

Analysis of the Errors of Hume and Darwin in the Argument from order

(Based on the reading of John Hospers)

Mohamad Javad Hasanzadeh Mashkani[✉] , Moslem Mohammadi 

Corresponding Author, Department of Islamic Studies, Kashan University of Medical Sciences,
Kashan, Iran E-mail : hasanzadeh-mj@kaums.ac.ir

Department of Shia Studies, Faculty of Theology, College of Farabi, University of Tehran,
Qom, Iran. E-mail : mo.mohammadi@ut.ac.ir

Abstract .

The Argument from Order is the simplest and most general argument that has been presented to prove the existence of God. This argument is composed of two premises. This argument, in Islamic texts, especially theological, has more supporters than other arguments. On the other hand, Western philosophers have questioned the validity of this argument.

Dr. John Hospers, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Full Professor at the University of Southern California, has sought to undermine it by explaining the pillars of this argument.

The research question is to analyze and examine John Hospers' objections to the premises of the Argument from order.

The research method in this article is an original research study, data collection, library studies, and critical analysis of the materials based on the sources available in the works of John Hospers.

According to the findings of the present study, it is clear that Hospers' objections to the premises of the Argument from order do not seem logical and scientific. He also used the foundations of thinkers such as Hume and Darwin for his claim, which is flawed.

Keywords:

Argument from order, orderliness of the world, natural and artificial world, divine and human design, John Hospers.

Problem statement

The argument from design is one of the topics in Islamic theology and serves as evidence for proving the existence of God. This argument has been presented in various formulations, such as the "formulation based on causality" (Gharavian, 1998, p. 80), "formulation based on coherence and interconnectedness of the world's components" (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2004, vol. 1, pp. 33-35), "formulation based on purposiveness" (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2004, vol. 1, p. 47), and "formulation based on the principle of probability" (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2004, vol. 1, p. 51), which are considered among its key versions.

The origins of the argument from design trace back to a time when scholars recognized order in nature and introduced it as evidence for the existence of a creator. This argument has held prominence among Islamic theologians. Thinkers such as Ash'ari (Ash'ari, 1952, p. 21), Ghazali (Ghazali, 1986, Vol. 1, pp. 125–126), and Fakhr Al-Razi (Fakhr Al-Razi, 1990, vol. 31, pp. 139-140) have substantiated the argument from design. However, Islamic philosophers have generally paid less attention to it. For instance, scholars such as Ayatollah Javadi Amoli, in his book *Exposition of the Arguments for Proving God* have raised several objections against this argument, questioning its validity as a definitive proof. (Javadi Amoli, 2009, pp. 227–243.)

In Western philosophy, the history of the Argument from order goes back to ancient Greece and Plato's *Timaeus*. In the Middle Ages, the last of Thomas Aquinas's five arguments is this Argument from order. (Hallingdal, 2008, p. 159 – 160.) In recent times, we find one of the most famous speeches of argument in the book *Natural Theology* by William Paley. (Barbour, 1983, pp. 104–111) Other philosophers who defended this argument after Paley were F. R. Tennant, Swinburne, John Brough, and Frank J. Tipler, who presented a new version of the argument. In contrast, there are people like Hume, Kant, Dawkins, and Voltaire.

David Hume, the Scottish philosopher, can be regarded as one of the most prominent critics of this argument. In his book *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* he presents five objections to it (Hick, 2008, p. 128). Similarly, Immanuel Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason* (Kant, 1992, p. 981) and Voltaire (Warburton, 2007, pp. 30-33) have also questioned the validity of this argument. In contrast, both Muslim and non-Muslim thinkers have responded to these criticisms. For instance, Morteza Motahhari addresses Hume's objections in his book *The Causes of Materialist Inclinations*. (Motahhari, 2009, vol. 1, p. 550).

Jan Hospers, following in the footsteps of his predecessors, rejects the argument from design. He believes that in this argument, natural creations are compared to human-made artifacts. Moreover, he argues that order is an intrinsic property of matter, not the result of an external cause. Additionally, the argument from design is compatible with the existence of multiple gods or designers, and it fails to justify the presence of evil despite the existence from order and a designer.

The necessity and reason for selecting John Hospers among other Western thinkers lie in his controversial and challenging nature, as well as his theories among atheists. His key and fundamental ideas are presented in his works. Another notable aspect is his clear and straightforward style of expression. His book, *The Philosophy of Religion* was used as a textbook for many years in Europe and America. Until his passing, he was a distinguished professor emeritus of philosophy at the University of Southern California. Additionally, the lack of a comprehensive book dedicated to exploring his works and thoughts is another reason for this choice.

This article examines John Hospers' arguments based on his renowned books *The Philosophy of Religion* and *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis* through a rational-philosophical approach.

مقاله
پژوهشی
فلسفه
مستند

Expounding Hume and Darwin's Perspective on the Argument from Design

The essence of Hospers' critique in the phrase "order is not the result of design" can be summarized as an argument previously proposed by Hume in his book *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*. Additionally, Hospers draws on Darwin's theory to support his claim. It is necessary here to briefly outline the perspectives of Hume and Darwin.

A) Hume's Theory

The history of the argument from design dates back to the second half of the eighteenth century. The first thinker to cast doubt on it was David Hume. In his book *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, Hume presented six objections to the argument from design. This book is written in the form of an imaginary dialogue among three characters named Cleanthes, Philo, and Demea. The dialogue is narrated by a fictional figure named Pamphilus, who reports it to an assumed listener named Hermippus.

Pamphilus describes "Cleanthes" as possessing a precise philosophical taste, "Philo" as being nonchalantly skeptical, and "Demea" as rigidly devout and inflexible. This book was published posthumously at Hume's request. There is debate about which of the three fictional characters represents Hume's true beliefs. Some consider "Cleanthes" to depict Hume's views, while others argue that "Philo" is the representative of his philosophy. Cleanthes adopts a positive stance toward the argument from design, whereas Philo takes a negative and dismissive approach. For this reason, Hume is often regarded as an opponent of the argument from design (Copleston, 2001, Vol. 5, p. 324.). It is worth noting that the publication of this book sparked a wave of responses among Western philosophers. What is presented in Paul Edwards' *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* regarding the argument from design can essentially be seen as an elaboration of Hume's objections.

Since John Hospers has revisited Hume's perspective, it is essential to address the objections raised by Hume against the second premise of the argument from design, which states that "order is not the result of intention." Here, only two of Hume's significant objections will be highlighted.

a) The first issue: Comparing natural artifacts to human-made artifacts:

Hume argues that the existence of purposeful order does not necessarily serve as evidence of a wise, capable, and deliberate designer. This is because the structure of the design argument relies on an analogy, comparing the natural world to human-made artifacts. However, this analogy is invalid. Humans have repeatedly observed and experienced human-made creations, but they have not observed the creation of the natural world.

The defining characteristic of human-made artifacts is that they do not come into existence without knowledge, power, and measurement. For instance, no one has ever seen fragments of iron randomly move and form orderly railroad tracks without prior design or planning.

Hence, the existence of orderly human-made artifacts serves as evidence of intellect and intention. However, this characteristic cannot be extended to natural phenomena because such an experience has never occurred in the world. The world in which humans live is the first world they have ever encountered since its creation.

According to Hume, this comparison would be valid only if worlds with similar characteristics were created by a wise and intelligent being. In that case, a thoughtful individual could, after observing the experienced worlds, conclude with certainty that this material world, like those worlds, also has a wise and capable designer. (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2007, p. 85)

John Hick articulates Hume's objection as follows: Human-made artifacts like a clock or a house provide a relatively weak analogy. The world does not bear a complete and exact resemblance to a vast machine. Following this analogy, one could compare the world to a large motionless creature, such as an enormous crab, or to a very large plant. This is where the argument from design encounters a flaw, as the question of whether arthropods or plants operate under an intentional and conscious design still remains unanswered. Only if it can be demonstrated that the world bears a relatively precise resemblance to a human-made creation—something we know possesses a specific design and order—would we have convincing evidence to affirm the existence of an intelligent planner or designer. (Hick, 2011, pp. 67-68.) Hospers refers to this very statement by Hume on page 98 of his book on the philosophy of religion.

B) The second issue - the emergence of order from the properties of matter:

In this objection, Hume draws upon the interpretation of matter's properties as described by earlier philosophers. He argues that proponents of the teleological argument aim to explain the order of the universe through an external cause, whereas it is also possible to attribute this order to the inherent characteristics of matter itself. Hume suggests that primordial matter inherently possesses qualities that, over time, have led it to reach its current state of perfection. This continuous process is driven by an internal factor capable of generating various forms within it. Therefore, if such a possibility is substantiated, there would no longer be a need for the teleological argument. John Hick, the author of *The Philosophy of Religion*, expounds on this aspect of Hume's objection in the following manner:

After acknowledging the existence of order in nature, the question arises: could this order have come into being without an intentional design? Hume, as a form of solution, suggests the Epicurean hypothesis. The universe consists of an infinite number of tiny particles that move randomly. Over an unlimited period, these particles form various combinations and take on all sorts of possible arrangements. If one of these combinations happens to attain a fixed and specific order, this system will stabilize over time through an appropriate framework. It is possible, then, that the universe, with the order we currently observe in it, has been formed from such combinations. (Hick, 2011, pp. 66.)

Evaluation of Hume's Perspective

In examining this claim, it is essential to refer to two thorough scientific evaluations.

۱. Evaluating the comparison of natural artifacts to human-made ones:

The error of Hume, and following him Hospers, lies in their assumption that the argument from design is entirely sensory and empirical in nature. They have thus categorized it as a matter of analogy and comparison, arguing that the attributes of human-made artifacts cannot be extended to natural phenomena. However, it must be stated that the argument from design is not solely sensory-based, meaning not all of its premises are derived from sensory perceptions. Furthermore, it does not belong to the category of analogy, where judgment is based on the similarity between two constructed or artificial objects. Nor is it a purely empirical argument, which would base its conclusions on the uniformity of instances within a single nature. The argument from design is a combination of an empirical-premised minor premise and a purely rational major premise. In this way, an observer of the world, after examining the order present in nature, concludes that this intricate and complex creation could not have come into existence without the intervention of a wise planner and an intelligent designer.

If the structure of the argument from design is based on the two following misconceptions, it could provide a basis for Hume's objections. Perhaps the primary reason for Hume's criticisms lies in these erroneous interpretations prevalent in the Western world. (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2007, p. 84.85)

The two misconceptions are as follows:

A: Analogical Thinking: This is the assumption that the world, in terms of order and harmony, is similar to human-made objects such as houses and ships. Just as human-made artifacts have an intelligent and capable creator, it is assumed that the world, too, must have a designer.

B: Anthropomorphic Perception: This refers to a form of comparison between nature and human-made creations, where it is deemed necessary to attribute the order of the world to the intervention of consciousness.

These two types of interpretation of the Argument from order are wrong, because the existence of similarity between two objects cannot be a proof of the unity of judgment between them. Also, it is not correct to use the method of experience based on the principle of symmetry, because symmetry can be useful when the two parties have used the same category, while the object of experience in the Argument from order is man-made, and doubtful, natural phenomena that have not yet been subjected to the scissors of experience.

In other words, if the Argument from order is presented in a way that consists of empirical minorities and rational majorities, it can be called a definitive argument that has nothing to do with the problems of allegory and experience, because the intellect, after studying nature and discovering its order, dictates that such a nature consists of a kind of precise calculation and measurement. It is a calculation that has proportioned the components of phenomena in terms of quantity and quality, and has established cooperation and coordination among them to achieve the desired goal. Such order and achievement of the goal is only the result of the science, precision, and design of a resourceful supervisor. (Ibid) Therefore, such an approach

is obtained that there is a logical relationship between ultimate order and conscious intervention.

In other words, Hume's problem is not introduced, because in this discourse of the Argument from order, the similarity of the universe to objects such as ships or the use of experience and experimentation is not involved in order to talk about the difference of criteria, but here the correct depiction is that the study of the existing order in phenomena, which is accompanied by features such as calculation, measurement, selection, organization, and purpose, has the ability to show that the wise designer and to prove the mighty. In fact, we are talking about this definite path of the intellect that experience and sensations are the only basis for this rational argument and not a part of it, so it does not matter whether it is a human creation or a natural phenomenon .

In other words, the general rule of reason is the same in artifacts and physics, because if the intellect does not believe that a calculator has emerged without a scientific plan and plan, it also does not believe that an orderly and always in its own orbit has been realized without planning.

2. Evaluation of the claim of the birth of order from the property of matter.

Hume seeks to explain the order of the universe on the basis of the intrinsic properties of things and not the external order. His claim needs to be investigated. If what Hume means by the property of matter is that each element has an effect of its own, in the light of which a third phenomenon is created in the light of its combination with the other, it is a correct statement, but it has nothing to do with the Argument from order. For example, every flower has its own smell and no one denies that the special feature of a flower is due to its internal components, but the Argument from order does not seek to explain this simple and clear point in order to imagine its uselessness. Rather, the task of the Argument from order is to prove that there is harmony between the components of the universe in order to achieve a specific goal. The justification for such an order cannot be the intrinsic property of each of the internal elements and components of objects. (Sobhani Tabrizi, 2007, p. 88)

The following example is needed to explain this claim. The sentence "Plato was the master of Aristotle" is composed of 24 letters, which are: 1 - f - l - a - i - and - n - a - s - t - a - d - a - r - s - i - and - b and d a s.

If someone claims that each of these letters has a specific sound and tone, it is a correct claim, but in addition to this internal tone, we can also see the proportion and coherence in the composition. If someone claims that this harmonious structure is derived from the properties of these letters, he is saying something false, because reason dictates that these letters, except for their own sound, are not capable of creating a purposeful combination. Rather, according to reason, the combination of the above sentence is the work of a thinker who knows at least the science of literature. How can the likes of Hume and Hospers believe that the orderly structure of phenomena derives from their internal order.

b) Darwin's theory;

Hospers believes that after Darwin's theory, it is no longer possible to believe that the creatures of the world were created with the support of a benevolent designer, but their evolution causes the previous design and plan to be damaged in them.

Explain :

Since the distant past, Western thinkers have been trying to explain the existential course of living beings without resorting to the universal regulator by presenting theories of "organic evolution". The first ancient Greek philosopher to propose the theory of evolution was Anaximander. He argued that living things first originated from the sea and then evolved into terrestrial beings. Although Kisminder's view was proposed in the Western world, it was never accepted as a comprehensive theory until Darwin, with the theory of the "principle of species", proposed a hypothesis according to which living organisms gradually evolved from the simplest unicellular to the most complex mammals through the struggle for survival and survival.

Hospers deduced two points from Darwin's theory :

(a) Darwin's theory does not require the denial of the Argument from order, but rather makes it unnecessary.

b) Darwin's theory requires the denial of a benevolent regulator.

At first, Hospers believes that Darwin did not reject the Argument from order with his hypothesis, but the way of explaining the formation of the world changed after Darwin's theory, that is, before Darwin, thinkers believed in the sudden and sudden formation of the world of creation and man, but after Darwin, we can talk about its gradual process.

If someone used to believe in order, after accepting all the results of Darwin's hypothesis, he can also believe in order as before, because he can say that it was previously thought that God created all kinds in an instant, but now he has chosen a gradual and slow process as a means of executing order. In this case, the method of order has changed, not the essence of its truth. (Hospers. 1990.p307.)

Therefore, the Argument from order is still a reasonable argument for thinkers, but it has lost its validity and has become irrational, because the Argument from order, in addition to reasonableness, also has a useful and practical role, and this aspect of this argument, i.e. its efficiency, has been damaged, so it is not necessary (not necessary) to talk about it in scientific books or to be raised by anyone. As an example, Hospers writes: "If you know that the doorbell was ringing by an itinerant salesman, you don't have to think of it as the sound of a single soul, as the ancients believed, although it is still possible that you think that the bell is the result of both the single soul and the itinerant salesman."(Hospers, No date, p. 100)

In his second look at Darwin's theory, Hospers seeks deep extraction. He believes that those who believe in the Argument from order do not only believe in proving a prudent ruler for

the world, but also that the governor considered by God is the same administrator with characteristics such as "benevolent and kind" who is far from evil. Therefore, the work that is arranged for Darwin's theory is too profound to merely deny the existence of a mere regulator, but according to Darwin's belief, it can be proved that the belief in a "benevolent regulator" is not compatible with Darwin's view.

It is difficult for the belief in the benevolent supervisor to be compatible with the belief in the evolutionary process because the evolutionary process is the scene of constant and endless strife and pain and death. Life is a struggle for survival in which many species become extinct and each person dies inevitably, and this death is mostly caused by a direct torment caused by hunger, cold, and disease, or they are eaten alive by animals. Personal life is perishable, millions of people of any kind die every day before they have a full life, has the Nazim applied all these sufferings just to preserve the species, and that too at the expense of people's lives? If this is the case, then consolation and condolences to people are meaningless. (Hospers, No date, p. 101)

In short, Hospers believes that Hume's and Darwin's flaws invalidate the Argument from order.

Evaluation of Darwin's view.

It seems that Hospers has made a scientific confusion between the "problem of the good system" and the "order argument" here, because the problems of God not being benevolent, whether in general or based on Darwin's theory, are raised in both the Argument from order and the problem of the good system, but the proof of the incompatibility between Darwin's theory and the benevolence of God is raised only in the "Argument from order". At the beginning of the text, Hospers talks about "the incompatibility of Darwin's theory with the benevolence of the prudent prefect" but then he moves the direction of the discussion to the field of "the good system and the evil nature". Although the line between the "Argument from order" and the "problem of the good system" is very narrow, the lack of accuracy in this regard can cause this scientific error. The only inconsistency of Darwin's theory with the Argument from order is mentioned here. Here it is necessary to examine Hospers' reference to Darwin's theory. To study the viewpoint of Nizam Ahsan, refer to the treatise "A Comparative Study of the Viewpoints of John Hospers and Ayatollah Javadi Amoli in the Problem of Evil" by Dr. Mohammad Javad Hassanzadeh Mashkani.

A) The first evaluation: the correctness or invalidity of Darwin's hypothesis .

At the outset, it is necessary to point out that the evaluation of Darwin's theory is based on the assumption that the hypothesis is correct, otherwise the first problem that precedes all the problems is in fact the "correctness or invalidity" of this hypothesis. It can be said that Darwin's theory is still presented as a hypothesis in the scientific community. (Salari, 2005, p. 97.)

That is, the audience does not accept this hypothesis or accepts it as a hypothesis rather than a theory. However, here we evaluate it with the possibility that Darwin's hypothesis is

correct. It should also not be forgotten that the study of Darwin's hypothesis will be discussed in relation to the Argument from order, and the study of its other dimensions is beyond the scope of this article.

b) Second Evaluation: The Necessity and Usefulness of the Order Argument :

Darwin's hypothesis about the creatures of the universe is related to the active causes of the system of existence and never exempts us from having final causes, because as philosophers have said, chance and chance in the system of existence can be conceived in two ways: one is against the active causes, in the way that the world has been created without a cause and accident, and the other is against the final causes, i.e. the orderly and prudent relations of phenomena are accidental And it should be thought of as far from teleology .

Darwin's hypothesis is about the discovery of causal causes and how they are, and the Argument from order is about the second issue, i.e. the purposefulness and wisdom of the world. Therefore, the domains of the Argument from order and Darwin's theory are separate from each other. In other words, the Argument from order is related to the teleology of phenomena and not the proof of subjective causes, so it is possible to accept the subjective causes as the claimants of communism and materialists have accepted, but deny the ultimate causes of the world system and its purposefulness and manageriality .

In fact, empirical sciences deal with the nature of phenomena and their relations with each other, not with their why, so the question "Why is that phenomenon like this?" is related to the field of ultimate causes and teleological problems, which the Argument from order answers and has nothing to do with the field of subjective causes and its quality .

The above analytical approach is based on the fact that what biologists, including Darwin, have all said about discovering the active causes of the emergence of organisms and have depicted the course of living organisms from one or more single-celled organisms. These hypotheses are outside the scope of the Argument from order and do not cause the slightest damage to it, because beyond all these subjective causes in the field of the struggle for survival and the choice of the fittest, there is a mysterious, poetic, and purposeful force that regulates and directs the course of these developments well. (Salari, 2005, p. 98)

Motahhari writes about this :

The principle of evolution shows more than ever the intervention of a resourceful, guiding and guiding force in the existence of living beings and presents the principle of ultimateness. Darwin personally commented on the principle of adaptation to the environment in such a way that he was told that he was talking about this principle like a supernatural principle. The truth is that the force of adaptation to the environment, in living beings, which is a very mysterious and astonishing force, is a supernatural force, that is, it is in the possession of a kind of guidance and consciousness with a purpose, and it is by no means a blind and aimless force. (Motahhari, 2009, pp. 137-138.)

According to Shahid Motahhari, the implication of the principle of evolution on the existence of an unseen possessor in the work of the world is no less than any principle. He believes that the reason why Darwin's theory is considered to be contrary to the famous theological argument was due to the weakness of philosophical systems and divine wisdom. Instead of using the emergence of the theory of evolution in favor of the theological school, theologians considered it to be something against the divine school, because they thought that it is only by the impulsiveness of the universe that the world's need for a cause and creator can be proved, and if the universe is a kind of gradual type of existence, then the gradual causes and factors of nature are sufficient to justify them. (Ibid)

As a result, as some scholars have written, "Darwinism has no relation to theology unless one considers theism to be incompatible with the acceptance of natural causes and interprets it as a denial of the world of causes. (Makarem Shirazi, 2000, p. 274.)

Therefore, there can be no contradiction between the Argument from order and Darwin's hypothesis. Just as Darwin himself did not see any contradiction between his theory and theism. Despite accepting natural causes, Darwin always remained a believer in the one God for the emergence of different types of animals. (Behzad, 1959, pp. 75-76.)

Interestingly, Hospers himself points out in his book *The Philosophy of Religion* that Darwin's theory did not contradict the view of the monotheists. He believes that assuming that Darwin's view is accepted, there will be no contradiction between him and the proof of the ruler, because despite Darwin's theory, the theory of the ruler has not yet been invalidated, and if someone believes in the universal ruler before Darwin's theory, after accepting all the results of Darwin's hypothesis, he can also believe in the ruler, because he can imagine that before Darwin's theory, God created all kinds in an instant. but after proving Darwin's theory, he has chosen a gradual and slow process as a means of implementing order in the universe. In other words, or the acceptance of Darwin's theory, the only method of order has changed, not the principle of its truth. This answer seems to be documented and reasoned and can be a collective aspect between the monotheists and Darwin, but Hospers clarifies that thinkers have not been satisfied with accepting the monotheistic view despite such an answer. "Yet the Argument from order has lost its credibility among scientists," (Hospers, No date, p. 101) writes Hospers, indicating his unscientific bias.

c) The third evaluation: the denial of the benevolent Nazim.

Hospers's claim that the Argument from order is flawed and that it is incompatible with Darwin's hypothesis is unscientific, because the first scientific step of a researcher, especially a philosopher, in the path of discovering facts is to separate descriptive topics from valid ones. Darwin's view of the problem of how organisms originated was a descriptive one that could not be deduced whether it was good or bad. In other words, descriptive discussions should not be mixed with real or valid and one should conclude from the other.

The discussion of the struggle for survival raised by Darwin was a discussion that had a biological aspect. He described that in this struggle for survival, an animal goes and remains an animal. Darwin never sought to state the bad or good of any of his propositions in order to

infer from this claim the inconsistency between his theory and the benevolent observer. Rather, Darwin's sole purpose was the emergence of some animals and the so-called survival of fitness.

There is no doubt that regardless of the meanings of good and evil and their various moral definitions, only as far as the scientific theory of emergence is concerned, the fittest is never in a more meritorious sense, possessed of more perfections, or superiority. Its meaning is only more in accordance with the environment and more permanent, and it is obvious that not everything that remains is superior to everything that goes (Soroush, 1979, p. 131.)

Hospers's error is that he wants to judge whether it is good or bad (good or bad) in the matter of survival, because what is observed in the world of nature is a description of the conflict between animals, in which one suffers and eats and the other perishes, but judging and judging the proposition of which one is good or bad, or whether this conflict of survival is good or evil. It is a matter that goes beyond Darwin's intentions .

Darwinists believe that Darwin himself was dissatisfied with these unfounded judgments and perceptions. His famous phrase "Never speak of superior and inferior" refers to this scientific error, because Darwin did not allow any use of his theory of value and did not consider it reasonable to consider it good and evil. Some researchers write, "This reminder suggests that Darwin was smart enough to never use biological evolution for value and morality." (Soroush, 1979, p. 137)

On the other hand, Hospers must answer by what criterion and criterion can he prove that the Administrator of the Universe is not benevolent? Can he rule that the Nazim is not benevolent just because of the occurrence of a conflict of survival among the animals? Wasn't this judgment and judgment of Hospers derived from the likes and dislikes of human beings and his tastes and desires?

Explain :

d) Fourth Evaluation: The Scope of the Argument from order.

In the second and third evaluations, it was proved that the claim of incompatibility of Darwin's hypothesis with the Argument from order is false and unscientific, because this hypothesis, due to its descriptiveness, is identical to proving or rejecting the Argument from order, but now the question arises whether the Argument from order seeks to prove the benevolent regulator at all, so that Hospers claims that it is incompatible with Darwin's hypothesis, or not, its scope is only the proof of the rational regulator, and Is he silent about divine attributes ?

Clarifying the quantitative and qualitative scope of the Argument from order causes us not to expect more than reality from it. It seems that the distortion of the Argument from order by Christian thinkers is rooted in this important principle. Also, the mistake of the likes of Hospers and his master Hume is that they think that if the problem of evil is not solved, the Argument from order will be futile. However, this judgment is far from the duty and mission

of the Argument from order. In fact, the same mission should be expected from it that the Argument from order is in line with it.

The mission of the Argument from order is that the existing order in nature indicates that planning and planning were involved in the creation of the world and created a being of knowledge called its creator. On the other hand, proving subjects or attributes such as the existence of the Creator or the accident of the Creator, justice, absolute goodness, or evil is beyond the scope of the Argument from order. The Argument from order does not seek to explain whether the Creator God is wise or non-wise, whether He is one or many. Therefore, we should expect answers to such questions from other arguments. In other words, the scope of the Argument from order has caused this argument to not be able to prove the existence of a necessary being without invalidating the cycle and continuity, because this argument alone is not capable of invalidating the cycle and continuity.

In other words, such objections raised by the deniers of the Argument from order have nothing to do with the Argument from order, and the objection of John Hospers, who said, "People do not want order alone, but they want order with goodness" is a logical fallacy, because it is not possible to impose the will of the people on the argument, but in order for the argument to be consequential, the harmony of the result with the premises must be considered.

Results:

The findings of this article are as follows :

١ . Hospers, following the great philosophers, has considered the problem of evil as a reason for rejecting the Argument from order. The scientific method of Hospers is such that he first explains the Argument from order and then distorts it in detail .

2. The inference of John Hospers' arguments in rejecting the Argument from order was explained in three headings: "The concept of order is not clear", "the world has no order", and "order is not the result of prudence". Also, Hospers has enlisted the help of greats such as Hume and Darwin to support its claim.

٣ . An examination of John Hospers's arguments in the above three headings concludes that his view cannot be accepted, because firstly, it seems that the concept of "order" at the beginning has a clear concept or does not need to be defined, so Hospers' words here are not accurate, and it is also possible to reach its designer from the order of a phenomenon even if its designer has not been observed .

4. By evaluating and criticizing the ideas of Hume and Darwin, as a result of Hospers' citation of them, they are also contradicted. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Hospers view is considered to be rejected in rejecting the argument of its order.

References

The Holy Quran

- ١ . Ash'ari, Ali, (1952), *Al-La'ma fi al-Ird ala Ahl al-Zigh and al-Bada'*, Beirut, Joseph Makart.
- ٢ . Barbour, Ian (1983), *Science and Religion*, translated by Bahá'u'lláh Khorramshahi, Tehran, University Publishing Center.
- ٣ . Behzad, Mahmoud (1959) *Darwinism*, Fifth Edition, Tehran, Nile Publications.
- ٤ . Copleston, Frederick, (2001), *History of Philosophy*, Vol. 5, Translated by Jalaluddin A'lam, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publishing Company.
- ٥ . Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, Mohammad bin Omar, (1990) *Al-Tafsir al-Kabir (Mafatih al-Ghayb)*, Beirut. Dar al-Fikr.
- ٦ . Gharavian, Mohsen, (1998) *A Journey in the Evidence of the Existence of God*, Second Edition, Qom, Bustan Ketab .
- ٧ . Ghazali, Mohammad, (1986) *Ihya Uloom al-Din*, Beirut. Dar al-Ma'rifa .
- ٨ . Hallingdale, Reginald John, (2008) *History of Western Philosophy*, translated by Abdolhossein Azarang, 7th edition, Tehran, Phoenix Publications .
- ٩ . Hick, John (2011). *Philosophy of Religion*, Translated by Behzad Saleki, Tehran, Al-Huda International Publications .
- ١٠ . Hick, John, (2008) *The Existence of God*, translated by Abdur Rahim Govahi, first edition. Tehran, Elm Publishing.
- ١١ . Hospers, J. (1990), *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*, 3rd Ed, Routledge. London .
- ١٢ . Hospers, John, (No date), *Philosophy of Religion (A Critique of the Proofs of the Existence of God by Philosophical Analysis)*, Translated by the Editorial Translation Group of the Center for Islamic Studies and Research, Islamic Propagation Office of Qom Seminary, Qom, Islamic Propagation Office .
- ١٣ . Javadi Amoli ,Abdullah, (2009) *Explanation of the Proofs of God*, Qom, Esra Publishing Center.
- ١٤ . Kant,Imman, (1992) *Critic of Pure Reason*, trans, Abbot, in the Great Books university of chicago.
- ١٥ . Motahhari, Morteza, (2009) *The Causes of the Tendency to Materialism*, Tehran, Sadra Publications .

۱۶. Makarem Shirazi, Nasser, (2000) *The Philosopher's Facades*, Tehran, Dar al-Kutub al-Islamiyya .
۱۷. Salari, Azizollah, (2005), *Answering John Hospers' Doubts in the Philosophy of Religion*, Tehran, Islamic Azad University.
۱۸. Sobhani Tabrizi, Ja'far (2007). *Introduction to New Issues in Theology*, Third Edition, Qom, Imam Sadiq Institute.
۱۹. Sobhani Tabrizi, Ja'far (2004.), *Theology on Huda al-Kitab wa al-Sunnah wa al-'Aql*, Qom, Imam al-Sadiq Institute.
۲۰. Soroush, Abdolkarim (1979), *Knowledge and Value*, Second Edition, Tehran, Yaran Publications
۲۱. Warburton, Nigel, (2007) *The Alphabet of Philosophy*, Translated by Masoud Olya, Third Edition, Tehran, Phoenix .