

## Teleological Argument for God's Existence

---

1. Anything that was designed had a designer.
2. If the universe was designed, then the universe had a Designer.
3. Fine-tuning means there is only a very precise setting of parameters that will yield a particular outcome.
4. Scientific calculations indicate that the physical properties of the earth and its solar system are fine tuned to sustain life for advanced conscious beings such as humans: Oxygen level, transparency of atmosphere, moon-earth gravitational interaction, carbon dioxide level, water vapor levels in atmosphere, Jupiter's protective gravitational field, thickness of the earth's crust, earth's rotation duration, earth's axial tilt, atmospheric discharge (lightning), etc. (See Geisler/Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*)
5. Scientific calculations indicate that the fundamental physical constants and quantities of the universe are exquisitely fine-tuned for life (life being any living, breathing, biological form that takes in food, processes it, reproduces, etc). This fine-tuning is the pre-requisite for any life at all, anywhere in the universe (i.e., life *in this universe with our laws of physics*; nothing is being affirmed or denied about what kind of life is possible or probable in a different universe with different laws of physics). These constants and quantities are not determined by the laws of nature (i.e., there are no laws of nature that govern how the laws of nature had to be). If these constants and quantities were the least bit different, there would not even be chemistry or matter for life to exist. The assessment and degree of fine-tuning is determined by comparing the life-permitting range of values with the set of values for which determinations can be made of whether the values are life-permitting or not. The smaller the ratio, the greater the degree of fine-tuning. Robin Collins describes a few examples of this fine-tuning:
  - a. If the strong nuclear force, the force that binds protons and neutrons together in an atom, had been stronger or weaker by as little as 5%, life would be impossible. (John Leslie, *Universes* 1989, pp. 4, 35; Barrow and Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*, p. 322.)
  - b. Brandon Carter calculated if gravity had been stronger or weaker by 1 in  $10^{40}$ , then stars such as the sun could not exist. (Paul Davies, *Superforce: The Search for a Grand Unified Theory of Nature* 1984, p. 242.)
  - c. If the neutron was not about 1.001 times the mass of the proton, all protons would have decayed into neutrons or all neutrons would have decayed into protons, and thus life would not be possible. (Leslie, *Universes* 1989, pp. 39-40)
  - d. If the electromagnetic force were slightly stronger or weaker, life would be impossible, for a variety of different reasons. (Leslie, *How to Draw Conclusions From a Fine-Tuned Cosmos* 1988, p. 299.)

Roger Penrose of Oxford University has estimated that the early entropy level of the universe had to be fine tuned to 1 part in  $10^{10^{(123)}}$ . (*Road to Reality*, p. 730)

6. When all the extremely small probabilities of the many independent fine-tuned parameters are multiplied together, the chance probability of the universe being life permitting is practically zero. But not to give up on chance, atheistic theorists argue that there are an actual infinite number of real universes with randomly ordered constants and quantities, guaranteeing that at least one of those universes permits life--and we are in an extremely improbable life-permitting universe. For those who refuse to acknowledge a cosmic Designer, it seems the only place they have to turn is this metaphysical speculation of a multi-verse (i.e., World Ensemble), for which there is no scientific evidence. By simply assuming a greater probabilistic resource base, anything whatsoever can be explained to be a chance event, no matter how improbable. Therefore, the multi-verse theory is unscientific and explanatorily absurd.

William Lane Craig summarizes the fine-tuning argument this way:

Now there are three live explanatory options for this extraordinary fine-tuning: physical necessity, chance, or design. Physical necessity is not, however, a plausible explanation because the finely tuned constants and quantities are independent of the laws of nature. Therefore they are not physically necessary. So could the fine-tuning be due to chance? The problem with this explanation is that the odds of a life-permitting universe governed by our laws of nature are just so infinitesimal that they cannot be reasonably faced. Therefore, the proponents of chance have been forced to postulate the existence of a World Ensemble of other universes, preferably infinite in number and randomly ordered, so that life-permitting universes will appear by chance somewhere in the Ensemble. Not only is this hypothesis, to borrow Richard Dawkins' phrase, "an unparsimonious extravagance," but it faces an insuperable objection. By far, most of the observable universes in a World Ensemble would be worlds in which a single brain fluctuates into existence out of the vacuum and observes its otherwise empty world. Thus, if our world were just a member of a random Ensemble, we ought to be having observations like that. Since we don't, that strongly disconfirms the World Ensemble hypothesis. So chance is also not a good explanation.

It follows that design is the best explanation of the fine-tuning of the universe. Thus the fine-tuning of the universe constitutes evidence for a cosmic Designer. We can summarize this argument as follows:

- (1) The fine-tuning of the universe is due to either physical necessity, chance, or design.
- (2) It is not due to physical necessity or chance.
- (3) Therefore, it is due to design.

Refer to lectures 14-18 at <http://www.reasonablefaith.org/defenders-2-podcast/s4>, <https://answersingenesis.org/evidence-for-creation/the-universe-is-finely-tuned-for-life/>