A Discourse on God's Existence: Cosmological and Teleological Proofs

PHILIP, Oghenetega Esther

University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.908000611

Received: 13 August 2025; Accepted: 19 August 2025; Published: 24 September 2025

ABSTRACT

This literature review examined the evolution and contemporary significance of cosmological and teleological arguments as philosophical and theological proofs for the existence of God. The review deconstructed how these arguments have been shaped by the dynamic interplay between theology, philosophical reasoning, and scientific discovery from ancient Greek philosophy through modern scientific developments. The cosmological arguments are examined through the Leibnizian framework, based on the Principle of Sufficient Reason, and the Kalam argument, which posits that whatever begins to exist must have a cause. The review explores how these arguments engage with contemporary scientific theories including the Big Bang, quantum mechanics, and multiverse hypotheses, while addressing persistent philosophical challenges such as infinite regress and the problem of explanation.

The teleological arguments are analysed through William Paley's watchmaker analogy and Michael Behe's concept of irreducible complexity, examining how these design-based arguments have adapted to advances in biological science. The review evaluated how evolutionary theory, molecular biology, and modern genetics have challenged and these arguments, while refining and exploring their theological implications for understanding the question of the existence of God and the nature of life as we know it. The analysis revealed that while mainstream science has not accepted the design/creation inferences these arguments allude to, they remain fluxive in theological and philosophical debate about the boundaries between the scientific and the metaphysical.

The review concludes that cosmological and teleological arguments remain influential in contemporary philosophical theology, bridging reason and faith while adapting to new scientific understanding. These arguments continue to raise fundamental questions about the nature of existence, the limits of human knowledge, and the relationship between science and religion

Keywords: Cosmological, Theological, Teleological, Philosophical, Scientific.

INTRODUCTION

The quest to understand the origins and nature of the universe has been a central preoccupation for philosophers throughout history. In time, modern science joined the race. However, the origins of the universe, has been attributed to who man has given several names; God, the Ultimate Reality, Allah, Brahman etc. At the crossroads of this inquiry lie two of the most enduring and debated arguments in philosophy and theology: the cosmological and teleological arguments. These arguments, which attempt to prove the existence of God or a supreme being through and observation and the telos (purpose)of the universe, have evolved significantly over time, shaped by the interplay between theology, philosophical reasoning, and scientific discovery. This literature review aims to explore the multifaceted dimensions of these arguments, examining their theological, philosophical, and scientific aspects.

The cosmological argument, in its simplest form, posits that the existence of the universe necessitates a cause, ultimately leading to the conclusion of a first cause, often identified as God. The teleological argument, also known as the argument from design, suggests that the apparent order and purposefulness in the universe imply

the existence of an intelligent designer. Craig (1979) asserts that both arguments have roots in ancient Greek philosophy, with Plato and Aristotle laying foundational concepts that would be developed and debated for millennia.

Throughout the medieval period, Islamic and Christian scholars expanded upon these arguments. Al-Ghazali's work on the Kalam cosmological argument influenced later thinkers, while Thomas Aquinas' Five Ways became a cornerstone of Christian apologetics. The Renaissance and Enlightenment periods brought new perspectives, with figures such as René Descartes and Isaac Newton contributing to a mechanistic worldview that both challenged and reshaped traditional arguments (Brooke, 1991).

From a theological standpoint, cosmological and teleological arguments have been central to apologetics across various Abrahamic traditions. They represent attempts to reconcile faith with reason, offering logical pathways to belief in a divine creator. These arguments are continuously refined by contemporary theologians in light of modern scientific knowledge, engaging concepts such as the Big Bang theory and the fine-tuning of universal constants.

Philosophically, these arguments have been subject to rigorous analysis and critique. David Hume's sceptical approach challenged the logical structure of cosmological and teleological arguments, while Immanuel Kant argued that such proofs were beyond human reason. Modern philosophers have continued this tradition of critical examination, offering new interpretations and reformulations of these classic arguments (Plantinga, 2011).

The scientific dimension of this discourse has become increasingly prominent in recent centuries. The development of modern cosmology, particularly the Big Bang theory, has profoundly impacted discussions of the universe's origin. Davies (2006) posits that some scholars argue that the Big Bang supports the notion of a cosmic beginning, aligning with the cosmological argument. In contrast, others contend that it undermines traditional concepts of causality. Similarly, discoveries in physics and biology have influenced teleological arguments, with ideas like the anthropic principle and the apparent fine-tuning of universal constants providing new fodder for debate (Ellis, 2007). In recent decades, the discourse surrounding cosmological and teleological arguments has been energized by contributions from both religious apologists and critics. Philosophers and theologians like William Lane Craig have refined and defended these arguments, while scientists and authors like Richard Dawkins have presented forceful critiques.

This review will explore a vast body of literature surrounding these topics, tracing the evolution of cosmological and teleological arguments from their ancient roots to their modern formulations. By considering the theological, philosophical, and scientific dimensions of these arguments, we aim to provide a comprehensive overview of this fascinating and enduring area of human inquiry. In doing so, we hope to illuminate not only the arguments themselves but also the broader questions they raise about the nature of existence, the limits of human knowledge, and the relationship between science and religion in our quest to understand the cosmos and the place of God in it if there is one

Dimensions to the Cosmological Arguments

Cosmological arguments have been a cornerstone of natural theology for centuries, attempting to prove the existence of God through reason and observation of the universe. These arguments, in their various forms, seek to demonstrate that the existence and nature of the cosmos necessitate the existence of a divine creator. While primarily philosophical in nature, cosmological arguments embody theological implications, shaping our understanding of God's existence, his nature, his act of creation, and the relationship between the divine and the physical universe.

The foundations of cosmological arguments can be traced to ancient Greek philosophy. Zeyl & Sattler (2022) espouses that Plato in his dialogue "Timaeus," introduced the concept of a divine craftsman or "Demiurge" who shaped the universe according to eternal forms. While not a formal cosmological argument, this idea laid groundwork for later thinkers. Aristotle (384-322 BCE) made more direct contributions in his "Metaphysics" where he argued for an "Unmoved Mover" as the first cause of all motion in the universe:

"There is therefore also something which moves it. And since that which moves and is moved is intermediate, there is something which moves without being moved, being eternal, substance, and actuality." (Aristotle, Metaphysics, 12.7)

These became foundational for later cosmological arguments. To be expanded upon by medieval philosophers and theologians across the Abrahamic traditions. In the Islamic world, Craig (1979) suggests that scholars like Al-Kindi and Al-Ghazali developed sophisticated arguments for God's existence based on the contingency of the universe. Jewish philosophers such as Maimonides incorporated Aristotelian concepts into their theological frameworks, arguing for a necessary being as the ultimate cause of existence (See skin, 2005).

In the Christian tradition, Thomas Aquinas famously presented five ways to prove God's existence, three of which are variations of the cosmological argument. His arguments from motion, causation, and contingency influenced Western theological thought. However, during the Enlightenment, two of the most enduring formulations of the cosmological argument took shape: the Leibnizian argument from contingency and the Kalam argument, which was revived and refined in the 20th century.

This discussion will explore the dimensions of cosmological arguments, focusing particularly on the formulations of Leibnizian and Kalam. We will examine how these arguments have evolved, their key premises and conclusions, and the theological insights they offer. Additionally, we will consider criticisms of these arguments and their contemporary relevance in both philosophical and scientific contexts.

Theological Dimensions to the Cosmological Arguments

Leibniz Cosmological Argument

Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, a 17th-century polymath, developed a cosmological argument based on the principle of sufficient reason. This principle states that for every fact or truth, there must be an explanation for why it is so and not otherwise (Leibniz, 1991)Leibniz's argument is summarized as follows:

Every existing thing has an explanation of its existence, either in the necessity of its own nature or in an external cause.

1. The universe (the collection of all contingent things) exists.
2. If the universe has an explanation of its existence, that explanation is God.
3. The universe does not exist by necessity.
4. Therefore, regarding the explanation of the universe's existence, it is God.

In his "Monadology," Leibniz states:

"Now this sufficient reason for the existence of the universe... which has no need of any other reason... must be outside this series of contingent things and must be in a substance which... a necessary being is bearing the reason for its existence within itself." (Leibniz, 1714)

Look (2020) states that this principle of sufficient reason (PSR) became central to Leibniz's cosmological argument and while this principle has been influential in philosophy it is not universally accepted. Pruss (2006) affirms that some philosophers argue that it leads to an infinite regress or that some facts might be brute facts without further explanation. However, he goes on to say that the PSR, properly understood, leads to the existence of a necessary being that explains the existence of all contingent things"

This argument has significant theological implications. It posits God as a necessary being, existing by the necessity of His nature, in contrast to the contingent universe. Morris (1991) explains that this conception of God aligns with classical theism's view of divine aseity – the idea that God is self-existent and not dependent on anything else.

Kalam Cosmological Argument

1. The Kalam cosmological argument, with roots in medieval Islamic philosophy, gained renewed attention through the work of philosopher William Lane Craig. The argument is structured as follows:
2. Whatever begins to exist has a cause.
3. The universe began to exist.
4. Therefore, the universe has a cause.

This cause, Kalam argues, must be timeless, spaceless, immaterial, and incredibly powerful attributes traditionally associated with God (Craig, 1979). It also delineates certain aspects regarding the nature of creation and God's relationship to time. It suggests a finite past for the universe, supporting the doctrine of creation ex nihilo (creation out of nothing). Craig and Sinclair (2009) agree that allows questions about God's temporality and the nature of divine action in bringing the universe into existence.

The Leibnizian and Kalam cosmological arguments, while primarily philosophical in nature, carry theological implications that shape our understanding of God's essence and relationship to the universe. Swinburne (2004) argues that both arguments point to a being with specific attributes. The Kalam argument, in positing a cause for the universe, implies a being that is timeless (at least without the universe), spaceless, immaterial, and incredibly powerful. These attributes correspond to the traditional divine qualities of immortality, omnipresence, and omnipotence.

The Kalam argument, which supports the doctrine of creation ex nihilo aligns with the Abrahamic concept of divine creation as an act of bringing something into existence that previously did not exist, (Copan and Craig, 2004) raising questions about God's relationship to time. If God caused the universe to begin, and time is a property of the universe, then God must in some sense transcend time. This has led to theological discussions about divine temporality versus a-temporality (Ganssle, 2001).

Leftow (2012) also contends that the Leibnizian argument emphasises the contingency of the universe, implying that God's act of creation was free rather than necessary. This supports the theological notion of God's freedom in creation, an important aspect of many theistic traditions.

Criticisms

Critics of the Leibnizian argument often focus on the fourth premise. They argue that even if the universe requires an explanation, it doesn't necessarily follow that this explanation must be God. Alternative explanations, such as a multiverse theory or a self-causing universe, have been proposed, (Oppy, 2006) such as the theory of evolution which rests on the irrelevance and impracticality of a creator. this evident from the arguments as the premises show do not necessarily result to their conclusions.

Critics also argue that these arguments merely push the question of origin back one step. If everything needs a cause, what caused God? Proponents respond that God, as a necessary being (Leibniz) or as eternal (Kalam), doesn't require a cause (Pruss, 2006). While this is often reiterated by Christian apologetics, it's seen as

The theological dimensions of these arguments are, shapes my religious doctrines, hence conforming to the beliefs of the act of creation, and the relationship between the divine and the physical universe, providing a framework for understanding God as a necessary, powerful, and transcendent being, while also raising intriguing questions about divine action, temporality, and freedom.

Philosophical Dimensions to the Cosmological Argument

At their core, cosmological arguments rely on certain logical structures and metaphysical assumptions. Leibniz argued that the Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR) applies not just to events within the universe, but to the existence of the universe itself (Rocca, 2010)

Leibniz cosmological argument highlights these philosophical implications:

Necessary vs. Contingent Existence: The argument introduces a crucial distinction between necessary and contingent existence. It suggests that while the universe is contingent (it could have failed to exist), its ultimate explanation must be a necessary being (Reichenbach, 2021). Plantinga (1974) argues that this also raises questions about the nature of necessity and whether it's coherent to speak of a necessary being.

Nature of Explanation: The argument raises questions about what constitutes a sufficient explanation. Pruss (2006) questions whether it challenges us to consider if causal explanations are the only valid form of explanation, or if there might be non-causal explanations for existence.

Limits of Reason: By applying the PSR to the universe as a whole, the argument pushes the boundaries of reason and explanation. It asks whether our demand for explanations can legitimately extend beyond the physical universe (Van Inwagen, 1983).

The Nature of Causality: The concept of causality is central to cosmological arguments. However, philosophers have debated the nature of causality itself. David Hume famously questioned our ability to perceive causal relationships, arguing that we only observe constant conjunction, not causation itself.

The Kalam Cosmological Argument, with roots in medieval Islamic philosophy, gained renewed attention in contemporary philosophy through the work of William Lane Craig. The seemingly deceptively simple syllogism it employs, is philosophical significant. The first premise relies on the principle of causality, a fundamental concept in metaphysics. It asserts that ex nihilo nihil fit – nothing comes from nothing. Smith (2007)asserts that this principle has been a cornerstone of philosophical and scientific thinking, although it has faced challenges in light of quantum mechanics.

The second premise is where much of the philosophical debate centres. It combines metaphysical arguments against the possibility of an actual infinite with scientific evidence for the beginning of the universe. Philosophically, it draws on paradoxes of infinity, such as Hilbert's Hotel, to argue that an infinite temporal regress is impossible (Craig and Sinclair, 2009) A few of the implications are highlighted below;

The Nature of Time: If the universe had a beginning, it implies that time itself had a beginning. This challenges our intuitive understanding of time and about the nature of temporality (Morriston, 2003). Nonetheless, this does not truly prove that time has a beginning, as many of Eastern religions and Philosophies have notions around the eternal nature of time.

Causality and a First Cause: a first cause that was itself not caused and one that transcends the physical universe. Oppy (2006) observes that there has been philosophical speculation about the nature of this cause and whether it must possess certain attributes traditionally associated with God. This is also the baseline for Thomas Aquinas's Second Way.

Limits of Scientific Explanation: By arguing for a cause outside the physical universe, the Kalam argument suggests limits to scientific explanation, touching on the demarcation problem philosophically. These limits suggest that there was a time before the beginning of the universe which science posits at 13.5 billion ago which came from a big bang, but did the big bang come from nothing or did it have a cause. Furthermore, even now, there are time periods, for which very little scientific evidence is available.

While the Kalam and Leibnizian arguments aim to establish the existence of God, they differ in their approach and philosophical foundations.

Temporal vs. Logical Priority: The Kalam argument focuses on temporal causation, arguing that the universe had a beginning in time. In contrast, the Leibnizian argument is concerned with logical or metaphysical priority, seeking an explanation for the universe's existence regardless of whether it had a temporal beginning (Pruss, 2006).

Empirical vs. A Priori Reasoning: The Kalam argument incorporates empirical evidence, particularly from particularly from cosmology, to support its second premise. The Leibnizian argument, Gale & Pruss (1999) argument, relies heavily on a priori reasoning and metaphysical principles like the PSR

Nature of Divine Causality: The Kalam argument implies a temporal creation, suggesting God as a first cause in time. The Leibnizian argument, by contrast, allows for the possibility of an eternal universe sustained by a necessary being, emphasizing explanatory rather than temporal priority (Craig and Sinclair, 2009).

Metaphysics of Modality: Both Kalam and Leibniz arguments have spurred ongoing debates about the nature of necessity and possibility, contributing to developments in modal logic and possible world semantics (Plantinga,1974).

Criticisms

Both of these arguments have been subject to diverse scientific and philosophical scrutiny. One of the major problems associated with it is the problem of Infinite Regress. Critics argue that both arguments merely push the question of origin or explanation back one step. If everything needs a cause or explanation, what caused or explains God? Defenders respond that God, as a necessary being, doesn't require an external explanation. Cosmological arguments often rely on the concept of explanation, but what constitutes a satisfactory explanation is itself a philosophical question. Dawkins (2006) argue that pointing to God as the ultimate explanation merely pushes the question back one step without truly explaining anything.

A crucial area that has subjected these arguments to scrutiny is that of Quantum Mechanics and Causality. Physicists have argued that quantum events appear to occur without cause, challenging the Kalam argument's first premise. However, defenders contend that quantum events still have probabilistic causes and occur within a pre-existing framework or quantum vacuum (Smith, 2007).

Furthermore, the jump to Theism, from these arguments have opened it to a wide range of scrutiny, as opponents have queried how theism can be proven from these arguments. Critics have argued that even if one accepts the logic of cosmological arguments up to the point of a first cause or necessary by identifying this cause or being with theism still requires a philosophical leap. Oppy (2006) argued that the properties typically attributed to God (omniscience, omnipotence, benevolence) do not necessarily follow from the conclusion of cosmological arguments.

In conclusion, these arguments have continuously been debated and often improvised for current debates in philosophy. The question, however, is open-ended: Can these arguments truly be proven or disproven?

Scientific Dimensions to the Cosmological Argument

The cosmological arguments proposed by Leibniz and Kalam, though rooted in philosophical reasoning, have become increasingly entangled with scientific inquiry. As our understanding of the universe has expanded through advancements in physics, cosmology, and related disciplines, these age-old philosophical contentions have gained new dimensions and faced novel challenges. This exploration will delve into the scientific aspects of these arguments, illuminating how modern scientific discoveries and theories have both bolstered and contested their premises. We will examine the dynamic interplay between these philosophical constructs and contemporary scientific thought, considering how each has influenced and shaped the other.

Leibniz's Cosmological Argument: Scientific Dimensions

Leibniz's argument, based on the Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR), posits that there must be an explanation for why the universe exists rather than not existing. While this is primarily a philosophical principle. Today, these arguments have reined in some interesting scientific implications. They include;

Quantum Mechanics and Determinism: The PSR seems to imply a deterministic universe, where every state has a sufficient explanation in prior states. However, quantum mechanics introduces apparent indeterminism at the subatomic level. The Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics suggests that some events occur without a deterministic cause (Heisenberg, 1958). This presents a challenge to Leibniz's argument. However, some interpretations of quantum mechanics, such as the de Broglie-Bohm theory, maintain determinism at a deeper level (Bohm, 1952). Furthermore, Bell (1964) argue that the phenomenon of quantum entanglement raises questions about the nature of causality and locality that complicate simple cause-and-effect reasoning.

The debate continues, with implications for how we understand causality and explanation in the physical world.

Multiverse Theories: Modern cosmological models now include string theory and eternal inflation, which propose the existence of multiple universes (Greene, 2011). This concept of a "multiverse" could be seen as an attempt to provide a sufficient reason for our universe's particular properties.

However, critics argue that pushing the explanation to a multiverse merely shifts the question: what explains the multiverse itself? This echoes Leibniz's concern with ultimate explanations. The multiverse hypothesis is sometimes proposed as an alternative explanation for our universe's existence. However, proponents of cosmological arguments suggest that a multiverse would itself require explanation, potentially strengthening the case for a necessary being (Collins, 2009). Carr (2007) espouses that they potentially provide alternative explanations for the fine-tuning of our universe, which is sometimes used in conjunction with Leibniz cosmological arguments. Again, raising questions about what we mean by "the universe" in cosmological arguments – does it refer to our observable universe, or the entire multiverse (Ellis, 2011)

Entropy as an Arrow of Time: The second law of thermodynamics, which states that the entropy of an isolated system always increases over time, provides a scientific basis for the "arrow of time." (Eddington, 1928) This law gives a direction to physical processes, potentially supporting Leibniz's idea that there are reasons why things are one way rather than another. However, the low entropy state of the early universe remains a puzzle. Some physicists, like Roger Penrose (2010) proposed explanations involving cyclic models of the universe, which could be seen as attempts to provide a sufficient reason for this initial state.

Overall, Leibniz cosmological argument has been adapted for today's world built on scientific understanding of these arguments and their implications for arguments for the existence of God.

Kalam's Cosmological Arguments: Scientific Dimensions

The Big Bang Cosmology: The development of Big Bang theory in the 20th century had a significant impact on cosmological arguments. Proponents of these arguments, particularly the Kalam Cosmological Argument, saw the Big Bang theory as scientific support for the idea that the universe had a beginning, aligning with the second premise of many cosmological arguments.

However, this interpretation is not without controversy given the nature of the Big Bang. Hawkins and Mlodinow (2010) argue that the Big Bang represents the limit of our current understanding, not necessarily the absolute beginning of the universe. Scientific understanding of time, particularly in relation to general relativity, has implications for cosmological arguments. The idea that time itself began with the Big Bang complicates notions of causality that assume a temporal sequence (Hawkins,1988).

Quantum Vacuum Fluctuations: Some models of quantum cosmology suggest the possibility of the universe arising from quantum fluctuations, potentially challenging the idea that "nothing can produce "something". (Krause, 2012). Quantum field theory suggests that even in a vacuum, particles can spontaneously come into existence due to quantum fluctuations. Some physicists, like Lawrence Krauss (2012) have argued that this might provide a mechanism for the universe to come into existence from "nothing". This challenges the Kalam argument's first premise that everything that begins to exist has a cause. However, critics point out that the quantum vacuum is not truly "nothing" in the philosophical sense, as it still represents a physical system with properties governed by quantum laws.

Cosmic Inflation: The theory of cosmic inflation, proposed by Alan Guth in 1980, suggests that the universe underwent a period of rapid expansion in its very early stages. This theory helps explain the uniformity of the cosmic microwave background and the flatness of space (Guth, 1981). While inflation doesn't necessarily contradict the Kalam argument, it does complicate the picture of the universe's early moments. Vilenkin (2006) argues that some models of eternal inflation suggest that our observable universe might be part of a larger, possibly eternal, inflationary space.

Borde-Guth-Vilenkin Theorem: In 2003, Arvind Borde, Alan Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin brought forth a theorem suggesting that any universe which has, on average, been expanding throughout its history cannot be eternal in the past but must have a past boundary . This theorem has been used to support the Kalam argument's premise that the universe began to exist. However, the theorem relies on classical general relativity and doesn't account for potential quantum gravitational effects. Ashtekar et al. (2006) also argue that quantum effects might allow for the avoidance of an initial singularity.

We must however, be reminded that there are limitations to science especially what we know of the universe. Both arguments touch areas at the limits of current scientific knowledge, such as the nature of time before the Big Bang or the ultimate origin of physical laws. Again, the application of scientific concepts to these philosophical arguments often involves interpretation and extrapolation beyond what the science directly states. Finally, as scientific knowledge advances, the specifics of how these arguments engage with science continue to evolve, demonstrating the dynamic nature of the dialogue between philosophy and

In conclusion, cosmological arguments, particularly in their Leibnizian and Kalam formulations, continue to exert significant influence in philosophical theology. While not without criticisms, these arguments offer a rational approach to theistic belief that engages with both ancient philosophical questions and contemporary scientific understanding. These arguments serve not only as attempts to prove God's existence but also as frameworks for exploring the limits of human knowledge and the relationship between scientific and metaphysical explanations of reality.

Dimensions to the Teleological Arguments

Teleological arguments, also known as arguments from design, have been a cornerstone of natural theology for centuries. These arguments attempt to prove the existence of God by pointing to evidence of design or purpose in nature. Two notable proponents of teleological arguments are William Paley (1743-1805) and Michael Behe (1949-present). While separated by two centuries, their arguments share similar structures but differ in their specifics due to advancements in scientific understanding. This discussion will explore Paley's watchmaker analogy and Behe's concept of irreducible complexity, examining their arguments and the theological, philosophical and scientific implications they entail.

Theological Dimensions to the Teleological Arguments William Paley's Watchmaker Analogy

William Paley presented his teleological argument in his 1802 work "Natural Theology." The crux of his argument is the famous watchmaker analogy, which may be summarized as follows:

1. If we find a watch in a field, we would naturally conclude it was designed by a watchmaker due to its complexity and apparent purpose.
2. The natural world exhibits complexity and apparent purpose far greater than that of a watch.
3. Therefore, the natural world must also have a designer, and this designer is God (Paley, 1802)

Paley argued that just as the intricate mechanisms of a watch imply the existence of an intelligent watchmaker, the complex structures and systems in nature imply the existence of an intelligent Creator. McGrath (2011) agrees with Paley that the there is a God of supreme intelligence, capable of designing the intricate systems observed in nature. This aligns with the traditional theistic conception of an omniscient deity. Paley's analogy portrays God as a divine craftsman or engineer, carefully designing each aspect of creation. Ratzsch (2001) states that while this image resonates with the Christian concept of God as Creator it may conflict with other theological views that emphasize God's transcendence.

Michael Behe's Irreducible Complexity

Michael Behe, a biochemist, introduced the concept of irreducible complexity in his 1996 book "Darwin's Black Box." His argument may be summarized as follows:

1. Some biological systems are irreducibly complex, meaning they consist of several interacting parts, all of which are necessary for the system to function.

2. Such systems could not have evolved gradually through natural selection, as the intermediate stages would not be functional.
3. Therefore, irreducibly complex systems must have been designed by an intelligent agent (Behe,1996).

Behe continues by using examples like the bacterial flagellum and the blood-clotting cascade to illustrate his concept of irreducible complexity, espousing that their intricacies cannot be random as it clearly shows the presence of design and by inference a designer.

Behe's argument, while more focused on biological systems, have been clearly adapted for its theological implications.

Behe's work has become a cornerstone of the Intelligent Design movement, which seeks to find scientific evidence for a designer. This movement has theological implications, as it attempts to bridge science and faith in a way that some view as problematic (Numbers, 2006). Behe's argument also challenges the principle of methodological naturalism in science, which excludes supernatural explanations. This further increases the contentious relationship between science and theology.

Criticisms

God of the Gaps: Critics argue that Behe's argument falls into the "God of the gaps" fallacy, invoking divine intervention to explain current gaps in scientific understanding. This raises questions about how we understand God's role in relation to scientific knowledge. Behe's argument could imply a God who intervenes at specific points in evolutionary history to create complex biological systems. Miller (1999) highlights that this has implications for how we understand divine action in the world, as some theologians express discontent that these arguments reduce God to a mere designer or engineer, potentially limiting divine attributes like omnipotence and transcendence.

Both arguments have faced significant criticism especially since the dawn of Darwin's theory of evolution. Dawkins (1986) argues that Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection provides a naturalistic explanation for the complexity and apparent design in nature, challenging both Paley's and Behe's arguments.

Gould (1980) also points out that there are flaws in the design of the world. He continues by pointing out imperfections in biological systems, arguing that these are more consistent with evolution than with intelligent design. Again, as scientific understanding advances, phenomena once thought to be irreducibly complex are often explained through natural processes, potentially relegating the designer to an ever-shrinking domain (Miller, 1999).

The teleological arguments of Paley and Behe represent significant attempts to infer the existence of God from the apparent design in nature. While they share a standard structure, their differences reflect the evolving relationship between science and theology over the past two centuries.

Philosophical Dimensions to the Teleological Arguments

Paley's and Behe's Teleological arguments have been discussed and debated, adding to the philosophical discourses on the existence of God. However, it is essential to remember that Behe's argument is scientific in nature, rather than philosophical, like most proofs for the existence of God. We shall examine the philosophical dimensions of both arguments

Paley's argument addresses multiple philosophical notions and simultaneously raises important questions.Paley's use of analogy as an argument is a subject of philosophical interest. The argument relies on inductive reasoning, extrapolating from human design to cosmic design. The strength of his argument depends on the validity of comparing natural objects to human artefacts. The arguments receive a serious rebuttal from David Hume, as he claims that the world could not be compared to a watch (Hume, 2007). However, analogies have been used to express arguments throughout history. Lipton (2004) opines that Paley arguments can be seen as an early example of inference to the best explanation, a form of inductive reasoning that has been widely discussed in philosophy of science, however we may ask the question of whether it is plausible in

determining the existence of God. This leads to question of what constitutes complexity and how we can objectively measure or identify it. Contrarily, the question should be if we truly see convolution in the world. This answer will be yes. Our constant acts of unravelling nature's laws and secrets, have shown several complexities in nature. Consequently, this leads us to the purpose of the watch. Paley's argument assumes that the appearance of purpose implies actual purpose or does it not? Is there purpose to nature? The seemingly appearance of orderly events and sometimes randomness, questions how much telos exists in the universe and, by extension, whether it was orchestrated by a designer.

While Behe's argument is more focused on biological systems, it can be viewed through the following philosophical lenses and raises philosophical problems within biological science.Van Fraassen (1980) notes that Behe's argument raises questions about what constitutes a satisfactory scientific explanation, touching on longstanding debates in philosophy of science. However, the question remains that there exist certain things in science and nature that show craftsmanship, while biology heavily denies this in some parts of nature, quoting randomness, Behe's argument and examples such as the bacterial flagellum and its uses and structure, point to this. This brings us to the questions surrounding the boundary between science and non-science, relating to the philosophical demarcation problem (Popper, 1956). The arguments focusing on the irreducibility of certain systems touches on the philosophical debate between reductionist and holistic approaches to understanding biological phenomena (Ayala,1974). Behe's argument also raises philosophical discussions on the subject of emergence; whether complex systems can arise from simpler components in ways that are not immediately predictable directly questioning whether purely naturalistic explanations can account for all phenomena, a key issue in philosophy of science and metaphysics.

Criticisms and Philosophical Challenges

Both Paley's and Behe's arguments have faced significant philosophical challenges:

Primary to the criticisms, is the Problem of Evil. If a benevolent God designed the world, how do we account for apparent imperfections and suffering? This is a longstanding problem in the field of Philosophy of Religion of evil. It can be noted that Behe's argument is more agnostic about the nature of the designer, reflecting a shift towards methodological naturalism in science, instead the usual theistic conceptions of God.

Carter (1974) espouses in his work that some scientists and philosophers agree that the apparent fine-tuning of the universe for life can be explained by the weak anthropic principle, without recourse to a designer. The development of evolutionary theory and other scientific explanations challenges the need for a design inference, relating to philosophical discussions about parsimony and Occam's razor (Sober, 2015). However, according to Ratczh (2001) these arguments prompt us to consider what we mean by "design" and whether this concept can be meaningfully applied to natural phenomena.

Again, Dawkins (1986) raises the question of infinite regression. If complex systems require a designer, wouldn't the designer itself be complex and thus require explanation? This leads to potential infinite regress. Salmon (1964) contends that both arguments potentially commit the fallacy of composition by inferring properties of the whole (the universe) from properties of its parts. They raise questions about the extent to which human reason can comprehend and make inferences about the origin and nature of the universe. These arguments contribute to ongoing debates about the rationality of religious belief and the role of evidence in supporting such beliefs.

In conclusion, the teleological arguments of Paley and Behe represent significant attempts to infer the existence of a designer from observations of the natural world. While they share a common structure, their differences reflect the evolving relationship between philosophy, theology, and science over the past two centuries. Expanding on fundamental philosophical questions about the existence of God, the limits of human reason, the relationship between complexity and design, and the boundaries of scientific inquiry. They challenge us to consider how we interpret the order we observe in the universe and what inferences we can justifiably draw from this order.

Scientific Dimensions to the Teleological Argument.

Teleological arguments, which infer the existence of a designer from apparent design in nature, have long intersected with scientific understanding. This discussion will explore the scientific dimensions of two prominent teleological arguments: William Paley's watchmaker analogy and Michael Behe's concept of irreducible complexity. We will briefly examine how these arguments engage with scientific concepts, how they've been influenced by scientific progress, and how they've been evaluated from a scientific perspective.

William Paley's Watchmaker Analogy: Scientific Dimensions

William Paley watchmaker analogy foreshadowed significant scientific advancement. The scientific context of Paley's era is crucial to understanding his argument:

Newtonian Mechanics: Paley's time was dominated by Newtonian physics, which presented a mechanistic view of the universe. This worldview aligned well with Paley's analogy of the universe as a complex mechanism.

Geology: The emerging field of geology was beginning to reveal Earth's ancient history, challenging traditional biblical chronology. Rudwick (2005) notes that, the concept of deep time also seemed to allow for gradual, divinely guided processes of change.

Biological Classification: The work of Carl Linnaeus in taxonomy had revealed intricate hierarchies in nature, which Paley saw as evidence of divine design, (Ruse,1999) propelling his arguments to be framed up in a manner of universal complexity.

Consequently, Paley's argument makes several implicit scientific claims which is evident in the argument. Paley argues that intricate, interrelated systems in nature are analogous to human-made machines, implying that complexity is a reliable indicator of design. Hence, involution and purpose are evidence of design in the universe, and therefore a designer. Paley goes on to argue that natural structures appear to serve specific purposes, emphasising the integrated functionality of biological systems, an observation that remains central to modern a claim that relates to ongoing debates about teleology in biology (Ariew, 2007) Paley's argument faced significant scientific challenges when initially received:

Evolutionary Theory: The arrival of Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection provided a naturalistic explanation for the complexity and apparent design in living organisms (Darwin, 1859). This theory directly challenged Paley's design inference. However, Paley's work predates Darwin and thus we may not infer his objections.

Imperfect or Obsolete Design: Scientists began to recognize numerous examples of seemingly suboptimal design in nature, such as the recurrent laryngeal nerve in giraffes, which is difficult to explain under a model of intelligent design (Dawkins, 1986). Wiedersheim (1895) asserts that the discovery of vestigial structures in organisms, such as the human appendix or whale pelvis, challenged the notion of perfect design. However, an imperfection in design does not spell the absence of a designer. Although, it does not truly characterize the theistic concept of God, they insist on his perfection in creation.

Michael Behe's Irreducible Complexity: Scientific Dimensions

Michael Behe Situated his argument within the context of modern biology, focusing on molecular and cellular systems. This shift since Paley's argument reflects the advancement of biological knowledge over two centuries.Central to the development of his argument is the revolution of Molecular Biology. Alberts et al (2002) affirms that Behe's argument emerged during a period of rapid advancement in our understanding of cellular and molecular processes. The emerging field of systems biology, which studies complex interactions within biological systems, provides a backdrop for Behe's focus on integrated cellular systems (Kitano, 2002). His argument directly challenged the neo-Darwinian model of evolution, which combines Darwin's theory with modern genetics.

Behe's argument mainly highlights the following implications on its scientific claims:

Irreducible Complexity and Scientific Data: Behe argues that certain biological systems, such as the bacterial flagellum, are "irreducibly complex," meaning they require all of their parts to function (Behe, 1996). This claim challenges the gradualist models of evolution, with some stressing that many of these parts are no longer useful, hence, they evolved for function they may no longer need to carry out. Behe's argument makes more specific, testable claims about biological systems, reflecting the increased emphasis on empirical testing in modern science. Behe's argument relies heavily on specific scientific findings in molecular biology. The holistic approach of systems biology, while not directly supporting design arguments, has highlighted the intricate interrelationships within biological systems that fascinated both Behe and his concept of a designer may be inferred.

Limits of Random Mutation and Natural Selection: Behe's work directly engages with and challenges modern evolutionary theory, reflecting the central role of evolution in contemporary biology (Pennock, 2001) Behe (2007) contends that random mutation and natural selection are insufficient to explain the origin of irreducibly complex systems, implying limits to the explanatory power of evolutionary theory. Behe proposes that there is an "edge" to what evolutionary processes can accomplish, suggesting a boundary to the explanatory scope of evolutionary theory. Due to this he insists that science and evolutionary biology cannot rule out the place of an intelligent designer.

Criticisms

Evolutionary Pathways: Scientists have proposed and demonstrated potential evolutionary pathways for systems Behe claims are irreducibly complex. For example, Pallen & Matzke (2006) point out that research on the evolution of the bacterial flagellum has shown how it could have developed from simpler precursor systems. Miller (1999) also argue that Behe's definition of irreducible complexity is flawed, as systems can evolve through stages where they perform their functions less efficiently. The field of evolutionary development also known as evo-devo has provided new insights into how complex structures can evolve through changes in developmental processes, addressing some of the challenges raised by teleological arguments (Carroll, 2005). The concepts of co-option (where a structure evolved for one purpose is recruited for another) and exaptation (where a structure gains a new function) provide mechanisms for the gradual evolution of complex systems. (Gould and Vrba, 1982). All these scientists theorise, eliminate the need for an intelligent designer, refuting Behe's arguments.

Protein Evolution: Research in protein evolution has shown how complex molecular machines can evolve through incremental steps, challenging Behe's claims about the limits of evolutionary processes. Kauffman (1993) also argues that the advances in complexity theory and self-organization have provided new perspectives on how complex systems can arise without top-down design, thereby de-emphasizing the need for an intelligent designer.

CONCLUSION

The teleological arguments of Paley and Behe continues to raise important issues in the philosophy of science. Primary among them is the question on whether and when design inferences are appropriate in scientific reasoning. As some point out, that science and philosophy are distinct fields and thus the boundaries are blurred with arguments that raise concerns in both fields. Another point to note is the implicit challenge of the principle of methodological naturalism in science. Both arguments challenge this methodology, as Behe emphasised that it is not objective to assume that biological systems only exude randomness, when several examples of design are featured throughout nature.

The teleological arguments of Paley and Behe, while the former is primarily philosophical in nature, the latter engages deeply with scientific concepts and findings. Their evolution from Paley to Behe reflects the tremendous advancement of biological knowledge, particularly in biology and biochemistry over the centuries and thus the evolution of arguments for the existence of God.

In conclusion, the persistence of these arguments also highlights the ongoing challenge of reconciling the appearance of design in nature with naturalistic explanations. As our scientific understanding continues to advance, it's likely that new forms of teleological arguments will emerge, continuing this long-standing dialogue between design-based and naturalistic understandings of the cosmos.

REFERENCES

1. Ariew, 2007. Teleology. In D. L. Hull & M. Ruse (Eds.), The Cambridge Companion to the Philosophy of Biology, Cambridge University Press, 160-181
2. Ashtekar, T. Pawlowski, & P. Singh, 2006. Quantum Nature of the Big Bang. Physical Review Letters, 96(14), 141301.
3. Borde, A. H. Goth, & A. Vilenkin, 2003. Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions. Physical Review Letters, 90(15), 151301.
4. E. McGrath, 2011. Darwinism and the Divine: Evolutionary Thought and Natural Theology. Wiley-Blackwell
5. H. Guth, 1981. Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems. Physical Review D, 23(2), 347-356.
6. Plantinga, 1974. The Nature of Necessity. Oxford University Press
7. Plantinga, 2000. Warranted Christian Belief. Oxford University Press.
8. Plantinga, 2011. Where the conflict really lies: Science, religion, and naturalism. Oxford University Press.
9. R. Pruss, 2006. The Principle of Sufficient Reason: A Reassessment. Cambridge University Press.
10. S. Eddington, 1928. The Nature of the Physical World. Cambridge University Press.
11. Vilenkin, 2006. Many Worlds in One: The Search for Other Universes. Hill and Wang.
12. Aristotle. c. 350 BCE. Metaphysics. 12.7, 1072, 25-27
13. Alberts, A. Johnson, J. Lewis, M. Raff, K. Roberts & P. Walter, 2002 Molecular Biology of the Cell (4th ed.). Garland Science.
14. C. Look, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2020.
15. C. Van Fraassen, 1980. The Scientific Image. Oxford University Press.
16. Carr, (Ed.). 2007. Universe or multiverse? Cambridge University Press.
17. Carter, Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology. In M. S. Longair (Ed.), Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data, Reidel, 1974, 291-298
18. Greene, 2011. The Hidden Reality: Parallel Universes and the Deep Laws of the Cosmos. Vintage.
19. Leftow, 2012. God and Necessity. Oxford University Press.
20. Reichenbach, 2021. Cosmological Argument. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Stanford University
21. Darwin, 1859. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection. John Murray.
22. Shields, 2020. Aristotle. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
23. Bohm, 1952. A Suggested Interpretation of the Quantum Theory in Terms of “Hidden” Variables. I. Physical Review, 85(2), 166-179.
24. Hume, 2007. Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion. Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1779)
25. Ratzsch, & J. Koperski, 2020. Science and Religion. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Stanford University.
26. Ratzsch, 2001. Nature, Design, and Science: The Status of Design in Natural Science. SUNY Press
27. Zeyl, & B. Sattler, 2022. Plato’s Timaeus. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
28. Mayr, 1993. What Was the Evolutionary Synthesis? Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 8(1), 31-34.
29. Sober, 2015. Ockham’s Razors: A User’s Manual. Cambridge University Press.
30. J. Ayala, 1974. Introduction. In F. J. Ayala & T. Dobzhansky (Eds.), Studies in the Philosophy of Biology, Macmillan, Vii-xvi
31. B. Ferngren, 2017. Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction. Johns Hopkins University Press.
32. E. Ganssle, 2001. God and Time: Four Views. InterVarsity Press.

33. F. Ellis, 2011. Does the multiverse really exist? Scientific American, 305(2), 38-43.
34. F. R. Ellis, 2007. Issues in the philosophy of cosmology. In J. Butterfield & J. Earman (Eds.), Philosophy of physics. Elsevier,. 1183-1285
35. Oppy, 2006. Arguing about Gods. Cambridge University Press.
36. W. Leibniz, 1991. Discourse on Metaphysics and Other Essays. (D. Garber & R. Ariew, Trans.). Hackett Publishing Company(Original work published 1686)
37. W. Leibniz, Monadology. 1714, 37-38,
38. Kitano, 2002. Systems Biology: A Brief Overview. Science, 295(5560), 1662-1664.
39. H. Brooke, 1991. Science and religion: Some historical perspectives. Cambridge University Press.
40. S. Bell, 1964. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. Physics Physique Fizika, 1(3), 195.
41. Popper, 1959. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. Hutchinson & Co.
42. K. R. Miller, 1999. Finding Darwin's God: A Scientist's Search for Common Ground between God and Evolution. HarperCollins.
43. K. Seeskin, 2005. Maimonides on the Origin of the World. Cambridge University Press.
44. M. Krauss, 2012. A universe from nothing: Why there is something rather than nothing. Simon and Schuster.
45. Della Rocca, 2010. PSR. Philosophers' Imprint, 10(7), 1-13.
46. M. J. Behe, 1996. Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution. Free Press.
47. M. J. Behe, 2007. The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism. Free Press.
48. M. J. Pallen & N. J. Matzke, 2006. From The Origin of Species to the Origin of Bacterial Flagella. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 4(10), 784-790.
49. M. J. S. Rudwick, 2005. Bursting the Limits of Time: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution. University of Chicago Press.
50. M. Ruse, 1999. The Darwinian Revolution: Science Red in Tooth and Claw. University of Chicago Press.
51. Clayton & P. Davies, (Eds.). 2006. The Re-Emergence of Emergence. Oxford University Press.
52. Copan &, W. L. Craig 2004. Creation out of Nothing: A Biblical, Philosophical, and Scientific Exploration. Baker Academic
53. Davies, 2006. The Goldilocks enigma: Why is the universe just right for life? Allen Lane.
54. P. Lipton, 2004. Inference to the Best Explanation (2nd ed.). Routledge.
55. P. Van Inwagen, 1983. An Essay on Free Will. Oxford University Press.
56. Smith, 2007. Kalam Cosmological Arguments for Atheism. In M. Martin (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Atheism. Cambridge University, 182-198
57. Collins, 2009. The teleological argument: An exploration of the fine-tuning of the universe. In W. L. Craig & J. P. Moreland (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology. Wiley-Blackwell, 202-281
58. R. Dawkins, 1986. The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe without Design. W. W. Norton & Company.
59. R. Dawkins, 2006. The God delusion. Bantam Books.
60. R. L. Numbers, 2006. The Creationists: From Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design. Harvard University Press.
61. R. M. Gale, & A. R. Pruss, 1999. A New Cosmological Argument. Religious Studies, 35(4), 461-476.
62. R. Penrose, 2010. Cycles of Time: An Extraordinary New View of the Universe. Bodley Head.
63. R. Swinburne, 2004. The Existence of God (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
64. R. T. Pennock, 2001. Intelligent Design Creationism and Its Critics: Philosophical, Theological, and Scientific Perspectives. MIT Press.
65. R. Wiedersheim, 1895. The Structure of Man: An Index to His Past History. Macmillan and Co.
66. A. Kauffman, 1993. The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution. Oxford University Press.
67. S. B. Carroll, 2005. Endless Forms Most Beautiful: The New Science of Evo Devo and the Making of the Animal Kingdom. W. W. Norton
68. S. Hawking & L. Mlodinow, 2010. The grand design. Bantam Books
69. S. Hawking, 1988. A brief history of time. Bantam Books.
70. S. J. Gould, 1980. The Panda's Thumb: More Reflections in Natural History. W. W. Norton & Company.

71. S. J. Gould & E. S. Vrba, 1982. Exaptation—a Missing Term in the Science of Form. Paleobiology, 8(1), 4-15.
72. S. Sarkar, 2007. Doubting Darwin? Creationist Designs on Evolution. Blackwell Publishing.
73. V. Morris, 1991. Our Idea of God: An Introduction to Philosophical Theology. InterVarsity Press.
74. C. Salmon, 1967. The Foundations of Scientific Inference. University of Pittsburgh Press.
75. Heisenberg, 1958 Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science. Harper & Brothers.
76. L. Craig & J. D. Sinclair, 2009. The Kalam Cosmological Argument. In W. L. Craig & J. P. Moreland (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology. Wiley-Blackwell, 101-201
77. W. L. Craig, 1979. The Kalam cosmological argument. Macmillan, 1979.
78. W. Morriston, 2003. Must Metaphysical Time Have a Beginning? Faith and Philosophy, 20(3), 288-306.
79. W. Paley, 1802. Natural Theology: or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature. R. Faulder. & Company.