

M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-5/20171213/CSD

A1)

P1: Living things are intricate and have a complex mechanism.

P2: Intricate and complex designs can not be produced by themselves (i.e. they need some intelligent designer)

C: Living things are created by some intelligent designer. (From P1, P2)

A2)

P1: A have property B

A = Living Things, B = Complex mechanism

P2: NOT(D) implies NOT(B)

D = Intelligent Designer

C: A implies D (From P1, P2)

Example:

P1: A phone is chargeable

A = Phone, B = Chargeable

P2: Chargeable property can not exist if there is no chargeable battery

D = Chargeable battery

C: A phone have a chargeable battery

A3)

Watch analogy can support my argument, as in the second premise it states that "Intelligent and complex designs can not be produced by themselves (i.e. they need some intelligent designer)" and watch example very well supports it.

It is known that the watch has an intricate design with complex (well designed) mechanism underneath (i.e. every piece is fitted perfectly to work in unison, even if one piece is not working or is not packed well, watch doesn't work). Also, it is known that there is a designer behind every watch who created it.

Hence, it supports the given premises stated in (A1).

A4)

Consider the design of a water bubble, it is an intricate phenomenon, as it has a perfect spherical shape and the water molecules hold each other in a complex fashion so it doesn't pop easily and its existence remain (rather than never coming into existence) but we all know, there is no tangible "intelligent" designer or we can not see anyone out there who designed that other than water molecules themselves (it came into picture naturally).

Hence, the **second premise** "Intricate and complex designs can not be produced by themselves (i.e. they need some intelligent designer)" is weak, given the example of the water bubble in the last paragraph.