Specific Probability Theory to Reveal a Design Criterion

Yahya Mohamed

Specific probability theory has been formulated in several studies, notably (The Holy Grail in Discovering the Design Criterion), which included a critique of the Specified Complexity in Design Discovery as stated by William Dempsky and other proponents of the intelligent design movement. We have classified cosmic and biological phenomena into five categories, represented by each of the following relationships: strict, statistical, random coincidences, particle indeterminacy, and the category of intentional relationships.

It is agreed that the latter relations are represented by human behavior and its technical, scientific, industrial, and other effects. But the point of contention concerns biological systems and some complex cosmic systems. Except for a few, scientists denied that these systems are capable of interpretation according to the type of intentional or intelligent relationships.

With this, we set a criterion that defines what belongs to the latter category to reasonably distinguish it from the rest of the other categories of interpretation of cosmic and biological phenomena. The condition of this criterion is that the realized event or phenomenon belongs to a very narrow area of specific probability corresponding to another that is very broad because of its many combinations or probabilistic possibilities.

As it is assumed in this case that two contradictory regions are far apart in terms of specific, not personal, probability. Whenever one of them becomes stronger, the other weakens, and vice versa, to the point where we expect that the spontaneous occurrence will be the share of a

member of the wide area, not the narrow, and when the opposite occurs, this can be considered a sign of intelligence; Depending on the extent of the disparity between the two regions.

In terms of accuracy, the design criterion is achieved according to three conditions, namely: complexity, a specific probability that is bilaterally far, and the achievement of one of the members of the narrow area. Undoubtedly, these conditions apply to various forms of complex structures, the latter may be real, artificial, imaginative hypothetical, or abstract mathematical, depending on our division of systems that accept this criterion in one way or another, and they are four: recursive, functional, finely tuned numbers, and abstract mathematical.

The most important of these systems is the functional system, characterized by the complex function arising from random structural complexity. By complex random structure, we mean that its associations are highly irregular, as in the genetic and protein sequences. This random complexity can generate different functions, and it has a real existence, as in machines and biological systems, as well as machines made by humans. It also has another unreal existence without a natural or artificial origin, as in the linguistic characters, since their associations are random and they do not produce meaning within. Rather, humans agreed to make them productive for purposes related to human and social needs.

Undoubtedly, all the previous phenomena are difficult to explain without assuming the factor of intelligence. Rather, the narrowness of the specific probability region may lead to a complete rejection of every explanation that is not based on this factor, when the amount of specific probability reaches less than the upside-down of the total processes of the universe or available probabilistic resources.

We point out that the conclusion of the design, in this case, is different from the conclusion of scientific theories despite relying on the same

reliable basis in induction and the logic of probabilities. The state of design is characterized by gaining countless clues that indicate it without a competitor. The parties in it are also characterized as being closed and very limited, as they are two competing parties, as they are embodied in two narrow and wide probability areas, in contrast, to open scientific theories. Any scientific theory that is taken for explanation can be replaced by another that surpasses it, and so without limits. Therefore, the open scientific system does not lead to certainty in concepts that are not directly perceived, unlike the closed system because there is a mental limitation of the priori parties, as represented by random coincidences and design. The probability clues are distributed between these two parties without a competing third party.

In general, the most important rules and results that we have concluded in this field are as follows:

1- There are four different systems, two of which are directly related to randomness as a generative condition, they are recursive and functional, in addition to the finely tuned numbers system similar to functional in some respects, and finally the abstract mathematical system.

2- A regular structure can only produce simple functions. Hence, the relationship between regular structure and complex functions is inversed.

3- The random structure is linked to the complex functional system in a positive correlation.

4- Both functional complex systems and numerical fine-tuning fall within a very narrow structural circle; It is the rejection region used in the statistical hypotheses - compared to all other possible cases within the random structure of each. This is what makes them need a non-naturalistic explanation based on the element of intelligent guidance, as they indicate intelligence in terms of the subjective and not the

accidental, unlike the other two systems, where they have nothing to do with intelligence except in terms of accidental use.

Translated by **Zaid Kanady**

The reference

https://www.fahmaldin.net/index.php?id=2561