**How convincing are the teleological arguments for the existence of God? (40)**

the teleological arguments are and a posteriori approach to prove the existence of God. Aquinas and Paley have put forward the most famous approaches and arguments from saying there must be a designer who designed the world and everything must be designed by the designer God. This approach is very convincing fourthly a spot many have criticised that this is not convincing and has suggested different approaches for example, the cosmological argument and ontological saying that the existence of God should be proved through reason

Aquinas advocated that nature seems to have a purpose and order in it. Everything has a purpose and it comes from the will of God. Things that are inanimate do not have purpose itself; they are directed to their goal by God, they cannot move in order without the aid of the “guiding hand” (for example the archer shooting and arrow). The regularity of the sun and moon coming out in going in the same time each day suggest the purpose and orderliness behind it. Therefore things that are moving even when they have no intelligence in it because somebody has caused it and the first on caused causer is God. However, Anthony flew has pointed out that there is no clear evidence to prove and show things are directed towards some purpose. The things occur and motion in the world could be through natural selection or evolution. As Charles Darwin has suggested that, evolution theory does not suit the idea of reason/purpose behind things, evolution suggests we, and all species, all evolved rather randomly. In natural selection, the best suited to the environment will survive but those who do not will die, survival is a pure chance and is according to external influences. If the world is designed, natural selection would become a wasteful process.

Yet F.R.Tenant has suggested an anthropic principle, saying that the world is exactly right in creating a precise environment for man to survive, if anything changed for example if the sun had moved a little further away, no life would be possible to survive. He adds on saying that creation includes everything in the universe, not just things we can see or touch but also concepts. How do we argue concepts came into existence without a designer creating it? He points out the aesthetic form of our concepts on beauty music love suggesting that the designer was also concerned and interested in personal aspects in the world. With such complexity, it seems implausible saying that it is just result. Nevertheless people may argue that they may not feel uncomfortable with the world being the result of random chance but the unpalatable does not mean it is an error, it just means that it is an uncomfortable fact.

The other famous approach was put forward by Paley. He famously uses the analogy of the watch to demonstrate that if we came across a watch one day somewhere, even if we don’t know what it is, why it is there and its purpose, from all the marks of contrivance and design we know it must be designed by a designer. His attacker, Hume, has criticised him at Paley’s analogy is weak, he should not compere watch the objects that occur in nature, the evidence in nature is not so obvious. He adds that comparing machines with nature – that with very less similarity, thinkers like Paley already determined the result he wants. Also, Hume says the argument start from the universe which is familiar to us but reaches the conclusion outside our experience of God and this seems nonsense. Besides, why do we assume the person who designed the world must be God, or even the perfect omnipotence Christian God? Similarly, cant argued that a cause/designer of something of our sense experience God is outside time and space. It seems that we have already assumed God already exists and we are just finding evidence to support our conclusion rather than proving God’s existence Paley responded using an example of an eye complexity within a natural object like the ITV shows crafts and skills on the smallest scale will stop

Richard Dawkins has given an example of the digger wasp, which lays eggs to a Caterpillar to feed themselves off; how can an omni-benevolent God create a world full of cruelty in nature. J.S.mill also put the idea of natural evil for example earthquakes and droughts, all else indicated a morally flawed designer, if he is perfect why should the designer want us to suffer. Our concept of God is perfect and omnipotence but the existence of evil seems to undermine our understanding of God and its accuracy.

Swinburn has commented on Hume’s argument that if there are so many marks of design that point to so many designers could that be different gods who are experts of different areas and create the universe together? Swinburn uses Ockham’s Razor to support his view that the idea of a single God is simpler than many gods. When two competing theories put together the one that has the less hypothesis is more likely to be true.

Yet somehow put forward the cosmological argument which thinks the universe exists because of cause. Leibnitz uses the principle of sufficient reason to suggest that everything that exists must have an x-ray nation for it. Whether or not something is moving, or is true, there must be a reason for it, could be known or unknown. The reason must be external and self-explanatory, therefore it is God. However, Russell has argued that just because every individual has a mother does not mean all mankind has a mother. This is a logical fallacy, things can be just there and require no explanation. Hume also made similar comments saying that we are taking an inductively, imagination makes connections between cause and effect, we think we know more about the world that we actually do. This is dangerous because we may be confusing ourselves from concepts to making us feel it is a reality.

The teleological arguments are useful and convincing in giving the reasons why they are so complicated and who has walked things into existence but the fact that we can’t find purpose in everything seems to dismiss the argument. Although it does not convince everyone, especially the atheist, the fact that somebody has designed it seems to give an answer as to why things are there the teleological argument is only seem to the extent of why things exist instead of proving the existence of God.