

Paley's argument from design, and Hume's counter-analogy essay

[Art & Culture](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Hume's counter-analogy does not succeed in undermining Paley's argument from design.

Paley clearly explains to his reader that humans are so complicated that we must have been made by a designer. Hume argues that since the universe is not a human art, and is more like an animal, it does not need a designer.

Paley argues that the complexity and functionality of a watch clearly shows that it was made by a designer. Animals are also complex and functional, therefore, Hume does not change the argument adequately enough to effectively counter it. Paley lays his argument as such: a watch is like the universe in complexity and functionality, a watch needs a designer, therefore, the universe needs a designer as well. Paley's argument centers around the simile between a watch and the universe . He points out that the watch is complicated with many parts, yet all work together to form a functional machine.

Paley shows in his argument that all the pieces of the watch are put together for a definite purpose. No matter how many watches were made before this one, Paley explains that the watch still has a maker. Watches cannot be designed by other watches, some superior being must have created at least the first one.

The designer obviously understands how the watch works and how to create it to function properly. With this premise, Paley introduces the connection between the watch and our universe. He explains clearly that if a watch needs a designer, surely the far more complex universe should need one to. Paley justifies the existence of God through this watch and universe simile.

He concludes that if a watch needs a superior designer, then the universe needs a maker as well, this maker being God. Hume attempts to counter Paley's argument by saying that the universe is more like an animal than a work of human art. He says that because the universe is not a human art, it does not need a maker, just as animals do not need makers.

Therefore, Paley argues, the universe also does not need a designer, and because of this, God does not exist. Hume does not effectively counter Paley's argument because he simply replaces a complex watch with an even more complex animal in his statements. He does not successfully address the fact that animals were at some point created as well.

They could not exist infinitely, they had to have come from somewhere.

Paley explains the creation as being through God. Paley bases his argument on something he knows for a fact: a watch needs a designer. That is a clear-cut true statement. A large premise in Hume's argument however is that an animal does not need a creator. Hume does not know this for a fact, that is a personal opinion, no matter how thought out.

Hume has no idea whether animals go back in time infinitely or if they were instantly created by God. Hume may say that the universe is not like a human art, but that does not rule out the option that the universe may have been created by God. Hume argues with a premise that he cannot prove, which makes his argument weak in comparison to Paley's. I believe the universe is not a human art, but it is a Godly art. Just as you can obviously see that a watch must have a designer, it is also clear that the universe had one as well. The difference here is that a watch was made by a mere human,

<https://assignbuster.com/paleys-argument-from-design-and-humes-counter-analogy-essay/>

and the world, seeing that it is an amazing and functional artwork, was clearly created by God, someone far superior than a human could ever be.

Although Hume attempts to counter the argument by comparing the universe to an animal instead of a watch, the likeliness remains that they need a creator based on complexity and functionality. In fact, an animal is more complex than a watch, which would actually make Paley's argument even stronger. Before writing this paper, my personal opinion was that there is a God, an almighty creator. Paley's argument actually strengthened my personal beliefs. He offered a very clear argument based on factual similarities that points to the existence of God.

Hume's weak argument failed to change my mind that there is a God, but rather strengthened my previous opinion: there is a God.