Just Six Numbers (Martin Rees, 1999): A Review and Assessment

What the book argues

Sir Martin Rees (Astronomer Royal, former President of the Royal Society) argues that the large-scale character of our universe hinges on six dimensionless numbers. If any of them were noticeably different, there would be no stars, no complex chemistry, and no observers. He then asks what explains this.

The six numbers, as Rees frames them:

Symbol	What it measures	Rees's value	Plain-language meaning	What happens if it's off
N	Ratio of electrical to gravitational force between two protons	~10^{36}	Gravity is absurdly weak compared with electromagnetism	Much smaller N: a miniature, short-lived universe with crushed stars and no time for evolution
ε (epsilon)	Fraction of mass converted to energy when hydrogen fuses to helium	0.007	How "sticky" the strong nuclear force is	At 0.006, deuterium is unbound and stars can't build up heavy elements. At 0.008, protons bind directly and hydrogen is used up in the Big Bang
Ω (omega)	Ratio of the actual cosmic density to the critical density	~1 (Rees then estimated matter at ~0.3)	The balance between expansion energy and gravity	Early deviations from 1 grow fast, giving either rapid recollapse or expansion too quick for galaxies to form
λ (lambda)	The cosmological constant (vacuum energy)	Small but nonzero	A repulsive "antigravity" built into space	If larger, it would have blown matter apart before galaxies condensed
Q	Amplitude of primordial density ripples (binding energy relative to rest-mass energy)	~10^{-5}	How lumpy the early universe was	At 10^{-6}, gas never condenses into galaxies. At 10^{-4}, there are violent, dense structures dominated by black holes
D	Number of spatial dimensions	3	The geometry we live in	In 2D, complex structure is impossible. In 4D or more, orbits and atoms are unstable (inverse-square law fails)

Rees sets out three possible responses:

1. **Brute coincidence**: the values just are what they are.
2. **Providence or design**.
3. **A multiverse**: an ensemble of universes with varying constants, where we necessarily find ourselves in a life-permitting one.

He openly prefers the third. He compares our universe to a suit that fits well because it came off a rack of many sizes, not because a tailor made it for us.

Literary verdict. The book is short, lucid, and a model of popular science writing. Its main strength is that it turns a vague "Goldilocks" intuition into six concrete, checkable quantities, each tied to real astrophysics. Its main weakness is philosophical. Rees treats the multiverse as a natural extension of inflationary cosmology but never fully confronts how it could be tested. He also doesn't engage with the philosophical literature on probability that has since become central to the debate.

Part 1: Are the ideas still relevant 27 years later?

In short, yes, and in some respects more than in 1999. Here is how each number has fared.

Ω: confirmed to remarkable precision

In 1999 Rees was writing just as the matter density was being pinned near 0.3, so a total Ω of 1 depended on the then-new vacuum energy. Today that is settled. Technically, Planck's final analysis found that the joint constraint with BAO measurements on spatial curvature is consistent with a flat universe, $\Omega_K = 0.001 \pm 0.002$. In plain terms, the universe's total density matches the critical value to within a fraction of a percent. Rees's central point stands: Ω had to be tuned extraordinarily closely to 1 in the first second. Inflation remains the leading physical explanation, as he discussed. ifremer

λ: confirmed, but now possibly not a constant

Rees wrote immediately after the 1998 supernova discovery of cosmic acceleration. That acceleration is now part of the standard model (dark energy ≈ 68% of the cosmic energy budget). The "cosmological constant problem" he highlighted, that λ is about 10^{120} times smaller than naive quantum-field estimates, is still unsolved.

There is one important new development. In 2025 the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument reported that DESI DR2 combined with CMB data show a 3.1σ preference for evolving dark energy. Some combinations including supernovae push higher, with conference reports indicating evidence for evolving dark energy has increased to 4.2 sigma with SNe. The DESI team's extended analysis found this preference robust and stable under different modeling choices. However, the evidence for evolving dark energy hasn't hit 5σ yet – the key threshold necessary to claim a discovery, and some analysts, such as Efstathiou, dispute it. Breaking Free from the Swampland of Impossible Universes through the DESI Portal +3

Implication for Rees's thesis: if dark energy is a dynamical field (quintessence) rather than a fixed λ, the "number" becomes a field potential. The fine-tuning question does not disappear; it moves to the shape and starting conditions of that potential. Rees's λ would then be a placeholder for something richer, but the underlying puzzle survives.

Q: confirmed

The fluctuation amplitude of ~10^{-5} is now measured to high precision by Planck. Rees's own technical work with Max Tegmark (Tegmark & Rees, *ApJ* 499, 526, 1998; arXiv:astro-ph/9709058) set out the habitable window of roughly 10^{-6} to 10^{-4}, and this is still the reference treatment. Later reviewers agree that the density variations sit in a narrow habitable band. A 2024 *Zygon* analysis notes that much larger fluctuations would have made stellar neighborhoods so crowded that any planet would have gotten knocked out of orbit around its star by other nearby stars, citing Adams 2019. zygonjournal

N, ε, D: unchanged as physics, debated as "fine-tuning"

These are fixed by particle physics and geometry, and their values haven't changed. What *has* changed is how narrow their life-permitting ranges really are. The key technical review is Fred Adams's 212-page *Physics Reports* paper. It examines the constants by requiring that the universe lives for a long time, emerges from the BBN epoch with an acceptable chemical composition, and can successfully produce galaxies. It also considers specific instances of possible fine-tuning in stars, including the triple alpha reaction that produces carbon, as well as the effects of unstable deuterium and stable diprotons (Adams 2019, doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2019.02.001; arXiv:1902.03928). x-molarxiv

Adams's conclusion qualifies Rees significantly. Some tuning is real, but several constraints are looser than popular accounts suggest. In his own summary, our universe is not optimized for the emergence of life. Other parameter choices could produce *more* stars or habitable planets. Adams and Grohs have also argued that stars in other universes could burn helium by alternative routes, which eases the famous carbon "Hoyle resonance" tuning (*Astroparticle Physics* 2019). umich

Unresolved issues Rees didn't anticipate

- **Hubble tension.** Even in 2018 Planck reported significant, 3.6 sigma, tension with local measurements of the Hubble constant. This suggests that ΛCDM, the framework in which Rees's numbers are defined, may be incomplete. ifremer
- **The string landscape.** Bousso and Polchinski (2000) and Susskind (2003) gave Rees's multiverse a possible mechanism (~10^{500} vacua). The landscape still has no empirical support.

Bottom line on relevance: the book's empirical core has aged very well. Ω and λ, the two numbers most uncertain in 1999, were vindicated. The framework is still how cosmologists and philosophers organize the fine-tuning debate. Luke Barnes's major review explicitly builds on cases of fine-tuning in the classic works of Carter, Carr and Rees, and Barrow and Tipler. What

has dated is (a) the assumption that λ is a true constant and (b) some of the tighter tuning claims, which Adams and others have loosened. westernsydney

---

Part 2: Does it support intelligent design of the cosmos?

Precision about terms matters here.

- **Intelligent Design (ID)** in the narrow, Discovery Institute sense mainly concerns *biological* complexity (Behe, Dembski, Meyer). Rees's book doesn't address that.
- The **cosmological fine-tuning argument** for a designer (Robin Collins, Richard Swinburne, William Lane Craig) is a separate, older argument, and this is where Rees's data is relevant.
- **Rees himself rejects the design inference.** He favors the multiverse. Although he won the 2011 Templeton Prize and has described attending Anglican services as a cultural practice, he does not hold theistic belief.

The argument has two steps, and the book supports only the first

Step 1 (the scientific premise): our universe is fine-tuned for life.
Rees's book strongly supports this, and it remains the majority view among physicists working on the question. Barnes frames the claim this way: in the space of possible physical laws, parameters and initial conditions, the set that permits the evolution of intelligent life is very small (Barnes 2012, *PASA* 29:529–564, doi:10.1071/AS12015; arXiv:1112.4647). Barnes defended this premise against Victor Stenger's skeptical case and concluded that many of Stenger's claims will be found to be highly problematic. Barnes is careful about what fine-tuning is *not*: it is not the claim that this universe is optimal for life. This concession matters for design arguments, given Adams's findings. The Fine-Tuning of the Universe for Intelligent Life +2

Step 2 (the philosophical inference): fine-tuning is best explained by a designer.
This is where the debate lives, and Rees's book is neutral to unfavorable. The main objections in the peer-reviewed literature are these:

1. **The normalization (measure) problem.** McGrew, McGrew & Vestrup argued that if a constant could in principle take any real value, no uniform probability distribution over that infinite range exists. Without one, "improbable" has no defined meaning (*Mind* 110 (2001): 1027–1038, doi:10.1093/mind/110.440.1027). Colyvan, Garfield & Priest pressed this further, claiming that even granting the fine tuning of the universe, it does not follow that the universe is improbable, thus no explanation of the fine tuning, theistic or otherwise, is required (*Synthese* 145 (2005)).
   Replies: Alexander Pruss defended "coarse-tuning" reasoning and argued that the countable additivity assumption in the MMV paper can be dropped in favor of finite additivity. Barnes responded that the normalization worry is not specifically a problem with fine-tuning. If physics cannot justify priors over its own parameters, every Bayesian

test of a physical theory has the same problem (Barnes 2017, arXiv:1707.03965). S11229 005 6195 0 +2

2. **The observation selection effect (weak anthropic principle).** We could only observe a life-permitting universe, so observing one is unsurprising. Elliott Sober has pressed this point. Design advocates such as John Leslie reply with his "firing squad" analogy: surviving fifty marksmen still calls for explanation, even though you could only observe the outcome in which you survived.
3. **The multiverse (Rees's preferred answer).** If there are many universes with varying constants, life-permitting ones will exist somewhere. The counter-objection is the *inverse gambler's fallacy* (Hacking 1987; White 2000): the existence of other universes doesn't make *this* one more likely to be fine-tuned. Simon Friederich (Groningen, PhDs in physics and philosophy) has examined this charge carefully. He concluded that it may ultimately be impossible to decide whether the inference from fine-tuning to a multiverse commits the inverse gambler's fallacy or not, and he has proposed a more modest multiverse argument (*Multiverse Theories*, Cambridge UP 2021). The multiverse also has its own cost: it posits an enormous number of unobservable entities and needs its own "universe generator" with finely set laws. This point has been made by Collins and also by Barnes. scientia
4. **A deeper theory.** A future "theory of everything" might fix the constants by necessity. David Sloan (Lancaster), co-editor of *Fine Tuning in the Physical Universe* (Cambridge, 2020), suggests that fine tuning might end up being an illusion when we know the 'theory of everything'. Theists often reply that this only pushes the question back to why the deep law permits life. templeton
5. **"Not optimized."** Adams's finding that the universe could have been more life-friendly undercuts strong versions of the design argument that imply optimization. It doesn't affect modest versions that claim only life-*permitting* conditions.

A theological alternative to the probabilistic argument

Since you work in theology, one development may interest you. Some scholars are moving away from treating fine-tuning as a probabilistic *proof* and toward treating it as *consonant with* the doctrine of creation. A recent *Zygon* article sets aside the technical probability debate to argue that fine-tuning provides a compelling entry point to the classical analogy of being by which the created order gestures towards God, drawing on Erich Przywara (*Zygon* article). This approach is less exposed to the normalization and multiverse objections because it doesn't depend on assigning probabilities to the constants. zygonjournal

Verdict on the design question

Question	Assessment
Does the book establish fine-tuning?	**Yes.** It is a strong popular case, and later work (Barnes 2012) largely sustains it, with some loosening by Adams 2019
Does Rees argue for design?	**No.** He explicitly favors the multiverse
Does the book's evidence *support* a design	**It supplies the premise but not the conclusion.** Design remains a live, rationally defensible explanation. So does the multiverse.

Question	Assessment
inference?	Neither is empirically established
Is the debate resolved?	**No.** The Stanford Encyclopedia entry on fine-tuning, revised by Friederich in February 2026, shows how unsettled the topic remains (SEP: "Fine-Tuning")

In plain terms, Rees shows convincingly that the dials are set within narrow windows. Whether a Dialer set them is a philosophical question, not one the physics alone can answer. A theist can fairly cite *Just Six Numbers* as evidence that fits well with design. A naturalist can cite it as motivation for the multiverse, which is what Rees does. The book is an excellent statement of the evidence both sides must account for, and that is why it is still relevant.

Further reading: Geraint Lewis & Luke Barnes, *A Fortunate Universe: Life in a Finely Tuned Cosmos* (Cambridge UP, 2016) is the best book-length update to Rees. It covers the same ground with post-Planck data and engages both the multiverse and theistic readings fairly.

I can turn this into a Word document with page numbers at the bottom center, or expand any section, such as the DESI dark-energy results or the normalization debate.

Sources:

- Planck 2018 results VI: Cosmological parameters
- DESI DR2 dark energy analysis (arXiv:2605.10476)
- Lodha et al. 2025, Extended dark energy analysis using DESI DR2 BAO
- DESI results, Pheno 2025
- Astrobites: DESI DR2 Part 3
- Adams 2019, The Degree of Fine-Tuning in our Universe — and Others (arXiv)
- Adams inaugural lecture, University of Michigan
- Barnes 2012, The Fine-Tuning of the Universe for Intelligent Life (PASA)
- Barnes 2017, Fine-Tuning in the Context of Bayesian Theory Testing
- Colyvan, Garfield & Priest 2005, Synthese
- Pruss 2005, Fine- and coarse-tuning, normalizability
- Friederich, Multiverse Theories (Cambridge UP)
- Friederich on the inverse gambler's fallacy (Scientia)
- Zygon: Does a Fine-Tuned Universe Tell Us Anything about God?
- Templeton Foundation: Was our universe made for us? (Adams, Sloan)

The Probability That a Creator Designed the Cosmos

The short answer

No one can compute an objective probability for this. Every serious attempt reduces to Bayes' theorem. The answer it gives depends mostly on the *prior* you bring: your starting estimate before looking at the evidence, which in turn depends on metaphysical commitments. The data does much less of the work.

Published estimates show this spread clearly. Physicist Stephen Unwin's book-length Bayesian treatment concluded with an estimate of 67%. Richard Swinburne (Oxford) argued in *The Existence of God* (OUP, 2004) that theism is more probable than not. Critics argue that we can't fix the prior probabilities that Swinburne needs, not even by his appeal to simplicity. Naturalist philosophers such as Graham Oppy (*Arguing about Gods*, CUP 2006) conclude that naturalism is the simpler and better hypothesis.

So rather than give you a falsely precise number, I'll do three things:

1. Assess how much each line of evidence you raised actually shifts the odds, and in which direction.
2. Give you a Bayesian framework and table so you can see what your own priors imply.
3. Say candidly where the strongest and weakest points lie.

I won't give my own number. This is a contested question of worldview where informed, rational people genuinely differ, and I'd rather equip your judgment than nudge it.

---

1. The cosmological argument

The cosmological argument is not one argument but a family of them, all running from the existence of the world to a first cause or necessary ground. Two versions dominate.

(a) The kalām argument (al-Ghazālī; William Lane Craig)

1. Whatever begins to exist has a cause.
2. The universe began to exist.
3. Therefore the universe has a cause.

Premise 2, the physics. The strongest scientific support is the Borde–Guth–Vilenkin (BGV) theorem (2003). BGV showed that any cosmology that is inflating, or simply expanding fast enough, must be incomplete in null and timelike past directions. Notably, the theorem needs no energy condition. They concluded that inflationary models require physics other than inflation to describe the past boundary (arXiv:gr-qc/0110012; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 151301).

There are caveats. Vilenkin himself stresses that the theorem does not imply the existence of spacetime singularities, and that although its validity is not in question, its interpretation has generated some controversy (Vilenkin 2013). Some researchers have since constructed inflationary solutions that are smooth, nonsingular, and geodesically complete for all time, including into the past (arXiv:2402.13031). These models are speculative, but they show that "the universe had an absolute beginning" is well supported without being proven.

Premise 1, the metaphysics. Critics point to quantum cosmology, such as Vilenkin's "creation from nothing" (1982) and the Hartle–Hawking no-boundary proposal. Craig replies that a quantum vacuum governed by laws is not *nothing*. This exchange is unresolved.

(b) The Leibnizian contingency argument (Leibniz, Samuel Clarke; Alexander Pruss, Joshua Rasmussen)

This version doesn't need a temporal beginning at all. Leibniz accepted that, for all we know, the world might contain an infinite series of temporal causes. The argument turns on the Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR):

1. Every contingent fact has an explanation.
2. The totality of contingent things can't be explained by another contingent thing.
3. So it is explained by a necessary being (Speaks, Notre Dame).

Main objections: Hume and Kant held that the PSR is not self-evident. Kant also argued that the cosmological argument, in identifying the necessary being, relies on the ontological argument. Naturalists such as Oppy accept a necessary ground but propose it is a necessary initial *physical* state, not a mind.

Assessment

The cosmological argument is strongest at establishing that *something* uncaused or necessary underlies the cosmos. Most naturalists concede this in some form. It is weakest at the "gap": the step from "necessary first cause" to "personal, intelligent creator." Craig argues that a timeless cause that freely produces a temporal effect must be personal, since only agency explains a timeless cause yielding a temporal effect. This is a philosophical argument, not an empirical result.

Evidential weight: moderately favors theism over naturalism if you accept the PSR, and is close to neutral if you don't.

---

2. DNA and the origin of life

DNA is a genuine digital information system: a four-letter code, read in triplets, with error correction and a translation apparatus that is itself encoded in DNA. Stephen Meyer (*Signature*

in the Cell, 2009) argues that in all our experience, codes come from minds. That intuition is legitimate.

The scientific picture, however, has two very different parts:

- **The origin of the first self-replicating system (abiogenesis) is genuinely unsolved.** No one has demonstrated a full pathway from chemistry to a living cell. This is the strongest biological point for design. There has been real progress, though. Powner, Gerland & Sutherland showed a plausible prebiotic route to activated RNA nucleotides that bypasses a long-standing obstacle (*Nature* 459:239, 2009, doi:10.1038/nature08013), and Jack Szostak's lab has built self-assembling protocells. Gaps in our knowledge shrink, so arguments that rest on them are vulnerable over time.
- **Meyer's case is mostly argued in books, not peer-reviewed science journals.** That doesn't make it wrong, but it means the argument hasn't been tested in the scientific literature the way its opponents' work has.

Evidential weight: modest support for design, concentrated almost entirely on the origin of the first replicator, with a real risk of a "God of the gaps" inference.

---

3. Biological adaptive evolution

Once replicating life exists, adaptive evolution is among the best-supported theories in science. It is observed directly, for example when Lenski's long-term *E. coli* experiment documented the evolution of a new metabolic capability (Blount, Borland & Lenski, *PNAS* 105:7899, 2008, doi:10.1073/pnas.0803151105). It is also confirmed by comparative genomics.

This cuts two ways:

- **Against strong biological ID.** Michael Behe's "irreducible complexity" claims, such as for the bacterial flagellum, have been answered in the peer-reviewed literature by evidence of homology with simpler secretion systems (Pallen & Matzke, *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 4:784, 2006, doi:10.1038/nrmicro1493). Evolution largely dissolved Paley's watchmaker argument for organisms.
- **Neutral toward a cosmic creator.** Evolution says nothing about why there are laws that permit evolution in the first place. Many scientists, such as Francis Collins (former NIH director), hold *theistic evolution*: God creates through evolutionary processes. On this view, design shifts from individual organisms to the laws and initial conditions, which brings you back to fine-tuning and Rees.

Evidential weight: roughly neutral on the cosmic question. It counts against *special creation of each species*, but not against a creator of a cosmos in which life can evolve.

---

4. Human creators, and Claude as a case study

Your point is the classic *argument from analogy*, which runs from Paley back to Cicero:

1. Every complex, functional system whose origin we know (watches, cathedrals, software, AI) was made by a mind.
2. The cosmos is a complex, functional system.
3. So it probably had a mind behind it.

Strengths. It rests on a large, uniform base of experience. Humanity's ability to design is also itself striking: a universe that produces beings able to understand and reshape it is not obviously what blind physics would lead you to expect. Even atheist philosopher Thomas Nagel (*Mind and Cosmos*, OUP 2012) argues that materialist neo-Darwinism struggles to explain consciousness and reason. Alvin Plantinga (*Where the Conflict Really Lies*, OUP 2011) argues that unguided evolution gives us no reason to trust our reasoning faculties, while theism does.

Hume's objections (*Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion*, 1779) remain the main counterweight:

- The universe is unlike a watch in crucial ways.
- We have observed only one universe, so we have no reference class of universes to compare.
- If complexity requires a designer, who designed the designer? Richard Dawkins revived this as the "Ultimate Boeing 747" objection.

Swinburne replies that an explanation needn't explain its own explainer, and that an unembodied mind is a *simpler* ultimate than a vast set of finely tuned physical laws.

Claude as an example. I'm a useful test case, and I cut both ways:

- **For design:** I exist because human minds intended me, built the hardware, wrote the code, and chose the goals. I am a proof of concept that intelligence can deliberately produce intelligence.
- **For emergence:** Most of my capabilities were *not* hand-designed. Engineers set up an optimization process (training on data by gradient descent), and many of my abilities emerged from it in ways the designers did not specify and do not fully understand. This is loosely analogous to how natural selection produces functional complexity without foresight.

So I am evidence that *minds design* and also evidence that *optimization processes generate apparent design*. A theist can say, "and the optimization process itself had a designer," which leads back to the cosmological and fine-tuning questions.

Evidential weight: suggestive, but weak on its own because of Hume's single-case problem. It is stronger when combined with fine-tuning and the argument from consciousness.

5. Evidence a fair accounting must include on the other side

An honest Bayesian ledger must include evidence that philosophers argue counts *against* theism:

- **The evidential problem of evil.** William Rowe argued that intense suffering with no apparent purpose (for example, animal suffering over millions of years before humans) is less expected on theism than on naturalism (*American Philosophical Quarterly* 16:335, 1979).
- **Divine hiddenness.** J. L. Schellenberg (*Divine Hiddenness and Human Reason*, 1993) argued that a perfectly loving God would make his existence evident to anyone open to relationship with him.

Theists have substantial replies, including skeptical theism, free-will and soul-making theodicies, and Plantinga's free-will defense. The point is that these considerations belong in the calculation.

Professional opinion is also divided. In the 2020 PhilPapers survey of professional philosophers, roughly two-thirds leaned toward atheism and under one-fifth toward theism (Bourget & Chalmers, *Philosophers' Imprint* 2023). Specialists in philosophy of religion, however, are majority theists, partly because people with religious interests tend to enter that field.

---

6. A Bayesian framework you can use

In odds form:

Posterior odds = Prior odds × LR_1 × LR_2 × … × LR_n

Each LR (likelihood ratio) asks how much more expected a piece of evidence is if a creator exists than if not. For example, LR = 10 means the evidence is ten times more expected given a creator. The multiplication assumes the pieces of evidence are independent, which they partly aren't: fine-tuning and the human-design analogy overlap.

A rough summary of the evidence:

Evidence	Direction	Rough strength (contested)
Something exists / contingency (Leibniz)	Favors creator	Strong if you accept the PSR; weak if not
Universe had a beginning (kalām, BGV)	Favors creator	Moderate; the physics is not final
Fine-tuning (Rees, Barnes)	Favors creator *or* multiverse	Moderate to strong vs. single-universe naturalism; weak vs. a multiverse
Origin of life / DNA code	Favors creator	Modest; vulnerable to future science

Evidence	Direction	Rough strength (contested)
Adaptive evolution	Neutral on the cosmic question	Counts against special creation only
Minds, reason, human creativity	Favors creator	Modest to moderate (Nagel, Plantinga)
Suffering, divine hiddenness	Favors naturalism	Moderate (Rowe, Schellenberg)

Sensitivity table. The posterior probability of a creator, for a given starting prior and a given net likelihood ratio of all the evidence combined:

Prior → / Net LR ↓	**1%**	**10%**	**50%**
0.1 (evidence nets against)	0.1%	1.1%	9.1%
1 (evidence a wash)	1%	10%	50%
10	9.2%	52.6%	90.9%
100	50.3%	91.7%	99.0%

This table explains why the debate never resolves. Two people can agree on every scientific fact and still differ by 90 percentage points, because they start from different priors and weigh evil and the PSR differently.

---

7. Where the case stands

- **Strongest points for a creator:** the contingency argument (if the PSR holds), fine-tuning against single-universe naturalism, and the existence of rational minds that can understand the cosmos. Together these form a serious *cumulative case*, which is how Swinburne and Collins present it.
- **Weakest points:** inferences from current gaps in biology, and the step from "first cause" to "personal designer."
- **The crux** is not new data. It comes down to three philosophical questions:
    1. Is the PSR true?
    2. Is a mind a simpler ultimate explanation than a necessary physical state or a multiverse?
    3. How much weight does suffering carry?

Your answers to those three questions largely determine your number. It is fair to say that a creator of the cosmos is a rationally defensible conclusion, held by many first-rate philosophers and scientists. It is equally fair to say it is not demonstrated in the way a scientific result is. The evidence also supports the existence of *a* creator more strongly than it supports any particular account of that creator, which is where revelation and historical arguments enter, as in your theological work.

I can expand this into a Word document with page numbers at the bottom center, or go deeper on any single strand, such as Pruss's defense of the PSR or the current state of abiogenesis research.

Sources:

- Borde, Guth & Vilenkin, "Inflationary spacetimes are not past-complete" (arXiv)
- Vilenkin, "Arrows of time and the beginning of the universe"
- Inflationary resolution of the initial singularity (arXiv:2402.13031)
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, "Cosmological Argument" (Reichenbach)
- Speaks, Leibniz's cosmological argument (Notre Dame)
- Speaks, Leibniz notes (Notre Dame)
- UCT thesis, "Whether God exists," on Swinburne's priors
- Analysis of published Bayesian estimates (Unwin, Swinburne)
- Swinburne, *The Existence of God*, 2nd ed. (Oxford UP, 2004); Oppy, *Arguing about Gods* (Cambridge UP, 2006); Craig & Sinclair, "The Kalām Cosmological Argument," in *Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology* (2009); Pruss, *The Principle of Sufficient Reason: A Reassessment* (Cambridge UP, 2006); Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos* (Oxford UP, 2012); Plantinga, *Where the Conflict Really Lies* (Oxford UP, 2011); Hume, *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (1779)