**1.Not necessarily designed by God**

* 1. The London Underground
* Who designed it?
* Who maintains it?

**Hume says**

* It is incredibly complex and has been designed
* But God did not design it……
* So if greatly complex things can be designed by things other than God, then a greatly complex universe could be designed by something other than God
  1. Epicurean Hypothesis
* That the world and its apparent design could have been the result of chance.
* *‘It is entirely plausible that the world arose from chance’*
* Epicurus said: at the time of creation the universe consisted of particles in random motion. They were chaotic but gradually over a long time they evolved into an ordered system. Thus apparent design could happen at random if given long enough and does not infer a designer. Modern illustration: is that if an unlimited number of monkey’s were all randomly typewriting for an infinite amount of time they would inevitably eventually write the complete works of Shakespeare.

**2.Poor Analogy**

1.1 Can we really compare a machine to the universe?

* Design arguments rely on an analogy
* If the analogy is weak the argument will be too
* Hume says you cannot compare a man made machine to the universe. They are too different, it would be illogical!

**3.Fallacy of Composition**

* 1. What is true of the part is not necessarily true of the whole
* It is logically incoherent to assume that because we may observe design or apparent design in parts, there must be design for the whole.
* Likewise it is illogical to assume that because you have seen one Mexican with a sombrero, all Mexicans wear Sombreros.
* It is illogical to assume that because you have seen one 17 year old driving that all 17 years old drive cars.
* Thus ‘what is true of the part need not be true of the whole’

**4.Apparent design does not point to the Judeo-Christian God of classical theism**

* 1. Bad Design- Natural disasters, evil and suffering
* Were these designed? Created?
* Or were they things that just ‘went wrong’?

**Hume says**

* Things go wrong in there world. There is suffering and evil.
* If there is design, it is not perfect so this contradicts the God of classical theism
* Or there is no design because if God was the only possible designer, his creation would not be so imperfect as to have so many ‘wrongs’ in it
* ‘nature is ***red in tooth and claw***’ - Highlights either no god or inadequacy of God
  1. Team Building
* How many people does it take to build and create something huge and incredibly complex?
* **Hume says**
* If there is design, it doesn’t mean there is only one God
* There might have been a whole team of Gods, just like a whole team of people are needed to build a house

Summary for criticism four

These points for criticism four maintain that the closer the analogy between design within the world and design of the universe as a whole, the   
more the picture emerges of a God who is dissimilar to the God of Classical Theism (omnipotent, omnibenevolent, omniscient etc). Rather we create an **anthropomorphic God.**

**Anthropomorphism = limiting God to human qualities and attributes**

**5.Universe- Making: Not our experience so cannot say**

1.1 Knowledge comes from experience alone. We cannot know about things we have not experienced

* Our concepts of design are so limited that we cannot apply them to the creation of the world. The fact that a machine needs a designer is part of our experience of being in the world, but we have no experience of making worlds,   
    
   *‘Have worlds ever been formed under your eye?’*
* **Hume is attacking the inductive logic once more. The leap from an observation in this world does not justify a metaphysical conclusion about the creation of the world, of this we have no experience.**
* How could a goldfish in a pond conclude anything about the process of pond making? It has no knowledge of pond making; whether the pond is a natural formation or the work of a clever gardener could not be known by the fish unless it had experience of pond making.