

Is david hume's argument against william paley here a strong one

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Task Hume's first argument against Paley is presented in the lines, " if any agent S believes that the order and complexity in some object O strongly points to design, then that is because S has had direct experiences of objects that resemble O and which have been produced by design" (Pojman and Vaughn).

This argument against Paley cannot be considered a strong argument because of several factors, the first factor being that other designers like Edison came up with new ideas. According to Hume's argument, there was no possibility that an individual would encounter something made out of design and fail to relate it to another object made out of design. From the evidence of inventors who developed new ideas, this argument is flawed because there would be no logical design that the inventors had encountered before designing their inventions. This indicates that Hume's argument was based on ignorance; there was no way that he would know that new designs would be invented; designs that would negate his argument.

Hume's argument is also flawed because of the apparent contradictions present in the argument itself. A summary of the argument indicates that Hume believed that an individual should only believe that an object is made from design if the individual had previously encountered similar design. Therefore, the argument by Hume seems to indicate that an individual who had not encountered design should not attribute designs to the working of a designer. This argument means that Hume preempts the human mind; the argument tries to negate the working of the human mind in deducing the result of design.

The other factor that indicates that Hume's argument was a weak argument

is in the design of the universe. Contrary to the biological argument presented by Hume, the universe is an infinite product of design. This means that any human being can attribute the design of the universe to some supreme deity, a fact that Hume tries to negate in his argument. The anthology that an individual has to have experienced design in order to recognize other instances of design would serve to negate the possibility of a supreme deity who gives humans deductive ability. Therefore, the argument by Hume can be considered weak because of its structural failures and the proposition.

The fact there exists unique designs in the universe is also proof that Hume's argument was not strong. This is because design is the product of the intellect, creativity, and innovativeness. Hume's argument seems to propose that design is born of previous design; a fact that would indicate that design cannot be created but just recreated. This means that Hume's argument concludes that design is never new, just a variation of existing design.

However, the universe is filled with many instances of new design, a fact that indicates the invalidity of Hume's argument. In conclusion, it can be said that Hume's first argument against the propositions of Paley is of no impact; the arguments are baseless and centered on ignorance. After an analysis of the arguments presented by Hume and Paley, it seems that Hume did not actually understand the analogy presented by Paley, and instead thought of the universe in a singular manner. This means that Hume did not consider the existence of new design and a deity in the supreme order of the universe. Therefore, the conclusion is that Hume's argument against Paley in this case is a weak argument.

Work Cited

Pojman, Louis, and Vaughn, Lewis. Philosophy: The Quest for Truth. London: Oxford University Press. Print.