

## M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-5/20171047/CLD

1)

I'll present Paley's argument in a slightly modified format. The aim here is to arrive at the same conclusion, have a similar essence in the thought structure build-up, but be much more conclusive and believable.

The Argument Reconstructed:

An entity whose working requires meticulous precision is crafted with a lot of thought, understanding, and analysis. When we encounter an entity such as a watch which works based on its design and accurate execution, we know that it was thought out by an intelligent and intellectual being and we call such an entity the outcome of intelligent design. A biological life form is highly efficient, capable and constructed adhering to fairly strict specifications for all its subsystems and submodules. Thus, life forms are created based on some schema of intelligent design.

2) Putting the above argument into a general form:

P1: If an entity A's working requires meticulous precision, then A is crafted after functional understanding and analysis

P2: If we encounter an entity A which works based on its structural design and its execution, then we know that an intelligent and intellectual being B actually conceptualized A's design

P3: If we know that an intelligent being B conceptualized the design of an entity A such that all of A's demonstrated functional requirements could be met, then we call A an outcome of intelligent design

O1: We observe a life form L and all of its capabilities and versatilities

I1: The realization of L required critical thinking, understanding and analysis (by O1 and P1)

I2: L was conceptualized by an intelligent being B (by O1 and P2)

C: L was the outcome of intelligent design (by I1 and I2)

- Example: We observe a Human Being, all of its major organ systems and organs and how they interact with one another for the smooth functioning of the human body. It is extremely unlikely that the functional design of the human being could have come about by fluke or some random phenomenon. Thus, some being thought-out the design of the human form after requirements analysis and a consideration of certain aesthetics. Thus, a human form is the outcome of intelligent design.

3)

We could fit a similar analogy using watches into our argument structure in part 1, which was generalized in part 2: Consider that we encounter a watch W and observe its functionalities and

precision. By P1, we know that W was crafted after functional analysis. By P2, we know that there must've been a being B who conceptualized the form of W. And, by P3 and the previous intermediate conclusion, we know that W was the result of intelligent design.

In much simpler terms, we see a watch and understand what its functional requirements are. Clearly, to meet those requirements, its form had to be thought-out well by someone. Thus, we conclude that the watch was created based on intelligent design facilitated by this intelligent being.

4)

P2 is the weakest premise in the above generalized argument structure. Let's say we encounter an entity A whose expected functionality clearly required some kind of understanding and calibration. It is not necessary that this was achieved by an external being B. In that, A might have been calibrated by itself or by whatever  $A_p$  had produced A. Reproduction is a known property of life-forms (this was known even before the knowledge of the theory of evolution). Thus, A's parent  $A_p$  might have produced A with some minor modification to its own design and form.

In a nutshell, it is not necessary that the design was created by a totally unrelated being (such as 'God'). There might have been trial and error as to what kind of modification works best, some sort of reward when one gets a change in the right direction and a penalty when the change is for the worse. This kind of an internal fine-tuning where the agent learns from its surroundings by taking small steps in certain directions could also be a possibility of gradual updation to one's design until it ultimately reaches a stable form. Thus, there are other possibilities to explain how one reached their present intelligent design.

Note that the argument structure present above technically remains unchallenged. The argument never claimed that the being B is someone who is an external observer. B can be the life form itself i.e  $B = A$  or B can be A's ancestor. The form of A and the fact that it is indeed based on intelligent design is unchallenged. By attacking P2, we gain more clarity as to what is the complete set of candidates from which B could have originated.