

Joshua Reed
Being and Knowing
Spring, 2017

Study Questions 9

Paley's 8 arguments seem to argue that there is no way to disprove god's existence. In that vein I do agree that there isn't a way to prove his existence, but none of his arguments seem to actually prove that god *does* exist.

For example argument #1 "Just because we can't fathom such a gifted and powerful designer doesn't mean the designer doesn't exist."

Seems entirely correct, but it also doesn't mean a god does exist. Beyond this, a lot of his arguments for a god seem to just be stop gaps for ignorance. Scientific exploration seems to keep pushing back the space that god can inhabit. During Paley's time, natural selection wasn't yet known or understood, so now the watch argument seems quite silly.

I think Pascal makes a slightly better case (for belief) with his wager, but I find both of these 'creationist' viewpoints to be shallow and unconvincing.