

TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT

The point of the argument can be put as follows: localized interaction by itself fails to make intelligible the possibility of any order whatever, notwithstanding that without some order the concept of interaction has no meaning. Hence to deny any nonlocalized form of interaction (i.e., a form at once universal and individual) is to deny all interaction whatever, which is meaningless, since "There is interaction" (and so, "There is order") is necessarily true, the alternative being nonsensical.

Following the general rule that the proofs for the existence of God are one and all "reductio ad absurdum arguments against alternatives or substitutes for theism," we may say that the teleological argument is successful to the extent that it shows all the alternatives to be without any coherent meaning in terms of our common human experience, thereby exhibiting theism as "sole residual legatee." Specifically, there seem to be the following alternatives to the idea of God as the nonlocalized form of interaction whereby there is any interaction at all: (1) there is no co-ordination or mutual harmony between the localized forms of interaction; (2) there is such co-ordination, but no common subordination of all the localized forms to one universal, nonlocalized, hence superior form; (3) there is both co-ordination and subordination, but the superior, superordinate form of interaction is not divine, i.e., not "worthy of inclusive devotion because supremely good."

But none of these three alternatives seems to have any coherent meaning. (1) There must be at least enough co-ordination or mutual harmony between the nonlocalized forms of interaction so that they do not exclude or prevent one another's existence. (2) But then this co-ordination

But if the point of the argument is that only strictly universal interaction can explain cosmic order, the notion of a plurality of universal interactors either implies a distinction without a difference (i.e., despite the plurality of interactors there is still cosmic order) or else makes the point of the argument impossible. Order is in principle the rule of one.

To sum up: the point of the argument is that localized interaction requires nonlocalized or cosmic interaction to set limits to chaos and mutual frustration.