International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

https://doi.org/10.26520/mcdsare.2025.9.162-167

MCDSARE: 2025
International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education

THE ODDS FOR GOD: WHEN DATA DEBUNKS

Douglas GROZELLE, writing as J. Thomas Cross (a)*,
*Corresponding author
a) Master's College and Seminary, Mississauga, Ont. Canada
Masters Divinity Subsidiary,
*E-mail: douggrozelle@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article evaluates the statistical improbability of key cosmic and biological phenomena appearing through blind chance. Utilising interdisciplinary frame-works—probability theory, cosmology, molecular biology, and philosophical logic—it analyses whether naturalistic models can truly account for seen order and complexity. Concepts such as cosmic fine-tuning, the information content in DNA, planetary conditions for life, and human existence are scrutinized through scientific data and philosophical reflection. The paper argues that intelligent design offers a more coherent, plausible framework than randomness.

Keywords: *Fine-Tuning; Intelligent Design; Anthropic Principle; Probability Theory; Cosmology, Philosophy of Science; Origin of Life; statistical theology;*

INTRODUCTION

Every day, humans encounter rare but statistically quantifiable events: a lightning strike, a car crash, or a lottery win. While unlikely, such events pale in comparison to the improbabilities involved in cosmic and biological existence. By applying mathematical reasoning and scientific data, this paper evaluates the odds behind existence itself—from universal constants to genetic code—and presents a philosophical argument for intelligent design as the most plausible explanation.

1. STATISTICAL REASONING AND SCIENTIFIC PROBABILITY

The U.S. National Weather Service reports the annual odds of being struck by lightning at approximately 1 in 1,222,000 (National Weather Service, 2024). Similarly, the International Shark Attack File estimates the odds of an unprovoked shark attack at 1 in 11.5 million (Florida Museum, 2023). When two statistically independent events are combined, for example, being struck by lightning and suffering a shark bite in the same year, the compound probability becomes neg-ligible.

This provides a useful analogy for understanding the improbabilities associated with fine-tuning and the origin of life. When countless factors—each with its small probability—must simultaneously align for life to exist, the compounded odds approach zero. The mathematical tools used to calculate these odds form the foundation of the argument presented in this paper.

International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

2. COSMIC FINE-TUNING

Modern physics has shown that the universe operates on multiple fundamental constants and initial conditions that lie within extremely narrow life-permitting ranges. British physicist Roger Penrose (2004) calculated that the entropy configuration at the Big Bang was fine-tuned to one part in 10^10^123. This is so astronomically small as to be effectively zero. Astrophysicist Hugh Ross (2008) estimates the odds of all cosmic constants aligning to permit life at approximately 1 in 10^138. To put this in perspective, trying to count one number per second to this 10^138 number is practically impossible; as not enough time in the universe has existed yet. (Counting to 10^138 would take significantly longer than the age of the universe, Billions of Light years, counting nonstop.)

According to PrepScholar, it's practically impossible to count to 10^138 in any meaningful timeframe. This is due to many factors controlling our existence.

The Earth resides in a finely tuned set of conditions, for example:

- Positioned in the Sun's habitable zone
- Possesses a stable climate
- Protected by a magnetic field
- Contains water, oxygen, and tectonic activity
- Stabilized by a large moon and shielded by Jupiter

Such precision suggests more than coincidence. Even minor deviations in gravitational force, the strong nuclear force, or the rate of cosmic expansion would render the universe lifeless. For example, if the expansion rate post-Big Bang were off by 1 part in 10^60, matter would either collapse back or expand too rapidly for stars to form (Barrow & Tipler, 1986).

Philosopher and physicist Paul Davies (2006) asserts, "The impression of design is overwhelming." Nobel Laureate Fred Hoyle (1982), though an atheist, remarked that the odds are so stacked that a "super intellect" has "monkeyed with physics." These assertions suggest that fine-tuning cannot be dismissed as a mere statistical fluke.

Many physicists (both theists and nontheists) agree that the fundamental constants of the universe appear fine-tuned to permit life. These include:

Constant/Factor	Probability for life-permitting value
Cosmological constant (Λ)	1 in 10^{120}
Gravitational force constant	1 in 10^{40}
Ratio of proton to electron mass	1 in 10^{37}
Flatness of the universe (Ω = 1 ± ε)	1 in 10^{60}
Entropy at the Big Bang	1 in 10^(10^123)

Cumulative Estimate:

Even If these were independent, the probability of getting all life-permitting values by chance is vanishingly small however, combined, it almost ceases to exist.

-Roughly 1 in 10^200 to 1 in 10^(10^123) depending on assumptions.

2.1 Bayesian Framework: Design vs Chance

A simplified Bayesian argument compares the probability of observing fine-tuning under two hypotheses:

H_1 (Design): There is an intelligent creator who intended to create a life-permitting universe.

H_2 (Chance): The universe's parameters are set randomly.

IFIASA
International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

2.2 Bayesian Example Defined and Displayed

$P(F \mid H_1)$ = Probability of fine-tuning given design → close to 1 (the designer would intend life)
$P(F \mid H_2)$ = Probability of fine-tuning given chance → ≈ 10^–200 or smaller
$P(H_1)$ = Prior probability of a designer (e.g., 0.5 or 0.1 or even 0.01)
$P(H_2) = 1 - P(H_1)$

2.3 Therefore, Bayes' Theorem RESULT

$P(H_1 \mid F) = [P(F \mid H_1) \times P(H_1)] / [(P(F \mid H_1) \times P(H_1)) + (P(F \mid H_2) \times P(H_2))]$

Variable Values Example (VVE)
VVE: $P(FH_1)$, $P(FH_2)$, $P(H_1)$,0.1, $P(H_2)$0.9,
Then: $P(H_1 \mid F) \approx [1 \times 0.1] / [(1 \times 0.1) + (10^{-200} \times 0.9)] \approx 0.1 / (0.1 + 9 \times 10^{-201}) \approx 1$

Summary Analysis: Estimated Odds		
Source Odds for	Fine-Tuning Relative	Credibility After Fine-Tuning
Intelligent Designer	1 in 1	Very high
Random Chance (1 universe)	1 in 10^200 or smaller	Nearly zero

If you are less skeptical and do not accept the multiverse or consider it speculative, then:
Design is more probable by a factor of 10^200… compared to blind chance.

2.4 A STEP FURTHER: Plausibility with Conservative Numbers:

If you were neutral, then fine-tuning alone swings the scale heavily:
Chance alone: P ≈ 10^–200
Vs
Design after fine-tuning evidence: P > 0.999999999999...
Therefore, even with a prior belief in design of only 1%, the odds after accounting for fine-tuning still overwhelmingly shift in favour of design.

3. BIOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY AND INFORMATION THEORY

DNA contains approximately 3.2 billion base pairs in humans, effectively a digital code. According to Meyer (2009), even a modest protein of one hundred amino acids has 10^130 possible configurations. Randomly producing a functional protein by blind chance is effectively impossible. Molecular biologist Douglas Axe (2004) concluded that the odds of randomly assembling a functional protein fold are around 1 in 10^77.

Even prebiotic experiments like Miller-Urey (1953) only succeeded in creating a few basic amino acids, not complex proteins, or DNA. As Britannica (2024) notes, no lab has ever transitioned from non-living chemistry to a self-replicating genome. The informational content of DNA resembles a language, governed by syntax and semantics, which chance processes alone do not explain.

Philosopher Antony Flew (2007), once a leading atheist, cited DNA's complexity as a reason for his late-life embrace of theism. He argued that intelligence is the only known source of complex specified information. In information theory, this is a decisive point: systems that carry functional, encoded messages are always the result of an intelligent mind (Dembski, 2004).

4. RARE EARTH HYPOTHESIS AND PLANETARY HABITABILITY

Beyond fine-tuning at the cosmic level, the Earth itself exhibits improbable life-permitting features. Located within the Sun's habitable zone, Earth also benefits from plate tectonics (regulating carbon), a magnetic field (shielding from radiation), a stable moon (moderating tilt), and the presence of Jupiter (diverting comets).

IFIASA
International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

Ward and Brownlee (2000) argue that such a confluence of factors is rare in the universe. While thousands of exoplanets have been discovered, very few appear to have comparable Earth-like conditions. Based on available data, the chance of such a planet existing may be less than 1 in 10^22 (Gonzalez et al., 2001).

This raises a critical question: if we reside in such a privileged location, is it merely a cosmic accident or a deliberate arrangement? Philosophically, such rarity aligns more naturally with a purposive design than with blind statistical emergence.

5. THE ODDS OF YOU EXISTING

Dr. Ali Binazir (2011) attempted to quantify the probability of any one person existing. Considering ancestral reproductive odds, genetic combinations, and cosmological fine-tuning, he estimated the likelihood of a person being born as 1 in 10^2,685,000. These mind-bending numbers support the philosophical claim that human life is not merely an evolutionary accident but possibly a designed outcome.

From a theological standpoint, Psalm 139:13-14 expresses this with poetic precision: “For You created my inmost being; You knit me together in my mother’s womb... I am fearfully and wonderfully made.” Such reflections, though ancient, align remarkably with the improbabilities revealed by modern science.

6. COMPETING EXPLANATIONS FOR EXISTENCE

Three primary explanations compete to account for these improbabilities:

1. Naturalism: Asserts that physical processes alone are sufficient.
2. Multiverse Hypothesis: Suggests infinite universes, each with different parameters.
3. Intelligent Design posits purposeful calibration by a conscious mind.

While naturalism is the dominant scientific paradigm, it struggles to explain the fine-tuned values and biological information without invoking extraordinary luck. The multiverse hypothesis faces criticisms of unfalsifiability, as it posits unseen realms with no empirical access (Ellis, 2011). Intelligent design, though controversial, provides a unified explanation rooted in causality, information, and purpose.

7. MULTIVERSE AND ETERNAL UNIVERSE THEORIES

Proponents of the multiverse argue that if countless universes exist, then even improbable events are guaranteed somewhere. However, this shifts the question rather than answering it. What mechanism created the multiverse? What turned the laws across universes? Moreover, if we cannot observe them, can they be considered scientific?

The eternal universe model—which suggests the universe has always existed—faces entropy objections. The second law of thermodynamics predicts increasing disorder, implying that if the universe were eternal, it would already be in heat death. Thus, both models face significant philosophical and scientific hurdles.

8. PHILOSOPHICAL REASONING AND THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Philosophers from Aristotle to Leibniz have argued for a necessary being to ground existence. The Principle of Sufficient Reason (Leibniz, 1714/1989) holds that everything must have an explanation. Randomness lacks explanatory power unless grounded in a deeper framework. Intelligent design provides such a framework.

Furthermore, purpose and order are not merely scientific but existential questions. The improbabilities outlined here suggest a world that is not merely the result of chaotic chance but of intentionality. The fine-tuning of constants, the linguistic structure of DNA, the precision of habitability, and the emergence of self-conscious minds all point to an author behind the cosmos.

IFIASA
International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

9. COUNTERARGUMENTS AND OBJECTIONS

Critics often argue that invoking design is a "God of the gaps" fallacy—placing a deity where science lacks an answer. However, this paper does not appeal to ignorance but to the positive evidence of specified complexity, fine-tuning, and information-rich systems. These are not placeholders but observable, measurable realities that consistently result from intelligence.

Others claim that improbability alone does not imply design. After all, improbable things happen. But the cumulative improbability of all conditions necessary for life, order, and mind—and their convergence—far exceeds the threshold of chance. As William Dembski (1998) explains, specified complexity is the hallmark of design.

The standard scientific narrative assumes that order arose from chaos. While the Big Bang and chemical evolution offer partial explanations, no known process produces complex life from non-life. Multiverse theories are invoked to mitigate improbability, yet they remain speculative. As Roger Penrose notes, even the multiverse hypothesis cannot resolve the fine-tuning dilemma.

9.1 Eternal Universe

Steady-state models are contradicted by the Second Law of Thermodynamics and cosmic background radiation. Philosophically, infinite regression fails to explain the origin of existence. William Lane Craig's Kalam argument succinctly posits: (1) Whatever begins to exist has a cause; (2) The universe began to exist; (3) Therefore, the universe has a cause.

9.2 Intelligent Design

Design theory proposes that a rational mind initiates the universe. It accounts for observed fine-tuning, DNA's information content, and life's complexity. As John Lennox and others argue, design is not anti-scientific but explanatory. Inference to the best explanation supports a designer.

9.3 Odds Recap and Summary Table

.

Phenomenon	Estimated Odds
Fine-Tuned Universe	1 in 10^(10^123)
Human Genome by Chance	~1 in 10^3,000,000,000
Earth-Like Planet Forming	<1 in 10^22
Your Existence	1 in 10^2,685,000

10. PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Design aligns with theism. Science reveals order: theology reveals purpose. If a rational Creator designed the universe, then questions of morality, meaning, and destiny gain coherence. As physicist Paul Davies concluded, fine-tuning offers "powerful evidence" for intelligence behind nature.

In July 2025, Dr. Young Hoon Kim, reputed to have an IQ of 276, claimed in a public statement that logic, probability, and quantum science pointed him to Christ. While controversial and unverifiable in academic circles, such a statement reflects a broader trend: intelligence does not contradict faith.

CONCLUSION

The data explored—from cosmic entropy to DNA coding, planetary precision to personal identity—strongly suggest that randomness is an insufficient explanation. While naturalistic models have advanced our understanding, they often fall short of answering the deepest "why" questions.

Intelligent design, while controversial in academic circles, remains philosophically coherent and scientifically informed. When data is this precise, this complex, and this ordered, we are justified in considering not only the how, but the who. We continued to rigorously run probabilities and quantifiable queries through modes of Artificial Intelligence to challenge logic and science. Inputting a fraction of new, quantifiable data finally broke the result.

IFIASA

International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

Finally, in JUNE of 2025, Artificial Intelligence gave us the following response: *" The question should not be Is there an Intelligent Creator? ... However, how can there not be one? ~ A.I. JUNE 2025*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Axe, D. (2004). Estimating the prevalence of protein sequences adopting func-tional enzyme folds. Journal of Molecular Biology, 341(5), 1295–1315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2004.06.058
[2] Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). The anthropic cosmological principle. Oxford University Press.
[3] Binazir, A. (2011). The universe has 10^82 atoms. But what are the odds of you being you? HighExistence. https://highexistence.com/odds-of-being-born/
[4] Collins, R. (2009). The teleological argument: An exploration of the fine-tuning of the universe. In W. L. Craig & J. P. Moreland (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology (pp. 202–281). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444308334.ch4
[5] Davies, P. (2006). The Goldilocks enigma: Why is the universe just right for life? Houghton Mifflin.
[6] Dembski, W. A. (1998). The design inference: Eliminating chance through small probabilities. Cambridge University Press.
[7] Dembski, W. A. (2004). The design revolution. InterVarsity Press.
[8] Ellis, G. F. R. (2011). Does the multiverse exist? Scientific American, 305(2), 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0811-38
[9] Florida Museum. (2023). International Shark Attack File. https://www.floridamuseum.ufl.edu/shark-attacks/
[10] Flew, A. (2007). There is a God: How the world's most notorious atheist changed his mind. HarperOne.
[11] Gonzalez, G., Richards, J. W., & Jay, W. (2001). The privileged planet. Regnery Publishing.
[12] Hoyle, F. (1982). The universe: Past and present reflections. Engineering and Science, 45(2), 8–12.
[13] Leibniz, G. W. (1989). Philosophical essays (R. Ariew & D. Garber, Eds.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1714)
[14] Meyer, S. C. (2009). Signature in the cell: DNA and the evidence for intelligent design. HarperOne.
[15] National Weather Service. (2024). Lightning strike statistics. https://www.weather.gov/safety/lightning-odds
[16] Penrose, R. (2004). The road to reality: A complete guide to the laws of the universe. Jonathan Cape.
[17] Rees, M. (2000). Just six numbers: The deep forces that shape the universe. Basic Books.
[18] Ross, H. (2008). Why the universe is the way it is. Baker Books.
[19] Swinburne, R. (2004). The existence of God (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
[20] Ward, P., & Brownlee, D. (2000). Rare Earth: Why complex life is uncommon in the universe. Springer.

International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education
MCDSARE 2025 e-ISSN: 2601-8403 p-ISSN2601-839X
https://www.ifiasa.com/mcdsare

International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education

MCDSARE- ISSN 2601-8403 |ISSN-L 2601-839X | https://doi.org/10.26520/mcdsare
Frequency: 1 issues/year, with possible supplementary issues. |

About IFIASA
Ideas Forum International Academic and Scientific Association (IFIASA) is a cultural-educational organization of distinguished members engaged in academic and scientific research.
IFIASA is a publisher, open access journals since its establishment in 2015.
IFIASA Publishing House
Târgoviște, Dâmbovița, Romania
https://www.ifiasa.com/
Email: ifiasa@yahoo.com

About MCDSARE
International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education (MCDSARE) is a peer reviewed anualy international journal for encouraging Researchers, Practitioners, Academicians from Life Sciences, Philosophy, Sociology, Communication, Social Work, Anthropology, Applied Philosophy, Ethics, Bioethics, History, Religious Studies, Arts & Architecture, Psychology, Educational Sciences.

Abstract & Index
Ceeol;
CrossRef; Doi;
Ezb; WorldCat;
Google Scholar;
Philpapers;
Scilit; PubMed;
OpenAlex; Fact;
Sudoc; Ifiasa-Red;

Publisher: IFIASA© Ideas Forum International Academic and Scientific Association