

The Fine Tuning Argument

- (1) The world is fine-tuned for life.
(Given all the ways the laws of physics could have been, it is remarkably improbable that we would have ended up with a world that could sustain life)
- (2) The best explanation of (1) includes an intelligent designer.
- (3) If (1) and (2), then it is reasonable to believe that there is an intelligent designer.
- (4) Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that there is an intelligent designer.

Examples of Fine-Tuning¹

Strong Nuclear Force

- It holds nuclei together, without it we'd have nothing but hydrogen atoms
- According to physicist Paul Davies, a change in the strength of gravity by only one part in 10^{100} would have prevented a life permitting universe.
- A 1% increase would result in all carbon being burned into oxygen
- A 2% increase would preclude protons formation from quarks, preventing the existence of atoms
- A 5% decrease would result in nothing but a universe of hydrogen atoms.

Other Forms Of Life – rejects (1)

Our kind of life is improbable, but not life *per se*.

Response: Some examples of fine tuning seem to not allow for any kind of life form.

More Fundamental Law – rejects (1)

Perhaps there is some more fundamental law such that there really could not have been much deviation from what we currently have. Premise (1) be false, were there this law.

First Response: Highly speculative

Second Response: Pushes the problem back

The Any Universe is Equally Improbable – rejects (2)

It's like if Mary were entered into a lottery. It's improbable that she wins, but for each particular person it's improbable that they will win. So, we shouldn't think that we need any special explanation to explain why she won.

Response: It's not just that the universe we have is improbable. It's improbable and surprising.

Imagine Mary is in a lottery to not get destroyed and some evil genius has given the other million tickets to crickets or machines. If Mary wins that's improbable – as improbable as all of the other outcomes. But her win is also surprising in a way that demands explanation.

The Many Universes Objection – rejects (1)

For just about every way the laws could be there is a universe where the laws are that way. It's not improbable that we end up with a life permitting universe.

¹ These are things *that I am told* the physicists would agree. I am, however, merely a philosopher. You shouldn't trust me as an authority on what the physicists say. The outcome of this argument should be regarded as conditional on these claims being true.

Who Designed the Designer? (Humean Objection)

It's not clear what the objection is, but Hume suggests that the soundness of any design argument would commit one to the designer having a designer. Note: Hume is not objecting to The Fine-tuning argument *per say*. It wasn't around, when Hume was around.

Response: Don't frame the argument by saying that all complexity requires a designer, just claim that the best explanation of complexity is a designer unless there is some positive reason to think that the complexity doesn't/couldn't have a designer.

Doesn't Prove Theism (Humean Objection)

True. And no theist who is being honest with themselves should claim that it does. But, the theist could argue that fine-tuning/design arguments would *if sound* disprove atheism. The classical theist could go on to offer independent reasons for thinking that the designer had other properties that the God of classical theism is alleged to have.