

Fine-tuning argument for God's existence

Preface

In this document, I will start by narrating my understanding of the fine-tuned universe argument for intelligent design. Then, I will demonstrate in 3 different ways that the argument does not prove the necessary existence of an intelligent being. I will also demonstrate how the universe is not fine-tuned for life at all.

Fine-tuned universe argument (as understood by me)

The proponents of the FTU argument for God postulate that the universe is fine-tuned for life. The FTU argument comes from the our understanding of natural sciences which has demonstrably shown the universal constants (such as G or M) to have assumed values that are very specific and special in the sense that outside of the “small” range within which the actual value of the constants lies, life could not have existed in this universe.

One common example is that if the gravitational constant G was any smaller than x or any bigger than y , complex structures would not exist in the universe with such a constant. The argument argues that for life to exist, there has to be the possibility for the existence of sufficiently complex structures which could not have existed had these universal physical constants assumed a value outside of a “small” range in which they indeed exist.

The argument states that there exists a “small” range for each such constant, sometimes unique to that particular constant, from which the constant must assume a value for complex structures to even exist, which according to them, leads to life.

Response

Complexity is not necessary for life to exist

Alternative title: The definition of life is arbitrary The supporters of the FTU argument propose that in order for a structure to be alive, it has to be complex so as to perform various life supporting functions. However, the idea I am proposing is that the definition of life we hold is very limited to the life we have always seen.

To say something is alive, we usually use our carbon-lifeforms-centric definitions of life that are heavily influenced by the form in which we ourselves exist. However, I argue, that there is nothing special about a complex structure, or rather, a “living” complex structure that necessarily makes it more of a “life form” than any simple “non-living” structure - except in the sense that we define characteristics of the complex one to be of a living being and those of a rock are deemed “non-living”. The point is that the definition of life could very well include the state of a rock in a vacuum. In fact, the human accepted definition of “living” is completely arbitrary.

I'll argue that there's nothing inherently different between an “non-living” rock and a “living” animal - except, obviously, one is more complex than the other in so that the trajectory of the movement or existence of the more complex one

is hard to predict when compared to the simple one - the rock. But that may very well be the case because all the “living” beings we have ever experienced are so close to our own structural complexity that it is hard for us to map all its various constituents and account for every random variable involved - which is very well possible to do for a random rock in vacuum. However, I propose that the measure of structural complexity is always capable of growing further and further with no upper bound. And for this reason, we’re as much of a rock to a living being of higher complexity than a rock is to us.

In other words, the universe is just as fine-tuned for life as it is for every non-living object that could not have existed otherwise.

The universe is not fine-tuned at all

Suppose a random physical constant P , which could mathematically assume any values between 1 and ∞ has assumed a value in the range q and r such that life could not exist if P had a value outside of the range q and r . Proponents of FTU propose that if the constant was outside of this very small range, life would not exist and that that proves that the universe is fine-tuned for life.

But the problem is that not only is this idea unverifiable but also likely to be irrelevant to the discussion of God.

Demonstration Suppose there exists a physical constant P that can mathematically take values from the set $r = (0, \infty]$. However, suppose, for life to exist, the value must be from $R = (x, y)$, implying the fine-tuned nature of the universe (as the values must be one from the very “small” range). But the problem arises when I then ask the proponent of the FTU argument for coming up with a range R' that’s acceptable to them that would make the universe “not-fine-tuned”.

But this is where the problem arises. No matter how larger the the new range with which they come up with is compared to R , it will always be insignificant to the vastness of the mathematically permissible range of r . Moreover, the range R' may also not be significantly larger than the range r because of the reason that for any range R' that is greater than R by a factor of x , there will always exist another range bigger than R' by a factor of x and *beyond*, rendering the size difference useless. Finally, the distance between any two points in a range of two real numbers is infinite further aiding to the meaninglessness of the difference of size in the two range.

For the reason that a range can be any size and it would still be infinitely smaller, from r and, that it will always have an infinite number of real numbers in it, it is unverifiable that whether the universe is fine-tuned and hence irrelevant to the presence of intelligent design.

FTU argument for God assumes only those random variables can change that would cause an apocalyptic end of complexity

Although, the universe is demonstrably fixed at seemingly specific values, and outside of the range, as discussed in the last section, life supposedly halts to exist, there seems to be a lack of consideration for infinite number of other ways

life could still exist and an infinite more that cannot be fathomed by what our 3-dimensional neuron lump cannot fathom.

The proponent of the FTU argument seem to assume that for life to exist, the life form must be material as we are. They, however, fail to foresee that life could still exist in various other ways even if really fundamental random variables were to change.

To list some of these random variables, which although are fundamental to the state of the universe, could change and still lead to life

1. In our universe, a life-form compatible with the human idea of “living” comes about when complex structures together act in sync. However, a universe with completely different life may very well bring that to structures without any complexity. This will be possible because it is the laws of the universe govern what can and cannot be complex or “organic-like” living, and, these laws could very well change.
2. It is also not inconceivable for life to exist in ways beyond our understanding such as without any physical form at all, only as a form of intelligence. We live in a universe of space and time, so we understand life as the universe has taught and allowed us to. This is not necessarily the case after many of these natural constants assume other values.