

ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN

Ted Sider
Intro Philosophy

In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a *stone* and were asked how the stone came to be there, I might possibly answer that for anything I knew to the contrary it had lain there forever; nor would it, perhaps, be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a *watch* upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place, I should hardly think of the answer which I had before given, 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 the stone? Why is it not as admissible in the second case as in the first? For this reason, and for no other, namely, that when we come to inspect the watch, we perceive, what we could not discover in the stone, that its several parts are framed and put together for a purpose... (Paley, *R&R*)

1. The parts of the human eye are arranged to achieve the purpose of vision
2. If 1 is true, then someone designed the eye.
3. Only God could have designed the eye.
4. Therefore, God exists.

...if the different parts had been differently shaped from what they are, of a different size from what they are, or placed after any other manner or in any other order than that in which they are placed, either no motion at all would have been carried on in the machine, or none which would have answered the use that is now served by it. (Paley, *R&R*)