



# A Re-Reading of William Parley's *Telos* in Design within the Context of Anthropic Principle and Its Implications for Contemporary Theology

Oluwatoyin Adebola Gbadamosi Ph.D.

Department of Religious Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

**Abstract:** *Philosophers and Theologians have grappled with the need to understand the nature of the universe for centuries, and for this subject to remain a subject of intense discussion in contemporary circles, suggests its continuous importance. Science has always been relevant, most significantly, in its attempt to explain our interest in the world around us. Thus, William Parley made use of the famous analogy of a watch and the world to explain the precision in the universe, and to prove the existence of a designer. This paper, therefore, attempts a re-reading of his work within the context of a scientific position known as the Anthropic Principle. This is done by focusing on William Parley's Teleological argument for God's existence; the nature of science and religion within the framework of this study; and lastly, the meaning of the Anthropic Principle and its implication for contemporary theology. This study employs the Providence theory of John Polkinghorne, which shows that God has created the universe in such a way as to provide what is needed for life, most especially human existence.*

**Keywords:** *William Parley, Telos, Anthropic Principle, Contemporary Theology*

## INTRODUCTION

Looking at the character of the universe: the stars, the oceans, the mountains, the sky, and nature generally, a rational mind would certainly wonder at the phenomena that we behold. This would further arouse his/her curiosity in form of some thought provoking questions such as: what brought together this immense structure that we see? Why is there a universe? Why are we here? What is responsible for the sensation that we behold? Is the universe created or is it an object of chance? Is there anything like the universe at all? Is God's existence, the best explanation for the universe? And most importantly, what is responsible for the obvious order in the universe? All these questions and many more, require answers which are sought by providing "explanations" for existence. "Existence" in this regard, is the sum total of all that exists. Hence, providing this explanation for existence has been a major task for philosophers and theologians since antiquity, however, this issue still remains unsolved in the contemporary circle. History reveals to us that philosophers have sometimes sought scientific explanations. A prominent example could be drawn from Aristotle, when he employs Physics to portray his understanding of existence. He firmly asserts that to understand something exists as it does, one must appeal to the three principles: form, matter and privation. (Peterson and Vanarrgon, 2004) This shows that scientific explanations have always been sought in unravelling answers of existence.

History also reveals that when scientific explanations do not suffice or better still, one might say *where the buck stops*, metaphysical conclusions are drawn and this is where theology comes in, even though the journey

of theology and science has never been a smooth one. This is much obvious considering the fact that religion, especially, Christianity has had to deal with issues in the wake of scientific discoveries, where some established beliefs were challenged. (Murray and Rea, 2008) Beliefs such as the shape of the earth, three storied universe (heaven above and hell below), the sun's movement and even creationism which stand at odds with the evolution theory and some other claims which were queried by science.

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, who lived 500-428 BC, was probably the first philosopher to attribute the obvious order in the universe to a larger plan or design. However, Socrates and his student, Plato, though influenced by Anaxagoras, challenged some of his ideas. Both held that since matter is currently in motion, there has to be a higher cause that sets it in motion. For Aristotle, the indigenous structural and functional design contained in all life forms was itself *ipso facto proof* of an "intelligent natural world that functions according to some deliberate design". Much later, philosophers like Augustine, Aquinas and notably William Parley, made use of this thinking of Aristotle to argue for the existence of a transcendent creator, that is, God, thereby drawing metaphysical conclusions from their physical observations of the natural world that our highly ordered physical world could not have been formed by chance alone. (Corey, 1993)

History is repeating itself because in recent decades, a new natural theology is becoming popular in the circle of some Christian scientists such as John Polkinghorne, Ian Barbour, Arthur Peacocke and several other scholars. This is not the old styled natural theology of Aquinas, rather it is based on the more modest observation of scholars like Hawks "that the universe exists in a very precise way that has allowed the development of complex living organisms including human beings" (Hawkes, 2012, p.53). This phenomenon has come to be known as the Anthropic Principle. This paper is domiciled in this new natural theology, as it discusses this "precision" in the universe and its implication for contemporary theology. However, this is not an unprecedented discourse as William Parley has earlier made a great case out of this "precision" in the universe (although he obviously did not call it the Anthropic Principle), to prove the existence of a *Designer*. Thus, this paper aims at re-examining his work within the context of contemporary evidence courtesy of science, with a view of discussing its implication for theology.

A Teleological argument for God's existence is based on the notion that there is order and design in the world, which is a product of intelligence or the work of a Designer. The order or design we see in the world is to serve an intentional purpose or end also known as *telos*. (Paley, 2006) Teleological arguments are concerned with the orderly character of the universe. A number of scholars have made use of the teleological argument such as Thomas Aquinas, in his 5<sup>th</sup> way, Richard Taylor, Richard Swinburne and F.R Tennant among several others. Furthermore, the famous critics of the teleological argument include David Hume, Charles Darwin's theory of evolution, John Stuart Mill and Immanuel Kant. (Oshitelu, 2002) However, the most popular version of the teleological arguments is found in the works of William Parley.

#### **William Parley and His *Telos* or Design Argument**

But can there be any person... who can consider the regular movements of the heavenly bodies, the prescribed courses of the stars, and see how all is linked and bound into a single system, and then deny that there is any conscious purpose in this and say that it is the work of chance? Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC), *De NaturaDeorum*. (Paley, 2006, p.ix)

This thinking of Marcus Tullius Cicero is clearly echoed in the works of Parley, because Parley believes that there is an obvious design in the universe, the delicate intricacies of what we behold in the universe are not mere products of chance because they serve an end. Parley holds that once you agree that there is a design, you are bound to concur that there is a designer and this Designer is inferred to be God. This simple analysis sums up the whole argument of Arch Deacon William Parley.

Aristotle postulated the existence of a larger "end" (*telos*) to which all events were magnetically attracted, and it was this end or purpose, which gave every object in the universe its ultimate meaning and significance. It

was Aristotle's rationale that influenced philosophers like Augustine, Aquinas and notably Parley, thousands of years later, to argue for the existence of a transcendent creator – God, and that our highly ordered world could not have been formed by chance alone. (Corey, 1993) According to Oshitelu, the teleological argument is also described as the argument from design or argument to design. This argument is the most popular, and probably the most controversial and criticised, of all the theistic arguments. (Oshitelu, 2002) Oshitelu goes further to explain the meaning of teleology, according to him, the word teleology is derived from two basic Greek words, *telos* which means “end” and *logos* that means “reasoning “ or “word”. This means teleological argument, using Oshitelu's words, is “reasoning to an end argument”. Teleological argument argues that the world shows order or design, and it shows this order or design in the sense of direction which points to an end. William Parley (1743-1805) was the Archdeacon of Carlisle, North England and his teleological argument is in his work, *Natural Theology* published in 1802. Natural Theology starts with the legendary analogy between the universe and a pocket watch (which in the form of the chronometer was high technology in 1802- if he were alive today maybe something like an I-phone would have conveyed the same message). Parley states thus:

If one were to encounter a stone while walking across a heath (desert place or uncultivated land), one might think it had always happened to be there. However, if one were to see a watch lying on the ground in the same manner, the intricacy of its part would surely lead one to conclude that it had been made by an intelligent designer. (Paley, 2006, p. xix)

Oshitelu (2002) provides a simple analysis of the logic of Parley's argument, where he submits that the point of the argument is that to find a stone on a heath will not really be a surprise to the finder or anyone hearing that a stone is found on a heath. However, if one were to find a watch on the same heath, it would definitely generate a different reaction. One would even be more surprised when the watch is opened and realizing that all its parts was working. The main inference of the argument is that the watch must have had a designer who designed it for a purpose. Hick goes further, quoting Parley, to argue as follows:

The natural world is as complex as a mechanism, and as manifestly designed as any watch. The rotation of the planets in the solar system, and on earth, the regular procession of the seasons and the complex structure and mutual adaptation of a living organism, all suggest design. The human brain as an example has thousands of millions of cells functioning together in a co-ordinated system... Can such complex and efficient mechanisms have come about by chance? (Hick, 1963, p.23-24)

Parley uses a number of other examples to show design in the world: a human mouth is shaped in a way as to take enough food down to the stomach tract, the gills of fishes are fashioned to allow them swim in water, and certain animals can survive extreme weathers. All these are not accidental, but deliberate on the part of the designer. As we have a watch-maker, so also we have a world-maker and this designer is called by the theological name, God. The teleological argument is quite straightforward, and the submission of Parley is simple. He believes that an observation of the world reveals order, which further shows a deliberate design, which is not accidental because it serves an end or purpose. Once the idea of deliberate design is accepted, it will be illogical to deny the existence of the designer and the simple inference is drawn theologically that this designer is God. Unfortunately, it is this theological conclusion or inference that is the basis of some of the criticisms meted out against the argument of William Parley.

David Hume, the Scottish philosopher did not share Parley's optimism, he was sceptical and vehemently argued that the fact that there is an order or some semblance of design does not imply there is a designer. And that the analogy between a watch, a house and anything at all with the world was weak. (Hick, 1963) Although it could be possible to agree with Hume and share his scepticism that a semblance of design or order

does not connote a designer, nonetheless, an objective examination of the teleological argument will reveal that the argument tilts more in favour of a designer rather than against it. And the fact that scientific discoveries, thousands of years after the submission of Parley, tend to present a clearer picture of what Parley had in mind. Parley with the limited knowledge of science available in his days, as seen earlier in this paper, discussed biology where he used his knowledge of the anatomy of humans and other living organisms. He also ventured into astronomy in his discussion of the solar systems to point out the obvious design in the world. Contemporary science has no doubt gone beyond where Parley and his contemporaries such as Aquinas stopped. Science in its continuous quest for knowledge has made some interesting discoveries, which are interpreted in some quarters as having profound implications for theology. One of such is the Anthropic Principle, which in a very simple term, shows that someone at some time and somewhere must have taken time to create what we have today, because just a very minute deviation or difference would have made a lot of difference and human beings would not have been here at all. Everything we see is just “so right” for it to have been an accident or products of chance. This principle re-echoes the logic in Parley’s argument and it seems as if the principle is a clearer elucidation on his position of the intentional design evident in the world.

### **The Anthropic Principle**

The terminology, Anthropic Principle, was first introduced by Brandon Carter, a British Physicist in a paper presented in Krakow, Poland in 1973 at a symposium held in honour of Copernicus’ 500<sup>th</sup> birthday. Brandon’s argument began with a discussion of Copernicus, whose heliocentric system (planets revolving round the sun) is often thought as removing humankind from any privileged position in the universe. Carter, however, challenged this thinking by insisting that humankind is privileged in that we exist to observe it. If the universe had been slightly differed in its size, age and character, then living things would not have lived to notice it. (Hawkes, 2012) There are some significant themes in the argument of Carter, which a lot of authors have elaborated and corroborated to discuss the Anthropic Principle both in the scientific and theological circles. The first is that the human race is privileged, the second is related to the first, why? The third is the answer: because the universe is exactly the way it ought to be, it is just right. And the final one is observation, this is quite profound because it means, human beings noticed or came to the awareness of its environment and the general character of existence. The term, “observation” features frequently in the writings of several authors such as Peacock, Goddard, Thompson, Noris and others that will be discussed shortly to show its significance to the Anthropic Principle.

Basically, the Anthropic Principle has been classified into two, the “weak” and the “strong” versions. The “weak” version says that the world has some properties compatible with the reality of an observer, because if it did not, no one would be here to observe it. We cannot have a cosmos that is slightly different from the one we live in because our existence and reality is subject to the preceding reality of such cosmos. The “strong” version of the Anthropic Principle is more contentious because in Hawkes terms, “it suggests that there is a designed purpose between the structure of the universe and the existence of human beings”. (Hawkes, 2012, p.54) Dress shares some of the opinions of Hawkes. He believes that there is something special about the Anthropic Principles because these principles are similar to some “observed” structures in the world. It is however, discovered that those features are necessary for the development of life. (Dress, 2012) Dress prefers to call these “observed” features “Anthropic Coincidences”, but one might ask, if they are truly coincidental and not deliberate? The position of Noris might suffice as an answer to this question. Noris opines that recent evidences, which discuss the Anthropic Principle suggest the universe is barely fit for human survival, if several of its basic features had been slightly different, human life could never had arisen. He goes further to say that the Anthropic Principle is an attempt to account for the fact that the universe appears “finely tuned” for human existence. (Norris, 1993) Goddard (2012) also expresses Peacock’s belief that the simple fact of our existence turns out to have great consequences. The consequences of the simple fact of our existence is the cause of considerable debate pervading the scientific community lately over what is called the Anthropic

Cosmological Principle, this, according to Goddard, is the idea that the universe is just right for life to occur. Goddard quotes an author who describes this principle succinctly, “the universe must be suitable for life, otherwise, we would not be here to wonder about it”. Thompson also shares this view because she argues “that the initial conditions and structure of the universe had to be **exactly** as they were in order for human kind to develop”. She goes further to argue that “certain features of the universe had enabled it to develop in the particular way it has; if the universe had developed differently, we would not have the galaxies we have,” (Thompson, 2013, Ebook) in the likes of the sun, the planets, and the earth that is capable of sustaining life. Goddard (2012) corroborates Thompson’s view when he asserts that there are numerous features and mathematical constants in the equation of physics and cosmology, which seem unable to be predicted by any known theory and seem to be miraculously tuned to allow life to persist. Any slight deviation from these settings would have been a catastrophe, causing stars to collapse and atoms to evaporate. Dress gives some examples of these settings, which allow existence in the universe. According to him, the special character of the universe has three dimensions of space and this is believed to have major benefits compared to either the ones having two or the one with four dimensions. Interestingly, the rate at which the universe expands is perfect as it is, for if it had been just a little greater or even a little lower, the world would not have had the stars or time would have been adequate for the occurrence of evolution. Dress says “we see a universe where there is carbon because we depend on carbon”. (Dress, 2012, p.117) In addition to these examples, the nuclear forces that exist in the universe had to be just right, if they had been even slightly weaker, we would have only hydrogen in the universe, if they were slightly stronger, only helium. The nuclear forces we have are just right to allow stable stars to develop. (Hawkes, 2012) The carbon and water are also necessary to develop life. Parley (2006) also shared this opinion of the special fine tuning of the universe, long before Carter coined the word Anthropic Principle. Parley ventured into chemistry, astronomy, and notably biology, he mentioned particular structures adapted to the curious ways of life of various organisms; and prospective contrivances, which show foresight and benevolence in creation by the provision of what was necessary. All these contrivances are beneficial in that they are necessary for life to exist and definitely deliberate and not occurring by chance. The Anthropic Principle points to a *telos* or ultimate purpose of what is observed in the universe. If the Anthropic Principle shows a *telos* or purpose in the design of the universe, it then has a serious implication, especially the “strong” Anthropic Principle, which suggests that there is a designed purpose between the organization of the world and the survival of human beings and life generally. This *telos* points towards a momentous direction and it needs a metaphysical conclusion, which is why some scientists may not be comfortable with the “strong” Anthropic Principle. The metaphysical conclusion is the same as the inference drawn from Parley’s analogy of the watchmaker, all what we observe are too intricate and deliberate to be trivialized as mere accidental. Who then is responsible for the structure of the universe that we observe? This is when a metaphysical inference is drawn, and where theology comes in.

### **Implications of the Anthropic Principle for Theology**

Aristotle introduced the notion of teleology into the study of philosophy and sciences, and in one way or the other, many subsequent debates have revolved around this idea. A major implication of this concept of teleology is that it puts a lot of emphasis not just on how nature works but why it works the way it does. This is the reason for the need to answer the big question of why nature seems to have inbuilt properties. (Sweetman, 2010) Science may not be able to answer this question adequately, which may be why the “weak” Anthropic version may be preferred, which says the world has some properties compatible with the reality of an observer, because if it did not, no one would be here to observe it. This version stops only at the mere stage of observation without going further to ask why it is so. This is where theology comes in and some inferences have to be drawn outside the purviews of science. The anthropic principle within a theological context can be summarized as follows:

- i. An observation of the world reveals that nature displays orderly patterns or processes (for example climate, seasons, human anatomy and so on)
- ii. These orderly patterns or processes are products of a planned effort or intelligence and not accidental occurrences.
- iii. If orderly patterns and processes are products of a planned effort or intelligence which are not accidental, then, a rational question would be what is responsible for all these?

The advent of this germane question shows that the strong version of the anthropic principle has already emerged. If the possibility of chance or accident is struck out, then a metaphysical conclusion comes into play courtesy of theology. Ian Barbour (1990) says that ancient scientists have frequently displayed their admiration for the harmony and order seen in creation, believed to be the products of God's hands. This new style of natural theology revolves around the Providence theory, the basis for the theoretical framework of this research and its conclusion. Although history tells us that theology and science have had a stormy journey, the situation has been undergoing some changes in recent years as philosophers, scientists and theologians are finding a nexus in the positions of the two fields. John Polkinghorne, in his book *Science and Providence* (1989), reveals that purpose and direction seen in creation are direct products of providence. He believes that God chose to create and nurture human kind through purpose and direction and not by mere chance. According to Mel Thompson, providence "is the belief that God has in some way chosen to create, nurture and sustain humankind: that life has not been made possible merely by some chance, or by the impersonal process of evolution, but is something guided by God for his own purpose in dealing with humankind". (Thompson, 2013, EBook) The strong version of the anthropic principle fits in readily into a theological milieu. This is because providence shows that that the creator, God in some ways, have put the process of evolution that occurred in the world in place, this was done to allow the creation of humankind.

Dress also shares this realist attitude seen in the providence theory, because he is cognizant of the fact that 'there is an external reality', which according to him is "ontological and that science is telling us something about the world", which he sees as 'epistemological'. He believes further that both disciplines of theology and science have a genuine "constructive side, which accommodates the distance between our ideas and reality." (Dress, 2012, p.108) This genuine constructive side is the basis of the theological implications of the Anthropic Principle. We cannot just stop at the level of the "observation" of the universe, which otherwise is the basis of what science tells us, we must proceed to understand the basis of all that we see around us. There must be an understanding of the reality responsible for the wonders, order and intelligent design that we see in the world. Hence, there must be reasons for the *telos* we observe, and this is where theology comes in and the basis for the providence theory.

The question of the significance of the Anthropic Principle and the reason for it is a scientific *metaquestion*. This is because although the Anthropic Principle arises from the insights of scientific cosmology, it goes beyond what science alone is competent to discuss. The reason for this is that our concern here is not physics, but metaphysics. (Polkinghorne, 1998) This is the basis for the implied need for a metaphysical explanation of the Anthropic Principle and where theology comes in. Hawk (2012) notices that although it is the "weak" Anthropic Principle that enjoys particular credence because most of the scientists that embrace the Anthropic Principle think in terms of order rather than something that was specifically designed to allow life. Hawkes goes further, quoting John Polkinghorne, that Polkinghorne is not impressed by the weak version of the Anthropic Principle because it fails to acknowledge the remarkable specificity of the universe. He says "it amounts to no more than saying "we are here because we are here", which he says is "an intellectual lazy response to an unexpectedly precise requirement. (Hawkes, 2012, p.55) Polkinghorne, in his book, *Beyond Science: The Wider Human Context*, shows that what we see in the universe is beyond science. The title of his work further reveals his obvious position that science is just a perspective and a wider human context will ultimately accommodate theology, which is why he is not impressed with the "weak" Anthropic Principle. He

believes that “the delicate fine-tuning of physical law has made existence possible and that we receive a valuable, if indirect, hint from science that there is a divine meaning and purpose behind the cosmic history.” (Polkinghorne, 1998, p.89-92) Science is possible and cosmic history has been fruitful because the universe we inhabit is a creation, which is what the whole Anthropic Principle means in fundamental terms. Goddard asserts also that the Anthropic Principle is most times interpreted as a religious argument to infer the existence of a Creator. In his words, “the reason our universe is so peculiar and well-fitted is because the creator wanted (willed) it to be that way for the formation of life.”(Polkinghorne, 1998, p.89-92) A fundamental question arrives from the necessary inference from the Anthropic Principle, who? Or what is responsible for what is understood as the Anthropic Principle? Nigro makes an assertive theistic case for the Anthropic Principle, he says, “the Anthropic Principle is the most theistic result to ever come out of science, perhaps, it is an atheist’s word for God or the closest an unbeliever can ever come to naming such.” (Nigro, 2013, p.12) Nigro believes that when an unbeliever is confronted with the incredible fine-tuning of nature and other life enabling necessities and the possibility of attributing this fine-tuning to chance is zero, what he comes up with is the Anthropic Principle. Murray and Rea (2008) share this belief of Nigro, they opine that the basis of the Anthropic Principle suggests that a great brain must have an outstanding mastery of the sciences, in physics chemistry and biology, this mastery shows that nothing was by accident. Murray and Rea further make use of the following argument, which they believe favours a theological implication of the Anthropic Principle:

The universe exhibits fine-tuning of a sort that makes it suitable for life.

The existence of fine-tuning is highly improbable under atheism.

Therefore, fine-tunings provide strong evidence in favour of theism over atheism.

(Murray and Rea, 2008, p.150)

The argument above is valid, and the logic employed here is straightforward. Premise one is quite obvious, and faulting it may not be an easy task. Premise two on the other hand, may be successful only if an atheistic explanation for fine-tuning is convincing, which may not be the case. Therefore, once the two premises are accepted, one is bound to accept the conclusion of the argument. This argument is similar to the logic in the teleological argument especially that of Parley. The Teleological argument simply is the belief that the cosmos looks like the creation of a Designer or Creator, with the purpose of a divinely inspired end (*telos*). Once a person acknowledges that there is a design, then, the person is bound to acknowledge the existence of a designer. In the same vein, once a person acknowledges that the fine-tunings we observe in the world is not accidental but deliberate; the person is also bound to acknowledge that someone or some-force must be responsible for this deliberate act. Proving that this designer is God is another case entirely because theologians like Parley took what can be expressed as a “leap of faith” to conclude that this designer is God and this inference is one of the reasons for the severe criticisms of the teleological argument. In order not to fall into this same trap, one may conclude by using what is now termed as “inferences to the best explanation”. According to Murray and Rea, “design arguments in contemporary philosophy of religion are constructed as inferences to the best explanation”. (2008, p.150) Therefore, it is quite safe to submit that theology- the existence of God - can be inferred as the best explanation for the Anthropic Principle. This means other explanations may be available to account for the suggestion that there is a designed purpose between the organization of the cosmos and the reality or survival of human beings and life generally but the best explanation is available courtesy of theology.

Although the findings of science in the Anthropic Principle has a major implication for contemporary theology because it further re-asserts the conclusion of the teleological arguments of primitive philosophers like Parley, a word of caution is essential, especially for theology. This caution is not necessarily to dampen the optimistic mood based on the findings of science, which seems to re-affirm the position of theology, but to make room for a little scepticism. This scepticism is as a result of the major strength of science, which unfortunately is also

its greatest weakness. Thomas Kuhn (1970) expresses this as a paradigm shift, which displays a sceptical approach to accepting scientific position since data are subject to re-evaluation, making any scientific position prone to revision in the light of new evidences.. This simply means that the Anthropic Principle is subject to revision or even total discard. However, regardless of this threat of paradigm shift, an important factor is the availability of existing evidences for God's existence before the Anthropic Principle or other findings of science. The Anthropic Principle is only an addition to what has been understood and accepted by faith, and also, what is already established in the theological circles, therefore, its conclusion is worth upholding. It is necessary also to note the challenge in attempting an empirical proof of God's existence. According to Oshitelu, who asks an interesting question. He asks that "is it possible to have an empirical proof of the existence of God?" He tries to answer this question, "Empirical proofs of the existence of things are often very straightforward. If I want to prove to someone that there is a cat in the sitting room, my procedure will normally be to take him there and ask the person to look for himself. The person is then likely to have a visual experience of a kind... and that would rest the matter. Deities are thought of as spatial beings, they manifest themselves in less direct ways." (Oshitelu, 2002, p. 54) The logic in Oshitelu's thinking points further to the difficulties in trying to attempt an empirical proof of God's existence. Nonetheless, a theological affirmation of the epistemological finding of science in regard to the Anthropic Principle is a worthy cause because it re-affirms the positions of theology. It is also worthwhile because it tries to speak the language understood by an age, which appears to be science driven and motivated.

## Conclusion

This paper has attempted a re-reading of the teleological argument of William Parley' *telos* or purpose in design in the context of a recent finding of science, also referred to as the Anthropic Principle, which seems to share the logic in the reasoning of Parley. The conclusion of the Anthropic Principle, especially the "strong" Anthropic Principle, suggests a deliberate act or intended end or *telos* in the universe. This inference has a significant implication for theology, and it has been interpreted as an additional proof for God's existence, an issue that has remained a subject of intense debate in the history of philosophy of religion. This has not been an easy task for philosophers and the Anthropic Principle may succeed in some quarters, while some may find other explanations for the deliberate *telos* observed around us, apart from the one that has a theological implication.

The major implication of the Anthropic Principle for contemporary theology is that it can be interpreted as additional evidence to the existence of God. The Anthropic Principle re-interprets the reasoning of William Parley because the existence of God is the best explanation for the designed purpose, *telos* or end that is seen in the universe. In conclusion, a pragmatic view will endorse the Anthropic Principle because it serves a useful purpose in the theological circle because it corroborates the established belief, most significantly, in the existence of God.

## References

1. Barbour, I. (1971). *Issues in Science and Religion*. New York: Harper & Row.
2. Corey, M. (1993). *God and the New Cosmology: The Anthropic Design Argument*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
3. Dress, W. (2012). Theology and Cosmology beyond the Big Bang Theory. In Fennema, J. & Iain, P. (eds.) *Science and Religion: One World-Changing Perspectives on Reality*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
4. Goddard, J. (2012). *Faith Vs Science: The Unnecessary Dichotomy* (ebook). Retrieved from [www.firsteditiondesignpublishing.com](http://www.firsteditiondesignpublishing.com)
5. Hawkes, N. (2012). *Evidence for God: A Scientific case for God*. Eugene: Wipf& Stock.



6. Hick, J. (1963). *Philosophy of Religion*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
7. Murray, M. & Rea, M. (2008). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Nigro, S. (2013). *The Soul of the Earth*. St. Louis: Central Bureau CCVA.
9. Norris, H. (1993). *Cosmology: Historical, Literary, Philosophical, Religious and Scientific Perspectives*. New York: Garland publications Inc.
10. Oshitelu, G. (2002). *The Philosophy of Religion: An Introduction*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
11. Parley, W. (2006), *Natural Theology: Oxford World's Classic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Peacock, J. (1999). *Cosmological Physics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Peterson, M. & Vanarrgon, R. (eds.) (2004). *Contemporary Debates in Philosophy of Religion*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
14. Polkinghorne, J. (1989). *Science and Providence*.
15. Sweetman, B. (2010). *Religion and Science: An Introduction*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, Ltd.
16. Thompson, M. (2013). *Religion and Science*. Hodder Education (ebook)