Intelligent Design: Scientific and Theological Perspectives

Submitted by Andrew Mark Sibley to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Master of Philosophy in Theology
In February 2012

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been
identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for
the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature:	•••••
------------	-------

Abstract:

This thesis examines the claims of the recently formulated Intelligent Design arguments, particularly in relation to the work of Michael Behe and William Dembski, and considers whether they are acceptable as good science and as good theology. I respond to scientific considerations mainly at the level of the philosophy of science, particularly from David Hume and related commentators such as John Mackie and Elliott Sober. Theological aspects are considered in light of Reformed Calvinism with influence coming from Augustine and Paul. Interestingly, it is also evident that there is an Augustinian influence in the philosophy of science and I will highlight some of this in this thesis, especially with regard to the work of Alvin Plantinga and Michel Polanyi. In chapter two I look at Hume's Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and identify various objections raised, for instance by Mackie. In this chapter I then consider the claim that the design argument can only be a weak or remote analogy to human intelligence and offer two ways forward. In chapter three I look more broadly at claims by Michael Ruse that Intelligent Design cannot be good science because it doesn't follow the rules of methodological naturalism. In response, I consider Plantinga's claim that Christians can move to Augustinian science and do not need to hold to naturalistic methodology in science. I also consider the thinking of Paul Feyerabend relating to criticism of methodological monism in science because it restricts scientific discovery. I also discuss concerns raised by Imre Lakatos because he believes a degree of dogmatism is necessary in science in order to hold to objective truth and avoid relativism. I then offer some thoughts as to what an Intelligent Design research programme might look like. In the fourth chapter I look at theological aspects of Intelligent Design. I discuss the question of whether it is possible to search for evidence for design apart from revelation and divine grace, and discuss difficulties highlighted by a number of theologians. I then consider the divine action debate in relation to Intelligent Design, and in the final part of the theology chapter examine question of theodicy that arise for Intelligent Design, again in light of Calvinism with its Augustinian-Pauline influence.

List of Contents

1.	. Introduction	5
	1.1. What is Intelligent Design? 1.1.1. Defining Intelligent Design. 1.1.2. A Renewed Interest in Design.	5
	1.1.3. How Does Intelligent Design Compare With Classical Natural Theology1.1.4. Is Intelligent Design Really Creationism?1.1.5. Intelligent Design And The Science - Religion Typology	13
	1.1.6. Alternatives to Intelligent Design.	
	1.2. Shape of research 1.2.1. Chapter Two 1.2.2. Chapter Three 1.2.3. Chapter Four	19 21
2.	. Hume's Dialogues and Intelligent Design	27
	2.1. Hume's Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion – Introduction and Analysis. 2.1.1. Cleanthes versus Philo 2.1.2. Philo Part VII 2.1.3. Cleanthes versus Demea 2.1.4. Discussion of the Dialogues	27 29 31 34
	2.2. Is Design a Weak Analogy to Human Intelligence?	
	2.2.1. Introduction	41
	2.2.2. Mackie and Swinburne's Dialogue on the Design Argument.2.2.3. Is the Design Argument Inductive of Abductive?	
	2.2.4. Prediction or Accommodation?	
	2.2.5. Intelligent Design, and Analogical Reasoning	
3.	Intelligent Design, Scientific Methodology and Research Programmes	56
	3.1. Intelligent Design and Scientific Methodology	57
	3.1.1. Ruse's Arguments for Methodological Naturalism	
	3.1.2. Plantinga's Response to Ruse	
	3.1.3. Where Might Augustinian Science be Appropriate?	
	3.1.4. Weak Arguments Against Methodological Naturalism	
	3.1.5. Responding to Two Stronger Reasons for Methodological Naturalism 3.1.6. Lack of Understanding	68
	3.1.7. Common Ground	
	3.1.8. Methodological Naturalism Has Some Success	
	3.1.9. A Problem in Dialectics – Dogmatism versus Relativism	
	3.2. Intelligent Design and Scientific Research Programmes	77
	3.2.1. Introduction	
	3.2.2. Intelligent Design and Explanatory Power	77
	3.2.3. Developing Research Programmes	81
	3.2.4. Michael Polanyi	
	3.2.5. Thomas Kuhn	
	3.2.6. Karl Popper	
	3.2.7. Lakatos and Feyerabend	
	3.2.8. Is an Intelligent Design Research Programme Theology or Science? 3.2.9. Summary	

4. Intelligent Design and Theological Considerations	97
4.1. The Nature and Character of the Designer 4.1.1. Introduction	
4.1.2. Intelligent Design and Models of God.	
4.1.3. Theological Problems	
4.2. Intelligent Design and Divine Action	106
4.2.1 Intelligent Design and Divine Intention	
4.2.2. Intelligent Design and Divine Action	
4.2.3. Intelligent Design, Deism and Occasionalism	
4.2.4. Divine Action and Openness	
4.2.5. Divine Action and the Word of God	
4.2.6. Divine Action and Three-Dimensional Order	
4.2.7. Divine Action, Intelligent Design and Miracles	
4.2.8. Summary	126
4.3. Intelligent Design and the Problem of Evil	127
4.3.1. Introduction	127
4.3.2. Intelligent Design, Theistic Evolution and Theodicy	
4.3.3. The Manichean Problem	
4.3.4. Pelagian Related Problems and Divine Grace	
4.3.5. Evolutionary Theodicy and the Biblical Understanding of the Fall	
4.3.6. Dembski's Pauline-Augustinian Theodicy	
4.3.7. Summary	146
5. Conclusion	148
5.1. Is Intelligent Design Good Science?	149
5.2. Is Intelligent Design Good Theology?	
References	