including the cosmos, without actually being a part of whatever it is in.

Although the Teleological Argument has taken great strides from what Anaxagoras of Clazomenae originally described, his definition of *nous* is the first traceable idea of intelligent design. Due to his separating intelligence and mind from every other aspect of the cosmos, he created a small picture of how intelligent design could actually be plausible. He described and defined the creation of a world that was systematically planned and meticulously ordered and

⁸ Aristotle, and Richard McKeon. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, (New York: Modern Library, 2001.)

designed. His version of the cosmos did not just appear, it was designed with a purpose and a way of continuing a system of order.

Plato

Plato, an influential figure in philosophy, became a philosopher mainly because of his mentor's, Socrates, influence before his untimely death. Much of Plato's writings include Socrates' ideas as well his own. Pieces of the Teleological Argument are woven into several of Plato's writings, but the two main locations it can be found is in *Pheado* and *Timeaus*. In these writings, Plato expounds upon Anaxagoras of Clazomenae's concepts, making the idea of a creator more specific and more detailed.

Pheado, a Socratic dialogue set right before Socrates' death, is Socrates first introduction to Anaxagoras of Clazomenae' idea of the *nous*. Socrates believed that Anaxagoras of Clazomenae generally had the right idea of a higher power, but some of the details of Anaxagoras's description were not fully developed. One of the details, keeping the *nous* to just the beginning of the cosmos since it was uninterested in everything happening, was not adequate in Socrates opinion. This idea paralleled the concept of Deism that God just created the world and then left it alone. Socrates believed the complete opposite; he thought the *nous* must love, especially in regards to human nature. In *Pheado*, Socrates describes that Anaxagoras of Clazomenae provided a basic starting point, but it was too simple and missed some of the key elements for intelligent design to exist. Socrates felt the idea of the *nous* was a necessary start, but he believed that Anaxagoras of Clazomenae did not fully explain the teleological account of the love that exists from the ordering by intelligent design.

In *Timaues*, Plato introduces his idea of the demiurge, an ultimate being, through his explanation of how the earth came into existence. Plato understood and was amazed by the order

and beauty in the universe. He describes his story as a “likely tale,” but he also warns his public not to look for an explanation beyond what he described.⁹ Plato first discussed the idea of who created the universe. He believed the most logical reason for creation to be “the God wanted everything to be good and nothing to be bad so far as that was possible, and so he took over all that was visible – not at rest but in discordant and disorderly motion – and brought it from a state of disorder to one of order, because he believed that order was in every way better than disorder.”¹⁰ The cosmos could only have been created by a divine craftsman who placed mathematical order on the chaos that already existed to ultimately create an ordered universe.¹¹ Plato believed that it was better for one to have a soul and intelligence than for one not to have such. Since intelligence is part of the soul, intellect cannot exist in anything without the soul. Because of soul and intelligence going hand-in-hand, “we must say divine providence brought our world into being as a truly living thing.”¹² Plato believed that the demiurge wanted the universe to be the best of all intelligible things therefore making it the only one of its kind; thus explaining why there are living things inside of the universe, but only one universe.¹³ If there were to be more than one universe, then it would not truly be the best of all intelligent things. Plato continues in *Timaeus* to explain characteristics of the demiurge seen through the universe he created. The creator is described as a “blessed God,” because of the intelligent, alive, good, and eternal world that he created.¹⁴

Plato’s idea of the demiurge was the first seen example of the universe being intelligently created. His creator was not omnipotent, but he still did the best with what was available. This

⁹ Plato. *Plato Complete Works*, 29d

¹⁰ Ibid. 30a

¹¹ Zeyl, Donald. "Plato's *Timaeus*." Stanford University. October 25, 2005. Accessed December 7, 2014. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-timaeus/>.

¹² Plato. *Plato Complete Works*, 30b

¹³ Ibid. 30d-31a

¹⁴ Ibid. 34b

allowed the creator to make order from chaos. Plato understood that the world could not have just happened, which is why he proposed that the world was specifically designed for things to have intelligence and souls only because there is one who initially created everything.

Aristotle

Aristotle, a student of Plato, believed that all of philosophy began with a sense of wonder about the world. He assumed that if there was wonder about a subject, then one could fully invest into that curiosity and discover an answer to their original question. Aristotle believed that no man could look at the carefully ordered world around them and not understand that there has to have been an intelligent creator. Through his writings, *Metaphysics* and *On Philosophy*, along with his concepts of the Prime Mover and Daimon, Aristotle expounded upon what Plato believed, and through the addition of scientific data, the argument was further proven. Aristotle believed that animals and humans were created for different purposes, and that everything created is designed to fulfill its specific function.

In Book XII of *Metaphysics*, Aristotle proposes his own teleological system. Aristotle first develops his system by defining three different types of substances.

“One that is sensible (of which one subdivision is eternal and another is perishable; the latter is recognized by all men, and included e.g. plants and animals), of which we must grasp the elements, whether one or many; and another that is immovable, and this certain thinkers assert to be capable of existing apart, some dividing it into two, others positing, of these two, only the objects of mathematics.”^{15 16}

Since Aristotle did not believe that everything was perishable, he defined two entities, motion and time, as imperishable. He believed that through logic alone, it was necessary for these two ideas to be eternal, because a creation of them would in itself not allow them to be in existence.

If time was created there would be a time before creation, but the whole concept of before

¹⁵ Aristotle, and Richard McKeon. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, 872

¹⁶ These three views of substance appear to have also been held by Plato, Xenocrates, and Speusippus

requires there to be time. Essentially, something cannot be created out of nothing is the conclusion that Aristotle drew. These ideas of substances, add to Aristotle's idea of an unmoved mover. "Since there were three kinds of substance, two of them physical and one unmovable, regarding the latter we must assert that it is necessary that there should be an eternal unmovable substance."¹⁷ Aristotle understood that in order for his three types of substances to exist, there has to be one unchangeable being that everything is related to and molded after. From the idea of the unmoved mover, Aristotle formed his belief that there is not a creator of everything, but instead an unmoved mover that everything else paralleled itself to. The cosmos in his opinion did not need one ultimate creator, but instead everything was related to and copied after an unmoved mover.

Aristotle also believed that how an animal used each of its features was crucial to understanding the world and how it was designed. While animals and humans are each created for a different function in Aristotle's mind, he did believe that the fact that both had unique characteristics and functions supported the idea that everything was created for different functions based on different design qualities.¹⁸ Aristotle believed that everything is intentionally built for a specific function and purpose and their job is to fulfill that objective. Everything created has a quality of design and order that is patterned after the unmoved mover.

Aristotle helped to make the Teleological Argument more relatable to everyday things. He used functions of animals and people to show how everything has design and order. He also defined three different substances that help to prove the idea of order seen all around the world. Aristotle argued that the most complete understanding to everything seen in the world is a teleological understanding.

¹⁷ Aristotle, and Richard McKeon. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, 877

¹⁸ *Aristotle's de Motu Animalium*, 60,66,69–70,73–81,94–98,101

Cicero

Cicero was a man involved in essentially every area of life: politics, law, and philosophy to name a few. He became known as a famous orator, recognized as one of Rome's greatest orators and prose stylists. In *De Natura Deorum* (*On the Nature of the Gods*), he developed an early version of the watchmaker argument. He also claimed that divine power is found through reason which exists throughout nature.

In *On the Nature of the Gods*, Cicero explains logically that the world could not have been created by a chance happening.

“But if all the parts of the universe have been so ordered that they could not have been better adapted for use, or more beautiful as regards appearance, let us see whether they are the work of chance, or whether their arrangement is one in which they could not possibly have been combined except by the guidance of consciousness and the divine providence.”¹⁹

He used pieces of art as a way of explaining how the world was intelligently designed. Cicero understood that when people see artwork, they recognize that someone spent time and effort creating whatever they are seeing. He then related that same idea to the universe. The universe has unique characteristics and design that could not have just occurred. It was crafted and designed so specifically and uniquely to have happened by accident. From this same idea, Cicero continues in Book II Section 34 to create his own early version of the watch argument. "When you see a sundial or a water-clock, you see that it tells the time by design and not by chance. How then can you imagine that the universe as a whole is devoid of purpose and intelligence, when it embraces everything, including these artifacts themselves and their artificers?" Cicero used not only art, but manmade items, to prove his point of intelligent design. He built his entire argument around items that he knew all people saw and understood like a ship

¹⁹ On the Nature of the Gods, Book II Section 34

being guided by intelligence or letters falling on the ground and forming a word.²⁰ Through relating his points to such basic things in life, more people began to fully comprehend what was being addressed.

Cicero's ideas laid the basic structure that William Paley later based his ideas upon. Cicero was incredibly effective in his arguments because he simplified his points and made them universally relatable. He also used an *a posteriori* method, strongly relying on people's experiences, to help further his arguments.

Saint Thomas Aquinas

Saint Thomas Aquinas, a well-known friar and a priest, had incredibly influential philosophical ideas; some of his most profound writing can be found in the *Summa Theologica*. In his Fifth Way to prove the existence of God, the beginning of the Teleological Argument is formed. He used a mainly *a posteriori* argument to prove God's existence.

In his fifth argument for God's existence, Aquinas supported his beliefs by using the design of the world, why it is necessary for beings to have purpose, order, and intelligence. His syllogism used is:

1. Nothing in nature, lacking a consciousness, tends toward a goal unless it is under the direction of someone with consciousness and intelligence.

2. Things in nature that lack a consciousness tend toward a goal.

3. Therefore, God exists and directs things in nature toward their respective goals.²¹

Items that do not have intelligence simply act towards an end result. These bodies act in the same manner every time in hopes of reaching the best result. Because of this lack of

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Aquinas, Thomas, St. "Part 1, Question 2, Article 3." *Summa Theologica*, 'Five Ways from Summa Theologica. University of California San Diego. Web. 5 Oct. 2014.

intelligence, these beings cannot perform their rote actions unless they are being instructed to do so by a being with design and intelligence in order to perform the necessary action. Therefore, Aquinas reaches the conclusion that there must be an intelligent designer that is directing everything to their end. Aquinas named this intelligent designer God.²²

Aquinas provided yet another reason why it is necessary for there to be a God that has designed the world with a purpose and is constantly keeping the world on the correct track. Aquinas believed that there is nothing in the world with intelligence other than humans. He believed that there must be an ultimate being (God) in charge because that is the only way to keep the world in order. Aquinas continued the teleological thought of things having a purpose and an ultimate being that is in control of everything.

William Paley

William Paley, a Christian Apologist, philosopher, and English Clergyman, moved the Teleological Argument in a new direction, and is still recognized as the instigator of the existence of God through design. He combined the science of his time with philosophy, and he gave specific examples of design and order obviously seen in the world as proof. He gave tangible application to an argument that had been spoken of, but was not overwhelmingly strong. William Paley took Cicero's basic watch analogy and expounded upon it in his book, *Natural Theology*, around the time of the Enlightenment. Paley simplified the whole concept of the Teleological Argument to an analogy that everyone could understand. The main point of his argument is God's design for creation is evident through general happiness that is seen through the physical or social order of things. He felt his book was synonymous to the preamble, and

²² Aquinas, Thomas, St. "Part 1, Question 2, Article 3." *Summa Theologica*, 'Five Ways from Summa Theologica. University of California San Diego. Web. 5 Oct. 2014.

anyone should research it before digging into any theological argument. He believed his argument could be seen as a preamble to apologetics as a whole.

Paley's most persuasive and recognized comparison is the watchmaker analogy that proves the existence of God. Simply put, his watchmaker analogy allows intelligent design in the world because of the existence of a designer. In the beginning of *Natural Theology*, Paley provides a plethora of analogies that relate to how things were created, and then he shows how they prove his point. He begins by telling a story about kicking a stone and then wondering if that stone was created or if it had always been there. He then relates that same idea to finding a watch on a hearth and wondering if the watch was designed or if it just happened to be on the hearth. Paley describes the complexity of the watch and each specific detail thus explaining how it is impossible for the watch to have just happened into existence. He finally concludes that "the watch must have had a maker: that there must have existed, at some time, and at some place or other, an artificer or artificers who formed it for the purpose which we find it actually to answer; who comprehended its construction, and designed its use."²³ A detailed discussion of all the arguments against intelligent design is listed in his book to help strengthen his argument, because he can refute what was brought against him.

Paley relates God's design to an artist. People do not know the artist firsthand, but they still accept the piece of art created by that artist as specifically planned and designed. Paley believed the same concept can and should be applied to God. There is obviously a designer and creator, God, of the universe that can be trusted just the same as an unknown artist.²⁴

A discussion of the perfection of things designed is the next area that Paley addressed. In all machinery created, it is necessary for the purpose to be evident and some mistakes are

²³ *Natural Theology*, William Paley, 1802, 1-8

²⁴ *Ibid*, 4

allowed. If there is a small glitch in a product that is made this is not necessarily a problem. “It is not necessary that a machine be perfect, in order to show with what design it was made: still less necessary, where the only question is, whether it were made with any design at all.”²⁵

According to Paley, mistakes are possible and necessary. He then disregards this fact from the argument because it is irrelevant. The only idea being argued is whether or not a God exists due to the design seen in the new world.

The third rebuttal or misconception that Paley challenges is the idea of not understanding every little detail. Paley believed that some confusion and misunderstanding to the machines’ purpose is necessary. Instead of relying on uncertainty to make the argument weaker, the ultimate affect relied solely on the assistance or aid that each piece brings to the whole.²⁶ Paley then used logic to ask questions and relate how impossible the idea of the watch just forming on its own seems. There are too many different possible combinations and possibilities for the watch to have just formed. If one watch could be created from certain materials in a location, there should be more watches that are able to form where the watch was found because the same situation still exists. Paley then describes that the only logical way the watch could have been created is through some intelligent being providing an “internal configuration” on how to form and preform.²⁷ Laws in Paley’s mind were not reason for something to form; instead they were just a path the intelligent designer takes to reach an end.

“A law presupposes an agent; for it is only the mode, according to which an agent proceeds: it implies a power; for it is the order, according to which that power acts. Without this agent, without this power, which are both distinct from itself, the law does nothing; is nothing.”²⁸

²⁵ Ibid, 5

²⁶ Ibid, 5-6

²⁷ Ibid, 6

²⁸ Ibid, 7

Paley believes laws initially appear as a reason or a conclusion, but instead they are just a jumble of worlds that have no real value or meaning. Paley did not want people to become discouraged because they did not necessarily understand and grasp all points of the analogy. He felt that “the consciousness of knowing little, need not beget a distrust of that which he does know.”²⁹

Paley’s analogy helped move the Teleological Argument in an entirely new direction than what had previously been done. His watch analogy has now become the foundation of most Teleological Arguments. While he was simplifying the argument to a level that all could understand, he was also creating a framework that all other later people have added to. Today, he is the most recognized name in the foundation of the modern Teleological Argument.

David Hume

David Hume was an empiricist Scottish Philosopher who wrote numerous rebuttals to the Teleological Argument proposed by Plato, Cicero, and Aquinas. His book, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, contains the majority of his arguments against the idea of intelligent design. Because most atheist writings were banned during his time period, his book was not published until after his death. The points he makes precede Paley by 20-30 years, however they still completely align with Paley’s beliefs.

Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion is Hume’s way of disproving the Teleological Argument, which in his mind disproves the idea of God entirely. He understood that the best argument proving the rationality of religious belief is the argument of design. If Hume disproved the idea of intelligent design, then, according to him, the whole argument for God’s existence through reason fails. Through the presentation of three different characters, Dema, Philo, and Cleanthes, each holding a different view on God’s existence, Hume is able to disprove the design argument from multiple religious perspectives. Dema argues from a religious Orthodox position

²⁹ Ibid 8

that no matter how much thought and logic is applied to attempting to understand God, a full comprehension can never be reached through reason. His ultimate conclusion is that God is completely unknowable because He is beyond human understanding. Demea clearly states his opinion in Part III, “the infirmities of our nature do not permit us to reach any ideas, which in the least correspond to the ineffable sublimity of the divine attributes. He searches for inconsistencies and paradoxes in anything that is put forth by others. Cleanthes, an empirical theist, is used by Hume to represent a person who believes in the design argument. In part II, Cleanthes lays out his entire analogous argument and to the best of his ability proves the argument of design. He describes the entire universe as being one big machine that is then divided into smaller parts that are then yet again divided until they are beyond human comprehension. Everything that has been subdivided fits together and preforms in such a way that it strikes wonder in every person who attempts to comprehend it. Cleanthes then paralleled this fitting together to how everything created by man goes together and preforms a function. Because of this relationship, Cleanthes draws the conclusion that since they relate, they are from a similar cause. Essentially, the creator of everything is similar to the mind of man, the creator was just more complex and everything he carried out was on a greater scale.³⁰ Cleanthes believed that by looking at the world, especially nature, there is undeniable and overwhelming evidence that the world was created through God’s intelligence which is incredibly similar to man’s intelligence.³¹ In response, Philo, a hard-headed skeptic, attempts to prove that the argument for design is not an analogous argument at all and is therefore, faulty. He believed that the fundamental analogy, the machine and the universe, is weak, therefore causing the rest of the argument to be weak as well. Secondly, he attempted to prove that the universe and a

³⁰ Ibid, 10

³¹ Ibid,

machine do not make sense in an analogy because they are two separate entities. They do not require one another to exist. In fact, the universe is a whole and a machine is simply a part of that whole. In Part V, Philo presents a strong attack against the design argument using Cleanthes's definition of empirical theism, the only way that the order and design seen in the world can be explained is through God, the intelligent designer. When these attributes of design are studied more through the use of scientific developments, there is less likelihood of humans understanding the design. Because of these advancements, it is no longer plausible that humans can decide whether or not something is intelligently designed. He also points out that even if anything could be inferred through the design argument, it is not able to prove the argument as a whole. Part VI consists of Philo continuing to refute the design argument. He again goes back to the analogy side of the argument and disproves it. Philo proposes multiple analogies that the universe could possibly be related to, based on evidences in nature. He states that relating the universe to a machine was just a random choice and has no real worth. One could liken the universe to an animal, and God to its soul, but it still does not prove that God exists. Philo introduces the idea that evidences of design in nature could simply have come out through nature, in Part VIII. Cleanthes attempts to disprove this idea by saying that some parts of nature have aspects that are beneficial to humans proving their must be a designer. The idea of natural selection could not have designed certain attributes of humans that are so necessary, only a designer could accomplish this feat. In response, Philo points out "thought has no influence upon matter except where that matter is so conjoined with it, as to have an equal reciprocal influence upon it. No animal can move immediately anything but the members of its own body" in attempts to show that intelligence does not change matter.³²

³² Ibid, 37

In the course of one book, Hume presents three different views about God, ultimately ending in the idea that the argument for design is flawed and it is a possible interpretation, but not the only explanation that can be drawn based off of what is observed. Hume presented the opposing side of the Teleological Argument through providing three main points that lead to the inconsistencies and limits of the argument. He proved that one cannot take reason from principles and ideas that work on earth and apply them to the whole universe. Secondly, Hume presented that the creation of the world must be taken out of the equation because it is a unique event and nothing can be compared to it. Hume thirdly presents that the order seen in the world could easily have just happened on its own due to essential properties of matter itself.

Immanuel Kant

Immanuel Kant is a German philosopher who is considered to have a major part in modern philosophy. His biggest work is *Critique of Pure Reason*, where he attempted to separate and explain the relationship between human experiences and reason. In this text, he speaks approvingly of the Teleological Argument, but ultimately he expresses his dislike and belief that too many logical steps are ignored to reach a final conclusion.

Kant initially speaks in high regards of the Teleological Argument saying “it is the oldest [argument], the clearest, and the most in conformity with the common reason of humanity... it would be utterly hopeless to attempt to rob this argument of the authority it has always enjoyed.”³³ Kant believes that there are some elements of design and intelligence in the world, but he did not believe that those elements pointed to God. Instead the aspects of nature which are obviously designed help answer questions about science. The Teleological Argument “proves at most intelligence only in the arrangement of the 'matter' of the universe, and hence the

³³ Kant, Immanuel, and Jonathan Bennett. *Critique of Pure Reason*, 383

existence not of a 'Supreme Being', but of an 'Architect'."³⁴ Kant stated that the Argument for Design is the only argument for God's existence that can logically without too many stretches identify some form of a creator of the world. This creator cannot be supreme and ultimate because its existence does not stand alone, but instead is obvious from observing the universe. When attempting to take the "Wise Author of Nature"³⁵ and move into a supreme infinite creator there is a logical jump that cannot be taken. Kant believes to make this jump; the existence of the being is no longer based on nature, but instead on itself. When this self-dependency is instilled, the use of the Ontological Argument is necessary, and Kant adamantly believed this argument was flawed.

Kant understood that the Teleological Argument had some merit to it in the science world, but he did not believe that it had any bearing in the theological world. Therefore, it is unable to prove the existence of God. There were too many holes and conclusions that must be drawn in order to get to something definite. Kant did not believe it to be possible that God created the world out of nothing because he did not first believe that there is a God. Kant understood how the Teleological Argument had been accepted for this long, but analyzed it in such a manner as to show that the argument did not prove God's existence, let alone a concept of design in the world.

³⁴ Ibid. 279

³⁵ Ibid.63

PROBLEM WITH DEISGN

The Teleological Argument has been used for a great length of time, unfortunately, due to some discrepancies; the argument has come to a bit of a standstill. In order to make the argument productive, successful and strong once again, there are terms that must be redefined, and there are ideas that must be reconsidered.

To first understand why the changes are necessary, a correct understanding of how design is applied to the argument and an absolute working definition of design according to the Teleological Argument is important to discuss. Due to varying definitions of this term, confusion has developed, causing the argument to be ineffective. For the function of this argument thus far, design has been defined as everything in nature that has a purpose. Because of this definition, the argument received the name teleological- from the end or purpose exhibited by the universe.³⁶ Assuming this as the working definition, the argument loses significance concerning aspects of nature that are designed and focuses solely on defining items in the world based on their purpose. This shift in terminology has also caused a shift in the underlying theme of the argument. Instead of using logic to prove the existence of God, the argument becomes centered on scientific arguments. Due to this definition, a majority of the time the argument becomes focused on scientific issues instead of theological issues.³⁷ An argument for God's existence then turns into a discussion concerning how things were created and if those things were truly created with some role to accomplish. The whole crux of the argument, design, is then lost amongst the discussion of purpose. Many things have a purpose, but those things do not necessarily point to the existence of a God.

³⁶ This definition comes from the Ancient Greek word telos meaning "end" or "purpose" and logica meaning "study of discourse."

³⁷ For example, the argument becomes a discussion of creation versus evolution rather than about the existence of an omniscient being.

Before design was redefined by society as purpose, design described something in the world that was specifically created and has attributes of originality and intelligence. However, this definition is incredibly vague and leaves a large portion of information up to personal interpretation. What one person may consider a feature of design may appear to another as an instance of mere coincidence. In order for this argument to be effective and form a conclusive and solid conclusion, this definition of design needs to be tailored with specific parameters that deal with some of the potential gaps or discrepancies. There is no set standard for what is considered as designed and what is considered a coincidence. This allows the fundamental idea upon which the Teleological Argument is based to have multiple interpretations. Due to this fluctuation, and the existence of different interpretations, the Teleological Argument has come to a sort of impasse. Because there is no universal standard concerning design and its presence in the world, every individual may interpret the signature of design differently. While one person may look at the way sand lands after being blown by the wind as a beautiful work of art, reminiscent of a designer, another person may just see a large pile of sand. Due to this difference in perception, the Teleological Argument is no longer as effective. Therefore, there needs to be a shift in the Teleological Argument making it a concept that is predictable and definite. This will allow for the argument to no longer stand upon a foundation of opinion, thus making the argument stronger and more sound.

THESIS PROOF

For the Teleological Argument to be considered a strong and accurate way to prove the existence of God, the entire notion of design needs to be refocused. Focusing on predictable mathematical patterns instead of the vague concept of design, allows the argument to become stronger and almost irrefutable.

Patterns are an example of one element that may be considered a symbol of design, and consequently allow a shift in the argument. Patterns, just like design, can be seen in numerous different ways and defined with multiple definitions. Therefore, the need of an exact fundamental definition is required. Predictable mathematical patterns allow for this absolute definition.³⁸ Using only predictable mathematical patterns removes all personal opinion and inconsistency. Simple patterns such as easily noticed shape sequences or any recognizable figure allow for the observer to insert their own opinion. They allow for variation and differences, but predictable mathematical patterns eliminate this issue. With this new definition, no longer can something be “designed” in one person’s opinion and just be a coincidence in another person’s opinion. Without fail, predictable mathematical patterns will always end in the same result. They can be observed in nature, and are irrefutable because there is always a mathematical means present that can be used to always draw the same conclusion. Something that possesses a pattern that will always be predictable cannot be reconsidered or ignored. While the definition of design leaves room for different interpretations, shifting the emphasis of the Teleological Argument to solely predictable mathematical patterns removes this inconsistency.

³⁸ A mathematically predictable pattern is a specific type of pattern that can be observed and then logically reached. It will always exist in nature and will not change due to the observer’s opinion. A mathematically predictable pattern becomes a fundamental definition that allows for no discrepancies because everyone is on the exact same page.

With a new definition of design, there are numerous mathematically predictable examples that can be observed in nature. All of these examples upon first glance may appear to just be random happenstance, but when considered further, are revealed as specific order and design. Fibonacci's principle and fractals both exhibit very obvious predictable mathematical patterns. Fibonacci's principle is often defined as nature's numbering system.³⁹ The idea of naturally recurring numbers is seen all throughout nature, and Fibonacci's sequence is a way to understand how they occur. Fibonacci's sequence is considered a reoccurring relation because it is an equation that continues due to a mathematical formula based upon the previous value. Each sequence is a function of the preceding term, a sum of the two numbers before it.⁴⁰ Due to this repetition of adding the two previous numbers, a predictable pattern develops. The next number in the sequence can always be determined and will always be what is expected. These patterns are seen in multiple different items throughout nature. Fibonacci's sequence is portrayed in sunflowers, pinecones, and nautilus shells. When observing a sunflower, the seeds have a distinct spiral pattern that they follow. They spiral to the right or to the left, with a different number of each spiral, but the pattern is still noticeable because the pairs are adjacent numbers in Fibonacci's sequence. When the numbers of spirals are counted, there are predictable pairs that will always be the total amount. These pairs are either: 21 and 34, 34 and 55, 55 and 89, or 89 and 144.⁴¹ Every time the head of a sunflower is observed, this will be the end result. These pairs allow not only for the space to be efficiently filled but the seeds will always be equally spaced despite the size of the sunflower's head. Fibonacci's sequence is not only seen in sunflowers, but in numerous other items in nature: pinecones, pineapples, flower petals, tree branches, shells, spiral galaxies, hurricanes, faces, fingers, and animal bodies. In each of these

³⁹ Knots, Ron. "Flowers and Fibonacci."

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Knots, Ron. "Flowers and Fibonacci." *Flowers and Fibonacci*. January 1, 2002. Accessed December 6, 2014.

examples, just like the sunflower, Fibonacci's sequence is developed through the addition of the two numbers before it allowing its features to be equally spaced. In this same way, fractals are never ending patterns that are similar to itself on different scales. Fractals are said to be a way to understand chaos since they create a predictable way to find patterns in what seems like only randomness.⁴² Representations of fractals often appear simply as confusion and seem chaotic, but when observed closely, a pattern can be seen and mathematically predicted. Through a repetition of the same process over and over, a loop is created that is easily anticipated. While the actual representation may get smaller and smaller in size, there is still a predicable repetition that exists. Snowflake symmetry represents fractals on a small scale. Each arm of a snowflake has a repetitive pattern that is entirely unique to itself since each of the six arms grows and develops on its own.

Each and every mathematically predictable pattern proves that there is order in the world. There is no way that Fibonacci's sequence and fractals are all coincidences. The exact precision in the way that items in nature are organized and aligned is too perfect to have simply happened. The only way that this order can be understood is through some sort of existing being who places an exact order. The fact that patterns are continually reoccurring and mathematically based cannot be denied. These predictable mathematical patterns are direct examples of design. They are seen in numerous places throughout nature and can always be mathematically reached. According to the Argument for Design syllogism:

- 1) The universe has identifiable patterns
- 2) Patterns are a component of design
- 3) Design requires a designer

⁴² Ibid.

4) Therefore, the designed universe requires a designer (God)⁴³

These mathematically predictable patterns could only have been designed by God.

This redefining of design allows for the argument to progress and actually have a purpose again. While simple patterns may be refuted and defined in different ways, mathematically predictable patterns are undebatable. These patterns exhibit order and design that is no longer vague and inconsistent. This idea of patterns pushes the argument in a new direction and allows the argument to be strong and places the burden of proof on the atheist.

⁴³ This syllogism was taken from Mr. Henderson's Apologetics Powerpoint.

REBUTTALS

Numerous rebuttals against the Teleological Argument have been raised and often addressed. Hume believed the entire argument was flawed because of the complexity of the argument. In people's opinion the universe is full of intricate items and is itself complex, requiring the universe to be designed. Hume refuted this by simply stating that people view the universe as complex because there is nothing better to compare it to. In his opinion, that does not cause the universe to be designed. Kant, in the same way, believed that the Teleological Argument did not actually prove God's existence. He argued the Teleological Argument was useful for scientific purposes but held no real value in answering the question if God really exists. He debated that to use the argument to reach the conclusion there is a God, there are numerous logical jumps that must be taken that are not possible. While both of these men, as well as many others, have debated the Teleological Argument and its effectiveness in answering the question of God's existence, all of the previously known rebuttals are in regards to the argument without a concrete definition of design. These rebuttals address purpose and a vague idea of design.

The idea of mathematically predictable patterns being used to define design is a completely new and unseen progression of the Teleological Argument. This redefining of terms and providing a single working definition for the use of this argument advances the Teleological Argument, but it is not widely known. This lack of popularity and understanding causes a lack of current rebuttals. When this version of the argument is further considered and expounded upon by philosophers, more rebuttals and issues may arise, but thus far only a few have been realized.

One rebuttal to the mathematically predictable patterns version of the Teleological Argument is not in the typical sense of a rebuttal. The idea being addressed stems from a misunderstanding of the terms being used in the argument. Instead of addressing a fault in the argument, the atheist is attempting to bring forth a point that appears to be a contradiction in the argument. The atheist may believe that math is simply a system created by man to understand the universe. It cannot actually be used to prove God's existence because it was originally created by man. Therefore, in the mind of the atheist, the argument fails because all that is being discussed is a system created and used for man's benefit.

The goal through this clarification of the definition is to confuse the theist and cause them to understand the "fault" in the argument. The atheist, in asking this question about the definition of mathematics, is simply strengthening the theist's argument. If mathematically predictable patterns do not exist in the universe in the first place, mathematics could not have been created by man to understand these predictable patterns. Man was able to create a system that is repeatable, logical, and predictable as a means of understanding things that exist within the world. How could this system be accurate and reliable if these patterns were not originally created by God? Mathematics is used as a way to define and understand order that only exists in the world because there was one who first created order, God. This useful system of mathematics would not be necessary unless this order already existed within the universe. The atheist's rebuttal simply comes from them losing sight of the argument. An issue with the definition and formation of math has nothing to do with the argument in its entirety. Math is already accepted as a reliable and necessary system. Instead, this rebuttal merely strengthens the argument because there would be no need for predictable, reliable, mathematical patterns unless these representations already were in existence in the world.

Another rebuttal against the Teleological Argument based upon mathematically predictable patterns would be posed against what exactly created the order. While atheists may reach the conclusion that these patterns are from the Laws of Nature, this is not possible. Order exhibited in mathematical patterns is too specific and exact to have come from the Laws of Nature.⁴⁴ Since order can only be discovered through an understanding of God the burden of proof is simply shifted to the atheist. This requires the atheist to explain how order can come from something other than one who created the order- God. Patterns must have some type of intelligent designer to be created. This intelligence that can create patterns that are predictable and reoccurring can only be found in God. God is the Order, and has the intelligence, to design these patterns.

⁴⁴ In order to reach an entire understanding of the Laws of Nature the Transcendental Argument must be used. This thesis solely discusses the Teleological Argument.

CONCLUSION

Through redefining the terms that make up the Teleological Argument, a solid proof for God's existence can be represented, thus removing the argument from the standstill it is currently in. The argument calls the atheist out on debating with a non- absolute definition of design and considering an argument that is not clearly defined. In order to respond, the atheist must also shift to the new definition, which only puts the theist at more of an advantage since the argument is structured for an existence of God. The theist also poses the idea of mathematically predictable patterns that are seen in numerous areas in the world and cannot be refuted simply upon their mathematical predictability; these ideas are not just coincidence. The atheist must either accept that there is order in the world that can only be caused by an Orderer, or accept the burden of proof and discover some other explanation for why there are mathematically predictable patterns in the world. This new redefined Teleological Argument allows for the argument to proceed and no longer be stopped by vagueness and inconsistencies. God's existence seen through the idea of intelligent design is now more explicit and clear, and can be witnessed by humans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anaxagoras, and Patricia Curd. *Anaxagoras of Clazomenae: Fragments and Testimonia : A Text and Translation with Notes and Essays*. Toronto: U of Toronto, 2007. *WorldCat*. Web. 03 Oct. 2014.
- Aristotle, and Richard McKeon. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York: Modern Library, 2001. Print.
- Aquinas, Thomas, St. "Part 1, Question 2, Article 3." *Summa Theologica*, 'Five Ways from Summa Theologica. University of California San Diego. Web. 5 Oct. 2014.
- Curd, Patricia. "Anaxagoras." *Stanford University*, Stanford University, 22 Aug. 2007. Web. 03 Oct. 2014.
- Curd, P., 2004, *The Legacy of Parmenides: Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998; rev. edn. Las Vegas: Parmenides Press.
- Dembski, William A. *Mere Creation: Science, Faith & Intelligent Design*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Falk, Darrel R. *Coming to Peace with Science: Bridging the Worlds between Faith and Biology*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Geivett, R. Douglas. *Contemporary Perspectives on Religious Epistemology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Ginosborg, Hannah. "Kant's Aesthetics and Teleology." *Stanford University*. Stanford University, 02 July 2005. Web. 15 Nov. 2014
- Hume, David. *Natural Theology or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity Collected from the Appearances of Nature*. Web.ecologia. Web. 10 Oct. 20014

- Hume, David, and Jonathan Bennett. *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, 2007. Early Modern Texts, 2007. Web. 10 Oct. 2014.
- Kant, Immanuel, and Jonathan Bennett. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Early Modern Texts. Early Modern Texts, 2007. Web. 10 Oct. 2014.
- Knots, Ron. "Flowers and Fibonacci." *Flowers and Fibonacci*. January 1, 2002. Accessed December 6, 2014.
- Palmer, Donald. *Does the Center Hold?: An Introduction to Western Philosophy*. 5th ed. Dubuque, IA: McGraw-Hill, 2011.
- Pasternack, Lawrence. "Kant's Philosophy of Religion." *Stanford University*. Stanford University, 22 June 2004. Web. 26 Oct. 2014.
- Peterson, Michael L. *Reason & Religious Belief: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Plato. *Plato Complete Works*. Ed. John M. Cooper and D. S. Hutchinson. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997. Print.
- Russell, Paul. "Hume on Religion." *Stanford University*. Stanford University, 04 Oct. 2005. Web. 30 Oct. 2014.
- Steven, Dutch. "David Hume and the Argument from Design." *David Hume and the Argument from Design*. Green Bay, 11 Mar. 2002. Web. 01 Dec. 2014.
- Thistlethwaite, Susan Brooks. *Adam, Eve, and the Genome: The Human Genome Project and Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.

"What Are Fractals?" *FractalFoundationorg RSS*. Fractal Foundation, Jan. 2009. Web. 01 Dec. 2014.

Zeyl, Donald. "Plato's Timaeus." Stanford University. October 25, 2005. Accessed December 7, 2014. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-timaeus/>.