

A review of the history of theistic discussion will show that the value of this argument has been variously estimated. At times, perhaps, too much has been expected from it, for it is to be remembered that it is not the only line of proof by which the belief in the divine existence is established. In modern times the design argument has fallen into bad repute in certain quarters, and then the theistic position has lost useful elements of proof. The Cartesians, in their zeal for ontology and cosmology, almost ignored teleology, and Descartes himself thought the design argument of little value. Then Kant in his famous critique did much to destroy its good name during the last century. It is a hopeful sign of the thought of the present generation to find this argument receiving earnest and respectful attention, for in some respects it is the most convincing of all the proofs of the divine existence. During the present century vast advances have been made in scientific research. Sometimes the facts brought to light thereby have been used as weapons against teleology, and in certain quarters the scientific spirit has been inclined to look on final causes with but ill-concealed scorn. Theism, however, may really rejoice in every advance true science makes, since in every established scientific fact she finds new material to fortify her position.

The proof of the divine existence under discussion is sometimes termed the argument from *design*, and sometimes the argument from *final causes*. Both forms of expression are imperfect, and need some explanation. In regard to the former, it must be carefully observed that we do not argue *from* but *to* design. We do not, in the first instance, make an inference from design, but we are called to argue in such a way as to prove the reality of design. To assume design is to beg the question. The existence of design must be first proved. In short, it must be shown that there are those features in nature which clearly indicate the existence of an intelligence adapting means to secure foreseen ends. In regard to the latter, it is necessary to point out the ambiguity of the expression, final cause. It sometimes denotes certain aspects of *order* simply; and, again, it often relates to certain features of *design*, or intention. Then, further, this design may be regarded either as intrinsic or extrinsic finality. In the former case there is adaptation of the various parts of an organ to each other, and in the latter