

Total points: 10

Word Limit: 500

---

**Instructions:**

- (i) Submit in Turnitin. Section: **Assignments**
- (ii) Use the format below for identifying your submission. Write it on the top as seen here.

M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-[#]/[Roll number]/Program

e.g. M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-2/20166737/CSE

- (iii) Your submission must be a single PDF, named with your IIITH id. E.g. 20166737.PDF
  - (iv) Viewing similarity report: **after due date**, Option to resubmit: **Yes**
  - (v) Similarity index threshold to be considered for evaluation: **15%**
  - (vi) DO NOT include the question in your submission.
- 

Consider William Paley's design argument for the existence of God. One could take his core argument to be an argument by analogy:

P1: Living things are like watches

P2: Watches are created by intelligent design

C: Therefore, living things are created by intelligent design

The above argument can be countered like this: "Living things are like watches. Watches are made in factories. Therefore, living things are made in factories". You could think of other objections as well.

- (1) Reconstruct Paley's core argument in a different way that is more forceful. Unlike an argument from analogy this would be another kind of non-deductive argument. [3]
- (2) Write down the general form of the argument you have reconstructed. Give your own example to illustrate this non-deductive argument. [2]
- (3) In what way could the analogy with watches be used to support the argument that you have reconstructed in 1.1? [2]
- (4) Paley wrote before Darwin and cannot be faulted for not considering the theory of evolution. But an atheist in Paley's time could hold that even if Science has not given an answer about life, it is unreasonable to posit an intelligent designer. This sort of atheist must reject at least one premise in the argument that you reconstructed in 1.1. Identify the weakest premise in your argument and explain why it might be reasonable to reject it. In doing so, do not try to invent your own theory of the origin of life. That would be hopeless speculation, and should not be necessary. [3]