Anthropic Principle, the

One of the several claims demolished by 20th-century science is that of chance. Research conducted since the 1960s has shown that all the physical balances in the solar system—indeed, in the entire universe—have been very finely regulated in order to support human life. The deeper research has penetrated, the more it has shown that the laws of physics, chemistry and biology; basic forces such as gravity and electromagnetism, and the structures of all atoms and elements are just as they need to be to support human life.

Western scientists today refer to this extraordinary creation as the Anthropic Principle. In other words, every detail in the universe has been created with the goal of supporting human life.

There are some 300 billion galaxies in the universe, each containing approximately as many stars. Eight major planets circle in great harmony around our Sun, which is one of those stars. Of these, only the Earth possesses conditions suited to life. Today, many scientists admit the impossibility of the universe being a collection of random clouds of hydrogen matter forming the stars that form galaxies, of matter thrown out randomly as the result of exploding stars, or of heavier elements coming together at specific points in such a way as to give rise to planets. In the face of this, Sir Fred Hoyle, who opposed the Big Bang theory for many years, expressed the astonishment he felt:

The Big Bang theory holds that the universe began with a single explosion. Yet as can be seen, an explosion merely throws matter apart, while the big bang has mysteriously produced the opposite effect—with matter clumping together in the form of galaxies. <u>26</u>

An article in the well-known magazine *Science* refers to the wondrous equilibrium at the beginning of the universe:

If the density of the universe matter had been a little more, then the universe, according to Einstein's Theory of Relativity, would never expand due to the attraction forces of atomic particles, and would have recollapsed to turn into a point. If the density had initially been a little less, then the universe would have expanded at the highest speed, and the atomic particles would not have been able to attract and capture one another, and stars and galaxies would never have been formed. Naturally, we, too, would not have existed! According to the calculations made, the difference between the initial real density of the universe and the critical density beyond which there is no likelihood of its formation is less than a quadrillion of a hundredth. This is like placing a pen on its sharp end that it can stay so even after one billion years. Moreover, this balance gets more delicate as the universe expands.<u>27</u>

Adherents of the theory of evolution try to account for this extraordinary order in the universe in terms of chance effects. Yet it is doubtless irrational and illogical to expect interconnected coincidences to give rise to such a complex order.

Since chance can be calculated mathematically, we can see the impossibility of such a thing happening. It has been calculated that the probability of an environment suited to life emerging through an explosion such as the Big Bang are 1 in 10×10123 .

This calculation was performed by the famous British mathematician Roger Penrose, a colleague of Stephen Hawking. In mathematics, Probabilities less than 1 in 1050 are regarded as essentially zero. The number in question is a trillion, trillion, trillion times larger than 1 in 1050—a number that shows that the universe cannot be accounted for in terms of chance.

Roger Penrose comments on this inconceivably vast number:

This now tells how precise the Creator's aim must have been, namely to an accuracy of one part in 10 x 10123. This is an extraordinary figure. One could not possibly even write the number down in full in the ordinary denary notation: it would be 1 followed by 10123 successive 0's. Even if we were to write a 0 on each separate proton and on each separate neutron in the entire universe—and we could throw in all the other particles for good measure—we should fall far short of writing down the figure needed.28

26 Fred Hoyle, The Intelligent Universe, London, 1984, p. 184.

27 Bilim ve Teknik ["Science and Technique"] magazine, Vol. 201, p. 16.

28 Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, New York: The Free Press, 1998, p. 9. <u>https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/anthropic-principle-the</u>