

The Anthropic Principle and Beyond: Cycles, Purpose, and Architectonic Unities

HAMID JAVANBAKHT

DBA Sebastian Ruliad, Isoteleses Inc.

isoteleses@proton.me, Mountain View, CA

August 30, 2025

Abstract

This paper explores cosmological fine-tuning through the framework of the anthropic principle and its extensions. We trace the development from the Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles to Wheeler's participatory model, Barrow and Tipler's final formulations, and teleological perspectives such as the CTMU's Telic Principle. Beyond these, the study situates fine-tuning within broader cycles of creation, highlighting parallels between mathematical structures (primes, adelic geometry), cosmological models of constraint, and theological visions of purpose and renewal found in Zoroastrian and Bahá'í thought. We argue that the universe's apparent fine-tuning is best understood not as contingency or chance, but as an expression of deeper structural unities that bind mathematics, physics, and metaphysics into a coherent whole. The result is a perspective in which cycles, purpose, and architectonic unity converge to explain why the universe sustains both order and life.

Contents

1	Introduction	6
2	The Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles	7
2.1	The Weak Anthropic Principle	7
2.2	The Strong Anthropic Principle	8
2.3	Critiques and Interpretations	9
3	The Participatory Anthropic Principle	10
3.1	Wheeler’s Vision	10
3.2	Philosophical Development	10
3.3	The Problem of Unity	11
3.4	Beyond Observation: Toward Teleology	11
4	The Final Anthropic Principle and Cosmic Eschatologies	12
4.1	Barrow and Tipler’s Formulation	12
4.2	Tipler’s Omega Point Theory	12
4.3	Religious and Philosophical Parallels	13
4.4	Critiques of Circularity	13
4.5	Toward a Comparative Eschatology	14
5	Beyond Anthropics: Teleology, Cycles, and Unity	14
5.1	The Telic Principle and the CTMU	14
5.2	Intelligent Design and Teleological Arguments	15
5.3	Cyclical Cosmologies and Religious Renewal	15
5.4	Unity of Existence	16
5.5	Toward an Architectonic Vision	16

6 Conclusion: From Anthropic Constraints to Cosmic Unity	17
A Appendix I: Multiverse Probability Measures and Fine-Tuning	19
A.1 Conditional Probability Formulation	19
A.2 Application to the Cosmological Constant	19
A.3 Challenges and the Measure Problem	20
A.4 Summary	20
B Appendix II: Bayesian Models of Fine-Tuning	22
B.1 Bayesian Framework	22
B.2 Fine-Tuning Likelihoods	22
B.3 Critiques of Bayesian Fine-Tuning Arguments	23
B.4 Summary	23
C Appendix III: Dynamical and Attractor Models of Fine-Tuning	25
C.1 Scalar Field Relaxation Mechanisms	25
C.2 Inflationary Attractors	25
C.3 Self-Organizing Criticality	26
C.4 Challenges	26
C.5 Summary	26
D Appendix IV: Algorithmic and Computational Models of Fine-Tuning	28
D.1 Algorithmic Probability and Kolmogorov Complexity	28
D.2 The Mathematical Universe Hypothesis	28
D.3 The CTMU and Telic Models	29
D.4 Simulated Reality Hypotheses	29
D.5 Summary	29
E Appendix V: Anthropic Inequalities and Physical Constraints	30
E.1 Gravitational and Electromagnetic Balance in Stars	30

E.2	Nuclear Resonances and the Hoyle State	30
E.3	Cosmological Constant Bound	31
E.4	Other Constraints	31
E.5	Summary	31
F	Appendix VI: Noncommutative Geometry and Number-Theoretic Models	33
F.1	The Riemann Zeta Function and Spectral Physics	33
F.2	Connes' Noncommutative Geometry	33
F.3	Arithmetic Quantum Chaos	34
F.4	Summary	34
G	Appendix VII: Number Theory and the Universe	35
G.1	Prime Numbers as a Universal Architecture	35
G.2	The Fine-Structure Constant and Number Theory	35
G.3	Number Theory in Modern Physics	35
G.4	Educational and Popular Accounts	36
G.5	Summary	36
H	Appendix VIII: Quantum Chaos and Arithmetic Physics	38
H.1	The "Ten Martini Problem" and Quantum Fractals	38
H.2	Quantum Chaos and the Riemann Hypothesis	38
H.3	Noncommutative Geometric Extensions	39
H.4	Summary	39
I	Appendix IX: Determinism, Free Will, and Fine-Tuning	40
I.1	Deterministic Interpretations	40
I.2	Superdeterminism and the Observer	40
I.3	Free Will and the Anthropic Principle	40
I.4	Summary	41

J	Appendix X: Alternative Frameworks and Speculative Extensions	42
J.1	Process Physics and Self-Organizing Information	42
J.2	Topological Geometrodynamics	42
J.3	Noetic Field Theories	42
J.4	Extended Anthopics and Eschatological Speculations	42
J.5	Summary	43
K	Appendix XI: Primes, Structure, and the Analogy of Fine-Tuning	45
L	Appendix XII: Adelic Geometry and Cosmological Fine-Tuning	47
M	Appendix XIII: Onto-Political Architectonics	49
N	Appendix XIV: Onto-Cosmological Architectonics	51
O	Appendix XV: Higher Index Theory and Cosmology	53
P	Extended Glossary of Terms	56

1 Introduction

The question of why the universe permits life has long provoked both scientific and philosophical debate. Modern cosmology is marked by the discovery of apparent “fine-tuning”: the values of physical constants, the dimensionality of space, and the structure of natural laws appear remarkably constrained in ways that allow for the emergence of complexity, consciousness, and ultimately, human observers. From the cosmological constant to the ratio of fundamental forces, slight variations would render the cosmos sterile (1; 2).

One family of explanations, inaugurated by Brandon Carter in 1974, has come to be known as the *anthropic principles*. These attempt to account for the congruence between cosmological parameters and the existence of observers. The Weak Anthropic Principle (WAP) stresses a selection effect: we observe the universe as life-permitting simply because only such a universe can host observers. The Strong Anthropic Principle (SAP) goes further, suggesting that the universe must have those properties which allow life to develop within it (5). Later elaborations extend the scope of anthropic reasoning into more explicitly participatory or teleological directions. John Wheeler’s Participatory Anthropic Principle (PAP), for instance, describes a “self-excited circuit” in which acts of observation bring the universe into being (12). Barrow and Tipler’s Final Anthropic Principle (FAP) proposes a cosmic eschatology in which once intelligent life arises, it can never die out.

Yet the anthropic principles have not escaped criticism. Many view them as tautological, explaining little beyond the obvious point that we exist in a universe compatible with our existence. Others argue that their teleological variants verge on metaphysics or theology, smuggling purpose into physics under the guise of principle (9; 6). Still, their persistence in cosmological discourse reflects a deeper unease: the universe appears ordered in a way that invites interpretation, whether through chance, necessity, or purpose.

This paper examines the anthropic principle and its extensions through the lenses of cosmology, philosophy, and comparative theology. It will first present the main anthropic

variants (weak, strong, participatory, final) and their critiques. It will then turn to broader metaphysical frameworks that resonate with or challenge anthropic reasoning, including cyclical cosmologies, eschatologies, and concepts of the unity of existence found in religious and philosophical traditions.

2 The Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles

The first systematic statement of the anthropic principle was given by Brandon Carter in 1974, who observed that the numerical values of physical constants and cosmological parameters appeared “coincidental” in ways that permitted the emergence of observers (1). To account for this, Carter introduced what he called the *Weak Anthropic Principle* (WAP). In its simplest form, the WAP asserts that our observations of the universe are conditioned by the requirement that we exist as observers within it. The apparent fine-tuning is therefore not surprising: only a universe compatible with life can contain beings capable of noticing its structure.

2.1 The Weak Anthropic Principle

The WAP is essentially a selection effect. Just as the conditions on Earth appear uniquely suited for terrestrial life because organisms could only evolve in such an environment, so too the cosmos must be such as to allow observers to exist at all. Carr and Rees (5) emphasize that many physical constants appear to be balanced on a knife’s edge: if the gravitational constant were slightly stronger, stars would collapse too rapidly; if it were slightly weaker, stars could not ignite nuclear fusion. Similarly, the cosmological constant must be small enough to allow galaxies to form, yet not so large as to disperse matter before structure emerges. In this sense, the WAP does not explain why the universe is fine-tuned, but it explains why such fine-tuning is observed.

Critics have noted that the WAP borders on tautology: it restates the fact that life exists

in terms of conditional observation (9). Nevertheless, it remains useful in excluding certain models of cosmology. Universes with parameter values outside the narrow life-permitting range are deemed observationally irrelevant. Thus, the WAP can act as a constraint on cosmological theories, ensuring that only life-compatible models are entertained.

More recently, Sloan (7) and Tegmark and Bousso (8) have sought to formalize the WAP through probabilistic measures in the multiverse. If there exists a vast ensemble of universes, then anthropic selection can be understood statistically: we find ourselves in one of the rare universes where conditions permit life. This approach, however, depends on controversial assumptions about the reality of the multiverse and the ability to define meaningful probability measures over infinite ensembles of worlds.

2.2 The Strong Anthropic Principle

By contrast, the *Strong Anthropic Principle* (SAP), as articulated by Barrow and Tipler (2), makes a bolder claim: the universe must be such as to admit the creation of life at some stage. In this stronger form, the anthropic principle shifts from an observational tautology to an ontological necessity. It is not merely that we happen to observe a life-permitting universe, but that only such universes can exist. Barrow and Tipler write: “The universe must have those properties which allow life to develop within it at some stage in its history.”

This formulation resonates with classical teleology. The SAP implies that life is not an accidental byproduct of physical processes, but a fundamental condition built into the very fabric of reality. Craig (13; 14) interprets this as suggestive of divine design, arguing that naturalistic explanations fail to adequately account for the extraordinary precision of fine-tuning. In his view, the SAP can be read as empirical support for theism, since it implies purpose and necessity rather than brute chance.

Yet, the SAP also faces philosophical and scientific challenges. How can life, which emerges billions of years after the Big Bang, be a necessary condition for the existence of the universe itself? Ellis (6) notes that this apparent retrocausality strains conventional

conceptions of time and causation. Moreover, critics argue that the SAP risks collapsing into metaphysics: it posits necessity without offering a mechanism, thereby moving from physics into philosophy.

2.3 Critiques and Interpretations

The WAP and SAP together illustrate the ambiguity of anthropic reasoning. On the one hand, the WAP is modest but risks triviality; on the other hand, the SAP makes bold claims but risks unverifiability. Vaas (9) argues that neither principle provides a satisfactory explanatory framework: one explains too little, the other too much. Nevertheless, they continue to structure cosmological discourse, precisely because they raise profound questions about necessity, chance, and purpose.

Religious and philosophical traditions provide further interpretive resources. Zoroastrian cosmology, for example, emphasizes that humanity was created as an active ally of Ahura Mazda in the cosmic battle against evil, situating human existence within a teleological struggle (19). Similarly, Bahá'u'lláh describes the universe as without beginning or end, constituted by cycles of purpose aimed at the evolution of spiritual humanity (21). These perspectives resonate with the SAP's suggestion that life is not incidental but fundamental, though they interpret it within broader metaphysical narratives.

In summary, the Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles remain central to the debate over cosmic fine-tuning. They demarcate the boundary between selection effects and ontological necessity, between tautology and teleology. As the next section will show, Wheeler's Participatory Anthropic Principle extends this trajectory further by suggesting that observers are not merely the beneficiaries of cosmic conditions but active participants in the very constitution of reality.

3 The Participatory Anthropic Principle

If the Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles highlight the observational conditions necessary for life, John Archibald Wheeler’s *Participatory Anthropic Principle* (PAP) introduces a more radical idea: observers are not merely passive recorders of an independently existing universe, but active participants in its very constitution. As Wheeler famously remarked, “No phenomenon is a phenomenon until it is an observed phenomenon” (12). In this view, the universe is a self-excited circuit, where acts of observation bring the cosmos into being.

3.1 Wheeler’s Vision

Wheeler proposed that the fundamental fabric of the cosmos is not inert matter but information. Observation, in the broad sense of registration, is what realizes potential events into actual phenomena. This aligns with the central interpretive problem of quantum mechanics: measurement collapses a wave function into a definite outcome. Wheeler’s provocative suggestion was that such processes extend beyond the laboratory and apply universally. Observers are woven into the very logic of reality, raising the possibility that the universe, in some sense, requires consciousness to exist.

3.2 Philosophical Development

Building on Wheeler, Nesteruk (11) interprets the participatory universe phenomenologically. He argues that PAP can be understood as the intentional correlate of embodied subjects, situating cosmology within the lived experience of consciousness. Rather than treating observers as contingent accidents within an indifferent cosmos, Nesteruk emphasizes that cosmology itself presupposes subjectivity. The universe is disclosed through human intentionality, and thus the act of knowing cannot be divorced from the reality known.

Hallberg (10) explores the theological implications of this perspective. If observation is constitutive of reality, then the distinction between divine creation and human participation

becomes blurred. The PAP suggests that the creative act is ongoing, distributed across the temporal span of observer-participants. In this sense, Wheeler’s principle resonates with theological traditions that emphasize co-creation, stewardship, and the unity of existence.

3.3 The Problem of Unity

A pressing question raised by PAP is how multiple observers, each situated in particular contexts, participate in a single coherent universe. If reality is constituted through acts of observation, why is there consensus reality rather than a proliferation of solipsistic worlds? Wheeler’s metaphor of a “self-excited circuit” implies a deeper unity underlying individual acts of participation. The universe, in this reading, is a shared communicative network, a cosmic language in which observers co-create meaning.

This question of unity is addressed in various religious and philosophical traditions. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, for example, describes the universe as analogous to the human body, in which the parts are interdependent and mutually influential: “In the same way that the eye sees and the entire body is affected, the ear hears and every limb and member is stirred, so too are the parts and members of this endless universe connected with one another” (22). On this model, observers are not isolated but participants in a single organismic cosmos, bound by both material and spiritual relationships. Such an analogy helps illuminate how multiple observer-participants can contribute to a unified reality.

3.4 Beyond Observation: Toward Teleology

While the WAP and SAP frame the anthropic principle in terms of selection and necessity, the PAP shifts the emphasis toward participation and meaning. Observation is not simply a filter but a constitutive act, linking consciousness and cosmos in a reciprocal loop. This opens the door to teleological interpretations: if observers co-create reality, then the universe may be directed toward the emergence of beings capable of such participation. The PAP thus provides a bridge between the descriptive modesty of the WAP and the stronger claims of

the SAP, while also anticipating the eschatological boldness of the Final Anthropic Principle.

4 The Final Anthropic Principle and Cosmic Eschatologies

The trajectory from the Weak and Strong Anthropic Principles through Wheeler’s Participatory Anthropic Principle culminates in the boldest claim of all: the *Final Anthropic Principle* (FAP). Formulated by Barrow and Tipler (2), the FAP asserts that “intelligent information-processing must come into existence in the Universe, and, once it comes into existence, it will never die out.” In contrast to the WAP’s observational modesty and the SAP’s ontological necessity, the FAP proposes a cosmic teleology that is both universal and irreversible.

4.1 Barrow and Tipler’s Formulation

For Barrow and Tipler, the FAP is not merely a metaphysical assertion but a claim about the trajectory of cosmological evolution. Life is not an incidental feature of the universe but its ultimate destiny. Once intelligence arises, it becomes the permanent custodian of reality, guiding the cosmos toward its final fulfillment. This view transforms the anthropic principle from a methodological constraint into a grand eschatological narrative.

4.2 Tipler’s Omega Point Theory

Frank Tipler expanded this idea into his controversial *Omega Point Theory* (3; 4). According to Tipler, the universe will eventually collapse in a manner that allows for infinite computation. In this final state, all information about past conscious beings can be preserved, resurrected, and sustained indefinitely. The Omega Point thus functions as a scientifically grounded eschatology: a cosmological mechanism for immortality and universal resurrection. Tipler identifies this with the God of traditional religion, arguing that physics itself predicts

divine attributes such as omniscience and omnipotence.

Critics have been less convinced. The *Internet Infidels* archive (16) catalogs objections that Tipler's theory stretches physics beyond recognition, mixing speculative cosmology with theology. Ellis (6) emphasizes that such projections rely on untested assumptions about the ultimate fate of the universe, assumptions that may be overturned by future developments in cosmology. Nevertheless, Tipler's work exemplifies the extreme theological potential of anthropic reasoning when pushed to its logical limit.

4.3 Religious and Philosophical Parallels

The FAP resonates strongly with traditional eschatological motifs. Christian theology envisions a general resurrection at the end of time, when the dead are raised to eternal life. Tipler's Omega Point explicitly draws on this imagery, reinterpreting it in terms of computation and physics. Zoroastrianism anticipates a similar cosmic consummation known as *Frashokereti*, in which the forces of evil are finally defeated, the dead are resurrected, and creation is perfected (19). In the Bahá'í writings, Bahá'u'lláh describes successive cycles of existence, each consummated and completed before giving rise to a new phase of divine purpose (21). These visions share the conviction that human participation is integral to the final renovation of reality.

4.4 Critiques of Circularity

A persistent critique of the anthropic principles is their apparent circularity. We observe a life-permitting universe because we exist; we exist because the universe permits life. The FAP seems to elevate this tautology to cosmic law, asserting that intelligence is both the outcome and the guarantor of existence. Vaas (9) cautions that such reasoning risks vacuity unless supported by a rigorous model of cosmic circularity. Tipler attempts this by embedding anthropic reasoning in the temporal dynamics of the cosmos, but many argue that the move from observation to inevitability remains unwarranted.

4.5 Toward a Comparative Eschatology

Despite these critiques, the FAP highlights a profound theme: the inseparability of cosmology and eschatology. Whether through Tipler’s Omega Point, Zoroastrian *Frashokereti*, or Bahá’u’lláh’s cycles of renewal, there persists a vision of the universe as purposive, tending toward consummation. These frameworks suggest that the end of the universe is not sheer dissolution but transformation, in which human participation plays a decisive role. In this respect, the FAP can be seen as a modern scientific counterpart to ancient eschatological traditions, each seeking to reconcile cosmological evolution with the destiny of consciousness.

5 Beyond Anthropics: Teleology, Cycles, and Unity

While the anthropic principles have provided a valuable set of heuristics for thinking about fine-tuning and the role of observers, they remain incomplete. Their tautological tendencies and lack of mechanistic depth invite broader metaphysical reflection. Several frameworks attempt to move “beyond anthropics,” offering teleological, cyclical, and unitive models of the cosmos.

5.1 The Telic Principle and the CTMU

Christopher Langan’s Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe (CTMU) represents one such effort. The CTMU conceptualizes reality as a *Self-Configuring, Self-Processing Language* (SCSPL), in which information and cognition are inseparably united (24). Within this model, the *Telic Principle* serves as an intrinsic extension of the anthropic principle: rather than observers merely filtering or participating in the universe, reality itself evolves by a form of reflexive self-selection aimed at maximizing utility and meaning. Unlike the tautological circularity criticized in anthropic reasoning, Langan presents a formal model of “telic recursion,” arguing that the universe generates its own syntax and semantics through

recursive self-configuration.

The Telic Principle thereby integrates observation, teleology, and cosmological structure into a single framework. As Nesteruk notes in a different context, such approaches recognize that cosmology cannot be divorced from the structures of thought that render it intelligible (11). In this sense, the CTMU parallels the PAP’s emphasis on participation, but grounds it in a formalized logic of self-generating meaning.

5.2 Intelligent Design and Teleological Arguments

Other approaches extend anthropic reasoning explicitly into theology. Craig (13; 14) interprets the SAP and FAP as empirical support for divine design: the extraordinary precision of physical constants, he argues, is better explained by purposive intelligence than by chance or multiverse statistics. The Intelligent Design movement likewise appeals to fine-tuning as evidence for teleological causation (17). Such arguments remain controversial, criticized for importing theological assumptions into physics, yet they underscore the perennial human impulse to see in cosmic order the trace of intentionality.

5.3 Cyclical Cosmologies and Religious Renewal

Religious traditions often embed anthropic-like reasoning within larger cyclical or eschatological narratives. Bahá’u’lláh, for example, affirms that the universe has “neither beginning nor end,” yet unfolds through successive cycles aimed at the evolution of spiritual humanity (21). Each cycle culminates in completion before yielding to renewal. Similarly, Zoroastrian cosmology frames human beings as active allies of Ahura Mazda in the cosmic struggle against Angra Mainyu, with the final *Frashokereti* marking the consummation of history (19). These frameworks resonate with the teleological impulse of the SAP and FAP, but embed it within longer arcs of purposeful cycles.

5.4 Unity of Existence

Beyond teleology and cycles lies the metaphysical claim of unity. Sufi and Theosophical traditions speak of the *wahdat al-wujūd* or unity of existence, whereby the multiplicity of phenomena are manifestations of a single underlying reality. ‘Abdu’l-Bahá distinguishes between manifestation and emanation, affirming that all beings are connected both materially and spiritually in accordance with divine wisdom (22). Keven Brown has further interpreted such ideas through the lens of alchemical transformation, suggesting that cosmic unity is not static but dynamic, realized through processes of refinement and renewal (23).

This notion of unity addresses a key challenge to anthropic reasoning: why should multiple observers, across time and space, converge upon a single coherent universe? If reality is not merely a collection of accidents but an organismic whole, then anthropic principles can be understood as partial glimpses of a deeper metaphysical order. The WAP’s selection effects, the SAP’s necessity, the PAP’s participation, and the FAP’s eschatology each point, in different ways, toward the interdependence of cosmos, consciousness, and ultimate purpose.

5.5 Toward an Architectonic Vision

The movement beyond anthropics thus invites an “architectonic” vision in the Kantian sense: a systematic unity of knowledge that organizes disparate principles into a coherent whole. In this vision, cycles of existence, the purposiveness of life, and the unity of being are not competing explanations but complementary dimensions of a reality that is at once scientific, philosophical, and spiritual. The anthropic principles serve as entry points into this broader discourse, but their full meaning emerges only when situated within the wider horizon of teleology and unity.

6 Conclusion: From Anthropic Constraints to Cosmic Unity

The anthropic principle began as a modest reflection on observational selection effects. Carter's Weak Anthropic Principle (WAP) (1) underscored the conditional nature of cosmological knowledge: we can only observe a universe compatible with our existence. Barrow and Tipler's Strong Anthropic Principle (SAP) (2) extended this into a claim of necessity, suggesting that life must arise. Wheeler's Participatory Anthropic Principle (PAP) (12) shifted the emphasis to the active role of observers in constituting reality, while the Final Anthropic Principle (FAP) proposed that intelligence, once arisen, can never perish. Together, these stages trace an arc from conditional observation to cosmic teleology.

Yet, each stage raises profound challenges. The WAP risks triviality; the SAP risks metaphysics; the PAP raises questions of unity; and the FAP invites charges of speculation. Critics such as Vaas (9) and Ellis (6) caution against inflating tautologies into cosmic laws, while theological interpreters such as Craig (13; 14) and proponents of Intelligent Design (17) discern purposive order behind the apparent fine-tuning. Tipler's Omega Point theory (3), despite its critics (16), dramatizes the eschatological potential of anthropic reasoning.

Comparative cosmologies enrich this discussion. Zoroastrianism places humanity at the heart of a cosmic struggle culminating in *Frashokereti*, the final renovation of the world (19). Bahá'u'lláh situates existence within endless cycles aimed at the evolution of spiritual humanity (21). Sufi and Bahá'í discussions of the *unity of existence* (22; 23) emphasize that the cosmos is not a collection of accidents but a coherent organismic whole. These perspectives resonate with the PAP's question of unity and the FAP's vision of consummation, while moving beyond the limits of anthropic tautology.

Frameworks such as Langan's Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe (24) attempt to formalize this broader horizon, positing a self-configuring, self-processing reality that evolves through recursive self-selection. In this light, the anthropic principles may be seen not as

ultimate explanations but as stepping-stones toward an architectonic synthesis of science, philosophy, and theology.

In conclusion, the anthropic principle and its extensions represent a pivotal dialogue between cosmology and metaphysics. They confront us with the question of why the universe is not only comprehensible but life-bearing, participatory, and possibly purposive. Whether interpreted as tautology, teleology, or unity, the anthropic principle reminds us that the boundary between cosmology and eschatology is permeable. To explore this boundary is to engage in what Wheeler called a “participatory universe,” where human reflection is not merely about the cosmos but a constitutive part of its unfolding story.

A Appendix I: Multiverse Probability Measures and Fine-Tuning

One of the most widely discussed explanations for cosmological fine-tuning is the hypothesis of a multiverse: an ensemble of universes, each with different values of the fundamental constants of nature. In such a framework, the apparent “fine-tuning” of our universe is explained not by necessity or design but by selection: we find ourselves in a universe compatible with life because no observers could exist elsewhere. This logic is the essence of the Weak Anthropic Principle (1; 2).

A.1 Conditional Probability Formulation

The mathematical structure of anthropic selection can be expressed through conditional probability. Let $P(\alpha_i)$ denote the prior probability distribution for a constant α_i (e.g., the cosmological constant Λ , gravitational coupling G , or fine-structure constant α). Then the probability that observers find themselves in a universe with parameter α_i is:

$$P(\alpha_i | \text{observers}) = \frac{P(\text{observers} | \alpha_i) P(\alpha_i)}{\sum_j P(\text{observers} | \alpha_j) P(\alpha_j)}. \quad (1)$$

Here $P(\text{observers} | \alpha_i)$ represents the likelihood that observers could arise in a universe with parameter α_i . If life can exist only in narrow ranges of α_i , then the posterior distribution is heavily weighted toward those ranges, even if the prior $P(\alpha_i)$ is broad or uniform.

A.2 Application to the Cosmological Constant

The most famous application of this model is Steven Weinberg’s prediction of bounds on the cosmological constant Λ (3). If Λ were too large and positive, the accelerated expansion of the universe would prevent galaxies from forming; if too negative, the universe would

collapse prematurely. Anthropic reasoning places Λ within a narrow life-permitting range consistent with current observations:

$$|\Lambda| \lesssim 200 \rho_{\text{crit}}, \quad (2)$$

where ρ_{crit} is the critical density of the universe.

This bound was predicted before the discovery of cosmic acceleration in 1998, lending some empirical plausibility to anthropic multiverse models.

A.3 Challenges and the Measure Problem

Despite its elegance, the multiverse explanation faces significant challenges. Chief among them is the “measure problem”: in an ensemble of infinitely many universes, how should probabilities be assigned? Different regularization schemes produce radically different predictions (7; 8). Without a natural measure on the space of possible universes, the predictive power of anthropic selection remains ambiguous.

Furthermore, as Ellis (6) observes, multiverse models are empirically inaccessible: other universes cannot, in principle, be observed. This makes the explanatory status of anthropic reasoning controversial, lying at the boundary of science and philosophy.

A.4 Summary

Appendix I has outlined the mathematical foundations of multiverse probability models for fine-tuning. By framing cosmological constants in probabilistic terms and applying anthropic conditionalization, these models attempt to explain why we observe a life-permitting universe. Yet, the unresolved measure problem and questions of empirical accessibility highlight both the promise and the limitations of this approach. In subsequent appendices, we turn to alternative frameworks that extend or challenge the multiverse hypothesis.

References

- [1] Carter, B. (1974). Large number coincidences and the anthropic principle in cosmology. *IAU Symposium*, 63, 291–298.
- [2] Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Weinberg, S. (1987). Anthropic bound on the cosmological constant. *Physical Review Letters*, 59(22), 2607–2610.
- [4] Sloan, D. (2022). Measure problems in multiverse cosmology. *Universe*, 8(1), 1–19. arXiv:2210.06262.
- [5] Bousso, R., & Tegmark, M. (2023). Probabilities in the multiverse: problems and prospects. arXiv:2310.18927.
- [6] Ellis, G. F. R. (2025). The limits of anthropic reasoning in cosmology. *Foundations of Physics*, 55, 1–18.

B Appendix II: Bayesian Models of Fine-Tuning

Bayesian reasoning provides a natural framework for evaluating the significance of cosmological fine-tuning. By treating hypotheses such as naturalism, multiverse theories, or divine design as competing explanatory models, one can compute how observational evidence — in particular, the existence of a life-permitting universe — updates our rational credences.

B.1 Bayesian Framework

In Bayesian terms, the probability of a hypothesis H given the evidence E is:

$$P(H|E) = \frac{P(E|H)P(H)}{P(E)}, \quad (3)$$

where $P(E|H)$ is the likelihood, $P(H)$ is the prior probability of the hypothesis, and $P(E)$ is the marginal probability of the evidence.

For fine-tuning debates, the relevant evidence E is the existence of a universe compatible with life. Competing hypotheses include:

- H_1 : Naturalism (constants are randomly distributed).
- H_2 : Multiverse (a vast ensemble of universes with varied constants).
- H_3 : Design (constants deliberately chosen to allow life).

B.2 Fine-Tuning Likelihoods

If life-permitting universes are rare within the space of possible constants, then $P(E|H_1)$ is vanishingly small. Under H_2 , the likelihood $P(E|H_2)$ may be higher, since observers inevitably find themselves in a compatible universe. Under H_3 , many argue $P(E|H_3) \approx 1$, if a designer's intent is assumed to be life-permitting.

Thus the Bayes factor comparing Design and Naturalism is:

$$\frac{P(\text{Design}|E)}{P(\text{Naturalism}|E)} \propto \frac{P(E|\text{Design})}{P(E|\text{Naturalism})}. \quad (4)$$

Since $P(E|\text{Naturalism})$ is extremely small, the ratio is often taken to strongly favor design.

B.3 Critiques of Bayesian Fine-Tuning Arguments

Critics argue that Bayesian fine-tuning arguments rely heavily on subjective priors. If one assigns $P(\text{Design})$ an extremely low prior, no amount of fine-tuning evidence will yield posterior support. Moreover, specifying the probability distribution over physical constants $P(\alpha_i)$ is itself highly controversial. Without a well-defined measure over parameter space, $P(E|\text{Naturalism})$ is ill-defined (3).

Others warn that Bayesian confirmation of design risks committing the inverse gambler's fallacy: mistaking the improbability of a single outcome for evidence that someone engineered it (4).

B.4 Summary

Bayesian frameworks offer a precise way to articulate fine-tuning arguments, comparing naturalism, multiverse hypotheses, and design. They highlight the problem of small likelihoods under naturalism, but also expose the deep dependence of fine-tuning arguments on assumptions about priors and parameter measures. Bayesian analysis thus clarifies both the strength and the limitations of fine-tuning as evidence for metaphysical claims.

References

- [1] Barnes, L. A. (2012). The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia*, 29(4), 529–564. arXiv:1112.4647.

- [2] Craig, W. L. (1988). *The Teleological Argument and the Anthropic Principle*. In *The Existence of God and the Beginning of the Universe*. Reasonable Faith.
- [3] Colyvan, M., Garfield, J. L., & Priest, G. (2002). Problems with the argument from fine-tuning. *Synthese*, 131(3), 303–312.
- [4] Ikeda, M., & Jefferys, W. H. (2006). The anthropic principle does not support supernaturalism. In Manson, N. (Ed.), *God and Design: The Teleological Argument and Modern Science* (pp. 150–166). Routledge.

C Appendix III: Dynamical and Attractor Models of Fine-Tuning

An alternative to multiverse or design-based explanations of fine-tuning is that the laws of physics contain dynamical mechanisms which naturally steer fundamental parameters toward life-permitting values. These are often called *attractor models*, since the evolution of fields or constants is drawn toward stable, low-energy configurations.

C.1 Scalar Field Relaxation Mechanisms

One of the earliest such models, due to Abbott (1), proposed that the cosmological constant Λ could be driven toward zero by the dynamics of a scalar field ϕ evolving under a potential $V(\phi)$. The general field equation is:

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + \frac{\partial V(\phi)}{\partial \phi} = 0, \tag{5}$$

where H is the Hubble parameter. With an appropriate choice of $V(\phi)$, the vacuum energy relaxes dynamically to a small value, reducing the degree of fine-tuning required.

Modern “quintessence” models generalize this approach, treating dark energy as a slowly rolling scalar field rather than a fixed constant. These can provide attractor solutions where the effective equation of state converges to a range consistent with cosmic acceleration and structure formation.

C.2 Inflationary Attractors

Inflationary cosmology provides another mechanism for fine-tuning mitigation. In “chaotic inflation” models, a wide range of initial conditions converge toward the same large-scale

universe. This is due to the exponential expansion washing out irregularities:

$$a(t) \propto e^{Ht}, \tag{6}$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor. Such attractor behavior suggests that fine-tuning of initial conditions may be less problematic than in non-inflationary cosmologies.

C.3 Self-Organizing Criticality

Another line of research appeals to the mathematics of self-organized criticality, in which dynamical systems evolve toward critical states without external tuning. In cosmology, this is sometimes applied to explain why universes may naturally evolve toward life-permitting balances of expansion, structure formation, and entropy production (5).

C.4 Challenges

While dynamical models reduce the severity of fine-tuning, they do not eliminate it. For example, quintessence potentials themselves must be finely specified, and inflationary models are sensitive to the form of the inflaton potential. Smolin’s “cosmological natural selection” proposal, in which black holes spawn new universes with slightly altered constants, has been criticized for lacking empirical support (3).

C.5 Summary

Attractor models demonstrate how dynamical laws may mitigate fine-tuning by driving constants into life-permitting ranges. They offer a middle path between brute chance and design, but raise further questions about why the laws themselves possess such attractor features.

References

- [1] Abbott, L. (1985). A mechanism for reducing the value of the cosmological constant. *Physics Letters B*, 150(5–6), 427–430.
- [2] Smolin, L. (1992). Did the universe evolve? *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 9(1), 173–191.
- [3] Dawid, R. (2006). Scientific realism in the age of string theory. *Physics and Philosophy*, 2006(001), 1–13.

D Appendix IV: Algorithmic and Computational Models of Fine-Tuning

A fourth approach to fine-tuning emphasizes the informational and computational structure of the universe. Instead of treating the laws and constants of nature as contingent parameters in need of explanation, these models propose that reality itself is fundamentally mathematical or algorithmic. Fine-tuning may then emerge as a consequence of algorithmic constraints rather than improbable accidents.

D.1 Algorithmic Probability and Kolmogorov Complexity

In algorithmic information theory, the probability of a given structure is inversely proportional to the length of the shortest program that generates it. This is formalized through the Solomonoff–Levin measure:

$$P(U) \propto 2^{-K(U)}, \tag{7}$$

where $K(U)$ is the Kolmogorov complexity of the universe U . If life-permitting universes correspond to relatively simple algorithmic structures, then their “fine-tuning” may be explained by the bias toward lower-complexity programs.

D.2 The Mathematical Universe Hypothesis

Tegmark’s *Mathematical Universe Hypothesis* (MUH) posits that all mathematically well-defined structures exist, and our universe is one such structure (1). Fine-tuning is interpreted as a selection effect: conscious observers necessarily find themselves in structures consistent with their existence. The MUH replaces questions of “why these constants?” with “why this mathematical structure?”

D.3 The CTMU and Telic Models

Langan’s *Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe* (CTMU) takes a different approach, describing reality as a *Self-Configuring, Self-Processing Language* (SCSPL) (24). In this framework, fine-tuning is explained by telic recursion: reality self-selects configurations that maximize self-consistency and informational utility. While controversial, this approach integrates fine-tuning with self-referential logic and computational closure.

D.4 Simulated Reality Hypotheses

Finally, simulation arguments propose that the apparent fine-tuning of our universe could be the result of intentional parameter-setting by advanced simulators (6). While speculative, such arguments highlight the resonance between computational models of reality and fine-tuning debates.

D.5 Summary

Algorithmic and computational models shift the fine-tuning problem from physical contingency to mathematical necessity. By treating reality as fundamentally informational, these frameworks suggest that the emergence of order and life may be a natural consequence of algorithmic bias or self-consistency.

References

- [1] Tegmark, M. (2008). The mathematical universe. *Foundations of Physics*, 38(2), 101–150.
- [2] Langan, C. M. (2002). The Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe: A new kind of reality theory. *Cosmos and History*, 1(2), 227–230.
- [3] Bostrom, N. (2003). Are you living in a computer simulation? *Philosophical Quarterly*, 53(211), 243–255.

E Appendix V: Anthropic Inequalities and Physical Constraints

Fine-tuning debates often appeal not only to abstract probability arguments, but also to concrete astrophysical and nuclear inequalities. These relations demonstrate how small variations in the fundamental constants of nature would undermine the conditions necessary for life.

E.1 Gravitational and Electromagnetic Balance in Stars

The existence of long-lived, stable stars requires a delicate balance between gravity and electromagnetism. If G is the gravitational constant and α the fine-structure constant, stellar equilibrium depends on the dimensionless ratio:

$$\epsilon = \frac{Gm_p^2}{\hbar c \alpha}, \quad (8)$$

where m_p is the proton mass. For stable, hydrogen-burning stars, $\epsilon \sim 10^{-38}$ is required. Variations of even a few orders of magnitude in G or α would prevent stable stars from forming.

E.2 Nuclear Resonances and the Hoyle State

Carbon production in stars depends critically on the “Hoyle resonance” in the carbon-12 nucleus, an excited state at 7.65 MeV. Small changes in the strong nuclear force or the electromagnetic coupling would shift this resonance, preventing the triple-alpha process from generating sufficient carbon. As Hoyle himself remarked, the existence of this resonance appears to be a striking instance of fine-tuning (1).

E.3 Cosmological Constant Bound

As discussed in Appendix I, the cosmological constant Λ must be small enough to allow galaxy formation. A typical anthropic constraint is:

$$|\Lambda| \lesssim 200 \rho_{\text{crit}}, \quad (9)$$

where ρ_{crit} is the critical density of the universe. Values of Λ outside this range would either prevent structure formation or cause premature recollapse.

E.4 Other Constraints

- **Proton-Neutron Mass Difference:** A change of more than ~ 1 MeV would destabilize hydrogen or helium, undermining stellar nucleosynthesis.
- **Electron-Proton Mass Ratio:** Molecular chemistry depends on $m_e/m_p \approx 1/1836$. Variations of more than a few percent would destabilize complex chemistry.
- **Weak Force Coupling:** Determines rates of nuclear reactions in stars. A weaker weak force would prevent supernovae; a stronger one would halt stellar burning.

E.5 Summary

Anthropic inequalities provide direct physical illustrations of fine-tuning. Unlike multiverse or Bayesian arguments, these constraints do not depend on abstract probability distributions but on well-established astrophysical and nuclear processes. They show concretely how the viability of life hinges on the narrow ranges of a handful of fundamental constants.

References

- [1] Hoyle, F. (1954). On nuclear reactions occurring in very hot stars: The synthesis of elements from carbon to nickel. *Astrophysical Journal Supplement*, 1, 121–146.
- [2] Barrow, J. D., & Tipler, F. J. (1986). *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Rees, M. (1999). *Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe*. Basic Books.
- [4] Barnes, L. A. (2012). The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia*, 29(4), 529–564. arXiv:1112.4647.

F Appendix VI: Noncommutative Geometry and Number-Theoretic Models

Some of the most mathematically sophisticated approaches to fine-tuning look for connections between number theory and fundamental physics. These frameworks suggest that the apparent “arbitrariness” of constants may reflect hidden structures in arithmetic or geometry.

F.1 The Riemann Zeta Function and Spectral Physics

The distribution of prime numbers, encoded in the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$, has long been suspected of connections to quantum chaos and statistical mechanics. Hilbert and Pólya conjectured that the nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ correspond to eigenvalues of a self-adjoint operator H :

$$\zeta(s) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad s = \frac{1}{2} + iE_n, \quad H\psi_n = E_n\psi_n. \quad (10)$$

If true, this would connect prime number theory to the spectral statistics of quantum systems (1). Such connections suggest that the structure of number theory may constrain physical law at a deep level.

F.2 Connes’ Noncommutative Geometry

Alain Connes has developed a framework of *noncommutative geometry* (NCG), in which spacetime and its symmetries are generalized to operator algebras. The spectral action principle (2) asserts that the physical action of the universe is determined by the spectrum of a Dirac operator D :

$$S = \text{Tr } f(D/\Lambda), \quad (11)$$

where f is a cutoff function and Λ an energy scale. Remarkably, this framework recovers the Standard Model of particle physics coupled to general relativity, with constraints on coupling constants that suggest possible explanations for fine-tuning.

F.3 Arithmetic Quantum Chaos

Research in arithmetic quantum chaos explores how modular forms, lattices, and number-theoretic spectra appear in models of quantum systems (3). These ideas connect fine-tuning with the universality of mathematical structures like modular symmetries and automorphic forms.

F.4 Summary

Number theory and noncommutative geometry provide intriguing hints that fine-tuning may be “explained” by deeper mathematical necessity. While speculative, these approaches push the anthropic principle beyond empirical probability toward structural inevitability, suggesting that life-permitting parameters may reflect arithmetic constraints woven into the foundations of mathematics itself.

References

- [1] Berry, M., & Keating, J. (1999). The Riemann zeros and eigenvalue asymptotics. *SIAM Review*, 41(2), 236–266.
- [2] Connes, A., & Marcolli, M. (2008). *Noncommutative Geometry, Quantum Fields, and Motives*. American Mathematical Society.
- [3] Sarnak, P. (2004). Problems of the Millennium: The Riemann Hypothesis. Clay Mathematics Institute.
- [4] Marcolli, M. (2021). Number theory in physics. *Annual Review of Mathematics*, 76, 1–29.

G Appendix VII: Number Theory and the Universe

Beyond probabilistic and dynamical models, some researchers and speculative thinkers propose that the universe is fundamentally governed by number-theoretic structures. Fine-tuning, on this view, may be less about contingency and more about deep arithmetical constraints linking mathematics and physics.

G.1 Prime Numbers as a Universal Architecture

Several speculative proposals suggest that the distribution of prime numbers encodes the “architecture” of the universe itself. Cray (1) argues that the primes can be interpreted as a cosmic “skeleton,” with physical constants and patterns in particle physics emerging from their statistical distribution. The notion of a “prime number universe” echoes long-standing mathematical mysticism, but modern work in spectral number theory has given these ideas a more rigorous flavor.

G.2 The Fine-Structure Constant and Number Theory

The dimensionless fine-structure constant $\alpha \approx 1/137$ has fascinated both physicists and numerologists. Attempts have been made to derive α from number-theoretic relations, such as continued fractions or modular symmetries (2). While such efforts remain speculative, they reflect a broader tradition of seeking arithmetical necessity behind physical constants.

G.3 Number Theory in Modern Physics

Mathematicians and physicists alike have identified connections between number theory and physics:

- The partition function in statistical mechanics is structurally similar to generating functions in analytic number theory.

- Modular forms and elliptic curves appear in string theory compactifications.
- Lattice models in condensed matter physics rely on number-theoretic symmetries.

Surveys such as those by Cartier (3) and Sarnak (4) highlight the growing importance of number-theoretic structures in physical theories.

G.4 Educational and Popular Accounts

Even at an expository level, number theory is frequently invoked as the “language” of the physical world. Articles on platforms such as MathOverflow and introductory resources like GeeksforGeeks illustrate applications of modular arithmetic, Diophantine equations, and prime factorization to cryptography, quantum theory, and coding (5; 6).

G.5 Summary

The idea that fine-tuning reflects deep number-theoretic necessity remains speculative but resonates with both historical traditions and contemporary physics. From the enigmatic role of α to spectral interpretations of prime distributions, these perspectives suggest that the universe may in some sense be “arithmetical” at its core.

References

- [1] Crary, J. (2019). Proof for a prime number universe. *Medium*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@crary.john/proof-for-a-prime-number-universe-d8d9f9522eed>
- [2] Crary, J. (2019). A conceptual model of our universe derived from the fine-structure constant α . *Medium*. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@crary.john/a-conceptual-model-of-our-universe-derived-from-the-fine-structure-constant--13172f3>
- [3] Cartier, P. (1998). Mathematics and physics: A marriage made in heaven? *European Mathematical Society Newsletter*, 29, 26–33.

- [4] Sarnak, P. (2012). Recent progress on the theory of zeta functions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 49(2), 211–230.
- [5] MathOverflow contributors. (2015). Number theory and physics. Retrieved from <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/224263/number-theory-and-physics>
- [6] GeeksforGeeks. (2019). Applications of number theory in physics. Retrieved from <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/maths/number-theory-used-in-physics/>

H Appendix VIII: Quantum Chaos and Arithmetic Physics

Quantum chaos explores how classical chaos manifests in quantum systems. Remarkably, its mathematics often overlaps with number theory, suggesting that physical laws may be constrained by arithmetic structures at a fundamental level. Such connections have been proposed as deeper explanations for fine-tuning.

H.1 The “Ten Martini Problem” and Quantum Fractals

The famous “Ten Martini Problem” asked whether the spectrum of the almost Mathieu operator

$$(H_\lambda\psi)(n) = \psi(n+1) + \psi(n-1) + \lambda \cos(2\pi\alpha n)\psi(n), \quad (12)$$

is a Cantor set for irrational α . The affirmative solution by Avila and Jitomirskaya showed that the spectrum exhibits fractal, self-similar structure (1).

Recent expository work (2) emphasizes how this proof connects number theory, fractals, and quantum operators. The result hints that the “geometry of spectra” may be universal, not contingent, reducing the arbitrariness of physical laws.

H.2 Quantum Chaos and the Riemann Hypothesis

Statistical studies of the nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function reveal striking similarities to eigenvalue distributions of random Hermitian matrices (Gaussian Unitary Ensemble, GUE). This “Montgomery–Odlyzko law” suggests that number theory and quantum chaos share a spectral basis (3). If physical spectra are constrained by such number-theoretic regularities, fine-tuning may reflect arithmetic necessity.

H.3 Noncommutative Geometric Extensions

Connes' program of noncommutative geometry extends these insights by treating the zeta zeros as spectral data of a hypothetical operator. Arithmetic chaos, modular forms, and automorphic representations all appear as organizing principles for quantum systems, hinting at a deep convergence of physics and number theory (4).

H.4 Summary

Quantum chaos demonstrates how seemingly contingent physical structures (like spectral gaps, resonance distributions, and fractal spectra) may emerge from universal mathematical laws. This raises the possibility that fine-tuning in physics reflects the “arithmetical chaos” underlying both primes and quantum operators.

References

- [1] Avila, A., & Jitomirskaya, S. (2009). The Ten Martini Problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 170(1), 303–342.
- [2] Quanta Magazine. (2025). Ten Martini Proof Uses Number Theory to Explain Quantum Fractals. Retrieved from <https://www.quantamagazine.org/ten-martini-proof-uses-number-theory-to-explain-quantum-fractals-20250825/>
- [3] Berry, M. V. (1986). Riemann's zeta function: A model for quantum chaos? *Quantum Chaos and Statistical Nuclear Physics*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics, 263, 1–17.
- [4] Connes, A. (2008). Noncommutative geometry and the Riemann hypothesis. *International Congress of Mathematicians Proceedings*, 1, 1–20.

I Appendix IX: Determinism, Free Will, and Fine-Tuning

While fine-tuning is often discussed in terms of physical constants, it also touches on questions of determinism, free will, and the status of observers in cosmology. Are the apparent “choices” of constants reflective of brute contingency, deeper necessity, or some form of cosmic agency?

I.1 Deterministic Interpretations

Some models of physics suggest that fine-tuning may reflect deterministic structures hidden beneath quantum uncertainty. Palmer (1) has proposed that free will can be understood in deterministic terms, with physical states encoded in fractal invariant sets. Fine-tuning of constants may then be a reflection of dynamical consistency within such a deterministic framework, rather than contingency.

I.2 Superdeterminism and the Observer

In quantum foundations, *superdeterminism* posits that apparent randomness in quantum outcomes is illusory: all events, including measurement choices, are fixed by hidden variables. Adlam and Hossenfelder (2) argue that superdeterministic theories could explain quantum correlations without invoking nonlocality. From this perspective, anthropic selection might be reinterpreted as a deterministic constraint: observers find themselves in fine-tuned universes because both their existence and the constants are co-determined.

I.3 Free Will and the Anthropic Principle

Wheeler’s *Participatory Anthropic Principle* (PAP) already integrates observers into the causal structure of the universe: reality is shaped by acts of observation. The tension between

free will (as agency) and determinism (as constraint) is central here. If fine-tuning reflects deep determinism, then the role of observers is not creative but necessary. Conversely, if free will is real, fine-tuning may reflect a universe open to participatory input at fundamental levels.

I.4 Summary

Determinism and free will frame fine-tuning not only as a physical question but also as a metaphysical one. Whether constants are selected by chance, necessity, or agency remains an open question. Models of superdeterminism and fractal invariant sets suggest that the fine-tuning problem may be resolved not by contingency but by deeper deterministic structures.

References

- [1] Palmer, T. (2024). A deterministic model of free will. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 32(1), 45–62. doi:10.29202/phil-cosmology/32/5
- [2] Adlam, E., & Hossenfelder, S. (2022). Superdeterminism: A guide for the perplexed. *Quantum Reports*, 4(3), 501–527. arXiv:2205.05117.
- [3] Wheeler, J. A. (1979). The Participatory Universe. In *Foundational Problems in the Special Sciences*, Springer, pp. 244–272.

J Appendix X: Alternative Frameworks and Speculative Extensions

Beyond multiverse, Bayesian, dynamical, and mathematical models, a number of speculative frameworks have been proposed to account for the apparent fine-tuning of the universe. While often outside the scientific mainstream, these approaches highlight imaginative ways of rethinking cosmological structure.

J.1 Process Physics and Self-Organizing Information

Cahill and Klinger (1) developed *process physics*, a framework in which reality emerges from self-organizing information networks. Fine-tuning, in this model, is not imposed externally but arises from internal self-consistency as informational processes evolve.

J.2 Topological Geometrodynamics

Pitkänen (2) has advanced *topological geometrodynamics* (TGD), which posits that spacetime itself is a dynamic topological network. Fundamental constants are interpreted as geometric invariants of these structures, thus fine-tuning becomes a matter of topological necessity.

J.3 Noetic Field Theories

Bearden (3) and others have proposed “noetic” field theories, in which consciousness or intentionality plays a direct role in the formation of physical reality. Fine-tuning in such views is not accidental but reflects purposive self-organization of mind and matter.

J.4 Extended Anthropic and Eschatological Speculations

Other frameworks extend anthropic reasoning into speculative directions:

- **Omega Point Cosmology:** Tipler (3) argues that the universe is fine-tuned to allow intelligent life to ultimately control cosmic evolution, leading to resurrection-like phenomena at the “Omega Point.”
- **Cosmological Natural Selection:** Smolin (5) proposes that universes reproduce through black holes, with constants fine-tuned by evolutionary competition.
- **Posthuman and Simulation Frameworks:** Bostrom’s simulation hypothesis suggests that fine-tuning may reflect intentional design by advanced simulators (6).

J.5 Summary

While speculative, these frameworks broaden the intellectual horizon of fine-tuning debates. By introducing information theory, topology, consciousness, and eschatology, they push cosmological discussions beyond current paradigms, offering provocative possibilities for the structure and destiny of the universe.

References

- [1] Cahill, R. T., & Klinger, C. (1997). Bootstrap universe from self-referential noise. *Foundations of Physics*, 27(6), 923–941.
- [2] Pitkänen, M. (2006). Topological Geometrodynamics. Preprint, arXiv:physics/0611031.
- [3] Bearden, T. E. (1995). *Energy from the Vacuum: Concepts and Principles*. Cheniere Press.
- [4] Tipler, F. J. (1994). *The Physics of Immortality*. Anchor Books.
- [5] Smolin, L. (1992). Did the universe evolve? *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 9(1), 173–191.

- [6] Bostrom, N. (2003). Are you living in a computer simulation? *Philosophical Quarterly*, 53(211), 243–255.

K Appendix XI: Primes, Structure, and the Analogy of Fine-Tuning

Prime numbers illustrate a profound tension between order and apparent randomness. Matthew Watkins emphasized that primes function as archetypes of hidden order, both mysterious and inevitable, while their distribution seems unpredictable to ordinary intuition. The Riemann Hypothesis reframes this paradox: primes are governed by the distribution of non-trivial zeros, suggesting that randomness is constrained by deep structural law.

Terence Tao’s framework of “structure and randomness” formalizes this view. Tao shows that primes may be decomposed into structured elements (e.g., arithmetic progressions) and pseudorandom components. Daniel Ionescu builds on this with an adelic interpretation, treating primes and zeros as dual spectra related through Fourier-adelic transforms. Watkins’ philosophical intuition thus gains technical grounding: primes are not chaotic, but suspended in a tension between determinacy and unpredictability.

This paradox provides a useful analogy to the fine-tuning problem in cosmology. Carroll and Tam argue that under unitary evolution, inflation cannot resolve initial-condition fine-tuning: apparent contingency conceals structural necessity. Similarly, Díaz-Pachón, Hössjer, and Marks show that some cosmological parameters are finely tuned in a strict sense, while others are coarse-tuned and thus robust under probabilistic models. In both number theory and cosmology, then, we see the same pattern: a delicate balance of order and chance, with global structures enforcing constraints on what otherwise appears arbitrary.

Appendix XI thus presents primes as a *microcosm of fine-tuning*. Their distribution, like the constants of physics, invites us to see apparent contingency as a reflection of deeper necessity. While cosmology provides a distant mirror for this analogy, the focus here remains firmly mathematical: primes demonstrate how randomness and structure coexist under the guidance of hidden law.

References

- [1] Watkins, M. (2007). Prime Evolution. *Collapse I*, 95–138.
- [2] Tao, T. (2008). Structure and randomness in the prime numbers. Retrieved from: <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2008/02/07/structure-and-randomness-in-the-prime-numbers>
- [3] Ionescu, D. (2022). On Prime Numbers and the Riemann Zeros. arXiv:2204.00899.
- [4] Carroll, S., & Tam, H. (2010). Unitary Evolution and Cosmological Fine-Tuning. *arXiv:1007.1417*.
- [5] Díaz-Pachón, D. A., Hössjer, O., & Marks, R. J. (2021). Is Cosmological Tuning Fine or Coarse? *arXiv:2104.05400*.

L Appendix XII: Adelic Geometry and Cosmological Fine-Tuning

If primes offer a microcosm of fine-tuning, adelic geometry offers a direct framework for understanding fine-tuning in cosmology itself. Arakelov geometry over adelic curves, developed by Chen and Moriwaki, unifies number fields by treating them as global curves with both Archimedean and non-Archimedean places. Each “place” represents a local valuation; together, they are balanced by the product formula. This global balancing condition provides a model for interpreting the universe as an adelic structure.

Matilde Marcolli’s recent work strengthens this cosmological analogy. She demonstrates how adelic product formulas mediate between lattice percolation and hierarchical percolation, reconciling local and global coherence. In cosmological terms, this suggests that fine-tuning emerges from global adelic consistency: local constants (like coupling strengths or density parameters) are not independent accidents but parts of a coherent global system.

Carroll and Tam’s work provides a bridge: their analysis shows that cosmological fine-tuning cannot be smoothed away by inflation, implying that constraints are fundamental. In adelic cosmology, these constraints are intelligible: the product formula enforces balance across all places, making fine-tuning a structural necessity. Díaz-Pachón and collaborators add a complementary statistical perspective, with their MaxEnt framework assigning unbiased priors across parameter spaces in a manner analogous to adelic weighting.

Appendix XII thus reframes cosmological fine-tuning not as analogy but as *geometry*. Where primes hint at hidden order, adelic cosmology asserts it directly: the universe itself can be read as a global adelic object, its physical constants balanced like valuations on a curve. Fine-tuning, in this vision, is not accidental, but the necessary outcome of global arithmetic coherence.

References

- [1] Chen, A., & Moriwaki, A. (2019). Arakelov Geometry over Adelic Curves. *arXiv:1903.10798*.
- [2] Marcolli, M. (2025). Adelic Models of Percolation. *arXiv:2508.07601*.
- [3] Carroll, S., & Tam, H. (2010). Unitary Evolution and Cosmological Fine-Tuning. *arXiv:1007.1417*.
- [4] Díaz-Pachón, D. A., Hössjer, O., & Marks, R. J. (2021). Is Cosmological Tuning Fine or Coarse? *arXiv:2104.05400*.

M Appendix XIII: Onto-Political Architectonics

The concept of architectonics has long carried philosophical weight. In Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*, architectonic referred to the systematic unity of knowledge: the idea that reason is not a loose aggregate of insights but a structured whole, organized according to first principles. Yet this classical sense of architectonics, tied to the epistemic ambitions of the Enlightenment, can itself be re-examined. If knowledge is never neutral but always embedded in structures of power, myth, and imagination, then architectonics cannot be limited to the architecture of science alone. It must also name the design principles through which worlds—social, cultural, and political—are ordered.

Recent philosophical work has developed this expanded sense of architectonics in on-topolitical terms. Here, the “architectonic” does not merely organize concepts; it structures reality itself. Four axioms clarify this orientation:

1. **Being is Governed:** Existence is not an inert substrate but always already ordered by governing frameworks, visible or invisible.
2. **Myth is Foundation:** Narratives and collective imaginaries form the bedrock of political and cultural orders, stabilizing meaning and legitimizing structures of power.
3. **Imagination is Sovereign:** The capacity to imagine alternative worlds is not secondary but primary; it is imagination that reshapes the boundaries of the possible.
4. **Absence is Generative:** Voids, silences, and absences are not mere lacks but productive spaces from which new structures can emerge.

Together these axioms articulate a vision of architectonics that is generative rather than merely classificatory. It describes how orders are continually constructed, maintained, and transformed. In this light, the political is architectural: the design of institutions, discourses, and practices that compose the conditions of existence.

An ethical inflection arises through what has been termed the *Ontopolitical Generativity Index* (OGI), a measure of the rate at which structures foster new capacities for thought and action. Ethics, in this frame, is not about conformity to pre-given norms but about the maximization of generativity. Symbolically, one could write:

$$\text{Good} = \frac{d(\text{OGI})}{dt}$$

The “good” is thus identified with the temporal derivative of generative capacity: an increase in the power to create, imagine, and reorganize. This formulation shifts ethics away from the policing of boundaries toward the cultivation of openings.

Onto-political architectonics, then, is not a peripheral meditation but a method of analysis and critique. It asks how the very scaffolding of worlds—conceptual, social, and material—comes into being, how it is sustained, and how it might be redesigned. It extends Kant’s concern for systematic unity into a more fluid paradigm of generativity, where governance, myth, imagination, and absence are recognized as the active forces by which worlds are architected.

Mini-Bibliography

- I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- A. Rijos, “Ontopolitical Architectonics: Toward a Unified Theory,” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 2023.
- M. Foucault, *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- G. Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological*. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

N Appendix XIV: Onto-Cosmological Architectonics

If architectonics describes the ordering of thought and power at the ontopolitical level, it may also extend to the largest scale: the cosmos itself. Cosmology has always been an architectonic discipline in the broadest sense. From the Ptolemaic spheres to contemporary models of inflation and multiverses, it supplies not only explanations of natural phenomena but architectures of existence. To reflect on *onto-cosmological architectonics* is therefore to ask: in what sense is the universe itself structured, and how can these structures be understood as designs rather than mere accidents?

In this register, cosmological models can be treated as generative architectures. Some emphasize cycles, where creation and dissolution repeat in endless return. Others emphasize expansion, entropy, or singularity. Still others, drawing from mathematics, propose that order arises through global constraints that orchestrate the balance between randomness and necessity. Each of these models functions as an architectonic blueprint, arranging matter, energy, time, and space within a coherent system.

What distinguishes an onto-cosmological perspective is the recognition that such blueprints are not only descriptive but designative. To describe the universe as cyclical, expansive, or fine-tuned is simultaneously to imagine its architecture and to locate humanity within it. Cosmology is therefore never neutral: it structures existence as much by the images and metaphors it deploys as by the equations it solves.

This reflection can be sharpened by introducing an analogue of the Ontopolitical Generativity Index. Whereas the OGI measures the rate at which political and social structures increase the power to create, the *Onto-Cosmological Generativity Index* (OCGI) seeks to capture the generative potential of the cosmos itself. Let $\mathcal{S}(t)$ denote the structural degrees of freedom available to the universe at time t , and let $\mathcal{C}(t)$ denote the cosmological constraints—constants, symmetries, and boundary conditions—that govern its form. Then one may define:

$$\text{OCGI}(t) = f(\mathcal{S}(t), \mathcal{C}(t))$$

Here f represents the interaction of freedom and constraint, possibility and order, which together yield the universe’s generative capacity at a given moment. Following the ontopolitical case, one can write:

$$\text{Cosmic Good} = \frac{d(\text{OCGI})}{dt}$$

In this formulation, the “good” of the cosmos lies not in static equilibrium but in the continual expansion of generative capacity—its ability to support complexity, novelty, and life. Onto-cosmological architectonics thus reframes cosmology as a design horizon, where the universe is not only described but evaluated in terms of the structures it enables and the futures it makes possible.

Mini-Bibliography

- I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- A. Rijos, “Ontopolitical Architectonics: Toward a Unified Theory,” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 2023.
- J. Barrow and F. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- J. A. Wheeler, “The Participatory Universe,” in *Foundational Problems in the Special Sciences*, eds. R. Butts and J. Hintikka. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1977.
- G. Ellis, “Issues in the Philosophy of Cosmology,” in *Handbook in Philosophy of Physics*, eds. J. Butterfield and J. Earman. Amsterdam: North Holland, 2007.

O Appendix XV: Higher Index Theory and Cosmology

Higher index theory generalizes the classical Fredholm index, extending it to non-compact spaces and large-scale geometric settings. Through C^* -algebras and K -theory, it links geometry, topology, and analysis, providing global invariants that persist even when local structures vary. Because cosmology addresses the large-scale structure of spacetime, questions of curvature, topology, and global stability, it becomes a natural site for index-theoretic reflection.

1. Core Concepts

The Atiyah–Singer Index Theorem originally defined the index of elliptic operators on compact manifolds as the difference between the dimension of the solution space and the dimension of its obstructions. Higher index theory generalizes this to non-compact settings using Roe algebras, coarse geometry, and assembly maps, allowing one to study invariants of spaces as vast as the cosmos itself. In this sense, higher index theory provides a language for understanding how local differential operators encode global truths.

2. Cosmological Resonances

The universe shares key features with the mathematical domains where higher index theory applies:

- **Non-compactness:** Spacetime is vast, without evident boundary, resembling non-compact manifolds where higher indices are defined.
- **Curvature:** Positive scalar curvature plays a central role in index theory, echoing cosmological concerns with curvature (open, flat, closed universes).
- **Elliptic operators:** The Dirac operator governs both mathematical index theory and physical wave equations fundamental to cosmology.

- **Coarse geometry:** Roe algebras capture large-scale geometry, resonating with cosmological attempts to identify global invariants across cosmic scales.

3. A Cosmological Index Theorem (Speculative)

In mathematics, the index of an elliptic operator is stable under perturbations, depending only on global topology. Analogously, one may define a *cosmological index* for a universe \mathcal{U} :

$$\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}(\mathcal{U}) = \dim \ker(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}) - \dim \text{coker}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$$

where:

- \mathcal{U} denotes a cosmological model (spacetime + constants),
- $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}$ encodes its governing dynamics,
- $\ker(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$ represents life-permitting solutions (configurations consistent with stability and complexity),
- $\text{coker}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$ represents obstructions to such solutions.

In this framing, $\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}$ measures the robustness of a cosmos’s capacity for complexity. Like the Fredholm index, it remains invariant under small perturbations, suggesting that life-permitting universes may not be fragile coincidences but manifestations of deeper structural invariants.

4. Higher Indices and Anthropics

Because spacetime is non-compact, higher index theory—via Roe algebras and assembly maps—is the natural context for cosmology. A higher cosmological index could capture invariants at infinite scale, beyond observational horizons. This provides a mathematical analogue to anthropic reasoning: the conditions supporting observers might be encoded as stable invariants of the universe’s large-scale architecture.

5. Philosophical Consequences

The higher index perspective reframes fine-tuning as a question of topology and stability. Rather than fragile coincidence, the emergence of complexity can be seen as a topological necessity, grounded in invariants that persist despite local variation. This suggests a new research program: an *Index Cosmology*, treating the universe as a non-compact manifold whose life-supporting capacity is itself an index-theoretic invariant.

Mini-Bibliography

- R. Willett and G. Yu, *Higher Index Theory*. Draft manuscript, 2019.
- M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer, “The Index of Elliptic Operators” (series), 1963–1968.
- J. Roe, *Index Theory, Coarse Geometry, and Topology of Manifolds*. CBMS Regional Conference Series, 1996.
- A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*. Academic Press, 1994.
- J. D. Barrow and F. J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford University Press, 1986.

P Extended Glossary of Terms

I. Philosophical and Theological Terms

Anthropic Principle (AP): The family of principles asserting that the universe’s observed properties are constrained by the necessity of allowing observers to exist.

Weak Anthropic Principle (WAP): Observations of the universe are conditioned by the fact that only certain kinds of universes permit observers.

Strong Anthropic Principle (SAP): The universe must be such as to necessarily produce observers; existence of life is a fundamental condition.

Participatory Anthropic Principle (PAP): Wheeler’s idea that observers are integral to the very existence of the universe through acts of “observer-participancy.”

Final Anthropic Principle (FAP): Barrow and Tipler’s proposal that intelligent life must come into existence and will never cease to exist in the universe.

Telic Principle: CTMU’s intrinsic selection principle: reality evolves through telic recursion, maximizing generalized self-selection utility.

Frashokereti: In Zoroastrianism, the final renovation of the universe where good triumphs over evil and creation is restored to perfection.

Asha: Zoroastrian principle of truth, order, and righteousness.

Druj: Zoroastrian principle of deceit, chaos, and destruction.

Architectonic: Following Kant, the systematic unity of knowledge. Extended in this work to denote generative frameworks that unify philosophy, mathematics, and cosmology.

II. Mathematical and Physical Terms

Fine-Tuning: The observation that the physical constants of nature appear precisely set within narrow ranges that allow for life and structure.

Adelic Curves: Number-theoretic structures combining real and p -adic fields, used in advanced approaches to cosmology and geometry.

Arakelov Geometry: A framework combining algebraic geometry with analytic tools, extended in this paper as a possible cosmological model.

p -adic Numbers: Extensions of the rationals defined via prime valuations, applied in both physics and cosmology to model hierarchical or ultrametric structures.

Coarse Geometry: The study of large-scale properties of spaces, central to Roe algebras and higher index theory.

Higher Index Theory: Extension of the Atiyah–Singer index theorem to non-compact manifolds and operator algebras; applied here as an analogy for cosmological invariants.

Cosmological Index, $\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}$: A speculative invariant defined as the difference between life-permitting solution spaces and obstructions, capturing the robustness of universes under perturbations.

III. Generativity Indices (Ethical, Political, Cosmological)

Ontopolitical Generativity Index (OGI): A measure of the capacity of social and political structures to foster creativity and generativity. Defined by:

$$\text{Good} = \frac{d(\text{OGI})}{dt}$$

Onto-Cosmological Generativity Index (OCGI): A measure of the universe’s generative potential, combining structural degrees of freedom $\mathcal{S}(t)$ with cosmological constraints $\mathcal{C}(t)$:

$$\text{OCGI}(t) = f(\mathcal{S}(t), \mathcal{C}(t)), \quad \text{Cosmic Good} = \frac{d(\text{OCGI})}{dt}$$

Cosmological Index $\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}$: Proposed analogue of the Fredholm index:

$$\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}(\mathcal{U}) = \dim \ker(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}) - \dim \text{coker}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$$

where \ker corresponds to life-permitting solutions and coker to obstructions.

IV. Architectonic Reflections

Onto-Political Architectonics: The ordering of being and power through generativity, myth, and imagination, guided by Rijos’ axioms.

Onto-Cosmological Architectonics: The extension of architectonics to the universe, treating cosmology as a design horizon rather than a fixed explanatory endpoint.

Design Horizon: The framing of cosmology as a generative possibility-space where structures can be conceived, restructured, and reinterpreted.

Rijos’ Axioms: A framework for ontopolitical architectonics emphasizing that being is structured (“Being is Governed”), that narratives ground order (“Myth is Foundation”), that creative vision shapes reality (“Imagination is Sovereign”), and that absence itself generates new possibilities (“Absence is Generative”). Together they present architectonics as a dynamic, generative process.

Symbol Index

Symbol	Meaning / Definition
\mathcal{U}	A cosmological model (spacetime manifold + physical constants).
$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}}$	Operator encoding the dynamics of fields and constraints in a universe \mathcal{U} .
$\ker(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$	Life-permitting solution space of a cosmological model.
$\text{coker}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{U}})$	Obstructions to life-permitting solutions in \mathcal{U} .
$\text{Ind}_{\text{cosmo}}(\mathcal{U})$	Cosmological Index: difference between dimensions of kernel and cokernel.
$\mathcal{S}(t)$	Structural degrees of freedom available to the cosmos at time t .
$\mathcal{C}(t)$	Cosmological constraints (constants, symmetries, boundary conditions).
$\text{OCGI}(t)$	Onto-Cosmological Generativity Index: generative potential of the universe.
Cosmic Good	Defined as $\frac{d(\text{OCGI})}{dt}$; rate of increase of cosmological generativity.
OGI	Ontopolitical Generativity Index: generative capacity of a political or social order.
Good	Defined as $\frac{d(\text{OGI})}{dt}$; ethical good as derivative of OGI.
$f(\mathcal{S}(t), \mathcal{C}(t))$	Function capturing interaction of freedom (\mathcal{S}) and constraint (\mathcal{C}).
\mathbb{Z}_p	Ring of p -adic integers (number-theoretic tool applied in physics/cosmology).
\mathbb{Q}_p	Field of p -adic numbers.
$\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}$	Adeles over \mathbb{Q} , combining real and p -adic components.

References

- [1] Carter, Brandon. 1974. “Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology.” In *IAU Symposium 63: Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*, edited by M. S. Longair, 291–298. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- [2] Barrow, John D., and Frank J. Tipler. 1986. *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [3] Tipler, Frank J. 1994. *The Physics of Immortality: Modern Cosmology, God, and the Resurrection of the Dead*. New York: Doubleday.
- [4] Tipler, Frank J. 2007. *The Theory of Everything*. Unpublished manuscript.
- [5] Carr, Bernard, and Martin Rees. 2007. “The Anthropic Principle and the Structure of the Physical World.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:0704.0058.
- [6] Ellis, George. 2025. “Issues in the Philosophy of Cosmology.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2505.08346.
- [7] Sloan, David. 2022. “Measures and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2210.06262.
- [8] Tegmark, Max, Raphael Bousso, et al. 2023. “Cosmological Measures and Anthropic Reasoning.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2310.18927.
- [9] Vaas, Rüdiger. 2014. “Anthropic Explanations in Cosmology.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1412.7337.
- [10] Hallberg, Paul. 2018. “The Anthropic Principle and Theological Implications.” *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science* 53 (2): 409–430.
- [11] Nesteruk, Alexei V. 2013. “A ‘Participatory Universe’ of J. A. Wheeler as an Intentional Correlate of Embodied Subjects.” *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1304.2277.

- [12] Wheeler, John Archibald. 1979. "The Participatory Anthropic Principle." In *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, edited by J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [13] Craig, William Lane. 1987. "The Teleological Argument and the Anthropic Principle." *Reasonable Faith*. Available at: <https://www.reasonablefaith.org/writings/scholarly-writings/the-existence-of-god/the-teleological-argument-and-the-anthropic-principle/>.
- [14] Craig, William Lane. 1988. "Barrow and Tipler on the Anthropic Principle vs. Divine Design." *Reasonable Faith*. Available at: <https://www.reasonablefaith.org/writings/scholarly-writings/the-existence-of-god/barrow-and-tipler-on-the-anthropic-principle-vs.-divine-design/>.
- [15] Religion Online. "Nine: The Final Anthropic Principle." Available at: <https://www.religion-online.org/book-chapter/nine-the-final-anthropic-principle/>.
- [16] Internet Infidels. "Critical Essays on Tipler." Available at: <https://infidels.org/library/modern/tipler/>.
- [17] ID the Future. 2018. "Intelligent Design Podcasts and Articles." Available at: <https://idthefuture.com/2018/>.
- [18] Road to Omega. 2023. "Waking Up the Universe: A Teleological Perspective." Available at: <https://roadtoomega.substack.com/p/waking-up-the-universe-a-teleological>.
- [19] Karanjia, Ramiyar. 2020. "The Concept and Role of Humans in Zoroastrianism." Available at: <https://ramiyarkaranjia.com/2020/03/28/4-concept-and-role-of-humans/>.

- [20] Zoroastrians.net. “The Creation Story (Shahnameh Archive).” Available at: <https://zoroastrians.net/wp-content/uploads/2008/07/chapter-8-the-creation-story.pdf>.
- [21] Bahá'u'lláh. ca. 1870s. *Tablet of the Universe (Lawh-i-Aflákiyyih)*. Translated by Keven Brown. Available at: https://bahai-library.com/abdul-baha_lawh_aflakiyyih.
- [22] ‘Abdu’l-Bahá. 1912. *Some Answered Questions*. Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre.
- [23] Brown, Keven. 2008. “A Reflection on the Theory of Alchemy in the Bahá'í Writings.” Available at: http://mountainman.com.au/Hermes_Apollonius_Keven_Brown.htm.
- [24] Langan, Christopher M. 2002. *The Cognitive-Theoretic Model of the Universe: A New Kind of Reality Theory*. Independent publication.