

Alam Sebagai Bukti: Sanggahan Terhadap Dalil Eksistensi Tuhan Ibn Rusyd

Nature as Evidence: On Ibn Rushd's Theorems for God's Existence

Alya Mumtaza Hafidz¹
Univeritas Darussalam Gontor
alyamumtaza04@gmail.com

Abstrak

Alam beserta kompleksitas dan keindahan yang terkandung di dalamnya telah menginspirasi banyak filsuf untuk mempostulasikan argumentasi eksistensi Tuhan. Dalam usahanya untuk mengomentari argumentasi kelompok mutakallimun yang banyak mengandung bid'ah, Ibn Rusyd menyediakan dua dalil alternatif sederhana yang ia deduksi dari ayat-ayat Al-Quran dan kerumitan alam semesta. Dalil-dalil tersebut tercantum pada Kitab Al-Kasyf 'an Manahij al-Adilla fi 'Aqa'id al-Milla yang ia sebut dengan dalil Inayah dan dalil Ikhtira'. Tidak hanya datang dari kalangan Muslim, kedua dalil tersebut memiliki kesamaan dengan argumentasi eksistensi Tuhan dari pemikir Barat yang dimunculkan pada abad modern; argumentasi dari prinsip Antropik dan argumentasi Pembuat Jam William Paley. Berangkat dari persamaan tersebut, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengomparasikan serta menunjukkan beberapa cacat logika beserta sanggahan terhadap dalil-dalil Ibn Rusyd dan argumentasi pemikir Barat. Melalui metode penelitian kepustakaan (library research), peneliti menemukan beragam kelemahan di dalam dua jenis argumen tersebut; di antaranya adalah fallacy of false cause, special pleading fallacy, false analogy, dan bahkan menimbulkan konsekuensi yang lebih besar dalam problem of evil. Dengan adanya kelemahan dan cacat pikir tersebut, dalil-dalil Ibn Rusyd dan argumentasi eksistensi Tuhan Barat yang bersandar pada bukti-bukti empiris alam semesta tidak dapat lagi dipertahankan.

Kata kunci: Ibn Rusyd, Argumentasi Eksistensi Tuhan, William Paley, Prinsip Antropik.

Abstract

The complexity of nature and its beauty have been inspiring some philosophers to postulate argument for God's existence. In his endeavour to comment on mutakallimun's argumentations, which contained with many falsehood, Ibn Rushd offered two simple alternative theorems that he deduced from Quranic verses and nature's complexity. These theorems was shown in Kitab Al-Kasyf 'an Manahij al-Adilla fi 'Aqa'id al-Milla which Ibn Rushd called dalil Inayah and dalil Ikhtira. Not only came from Muslim side, these theorems apparently have some similarity with argumentations that proposed by Western thinkers in modern era; argument from Anthropic principles and William Paley's Watchmaker argument. Based on those similarity, this research aims to compare and to show some logical fallacies along with objections toward Ibn Rushd's theorems and Western thinker's arguments. Through

library research, researchers have found some weakness in both type of arguments; such as fallacy of false cause, special pleading fallacy, false analogy, and even emerged bigger consequence from the problem of evil. With these flaws and logical fallacies, Ibn Rusyd's theorems and Western's argumentations for God's existence that based on nature's empirical evidences should not be sustained any longer.

Keywords: *Ibn Rusyd, Argumentations for God's existence, William Paley, Anthropic Principles.*

Introduction

Argumentation regarding the existence of God has undergone various developments since its emergence. During the early history of philosophy (the Greek era), Graham Oppy mentions Plato's "Laws," "Timaeus," and "Phaedo," as well as Aristotle's "Physics" and "Metaphysics," which contain cosmological and teleological arguments,¹ this was later refined by St. Thomas Aquinas with his Five Ways in the thirteenth century.² Then, in the eleventh century (the Middle Ages), St. Anselm of Canterbury formulated the ontological argument, which was developed by Descartes in the late seventeenth century and further refined by Leibniz shortly thereafter.³ Next, in the Enlightenment era, Immanuel Kant followed with moral arguments⁴ and the design argument by William Paley (Modern Era).⁵

The development of arguments for the existence of God continues into contemporary times. In the ontological argument, for instance, it has been furthered by Alvin Plantinga, who refined St. Anselm's argumen,⁶ The Anthropic Principle, which combines cosmological and design arguments, was formulated by Brandon Carter, building upon

¹ Graham Oppy (ed.), *Ontological Argument*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 1.

² Graham Oppy, *Arguing About Gods*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 98-107

³ Robert E. Maydole, "The Ontological Argument," dalam *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*, ed. William Lane Craig dan J. P. Moreland (United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing. 2009), 553

⁴ John Hick, *The Existence of God*, ed. Paul Edwards, (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1964), 137

⁵ Graham Oppy, *The Best Argument against God*, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. 2013), 32. Lihat juga: William Paley, *Collected Works*, vol. 4: *Natural Theology* (London: Rivington, [1802] 1819)

⁶ J. L. Mackie, *The Miracle of Theism: Arguments for and againts the existence of God*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press.,1982), 55-63

the work of G.J. Withrow⁷ Michael Behe's concept of Irreducible Complexity⁸ has received significant criticism. Lastly, there is the Kalam cosmological argument advocated by William Lane Craig.⁹

Why is the argument for the existence of God necessary? Michael Ruse interprets faith as an overflow of feeling loved which is deduced to God. But the problem is, not everyone experiences the same thing,¹⁰ Therefore, the argument for the existence of God needs to be raised. In the same vein, J. L. Mackie also believes that the question of whether or not God exists can and should be discussed rationally.¹¹ Furthermore, Holley suggests that arguments regarding the existence of God can serve several purposes, including explaining the statement of God's existence, assisting in convincing others about the existence of God, and providing justification for believing in God's existence.¹²

Ibn Rusyd (1126-1198), known as a Muslim philosopher with the title "The Commentator" in the Latin Christian community,¹³ He provided his own arguments for the existence of God, based on the Qur'an. He poured these arguments into his work, "Kitab al-Kashf 'an Manahij al-adilla fi 'Aqa'id al-Milla," and named them "dalil Inayah" and "dalil Ikhtira':.

We would answer that the method which the Precious Book recommends and calls all mankind to follow is found, if the Precious Book is reviewed, to consist of two kinds. The first is the method of providing for man, and creating all existing things for his sake. Let us call it the argument from providence. The second method [refers to] the manifest invention of the substances of existing beings, such as the invention of life in inanimate matter, as well as sense-perception and intellect. Let us call this the argument from invention¹⁴

⁷ J. J. C. Smart dan J. J. Haldane, *Atheism dan Theism*, 2nd ed, (Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 17

⁸ Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, (New York: The Free Press, 1996)

⁹ William Lane Craig, *The Kalam Cosmological Argument*, (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979)

¹⁰ Michael Ruse dan Brian Davies, *Taking God Seriously: Two Different Voices*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 7

¹¹ J. L. Mackie, *The Miracle of Theism...*, 1

¹² David M. Holley, "Should Believers Be Interested in Arguments for God's Existence?" *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1983), 383-385

¹³ Peter Adamson, *Philosophy in The Islamic World: a history of philosophy without any gaps*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 180

¹⁴ Ibn Rusyd, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla*, ed. Mahmud Qasim, ed. 2nd, (Cairo: the Anglo-Egyptian Library, 1964), terjemah Inggris oleh Ibrahim Y. Najjar,

Those two arguments were his efforts to demonstrate that within the Quran, there were arguments for the existence of God that had been overlooked by theologians (mutakallimun).¹⁵ He considered the arguments existing at that time to be confusing for the public.¹⁶ Not only the mutakallimun, Ibn Rushd divided several other groups who had their own arguments regarding the existence of God and blamed each other; 1) Literalists, who considered the word of God as sufficient evidence, 2) Ash'arites and 3) Mu'tazilites who both used reason, and 4) the Sufis who tended towards interpretations other than the word of God, which could only be attained after the soul was cleansed from worldly matters.¹⁷

Centuries later, similar arguments were also put forward by Brandon Carter with the Anthropic Principle and by the Watchmaker William Paley. Both of these arguments can serve as empirical justifications of Ibn Rushd's arguments regarding the existence of God. However, these arguments have several flaws and weaknesses. Through a literature review method (library research), this study will uncover these weaknesses and flaws in reasoning, thereby rendering both Ibn Rushd's arguments and Western arguments for the existence of God based on empirical evidence from the universe untenable

Result and Discussion

The Dalil Inayah

Fallacy of False Cause in Dalil Inayah

After analyzing the arguments of the four groups, Ibn Rushd concluded that none of them were able to provide arguments that were easily followed, hence he unveiled the first proposition based on two principles:

The first method is founded on two principles; one of them is that all existing beings, which are found here below, are suited to man's existence, and the second principle is that this suitability is necessarily due to an Agent both intending and willing, since it is not possible for this suitability to be due to fortuitous chance...moreover, it is evident that this suitability exists with respect to many animals, plants, inanimate objects and many particulars like

Faith & Reason in Islam: Averroes' Exposition of Religious Arguments, (Oneworld Publication: 2014), 45

¹⁵ Oliver Leaman, *Averroes and his Philosophy*, (New York: Routledge, 2013), 217

¹⁶ Ibn Rusyd, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla...*, 31

¹⁷ Ibn Rusyd, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla...*, 31-44

the rain, the rivers and the seas; and, in short, the earth, water, fire, and air. Moreover, providence is evident in the human and animal organs, I mean, their being suited to his life and existence¹⁸

"Inayah" itself can be interpreted linguistically as assistance, preservation, and care.¹⁹ With this argument, Ibn Rushd argues that the existence of God can be proven by the fact of the creation of the world and all its contents, which are directed towards the welfare of humanity.²⁰ The fact that humans can live at present is because everything has been determined by a determining agent and not by mere chance.²¹ He also asserts that this certainty can be seen in the phenomena of the alternation of day and night, the moon and the sun, as well as animals and plants, all of which are intended to fulfill human needs. To support his argument, Ibn Rushd then provides several justifications from verses of the Quran, such as:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ ضَرْبٌ مِّثْلٍ فَاسْتَمِعُوا لَهُ^{٢٢} إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَنْ يَخْلُقُوا ذُبَابًا وَلَوْ اجْتَمَعُوا لَهُ^{٢٣} وَإِنْ يَسْلُبْهُمُ الذُّبَابُ شَيْئًا لَا يَسْتَنْقِذُوهُ مِنْهُ^{٢٤} ضَعُفَ الطَّالِبُ وَالْمَطْلُوبُ

Meaning: "O mankind, an example is presented, so listen to it. Indeed, those you invoke besides Allah will never create [as much as] a fly, even if they gathered together for that purpose. And if the fly should steal away from them a [tiny] thing, they could not recover it from him. Weak are the pursuer and pursued." (Quran, Surah Al-Hajj [22:73])

أَوَلَمْ يَنْظُرُوا فِي مَلَكُوتِ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ وَمَا خَلَقَ اللهُ مِنْ شَيْءٍ وَأَنْ عَسَىٰ اَنْ يَكُوْنَ قَدِ اقْتَرَبَ اٰجَلُهُمْ^{٢٥} فَيَأْتِيَّ حَدِيثٌ بَعْدَهُ يُؤْمِنُوْنَ

Meaning: "Do they not see the realm of the heavens and the earth and all things that Allah has created, and [think] that perhaps their appointed time has come near? So in what statement hereafter will they believe?" (Quran, Surah Al-A'raf [7:185])

Based on the observation of the universe and statements from the holy scriptures, Ibn Rushd invites anyone who wishes to know and

¹⁸ Ibn Rusyd, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla...*, 45

¹⁹ Tonny Ílham Prayogo, M. Adib Fuadi Nuriz, M. Nurrosyid Huda Setiawan, M. Kharis Majid, "Ibnu Rushd's Criticism of the Existence of God Philosophy", *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, Vol. 30 No. 2, July-December 2022, 163

²⁰ Richard C. Taylor, "Averroes: religious dialectic and Aristotelian philosophical thought", dalam Peter Adamson dan Richard C. Taylor (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 189

²¹ Majid Fakhry, *Averroes (Ibn Rushd): His Life, Works and Influence*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008), 77

understand God to observe the universe, whose orderliness and perfection are structured in such a way that humans can live.

Sekilas At first glance, this argument resembles the Anthropic principle argument. Broadly speaking, arguments from the Anthropic principle are divided into two forms, strong and weak. In the weak form, this argument is quite simple: if x is a condition necessary for y to exist, and y exists, then x exists.²² In its strong form, this argument emphasizes that the universe must have been finely-tuned to be inhabitable by humans.²³ The statistical improbability implied by the anthropic principle is indeed high, making it seem implausible to occur by chance alone, as if everything appears to be designed by an agent.²⁴ Robin Collins then compiled a list of evidence for a fine-tuned universe, such as even slight changes in the speed and strength of the Big Bang or minor alterations in the nuclear force that binds atoms or gravitational force could have significant implications for life.²⁵

Before it was refined and officially named the "Anthropic Cosmological Principle" by Brandon Carter,²⁶ G. J. Withrow had introduced a similar type of argument earlier, which has the fallacy of false cause.²⁷ In *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Withrow assumed that the universe and life could not arise in two dimensions. The functions of organs in the human body can only exist

²² Daniel C. Dennett, "Atheism and Evolution" dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 144

²³ Michael Ruse dan Brian Davies, *Taking God Seriously: Two Different Voices...*, 71. Lihat juga: J. D. Barrow and F. J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)

²⁴ Gilbert Fulmer, "A Fatal Logical Flaw in Anthropic Principle Design Arguments," *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Apr., 2001), 102

²⁵ Robin Collins, "A Scientific Argument for the Existence of God," dalam Louis P. Pojman dan Michael Rea (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology*, ed. 6th, (California: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012), 203

²⁶ Ian Hacking, "The Inverse Gambler's Fallacy: The Argument from Design," *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 96, No. 383, (Jul. 1987), 339. Lihat juga: Brandon Carter, "Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology," dalam M. S. Longair (ed.), *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*, *International Astronomical Union / Union Astronomique Internationale*, vol 63, (Springer Dordrecht, 1974), 291-298.

²⁷ *Fallacy of False Cause* (Latin: *Post hoc, ergo propter hoc*) adalah kesalahan berpikir yang mengasumsikan adanya hubungan kausalitas antara dua hal yang independen. Lihat: Charles Leonard Hamblin, *Fallacies*, (London: Methuen & Co. 1970), 37, Irving Marmer Copi, *Introduction to Logic* (New York: Macmillan. 1953), 64 dan Edith Watson Schipper dan Edward Walter Schuh, *A First Course in Modern Logic*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960), 35

in a three-dimensional world. Therefore, Withrow concluded that the explanation for life's existence is because it exists in a three-dimensional world.²⁸

In *Atheism and Theism*, a book documenting debates between theists and atheists, J. J. C. Smart raised two objections to Withrow. Firstly, while three dimensions may be a necessary condition for life to arise, it is not a sufficient explanation. Life cannot emerge on the planet Venus, despite it being in three dimensions. Feeling full from eating grilled meat is a sufficient explanation, but grilled meat is not a necessity for feeling full as one can eat other dishes. Secondly, the fact that life exists does not explain or justify the dimensions of the universe being more than two. On the contrary, the existence of three dimensions in the universe is part of the reason why life can emerge.²⁹ And such is called the post hoc argumen.

The same criticism directed at the anthropic argument, thus Ibn Rushd's Inayah argument, has also been levied by several figures. A. C. Grayling states that the retrospective observation involved in the anthropic argument's conclusion renders it applicable only after the fact (*ex post facto*). He asserts that the fact of its existence at present is not a goal but rather, upon realizing its existence, one can see that it would not have occurred if certain processes or conditions had not taken place.³⁰ In other words, the argument would not exist unless certain conditions were realized first. David Mills also asserts that a new designing agent is only required when one's reasoning is reversed. The fact that the universe exists first and then humanity emerges indicates that life is essentially forced to adapt within it. The situation would be reversed if humans existed first and then the universe slowly adjusted to accommodate them.³¹

If the statistical improbability is still difficult to accept, that the world has formed in such a way without a creator agent with suitable proportions to allow life, then Brandon Carter offers another possibility: that perhaps our universe is not the only one that harbors

²⁸ J. J. C. Smart dan J. J. Haldane, *Atheism dan Theism...*, 17. Lihat juga: G. J. Whitrow, "Why physical space has three dimensions", *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 6 (21), 1995, 13-31

²⁹ J. J. C. Smart dan J. J. Haldane, *Atheism dan Theism...*, 18

³⁰ A. C. Grayling, *The God Argument: The Case against Religion and for Humanism*, (London: Bloomsbury. 2013), 61

³¹ David Mills, *Atheist Universe*, (Berkeley, CA: Ulysses Press, 2006), 222-223

life. It may be that there are other universes that also sustain life, and we are among those universes.³² The statistical improbability indeed arises due to chance and shapes the life that exists today. The conclusion of the anthropic principle's enigma can be addressed with a quote from Ian Hacking without falling into the post hoc fallacy:

*Why do we exist? Because we are a possible universe, and all possible ones exist. Why are we in an orderly universe? Because the only universes that we could observe are orderly ones that support our form of life.*³³

The Problem of Evil and Evolution in the Dalil of Inayah

The dalil of Inayah by Ibn Rushd is firmly grounded on the Quranic evidence concerning creation or the concept of creationism.³⁴ Creation here implies that all complexity in the universe occurs spontaneously and non-gradually, as stated by Seyyed Hossein Nasr

*A triangle is a triangle, and nothing evolves into a triangle; until a triangle becomes a triangle, it is not a triangle. So if we have three loose lines that gradually meet, even if there is one micron of separation, that is not a triangle. Only a triangle is a triangle. And life forms also have a finality of their own*³⁵

Michael Behe from the affirmative side asserts that such complexity cannot be reduced,³⁶ Hence, it shows that all creatures are final products created simultaneously without going through an accumulation process. In line with this, Thomas Aquinas also argues that the universe always exhibits the best possible outcome. This result, of course, cannot be achieved by mere chance, but by a design guided by the intelligence referred to as God.³⁷ Therefore, assuming that the universe is a creation is akin to positing a creator agent who has a purpose for that creation, as mentioned in the Quran.

³² J. J. C. Smart dan J. J. Haldane, *Atheism dan Theism...*, 19

³³ Ian Hacking, "The Inverse Gambler's Fallacy...", 337

³⁴

Creationism is a belief system that opposes the idea of a common ancestor as the origin of life and asserts that each living organism possesses an archetype predetermined by the Creator, thereby making macroevolutionary changes impossible. See: Shoaib Ahmed Malik, *Islam and Evolution: Al-Ghazali and the Mpdern Evolutionary Paradigm*, (New York: Routledge, 2021), 114-115

³⁵ Seyyed Hoessein Nasr, "On the Question of Biological Origins," *Islam and Science*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2006, 183

³⁶ Michael Behe. *Darwin's Black Box...*, 39

³⁷ George H. Smith, *Atheism: The Case Against God*, (New York: Prometheus Books, 1989), 227. Lihat juga: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, First Part, ed. Anthony Uyl, (Ontario: Devoted Publishing, 2018), 13-16

Contrary to Ibn Rushd's perspective, the aforementioned objections arise from the Darwinian theory of evolution. Douglas Futuyama elucidates biological evolution as the gradual alteration in the characteristics of organisms across successive generations.³⁸

The emergence or formation of new species is brought about by natural selection, migration, and genetic drift, leading to the prevalence of certain characteristics within a population.³⁹ There are three crucial components in the theory of evolution: variation, genetic inheritance, and differential fitness, wherein each species passes on traits to its offspring, allowing the species to survive longer.⁴⁰ The theory then suggests that all life on Earth, including humans, shares a universal ancestor known as the Last Universal Common Ancestor (LUCA), which lived approximately 3.5-3.8 billion years ago.⁴¹ This theory also does not postulate the existence of a creator or designer, so evolution tends to lean towards a naturalistic view rather than theistic.⁴² Another important distinguishing implication is that, lacking an agent, the theory of evolution does not have any purpose. Natural selection simply operates without any inherent goal or purpose.⁴³ All adaptations, extinctions, and species reproduction are solely for the sake of survival. Natural selection only favors species that can adapt. Therefore, it's no wonder Dawkins refers to this process as the Blind Watchmaker:

³⁸ Douglas Futuyama, *Evolution*, (Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, 2005), 2

³⁹ Timothy G. Barraclough, *The Evolutionary Biology of Species*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 8. Lihat juga: Sir Ronald Aylmer Fisher, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection: A Complete Variorum Edition*, ed. J. H. Bennett, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

⁴⁰ Robert N. Brandon, "Adaptation and Evolutionary Theory," *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, Vol. 9(3), (September 1978), 183

⁴¹ Kostas Kampourakis, *Understanding Evolution*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 127-129. Lihat juga: William J. Schopf, Anatoliy B. Kudryavtsev, Andrew D. Czaja, Abhishek B. Tripathi, "Evidence of Archean life: Stromatolites and microfossils". *Precambrian Research*, 158 (3-4), 5 October 2007, 141-155

⁴² Paul Drapper, "Evolution and the Problem of Evil," dalam Louis P. Pojman dan Michael Rea (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion...*, 317

⁴³ Michael Ruse, "Modern Biologist and the Argument from Design," dalam Neil A. Mason (ed.), *God and Design: The Teleological Argument and Modern Science*, (New York: Routledge, 2003), 319

It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker⁴⁴

Despite the contradictions between natural selection and religious texts, evidence from the theory of evolution has continued to accumulate in the modern era. This has led some Muslim thinkers to reconsider their interpretations of the meaning of "creation" and attempt to reconcile religion and science by suggesting that God does not work directly. Instead, they propose that He created natural selection and the laws of physics to shape life.⁴⁵ Or God has predetermined the cosmic parameters that would shape life in such a way.⁴⁶ Supporters of this view seek to reconcile religious claims with scientific findings, rather than the reverse as in the creationist perspective. An example is Rana Dajani,⁴⁷ Muhammad Iqbal⁴⁸ and Nidal Guessoum.⁴⁹ All three believe that the words in the Quran are often misunderstood, and some stories, especially that of Prophet Adam, need to be interpreted metaphorically rather than literally to reconcile religious claims with the theory of evolution. Of course, these thinkers position Allah as the creator, as stated by Dajani.:

...Allah states that man was created to be fit for his environment. To me, this supports evolution and is an example of misinterpretation of the meaning of words in religious texts for lack of the scientific knowledge on the issue by the interpreters⁵⁰

The implications of asserting an agent behind the theory of evolution lead to conclusions that are not easily justified, especially in the problem of suffering. In the Inayah argument, the creator who created the universe intended for the benefit of humans, known in the Quran to have the attributes of Most Merciful, Most Powerful, Most Knowing, and the Best Guardian. Not only does this defense violate the principle

⁴⁴ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, (New York: Norton. 1986), 5

⁴⁵ A. C. Grayling, *The God Argument...*, 59

⁴⁶ Graham Oppy, *The Best Argument against God...*, 29

⁴⁷ Rana Dajani, "Evolution and Islam: Is There a Contradiction?" *Muslim World Science Initiative: Islam and Science: Muslim Responses to Science's Big Questions*, Islamabad, February 12–13, 2015, 146

⁴⁸ Mohammad Iqbal, *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, (Stanford, MO: Stanford University Press. 2012), 66

⁴⁹ Nidal Guessoum, "Religion Literalism and Science-Related Issues in Contemporary Islam," *Zygon*, Vol. 45, No. 4, 2010, 828

⁵⁰ Rana Dajani, "Evolution and Islam's Quantum Question," *Zygon*, Vol. 47, No. 2, 2012, 349

of Ockham's Razor,⁵¹ The argument actually represents a fatal flaw for the theist camp. Michael Ruse emphasizes this point in "Biologist and the Argument from Design:

*In other words, if God's process of creation is through unbroken law, then He had to do it as He did—natural selection, pain and agony, imperfection, and all.*⁵²

Charles Darwin stated that natural selection and the theory of evolution clearly demonstrate the suffering that every species must endure in order to survive.⁵³

Most biological suffering that appears to be unreasonable is also pathological, meaning it results from malfunctions in a system. Take, for example, Homo sapiens. Hernias, spinal misalignments, and joint inflammation are some of the ailments caused by the transition of humans from the Hunter-Gatherer Era to the Agricultural Era 10,000 years ago.⁵⁴ Humans adhere to the Rules of Three used in survival training: they can only survive for three minutes without air, three hours without shelter in harsh conditions (freezing cold), three days without water, and three weeks without food.⁵⁵ Humans adapt to their environment, not the other way around.

The problem becomes even more complex when confronted with various sufferings accompanying life such as natural disasters, disease outbreaks, famine, and war, things beyond human capability and will to resolve or initiate. The existence of such suffering suggests a contradiction to the attributes of the creator agent. Faced with various sufferings and evils, Richard Swinburne, representing the apologetic camp, argues that a suffering or evil can be justified because ultimately it will be replaced by a greater good.⁵⁶ Indeed, that's true. Even in the

⁵¹ Ockham/Occam's Razor is a problem-solving principle that states, "Entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity." This principle advocates for selecting hypotheses with the fewest assumptions. See: Jonathan Schaffer, "What Not to Multiply Without Necessity," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 93(4), 2015, 644-664

⁵² Michael Ruse, "Modern Biologist and the Argument from Design," Neil A. Mason (ed.), *God and Design...*, 323

⁵³ Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: John Murray, 1859), 63-64

⁵⁴ Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens*, terj. Damaring Tyas Wulandari Palar, (Jakarta: KPG (Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia, 2017), 97-98

⁵⁵ Edward O. Wilson, *Half-Earth: Our Planet's Fight for Life*, (Liveright, 2016), 18

⁵⁶ Richard Swinburne, *The Existence of God*, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979), 207-208

theory of evolution, suffering is necessary for living beings to grow and develop more advanced features. Effort is required for living beings to attain their existence.⁵⁷

However, in the context of the existence of an agent or entity with the attribute of being All-Merciful who is responsible for all of creation, suffering becomes something absurd. The suffering endured by creatures merely to live and propagate does not provide sufficient moral justification for the All-Powerful and All-Knowing Creator.⁵⁸ Does God deliberately create pain and suffering? He certainly knows about it, so why doesn't He eliminate it? Or is this God depicted as a malicious and sadistic deity as Dawkins portrays Him??⁵⁹ The absurdity concerning suffering and the existence of a God who is All-Compassionate, All-Powerful, and All-Knowing has long been postulated by Epicurus.

*Epicurus' old questions are yet unanswered. Is he willing to prevent evil, but not able? then is he impotent. Is he able, but not willing? then is he malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Whence then is evil?*⁶⁰

If indeed suffering can be justified because the good that will be gained after facing that suffering is greater, then Quentin Smith suggests that we should all be happy with the existence of AIDS⁶¹ Or condemn Voltaire, who doubted the perfection of this world because of the Lisbon earthquake in 1755, which killed almost 100,000 people.⁶² In reality, no one can do so. Michael Ruse⁶³ and Quentin Smith⁶⁴ asserts that there is no goodness that outweighs the suffering of children in the Auschwitz camp or AIDS sufferers. Considering the billions of victims of the Khmer Rouge as punishment for their sins in the world also does

⁵⁷ Michael Ruse, "Modern Biologist and the Argument from Design," dalam Neil A. Mason (ed.), *God and Design: The Teleological Argument and Modern Science...*, 320

⁵⁸ Paul Drapper, Evolution and the Problem of Evil dalam Louis P. Pojman dan Michael Rea (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion...*, 323

⁵⁹ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker...*, 105

⁶⁰ David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and Other Writings*, ed. Dorothy Coleman, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 74

⁶¹ Quentin Smith, "The Anthropic Coincidences, Evil and The Disconfirmation of Theism, *Religious Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, September 1992, 350

⁶² A. C. Grayling, *The God Argument...*, 61

⁶³ Michael Ruse, "Modern Biologist and the Argument from Design," dalam Neil A. Mason (ed.), *God and Design: The Teleological Argument and Modern Science...*, 323

⁶⁴ Quentin Smith, "The Anthropic Coincidences...", 350

not make sense if done by the Most Compassionate.⁶⁵ If God requires evil to bring about good or if wickedness is needed for there to be goodness, then J. L. Mackie highlights a contradiction with the theist understanding of God's Almighty nature.⁶⁶ Could He not create a world full of goodness without introducing evil at the same time? If death, suffering, or calamity are tickets or pathways to greater blessings, why is no one joyful about them? We can easily answer with a firm statement that such a scenario is a moral absurdity,⁶⁷ which implies another fact: that the human moral compass may indeed originate from something deeper than religion or belief, namely, a product of natural selection and evolution.⁶⁸

Life today tends to exhibit facts that contradict the claim of a God who is All-Merciful, All-Knowing, and All-Powerful. Whether through evolution or creation, suffering remains a stark reality, affirming that the world or the universe was not made for life, particularly human life, as Ibn Rushd intended in his argument of Inayah

Dalil Ikhtira

Dalil Ikhtira and the Watchmaker Analogy" by William Paley.

In the same book, Ibn Rushd presents another argument regarding the existence of God based on the Quran. This argument is called the Ikhtira' argument:

The first is that all these existing entities are invented, which, in the case of animals and plants, is self-evident, as the Almighty says: "Surely, those whom you call upon, besides Allah, will never create a fly, even if they band together. [And if a fly should rob them of something, they cannot retrieve it from it. How weak is the invoker and the invoked!...]... The second principle is that for everything invented there is an inventor. From these two principles it correctly follows that for every existing entity there is an agent who is its inventor. Evidence for this conclusion is found in the sheer number of invented entities.

⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Andrea M. Weisberger, "The Argument from Evil," dalam Micahel Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism...*, 173

⁶⁶ J. L. Mackie, "Evil and Omnipotence," *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 64, No. 254 (Apr., 1955), 206

⁶⁷ Quentin Smith, "The Anthropic Coincidences...", 350

⁶⁸ Leonardo D. Katz. *Evolutionary Origins of Morality: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*, (Bowling Green, OH: Imprint Academic, 2002), x

⁶⁹ Ibn Rusyd, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla...*, 46

In this argument, Ibn Rushd has two main premises. First, he attempts to prove the existence of God by postulating that all creatures are creations. Because a creation needs a creator to exist, therefore, secondly, God fills the role of that creator. He also mentions that to prove His existence, one only needs to observe the universe and can conclude about His existence.⁷⁰ Just like the argument of Inayah, this argument is also based on several verses of the Quran, stating that Allah created and designed creatures in such a way.

This argument of creation can be likened to the Watchmaker argument put forth by William Paley in 1802. The similarity between William Paley and Ibn Rushd lies in the assumption of the existence of a creator or designer behind the universe. However, William Paley did not base the statement of creation or design on religious literature but provided an interesting analogy between a watch and the universe:⁷¹

In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone, and was asked how the stone came to be there; I might possibly answer that, for anything I knew to the contrary, it had lain there forever, nor would it perhaps be very easy to show the absurdity of this answer. But suppose I had found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch happened to be in that place; I should hardly think of the answer which I had before given, that, for anything I knew, the watch might have always been there.

Before Charles Darwin published "On the Origin of Species" in 1859, this argument was highly respected. In fact, Darwin himself admired this argument.⁷² However, long before Darwin and Paley, David Hume had made similar arguments and refuted them in "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion."⁷³ Cleanthes, a character in Hume's dialogue, sought to equate machines with the entire universe and concluded that if machines are the product of an intelligent maker, then the universe must also be so. From the dialogue, there are at least three objections that Hume raised against the design argument:

⁷⁰ Richard C. Taylor, "Averroes: religious dialectic...", 189

⁷¹ William Paley, *Collected Works*, vol. 4: *Natural Theology* (London: Rivington, [1802] 1819), 1

⁷² Victor J. Strenger, *God: The Failed Hypothesis: How Science Shows that God Does Not Exist*, (New York: Prometheus Books, 2007), 39, Lihat juga: J. Browne, *Charles Darwin: Voyaging*, Volume 1 of a Biography (New York: Knopf, 1995)

⁷³ David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and Other Writings*, ed. Dorothy Coleman, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

1. The first objection is the false analogy. Both Cleanthes and Paley err in equating a machine/watch with the entire universe.⁷⁴ Unlike machines/watches, humans lack sufficient empirical data about the entire universe, so regarding a 'design' or 'creation' as evidence of a designer/creator is merely speculative.⁷⁵ Graham Oppy asserts that the assumption of a creator/designer when observing machines/watches arises because both are not natural. The more something resembles nature, the more difficult it is to assert the presence of design behind it..⁷⁶

2. There are several designs or creations that are flawed, with wasted materials, thus contradicting the nature of the All-Powerful and All-Compassionate creator/designer .⁷⁷ A. C. Grayling points out this inconsistency by showing thousands of species that went extinct due to nature's failure and maintenance, as well as the repetition of the same method in producing creatures, when the All-Powerful and All-Knowing Creator could have changed it with a better and more efficient method.⁷⁸

3. There is no justification for the existence of a single creator or designer.⁷⁹ Another possibility is that there are multiple creators or designers who contributed to the creation of life but did not unanimously agree, hence the failures in creation can be explained. For instance, the imperfections in the human body, as compiled by S. Jay Olshansky, Bruce Carnes, and Robert N. Butler, such as our rib bones not adequately covering our internal organs, our bones losing minerals after the age of thirty making them susceptible to osteoporosis, and so on.⁸⁰

⁷⁴ Richard M. Gale, "The Failure of Classical Theistic Arguments," dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism...*, 97

⁷⁵ J. L. Mackie, *The Miracle of Theism...*, 144

⁷⁶ George H. Smith, *Atheism: The Case Against God...*, 235

⁷⁷ Graham Oppy, *Arguing About Gods...*, 231

⁷⁸ A. C. Grayling, *The God Argument...*, 59

⁷⁹ David Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and Other Writings...*, 43

⁸⁰ Victor J. Strenger, *God: The Failed Hypothesis...*, 58. Lihat juga: S. Jay Olshansky, Bruce Carnes, and Robert N. Butler, "If Humans Were Built to Last," *Scientific American* Vol. 284, No. 3 (March 2001), 50-55

Another objection comes from Immanuel Kant in his book "Critique of Pure Reason."⁸¹ Kant believes that the physico-theological proof (argument from design) is insufficient to lead the theist to absolute truth because the argument relies on empirical grounds. He considers that this argument can only postulate the existence of a life designer and inevitably must return to relying on a priori contingent order of dependency.⁸²

Although Ibn Rushd stated something similar, the concept of creation implying a creator in both of their premises, the return of the creator or design argument to the principle of a priori dependency raises larger issues. For one may ask, "Who created the creator?" The typical response to this is to consider the creator as uncreated but the source of all creation, or to echo al-Farabi's concept of al-Mawjud al-Awwal (the First Being).⁸³ This response contains a special *pleading fallacy*,⁸⁴ because there is no reason to halt the regression backward to God. This point is reiterated by Dawkins.:

*You have to say something like 'God was always there', and if you allow yourself that kind of lazy way out, you might as well just say 'DNA was always there' or 'Life was always there', and be done with it.*⁸⁵

Oppy⁸⁶ and Smart⁸⁷ agree that positing a creator or designer as an explanation is not an explanation at all because it answers something unexplained with something unexplained. The postulation of a creator also violates Occam's Razor principle, as there is already a simpler alternative explanation, which is the theory of evolution. By positing a creator, one ends up with two burdens of proof: the creator agent and the manner in which the agent creates.⁸⁸ Similar to the argument from

⁸¹ J. L. Mackie, *Miracle of Theism...*, 145. Lihat juga: Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, Transcendental Dialectic, Book II, Chapter III. Section 6, terj. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, (London: George Bell and Sons. 1890)

⁸² J. L. Mackie, *Miracle of Theism...*, 145

⁸³ Abu Nasr al-Farabi, *Ara Ahl al-Madinah al-Fadhilah*, (Mesir: Dar wa Maktabah al-Hilal, Cet. 1, 1995), 5

⁸⁴ *Special Pleading Fallacy* adalah kesalahan berpikir karena tidak menggunakan prinsip atau aturan yang sama pada sesuatu tanpa menyediakan alasan yang cukup untuk mendukung pengecualian tersebut. Lihat: T. Edward Damer, *Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-Free Arguments*, ed. 6th, (California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009), 171

⁸⁵ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker...*, 141

⁸⁶ Graham Oppy, *Arguing About Gods...*, 231

⁸⁷ J. J. C. Smart, "Laws of Nature and Cosmic Coincidence," *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 35 (July 1985), 275–76

⁸⁸ George H. Smith, *Atheism: The Case Against God...*, 234

design, the argument from Ikhtira' and Paley's Watchmaker also fail to demonstrate the attribute of God's Mercy, considering the numerous failures in design or creation in the universe and the problem of evil..⁸⁹ William Whewell highlighted the failures of creation in *Of the Plurality of Worlds*:

*Of the vegetable seeds which are produced, what an infinitely small proportion ever grow into plants! Of animal ova, how exceedingly few become animals, in proportion to those that do not; and that are wasted, if this be waste!*⁹⁰

With various logical fallacies and the problem of evil, the argument of Ikhtira by Ibn Rushd and the argument by William Paley can no longer be upheld.

Conclusion

The attempt to prove the existence of God through mere argumentation and relying on the interpretation of natural phenomena has its own weaknesses. There is no valid evidence to support it, as all phenomena can be freely interpreted. In these arguments, whether from the proofs of Ibn Rushd, William Paley, or the Anthropic Principle, there are flaws in reasoning, a burden of proof, and they fail to provide any substantial explanation. However, these arguments can still serve as a reinforcement of faith or as persuasive tools for belief. Especially because of their simplicity and intuitive nature, they are easily accessible to the general publi

⁸⁹ Richard M. Gale, "The Failure of Classical Theistic Arguments," dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism...*, 97

⁹⁰ William Whewell, *Of the Plurality of Worlds. A Facsimile of the First Edition of 1853: Plus Previously Unpublished Material Excised by the Author Just before the Book Went to Press; and Whewell's Dialogue Rebutting His Critics, Reprinted from the Second Edition*, ed. Michael Ruse (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1853] 2001), 222

References

- Adamson, Peter, *Philosophy in The Islamic World: A History of Philosophy Without Any Gaps*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)
- al-Farabi, Abu Nasr, *Ara Ahl al-Madinah al-Fadhilah*, (Mesir: Dar wa Maktabah al-Hilal, Cet. 1, 1995)
- Barraclough, Timothy G., *The Evolutionary Biology of Species*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019)
- Barrow, J. D., F. J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)
- Behe, Michael J., *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, (New York: The Free Press, 1996)
- Brandon, Robert N., "Adaptation and Evolutionary Theory," *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, Vol. 9(3), (September 1978): 181-206
- Browne, J., *Charles Darwin: Voyaging*, (New York: Knopf, 1995)
- Carter, Brandon, "Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology," dalam M. S. Longair (ed.), *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data, International Astronomical Union/Union Astronomique Internationale*, Vol. 63, (Springer Dordrecht, 1974): 291–298
- Collins, Robin, "A Scientific Argument for the Existence of God," dalam Louis P. Pojman dan Michael Rea (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology*, ed. 6th, (California: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012): 202-220
- Copi, Irving Marmer, *Introduction to Logic*, (New York: Macmillan, 1953)
- Craig, William Lane, *The Cosmological Argument From Plato to Leibniz*, (The Macmillan Press: London, 1980)
- Craig, William Lane, *The Kalam Cosmological Argument*, (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979)
- Dajani, Rana, "Evolution and Islam's Quantum Question," *Zygon*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (2012): 343-353
- Dajani, Rana, "Evolution and Islam: Is There a Contradiction?" *Muslim World Science Initiative: Islam and Science: Muslim Responses to Science's Big Questions*, Islamabad, February 12–13 (2016): 142–151
- Damer, T. Edward, *Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-Free Arguments, Sixth Edition*, (California: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009)

- Darwin, Charles, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: John Murray, 1859)
- Dennett, Daniel C., "Atheism and Evolution," dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 135-148
- Drapper, Paul, "Evolution and the Problem of Evil," dalam Louis P. Pojman dan Michael Rea (ed.), *Philosophy of Religion: An Anthology*, ed. 6th, (Boston: Wadsworth, 2012): 271-282
- Fakhry, Majid, *Averroes (Ibn Rushd): His Life, Works and Influence*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2008)
- Fisher, Sir Ronald Aylmer, *The Genetical Theory of Natiral Selection: A Complete Variorum Edition*, ed. J. H. Bennett, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- Futuyama, Douglas, *Evolution*, (Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, 2005)
- Gale, Richard M., "The Failure of Classical Theistic Arguments," dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 86-101
- Grayling, A. C., *The God Argument: The Case againts Religion and for Humanism*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2013)
- Guessoum, Nidhal, "Religion Literalism and Science-Related Issues in Contemporary Islam," *Zygon*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (2010): 817-840
- Hacking, Ian, "The Inverse Gambler's Fallacy: the Argument from Design," *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 96, No. 383, (Jul. 1987): 331-340
- Hamblin, Charles Leonard, *Fallacies*, (London: Methuen & Co. 1970)
- Harari, Yuval Noah, *Sapiens*, terj. Damaring Tyas Wulandari Palar, (Jakarta: KPG (Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia), 2017)
- Hick, John, *The Existence of God*, ed. Paul Edwards, (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1964)
- Holley, David M., "Should Believers Be Interested in Arguments for God's Existence?" *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1983): 383-389
- Hume, David, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion and Other Writings*, ed. Dorothy Coleman, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

- Iqbal, Mohammad, *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, (Stanford, MO: Stanford University Press, 2012)
- Kampourakis, Kostas, *Understanding Evolution*, (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2014), 127-129.
- Kant, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason* terj. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, (London: George Bell and Sons, 1890)
- Katz, Leonardo D. (ed.). *Evolutionary Origins of Morality: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*, (Bowling Green, OH: Imprint Academic, 2002)
- Leaman, Oliver, *Averroes and his Philosophy*, (New York: Routledge, 2013)
- Mackie, J. L., *The Miracle of Theism: Aruments for and againts the existence of God*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Malik, Shoaib Ahmed, *Islam and Evolution: Al-Ghazali and the Modern Evolutionary Paradigm*, (New York: Routledge, 2021)
- Maydole, Robert E., "The Ontological Argument," dalam *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*, ed. William Lane Craig dan J. P. Moreland (United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing, 2009): 553–592
- Mills, David, *Atheist Universe*, (Berkeley, CA: Ulysses Press, 2006)
- Mills, J. S., *A System Of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive*, (Harper & Brothers, 1874)
- Olshansky, S. Jay, Bruce Carnes, Robert N. Butler, "If Humans Were Built to Last," *Scientific American*, Vol. 284, No. 3 (March 2001): 50-55.
- Oppy, Graham (ed.), *Ontological Argument*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2018)
- Oppy, Graham, *Arguing About Gods*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2006)
- Oppy, Graham, *The Best Argument against God*, (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)
- Paley, William, *Collected Works*, vol. 4: *Natural Theology* (London: Rivington, [1802] 1819)
- Prayogo, Tonny Ilham, M. Adib Fuadi Nuriz, M. Nurrosyid Huda Setiawan, M. Kharis Majid, "Ibnu Rushd's Criticism of the Existence of God Philosophy," *Jurnal Ushuluddin*, Vol. 30 No. 2 (July-December 2022): 155-168

- Ruse, Michael, "Modern Biologist and the Argument from Design" dalam Neil A. Mason (ed.), *God and Design: The Teleological Argument and Modern Science*, (New York: Routledg, 2003): 307-325
- Ruse, Michael, Brian Davies, *Taking God Seriously: Two Different Voices*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2021)
- Rusyd, Ibn, *Manāhij al-Adilla fi Aqā'id al-Milla*, ed. Mahmud Qasim, ed. 2nd, (Cairo: the Anglo-Egyptian Library, 1964), terjemah Inggris oleh Ibrahim Y. Najjar, *Faith & Reason in Islam: Averroes' Exposition of Religious Arguments*, (Oneworld Publication: 2014)
- Schaffer, Jonathan, "What Not to Multiply Without Necessity," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 93(4) (2015): 644-664
- Schipper, Edith Watson, Edward Walter Schuh, *A First Corse in Modern Logic*, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960)
- Schopf, J. William, Anatoliy B. Kudryavtsev, Andrew D. Czaja, Abhishek B. Tripathi, "Evidence of Archean life: Stromatolites and microfossils." *Precambrian Research*, 158 (3-4), (5 October 2007): 141-155
- Smart, J. J. C., "Laws of Nature and Cosmic Coincidence", *The Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 35 (July 1985): 272-280
- Smart, J. J. C., J. J. Haldane, *Atheism dan Theism*, 2nd ed, (Blackwell Publishing, 2003)
- Smith, George H., *Atheism: The Case Against God*, (New York: Prometheus Books, 1989)
- Smith, Quentin, "The Anthropic Coincidences, Evil and The Disconfirmation of Theism," *Religious Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (September 1992): 347-350
- Strenger, Victor J., *God: The Failed Hypothesis: How Science Shows that God Does Not Exist*, (New York: Prometheus Books, 2007)
- Swinburne, Richard, *The Existence of God*, (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Taylor, Richard C., "Averroes: religious dialectic and Aristotelian philosophical thought", dalam Peter Adamson dan Richard C. Taylor (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005): 180-200
- Weisberger, Andrea M., "The Argument from Evil," dalam Michael Martin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 166-182

Whewell, William, *Of the Plurality of Worlds. A Facsimile of the First Edition of 1853: Plus Previously Unpublished Material Excised by the Author Just before the Book Went to Press; and Whewell's Dialogue Rebutting His Critics, Reprinted from the Second Edition*, ed. Michael Ruse (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1853] 2001)

Whitrow, G. J., "Why physical space has three dimensions," *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 6 (21) (1995): 13-31

Wilson, Edward O., *Half-Earth: Our Plante's Fight for Life*, (New York: Liveright. 201