

William Paley, Natural Theology

128-132

Reid Blackman

Finding a watch, we infer a designer (**128**).

- If we suppose the watch can make other watches, we are led with even greater force to conclude the watch was designed (130).
- Our inference is not undermined by noticing that sometimes it does not work perfectly, nor that we do not understand all the parts.

Claim: We cannot explain the workings of the watch by appeal to laws of nature.

Argument:

1. Acting in accordance with a law presupposes that a law is given by an agent.
2. In explaining a phenomenon it is not sufficient to appeal to law.
3. Thus, in explaining the order of the watch, we cannot simply appeal to law (129).

Claim: We cannot claim that the reproducing watches constitute a causal chain reaching backwards infinitely.

Argument:

1. We cannot doubt the watch was designed.
2. Claiming that the series of watches goes back in time infinitely never accounts for a designer.
3. Thus, claiming that the watches go back in time infinitely does not give an explanation for what needs explanation: that the watches were designed (**131**).