NATHAN AVIEZER

THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE:
What is it and Why is it Important for the Believing Jew?

In recent years, it has become clear to many scientists that the universe appears *as if* it were specifically designed for the existence and well-being of human beings. This expresses itself in two ways: (i) very slight changes in the laws of nature would have made it impossible for life to exist, and (ii) human life would not have been possible were it not for the occurrence in the past of a large number of highly improbable events. This phenomenon has attracted considerable scientific attention and has been named the anthropic principle. Illustrations of the anthropic principle will be presented, and its importance for the believing Jew will be discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, it has become clear to many scientists that the universe appears *as if* it were specifically designed for the existence and well-being of Man. This phenomenon, which has attracted considerable scientific attention, has become known as the *anthropic principle*,[1,2] from the Greek word "anthropos," which means "man." The anthropic principle expresses itself in two ways: (i) very slight changes in the laws of nature would have made it impossible for life to exist, and (ii) human life would not have been possible were it not for the occurrence in the past of a large number of highly improbable events. Whereas the secular scientist sees such a sequence of occurrences as mere "lucky accidents," the believing Jew sees in them the guiding hand of the Creator.

Our subject consists of two parts: first, an explanation of exactly what is meant by the anthropic principle, illustrated by a number of examples, and second, a discussion of the importance of the anthropic principle for the believing Jew. The first topic is purely scientific, whereas the second topic deals with religion. This distinction must be kept clear because the words commonly used by secular scientists in discussing the anthropic principle often sound remarkably similar to those used by the rabbis!

The thesis to be developed here
universe *appears as if* it were desig
Man — may be taken as evidence tha
the Almighty. This statement require
because most scientists view the anth
property of nature, having no significa
to understand why the believing Je
principle a confirmation of his belief

2. THE LAWS OF NATURE

The anthropic principle refers to the re
between the laws of nature and the e
that these two subjects had little in
principles of biology would be relat
the physical sciences. It is now know
scientific discoveries have shown tha
intimately dependent on the details
cosmology.

2a. Solar Energy

It is not necessary to elaborate on the
on the Sun, whose heat and light are
(aside from radioactivity, which is
solar energy, our planet would be i
begin our discussion of the anthro
that produces the Sun's energy.

The Sun contains only two kind
is inert, unconnected with solar e
further. Our discussion centers on
nucleus consists of only one partic
a vast assemblage of protons. Ho
first explained in the late 1930s by
the Nobel Prize for his discovery
many others, was dismissed from
He eventually settled in the Unite
Cornell University, where he mad

Because of the extreme conditi
proton may occasionally transfor
fundamental particle of nature. The

is that the anthropic principle — the
ied for the existence and well-being of
at the universe *really was* so designed by
s a detailed explanation and justification
ropic principle as being merely a curious
nce whatsoever. Therefore, it is important
w is justified in seeing in the anthropic
in the Almighty.

AND THE EXISTENCE OF LIFE

ecent discovery of a remarkable connection
xistence of life. It was previously thought
common. One can understand that the
ed to the existence of life, but surely not
n that such is not the case. Indeed, recent
at the very existence of living creatures is
of the laws of physics, astronomy, and

fact that life on Earth is crucially dependent
the primary source of all terrestrial energy
not relevant to our discussion). Without
ncapable of supporting life. Therefore, we
pic principle by examining the mechanism

s of atoms: hydrogen and helium. Helium
nergy, and therefore need not concern us
hydrogen, the simplest atom of all, whose
le — a proton. Thus, the Sun is basically
w these protons produce solar energy was
Professor Hans Bethe, who was awarded
. Bethe was a German Jew who, like so
his university post by the Nazis in 1933.
d States and joined the physics faculty of
e his Nobel-prize-winning discovery.
ions present in the interior of the Sun, a
n spontaneously into a neutron — another
e resulting neutron can combine with another

proton to form a composite particle known as a deuteron. These deuterons "burn" via a thermonuclear reaction and this "burning" provides the intense heat and brilliant light of the Sun. Thus, deuterons constitute the solar fuel that generates the energy of the Sun which enables life to exist on Earth.

A very important feature of solar "burning" is that it occurs very gradually. Since neutrons are only rarely formed from protons, a relatively small number of deuterons are produced at any one time, and thus solar fuel (deuterons) constitutes but a tiny fraction of the total material in the Sun. This ensures that the Sun "burns" slowly, generating solar energy only gradually.

Another possible nuclear reaction that could, in principle, take place is the combination of one proton with another proton. Fortunately for us, however, proton-proton combination does not occur. If one proton would have been able to combine with another proton, then all the protons in the Sun would immediately combine with each other, leading to a gigantic explosion of the entire Sun. As a result, the Sun would no longer be able to gradually generate solar energy.

In summary, in order to obtain the gradual "burning" of the Sun that is vital for life on Earth, two conditions must be met. First, a proton must be *able* to combine with a neutron to produce a deuteron, which is the solar fuel. Second, a proton must be *unable* to combine with another proton, because this would produce "explosive material." The possibility of proton-neutron combination and the impossibility of proton-proton combination both depend on the strength of the "nuclear force," one of the fundamental forces in nature (the other fundamental forces include the familiar force of gravity and the electromagnetic force). Detailed calculations[3] of the nuclear force have demonstrated the following results:

1. If the nuclear force were only a *few percent* weaker, then a proton would not combine with a neutron to form a deuteron. If this were the case, no deuterons would be formed in the Sun and hence no solar fuel would exist. As a result, the Sun would not shine ("burn"), but would merely be a cold ball of inert gas — precluding the possibility of life on Earth.
2. If the nuclear force were only a *few percent* stronger, then each proton would rapidly combine with another proton with explosive results. If this were the case, the Sun would soon explode and thus cease to shine ("burn"), once again precluding the possibility of life on Earth.

It is an extraordinary fact that the strength of the nuclear force *just happens* to lie in the narrow range in which neither of these two catastrophes occurs. The proton-proton explosion *does not* occur, but the gradual "burning" of

The thesis to be developed here is that the anthropic principle — the universe *appears as if* it were designed for the existence and well-being of Man — may be taken as evidence that the universe *really was* so designed by the Almighty. This statement requires a detailed explanation and justification because most scientists view the anthropic principle as being merely a curious property of nature, having no significance whatsoever. Therefore, it is important to understand why the believing Jew is justified in seeing in the anthropic principle a confirmation of his belief in the Almighty.

2. THE LAWS OF NATURE AND THE EXISTENCE OF LIFE

The anthropic principle refers to the recent discovery of a remarkable connection between the laws of nature and the existence of life. It was previously thought that these two subjects had little in common. One can understand that the principles of biology would be related to the existence of life, but surely not the physical sciences. It is now known that such is not the case. Indeed, recent scientific discoveries have shown that the very existence of living creatures is intimately dependent on the details of the laws of physics, astronomy, and cosmology.

2a. Solar Energy

It is not necessary to elaborate on the fact that life on Earth is crucially dependent on the Sun, whose heat and light are the primary source of all terrestrial energy (aside from radioactivity, which is not relevant to our discussion). Without solar energy, our planet would be incapable of supporting life. Therefore, we begin our discussion of the anthropic principle by examining the mechanism that produces the Sun's energy.

The Sun contains only two kinds of atoms: hydrogen and helium. Helium is inert, unconnected with solar energy, and therefore need not concern us further. Our discussion centers on hydrogen, the simplest atom of all, whose nucleus consists of only one particle — a proton. Thus, the Sun is basically a vast assemblage of protons. How these protons produce solar energy was first explained in the late 1930s by Professor Hans Bethe, who was awarded the Nobel Prize for his discovery. Bethe was a German Jew who, like many others, was dismissed from his university post by the Nazis in 1933. He eventually settled in the United States and joined the physics faculty of Cornell University, where he made his Nobel-prize-winning discovery.

Because of the extreme conditions present in the interior of the Sun, a proton may occasionally transform spontaneously into a neutron — another fundamental particle of nature. The resulting neutron can combine with another

proton to form a composite particle known as a deuteron. These deuterons "burn" via a thermonuclear reaction and this "burning" provides the intense heat and brilliant light of the Sun. Thus, deuterons constitute the solar fuel that generates the energy of the Sun which enables life to exist on Earth.

A very important feature of solar "burning" is that it occurs very gradually. Since neutrons are only rarely formed from protons, a relatively small number of deuterons are produced at any one time, and thus solar fuel (deuterons) constitutes but a tiny fraction of the total material in the Sun. This ensures that the Sun "burns" slowly, generating solar energy only gradually.

Another possible nuclear reaction that could, in principle, take place is the combination of one proton with another proton. Fortunately for us, however, proton-proton combination does not occur. If one proton would have been able to combine with another proton, then all the protons in the Sun would immediately combine with each other, leading to a gigantic explosion of the entire Sun. As a result, the Sun would no longer be able to gradually generate solar energy.

In summary, in order to obtain the gradual "burning" of the Sun that is vital for life on Earth, two conditions must be met. First, a proton must be *able* to combine with a neutron to produce a deuteron, which is the solar fuel. Second, a proton must be *unable* to combine with another proton, because this would produce "explosive material." The possibility of proton-neutron combination and the impossibility of proton-proton combination both depend on the strength of the "nuclear force," one of the fundamental forces in nature (the other fundamental forces include the familiar force of gravity and the electromagnetic force). Detailed calculations[3] of the nuclear force have demonstrated the following results:

1. If the nuclear force were only a *few percent* weaker, then a proton would not combine with a neutron to form a deuteron. If this were the case, no deuterons would be formed in the Sun and hence no solar fuel would exist. As a result, the Sun would not shine ("burn"), but would merely be a cold ball of inert gas — precluding the possibility of life on Earth.
2. If the nuclear force were only a *few percent* stronger, then each proton would rapidly combine with another proton with explosive results. If this were the case, the Sun would soon explode and thus cease to shine ("burn"), once again precluding the possibility of life on Earth.

It is an extraordinary fact that the strength of the nuclear force *just happens* to lie in the narrow range in which neither of these two catastrophes occurs. The proton-proton explosion *does not* occur, but the gradual "burning" of

deuterons *does* take place in the Su
are vital for life to exist on Earth. T
principle.

2b. Water and Air on our Planet

Another example of the anthropic p
and air on the planet Earth. Once a
the necessity of water and air for th
with an abundant supply of both, pe
two neighboring planets, Venus and
and hence devoid of life, as the spa
may not seem particularly noteworth
they really are.

It was recently discovered that,
planets (Earth, Venus, and Mars) ha
channels that are observed today or
ago by the copious fast-flowing Ma
Venus was once covered by deep
a layer of water three kilometers
the course of time, all surface wate
did the Earth escape this catastrop

The answer is that the Earth es
The Earth *just happens* to be suffic
water neither evaporated nor decor
the Earth *just happens* to be suffi
remains high enough to prevent a
happened on Mars. Therefore, the
system, is capable of supporting li

Similar remarks apply to the at
silicate geochemical cycle have shov
by a very delicate balance, involvin
balance is so delicate that if the I
Sun, surface temperatures would
precluding all possibility of a life-s
were only a few percent farther
dioxide in the atmosphere would
not be breathable by human bei
Earth *just happens* to lie at the cr
formation of a life-sustaining atm
narrow zone"[8]).

ın, providing the warmth and light that
'his is our first example of the anthropic

ɔrinciple relates to the existence of water
again, it is not necessary to elaborate on
he existence of life. The Earth is blessed
ermitting life to flourish here, whereas our
l Mars, are both devoid of water and air,
ace program has established. These facts
thy, but we shall see just how remarkable

shortly after they were formed, all three
d large amounts of surface water. The deep
ı the surface of Mars were carved out long
rtian primordial surface waters.[4] Similarly,
oceans which contained the equivalent of
deep over its entire surface.[5] However, in
ers on Mars and Venus disappeared. How
ɔhe?
scaped this catastrophe by sheer accident!
iently distant from the Sun that our surface
mposed, as happened on Venus. Moreover,
iciently near the Sun that the temperature
ll the oceans from freezing pemanently, as
Earth *alone*, among the planets of the solar
ife.
mosphere. Recent studies of the carbonate-
vn that the planetary atmosphere is controlled
ıg the subtle interplay of many factors.[6] This
Earth were only a few percent closer to the
ɔe far higher than the boiling point of water,
ustaining atmosphere. Similarly, if the Earth
from the Sun, the concentration of carbon
become so high that "the atmosphere would
ings."[7] Fortunately, the orbit of the planet
ucial distance from the Sun that permits the
ıosphere ("life could appear in this extremely

This remarkably fortunate coincidence is known among scientists as "the Goldilocks problem of climatology." Recall the children's story in which Goldilocks found the various items of Baby Bear to be "not too hot and not too cold....not too hard and not too soft....not too long and not too short....but *just right*" In that vein, scientists refer to the existence of water and air on Earth as another example of the anthropic principle.

2c. Physics and Astronomy

The above two examples of the anthropic principle are taken from among the many that could be brought from the physical sciences. Indeed, the examples are so numerous and so dramatic that many scientists have commented on the severe restraints that the existence of life places on the laws of nature. Particularly perceptive are the impressions of Professor Freeman J. Dyson[9] of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, one the world's leading mathematical physicists, whose words capture the essence of the anthropic principle:

> As we look out into the universe and identify the many peculiarities of physics and astronomy that have worked together for our benefit, it almost seems as if the universe must in some sense have known that we were coming.

2d. The Origin of Life

The branch of science dealing with the origin of life is called molecular biology. There has been enormous progress in the past few decades. Scientists have unraveled the structure of DNA (the long, thread-like molecules that form the genetic material found in each cell of every living creature) — the famous double helix. The genetic code has been deciphered. The hundreds of complex chemical reactions that take place within the cell are now understood. From all this scientific progress, one could easily form the impression that the "riddle of life" has been solved, i.e., that scientists have succeeded in explaining all the steps by which inanimate material became transformed into the complex biological systems that we call "life." However, such a conclusion would be completely erroneous.

After half a century of intensive research into molecular biology, scientists have come to appreciate just how extremely improbable and incredible the transformation of inanimate material into living cells appears. This was the central theme of a recent *Scientific American* article,[10] appropriately entitled, "In the Beginning...." (I love that title!) This article describes in detail the enormous difficulties encountered by all current scientific proposals to explain

deuterons *does* take place in the Sun, providing the warmth and light tha
are vital for life to exist on Earth. This is our first example of the anthropi
principle.

2b. Water and Air on our Planet

Another example of the anthropic principle relates to the existence of wate
and air on the planet Earth. Once again, it is not necessary to elaborate o
the necessity of water and air for the existence of life. The Earth is blesse
with an abundant supply of both, permitting life to flourish here, whereas ou
two neighboring planets, Venus and Mars, are both devoid of water and ai
and hence devoid of life, as the space program has established. These fac
may not seem particularly noteworthy, but we shall see just how remarkab
they really are.

It was recently discovered that, shortly after they were formed, all thr
planets (Earth, Venus, and Mars) had large amounts of surface water. The de
channels that are observed today on the surface of Mars were carved out lo
ago by the copious fast-flowing Martian primordial surface waters.[4] Similar
Venus was once covered by deep oceans which contained the equivalent
a layer of water three kilometers deep over its entire surface.[5] However,
the course of time, all surface waters on Mars and Venus disappeared. H
did the Earth escape this catastrophe?

The answer is that the Earth escaped this catastrophe by sheer accide
The Earth *just happens* to be sufficiently distant from the Sun that our surf
water neither evaporated nor decomposed, as happened on Venus. Moreov
the Earth *just happens* to be sufficiently near the Sun that the temperat
remains high enough to prevent all the oceans from freezing pemanently,
happened on Mars. Therefore, the Earth *alone*, among the planets of the so
system, is capable of supporting life.

Similar remarks apply to the atmosphere. Recent studies of the carbon
silicate geochemical cycle have shown that the planetary atmosphere is contro
by a very delicate balance, involving the subtle interplay of many factors.[6] T
balance is so delicate that if the Earth were only a few percent closer to
Sun, surface temperatures would be far higher than the boiling point of wa
precluding all possibility of a life-sustaining atmosphere. Similarly, if the E
were only a few percent farther from the Sun, the concentration of car
dioxide in the atmosphere would become so high that "the atmosphere wo
not be breathable by human beings."[7] Fortunately, the orbit of the pl
Earth *just happens* to lie at the crucial distance from the Sun that permits
formation of a life-sustaining atmosphere ("life could appear in this extre
narrow zone"[8]).

This remarkably fortunate coincidence is known among scientists as "the Goldilocks problem of climatology." Recall the children's story in which Goldilocks found the various items of Baby Bear to be "not too hot and not too cold....not too hard and not too soft....not too long and not too short....but *just right*" In that vein, scientists refer to the existence of water and air on Earth as another example of the anthropic principle.

2c. Physics and Astronomy

The above two examples of the anthropic principle are taken from among the many that could be brought from the physical sciences. Indeed, the examples are so numerous and so dramatic that many scientists have commented on the severe restraints that the existence of life places on the laws of nature. Particularly perceptive are the impressions of Professor Freeman J. Dyson[9] of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, one the world's leading mathematical physicists, whose words capture the essence of the anthropic principle:

> As we look out into the universe and identify the many peculiarities of physics and astronomy that have worked together for our benefit, it almost seems as if the universe must in some sense have known that we were coming.

2d. The Origin of Life

The branch of science dealing with the origin of life is called molecular biology. There has been enormous progress in the past few decades. Scientists have unraveled the structure of DNA (the long, thread-like molecules that form the genetic material found in each cell of every living creature) — the famous double helix. The genetic code has been deciphered. The hundreds of complex chemical reactions that take place within the cell are now understood. From all this scientific progress, one could easily form the impression that the "riddle of life" has been solved, i.e., that scientists have succeeded in explaining all the steps by which inanimate material became transformed into the complex biological systems that we call "life." However, such a conclusion would be completely erroneous.

After half a century of intensive research into molecular biology, scientists have come to appreciate just how extremely improbable and incredible the transformation of inanimate material into living cells appears. This was the central theme of a recent *Scientific American* article,[10] appropriately entitled, "In the Beginning...." (I love that title!) This article describes in detail the enormous difficulties encountered by all current scientific proposals to explain

the origin of life ("points out the ina
of a terrestrial genesis of life"), quoti

Professor Harold Klein,[11] chairm
Sciences committee that reviewed orig
American as follows:

> The simplest bacterium is so dar
> to imagine how it happened.

Professor Francis Crick,[12] who sha
structure of DNA, is also quoted as

> The origin of life appears to
> conditions which would have

If this Nobel laureate, known as a
feeling, sees fit to use the words "
of life, it is clear that quite an incre
occurred to generate the transformat

3. HIGHLY IMPROBABLE

3a. The Destruction of the Dinosa
So far, we have been discussing the
to make possible the existence of lif
with human life. Therefore, we ask:
occur to permit the existence of hu
answer is a resounding "Yes!" This

We begin our analysis of the hig
human life with a discussion of th
past. The dinosaurs were one of t
ever lived — the largest, strongest
The dinosaurs (and their close re
(flying dinosaurs), and the oceans
in constant fear of being devoure
Because the dinosaurs were the do
era is commonly referred to as the

After being the undisputed mast
all the dinosaurs worldwide sudde
of all the dinosaurs, together wi
famous of the mass extinctions th
of our planet, each time abruptly

The cause of this mass extinction had baffled scientists for many years. What could have caused the abrupt demise of these extremely successfully animals after they had enjoyed such a long period of dominance? What occurred to suddenly wipe out the dinosaurs?

After years of debate, the riddle of what caused the sudden and total destruction of the dinosaurs was finally solved in 1980 by Nobel laureate Luis Alvarez and his son Walter, who showed that a giant meteor from outer space had collided with the Earth to cause this worldwide catastrophe.[13] This explanation for the mass extinctions — the impact of meteors or comets colliding with the Earth — has become known as the "impact theory." The scientific evidence in favor of the impact theory accumulated rapidly, and by 1987, Professor Alvarez could point to *fifteen* different pieces of scientific data that supported the theory.[14]

The point of central importance to our discussion is that the collision between the meteor and the Earth was a matter of *sheer luck*. This has been repeatedly stressed by leading paleontologists (scientists who study fossils). For example, Professor David Raup, past president of the American Paleontological Society, has taken precisely this point as the central theme of his famous article (since expanded into a book with same title), *Extinctions: Bad Genes or Bad Luck?* In his article, Raup[15] emphasizes the role played by "luck" in mass extinctions.

> The extinction of a given species or higher group is more bad luck than bad genes.... Pure chance would favor some biologic groups over others.

The important role played by luck in mass extinctions has also been emphasized by Professor Stephen J. Gould[16] of Harvard University:

> If extinctions can demolish more than 90% of all species, then we must be losing groups forever by pure bad luck.

Professor George Yule[17] of the University of Oxford puts it in the following way:

> The species exterminated were not killed out because of any inherent defects, but simply because they had the ill-luck to stand in the way of the cataclysm.

Finally, we quote Professor David Jablonski[18] of the University of Chicago, a world authority on the subject of mass extinctions:

> When a mass extinction strikes, it is not the 'most fit' species that survive; it is the most fortunate. Species that had been barely hanging on... inherit the earth.

the origin of life ("points out the inadequacy of all [proposed] explanations of a terrestrial genesis of life"), quoting leading experts in the field.

Professor Harold Klein,[11] chairman of the U.S. National Academy o Sciences committee that reviewed origin-of-life research, is quoted by *Scientifi American* as follows:

> The simplest bacterium is so damn complicated that it is almost impossibl to imagine how it happened.

Professor Francis Crick,[12] who shared the Nobel Prize for discovering th structure of DNA, is also quoted as using picturesque language:

> The origin of life appears to be almost a miracle, so many are th conditions which would have had to be satisfied to get it going.

If this Nobel laureate, known as a man completely devoid of any religiou feeling, sees fit to use the words "almost a miracle" to describe the origi of life, it is clear that quite an incredible series of unlikely events must hav occurred to generate the transformation of inanimate material into living cell

3. HIGHLY IMPROBABLE EVENTS AND HUMAN BEINGS

3a. The Destruction of the Dinosaurs

So far, we have been discussing the many unlikely events that were necessa to make possible the existence of life itself. But our main concern, of course, with human life. Therefore, we ask: Did any extremely unusual events have occur to permit the existence of human beings? As we shall see, the scientis answer is a resounding "Yes!" This is the very heart of the anthropic princip

We begin our analysis of the highly improbable events that culminated human life with a discussion of the dinosaurs, those terrible monsters of t past. The dinosaurs were one of the most successful groups of animals th ever lived — the largest, strongest, fastest, and fiercest animals of all tim The dinosaurs (and their close relatives) inhabited every continent, the (flying dinosaurs), and the oceans (marine dinosaurs). Other animals liv in constant fear of being devoured or destroyed by these gigantic repti Because the dinosaurs were the dominant form of animal life, this geologi era is commonly referred to as the Age of Reptiles.

After being the undisputed masters of our planet for over 150 million ye all the dinosaurs worldwide suddenly became extinct. This sudden destruct of all the dinosaurs, together with most other animal species, is the m famous of the mass extinctions that have occurred periodically in the hist of our planet, each time abruptly wiping out the majority of animal spec

The cause of this mass extinction had baffled scientists for many years. What could have caused the abrupt demise of these extremely successfully animals after they had enjoyed such a long period of dominance? What occurred to suddenly wipe out the dinosaurs?

After years of debate, the riddle of what caused the sudden and total destruction of the dinosaurs was finally solved in 1980 by Nobel laureate Luis Alvarez and his son Walter, who showed that a giant meteor from outer space had collided with the Earth to cause this worldwide catastrophe.[13] This explanation for the mass extinctions — the impact of meteors or comets colliding with the Earth — has become known as the "impact theory." The scientific evidence in favor of the impact theory accumulated rapidly, and by 1987, Professor Alvarez could point to *fifteen* different pieces of scientific data that supported the theory.[14]

The point of central importance to our discussion is that the collision between the meteor and the Earth was a matter of *sheer luck*. This has been repeatedly stressed by leading paleontologists (scientists who study fossils). For example, Professor David Raup, past president of the American Paleontological Society, has taken precisely this point as the central theme of his famous article (since expanded into a book with same title), *Extinctions: Bad Genes or Bad Luck?* In his article, Raup[15] emphasizes the role played by "luck" in mass extinctions.

> The extinction of a given species or higher group is more bad luck than bad genes.... Pure chance would favor some biologic groups over others.

The important role played by luck in mass extinctions has also been emphasized by Professor Stephen J. Gould[16] of Harvard University:

> If extinctions can demolish more than 90% of all species, then we must be losing groups forever by pure bad luck.

Professor George Yule[17] of the University of Oxford puts it in the following way:

> The species exterminated were not killed out because of any inherent defects, but simply because they had the ill-luck to stand in the way of the cataclysm.

Finally, we quote Professor David Jablonski[18] of the University of Chicago, a world authority on the subject of mass extinctions:

> When a mass extinction strikes, it is not the 'most fit' species that survive; it is the most fortunate. Species that had been barely hanging on... inherit the earth.

These leading paleontologists are emp
falls from the sky and wipes out some
survive and ultimately to flourish, ther
luck — the occurrence of an extrem
event. The Darwinian principle of "t
such a process.

3b. The Dinosaurs and Man

We now turn to the important relatic
beings, explaining why the sudden d
is a dramatic example of the anthro
As long as the dinosaurs dominated
large mammals to exist. Only after
mammals flourish and become the c

This intimate connection betwee
emphasized by Professor Alvarez,[19]
destruction of all the world's dinos
gigantic meteor, with the following

> From our human point of view
> single events in the history o
> largest mammals alive today
> that were then scurrying arc
> dinosaurs.

But there is even more to the story. I
sufficient merely that such an impac
to have occurred with *just the right*

> If the impact had been weak
> the mammals would still be su
> wouldn't be writing this artic
> on this planet would have ce
> article. That tells me that th
> strength [to ensure that] th
> didn't.

3c. *Wonderful Life* by S. J. Goul

It has recently become clear to scie
world's dinosaurs was just one of a
improbable events whose occurren

— and *all these events just happened to occur in precisely the required sequence.* Indeed, this is a major theme in the recent book, entitled *Wonderful Life*, by Professor Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University, one of the world's leading authorities on evolutionary biology. Again and again, Gould emphasizes how amazing it is that human beings exist at all, because "we are an improbable and fragile entity... the result of a staggeringly improbable series of events, utterly unpredictable and quite unrepeatable."[21] His 320-page book abounds with examples of the anthropic principle. A few quotations[22] will illustrate Gould's point.

> Consciousness would not have appeared on our planet if a cosmic catastrophe had not claimed the dinosaurs as victims. In a literal sense, we owe our existence, as large reasoning mammals, to our lucky stars.
>
> Let the "tape of life" play again from the identical starting point, and the chance becomes vanishingly small that anything like human intelligence would grace the replay.
>
> It fills us with a kind of amazement (because of its improbability) that human beings exist at all. Replay the tape a million times from the same beginning, and I doubt that *Homo sapiens* would ever appear again. It is, indeed, a wonderful life.

4. CALCULATING PROBABILITIES

Having described in detail the scientific meaning of the anthropic principle, we now turn to the second part of the discussion and ask: What are the implications of the anthropic principle? In particular, what are the implications for the Torah Jew? I would like to begin this part of the discussion on a personal note. A few years ago, I wrote a book on biblical creation and science, entitled *In the Beginning*, showing that current scientific evidence is in remarkable agreement *with the biblical account of the origin and development of the universe. My* book has enjoyed a measure of success, having been reprinted ten times and translated into five languages.

However, the book was not to everyone's taste. Professor Raphael Falk, a geneticist at the Hebrew University and a militant secularist, was so outraged by my book that he published a ten-page article,[23] devoted *solely* to attacking both my book and me personally ("fundamentalist," "commits scientific rape," "writes pseudo-science," "manipulates facts," etc.). In particular, Falk[24] ridiculed my discussion of the anthropic principle by means of the following counter-argument:

These leading paleontologists are emphasizing that if a giant meteor suddenly falls from the sky and wipes out some species, while permitting other species to survive and ultimately to flourish, then the latter species were blessed with *good luck* — the occurrence of an extremely improbable and totally unexpected event. The Darwinian principle of "the survival of the fittest" is irrelevant in such a process.

3b. The Dinosaurs and Man

We now turn to the important relationship between the dinosaurs and human beings, explaining why the sudden destruction of all the dinosaurs worldwide is a dramatic example of the anthropic principle. The point is the following: As long as the dinosaurs dominated the Earth, there was no possibility for large mammals to exist. Only after the dinosaurs were wiped out, could the mammals flourish and become the dominant fauna.

This intimate connection between human beings and the dinosaurs was emphasized by Professor Alvarez,[19] who ends his article about the abrupt destruction of all the world's dinosaurs by the impact with the Earth of a gigantic meteor, with the following stirring words:

> From our human point of view, that impact was one of the most important single events in the history of our planet. Had it not taken place, the largest mammals alive today might still resemble the ratlike creatures that were then scurrying around trying to avoid being devoured by dinosaurs.

But there is even more to the story. For human beings to exist today, it was not sufficient merely that such an impact with the meteor occurred. The impact had to have occurred with *just the right strength.* As Professor Alvarez explains:

> If the impact had been weaker, no species would have become extinct, the mammals would still be subordinate to the dinosaurs, and I [Alvarez] wouldn't be writing this article. If the impact had been stronger, all life on this planet would have ceased, and again, I wouldn't be writing this article. That tells me that the impact must have been of just the right strength [to ensure that] the mammals survived, while the dinosaurs didn't.

3c. *Wonderful Life* by S. J. Gould

It has recently become clear to scientists that the sudden destruction of all the world's dinosaurs was just one of a long series of completely unexpected, highly improbable events whose occurrence was necessary for human beings to exist.

— and *all these events just happened to occur in precisely the required sequence.* Indeed, this is a major theme in the recent book, entitled *Wonderful Life*, by Professor Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University, one of the world's leading authorities on evolutionary biology. Again and again, Gould emphasizes how amazing it is that human beings exist at all, because "we are an improbable and fragile entity... the result of a staggeringly improbable series of events, utterly unpredictable and quite unrepeatable."[21] His 320-page book abounds with examples of the anthropic principle. A few quotations[22] will illustrate Gould's point.

> Consciousness would not have appeared on our planet if a cosmic catastrophe had not claimed the dinosaurs as victims. In a literal sense, we owe our existence, as large reasoning mammals, to our lucky stars.
>
> Let the "tape of life" play again from the identical starting point, and the chance becomes vanishingly small that anything like human intelligence would grace the replay.
>
> It fills us with a kind of amazement (because of its improbability) that human beings exist at all. Replay the tape a million times from the same beginning, and I doubt that *Homo sapiens* would ever appear again. It is, indeed, a wonderful life.

4. CALCULATING PROBABILITIES

Having described in detail the scientific meaning of the anthropic principle, we now turn to the second part of the discussion and ask: What are the implications of the anthropic principle? In particular, what are the implications for the Torah Jew? I would like to begin this part of the discussion on a personal note. A few years ago, I wrote a book on biblical creation and science, entitled *In the Beginning*, showing that current scientific evidence is in remarkable agreement *with the biblical account of the origin and development of the universe. My* book has enjoyed a measure of success, having been reprinted ten times and translated into five languages.

However, the book was not to everyone's taste. Professor Raphael Falk, a geneticist at the Hebrew University and a militant secularist, was so outraged by my book that he published a ten-page article,[23] devoted *solely* to attacking both my book and me personally ("fundamentalist," "commits scientific rape," "writes pseudo-science," "manipulates facts," etc.). In particular, Falk[24] ridiculed my discussion of the anthropic principle by means of the following counter-argument:

> Aviezer places particular empl
> which characterize the univers
> remarkable events could not hav
> the result of a guiding hand. Su
> but a little thought shows that
> to Aviezer's logic, the probab
> a dull yellow pencil, using my
> on the third floor of a specific
> completely negligible. Neverthe
> clearly mean nothing.

It is important to explain what is w
error is not immediately obvious and,
writers. For example, this same erro
principle,[25] written by a distinguishe
Jew. This author brings the followin

> I pull a $1 note from my wal
> G65538608D.... [probability fo
> billion.
> Thus, undeniably, *I am faced*
> I am not surprised. What is es
> between *improbable events tha*
> *are not.* (italics added)

I have italicized the two erroneous st
simply wrong. We shall soon see why
second italicized statement is meanin
surprising. Indeed, that is what is no

The key to understanding this to
laureate Richard Feynman, one of
century. In his marvelous, popular
which he explains this most comple
of a single equation!) Feynman[26] em

> In order to calculate correctly
> very careful *to define the even*

4a. Defining the Event

Following Feynman's advice, we sha
which immediately leads to the conc

hasis on the "remarkable coincidences"
e. The point of this claim is that such
ve occurred through chance, but rather are
perficially, this claim appears convincing,
that it is without foundation. According
ility that I am writing these lines with
r left hand, sitting at my kitchen table,
Jerusalem address — this probability is
less, all these events happened and they

rong with Falk's argument, because his
in fact, has been repeated by many other
r appears in an article on the anthropic
d philosopher who is also an observant
g example:

let and observe its serial number to be
or occurrence] was less than one in ten

here with an extremely rare event.... but
sential is to make the crucial distinction
t are genuinely surprising and those that

atements. The first italicized statement is
y we are *not* faced with a rare event. The
ngless, because *all* improbable events are
ormally meant by the word "surprising."
pic can be found in the words of Nobel
the most brilliant physicists of the 20th
book on quantum electrodynamics (in
x of theories simply and without the use
phasizes:

the probability of an event, one must be
t clearly."

ll clearly define the event described above,
clusion that there is a probability of 100%

that the dollar note pulled from the wallet has G65538608D for its serial number! Why? Because this number was chosen *by looking* at the serial number on the $1 note. In other words, one was simply asking, "What is the probability that the serial number on the note *is* the serial number on the note?" And the answer to this question, clearly, is 100%. Since the event was not improbable at all — but certain — there is no reason whatever to be surprised by its occurrence.

One may now apply the same logic to invalidate Falk's argument. What was the probability that Falk wrote his article on his kitchen table, using a dull yellow pencil held in his left hand, on the third floor of a specific Jerusalem address? The answer is: 100%! Why? Because Falk *chose* these unusual conditions on the basis of what he *already knew* to have happened. In other words, Falk simply asked, "What is the probability that what I know to have happened, really did happen?" The answer — by definition — is clearly 100%.

A rare, extremely improbable event occurs if one defines the conditions *before* knowing what will happen. For example, if one chooses a serial number *before* pulling the $1 note from the wallet, and then finds that the number chosen is exactly the same as the number on the note, we would all be absolutely astonished — and with good reason! Similarly, if Falk had guessed correctly all the conditions under which *someone else* had written an article, then we would all be flabbergasted — and rightly so.

4b. Events in Context — Playing the Lotto

We now turn to the second important aspect of Feynman's statement — *events must be defined in context*. An example will illustrate this point.

Among the popular national lotteries in Israel is "Lotto." Say, for concreteness, that one million people buy a Lotto ticket each week. If I am informed that this week's winner is Haim Cohen from Afula, I will certainly not get very excited about it. But why not? The chances that Haim Cohen would be the winner were only one in a million — and it happened! The reason for my lack of excitement is the following. I could not care less if the Lotto winner is Haim Cohen from Afula, Sarah Levi from Be'er Sheva or Shmerel Berel from Ramat Gan. In other words, each of the one million Lotto players is completely equivalent in my eyes to Haim Cohen from Afula (the technical term for this in statistics is "equivalent microstates"). Although the chances were only one in a million that the winner would be Haim Cohen from Afula, there exist one million "equivalent" Haim Cohens. Therefore, the substance of what I heard is that *someone* won the Lotto this week. And the

> Aviezer places particular emphasis on the "remarkable coincidences" which characterize the universe. The point of this claim is that such remarkable events could not have occurred through chance, but rather are the result of a guiding hand. Superficially, this claim appears convincing but a little thought shows that that it is without foundation. According to Aviezer's logic, the probability that I am writing these lines with a dull yellow pencil, using my left hand, sitting at my kitchen table on the third floor of a specific Jerusalem address — this probability is completely negligible. Nevertheless, all these events happened and they clearly mean nothing.

It is important to explain what is wrong with Falk's argument, because his error is not immediately obvious and, in fact, has been repeated by many other writers. For example, this same error appears in an article on the anthropic principle,[25] written by a distinguished philosopher who is also an observant Jew. This author brings the following example:

> I pull a $1 note from my wallet and observe its serial number to be G65538608D.... [probability for occurrence] was less than one in ten billion.
>
> Thus, undeniably, *I am faced here with an extremely rare event....* but I am not surprised. What is essential is to make the crucial distinction between *improbable events that are genuinely surprising and those that are not.* (italics added)

I have italicized the two erroneous statements. The first italicized statement is simply wrong. We shall soon see why we are *not* faced with a rare event. The second italicized statement is meaningless, because *all* improbable events are surprising. Indeed, that is what is normally meant by the word "surprising."

The key to understanding this topic can be found in the words of Nobel laureate Richard Feynman, one of the most brilliant physicists of the 20th century. In his marvelous, popular book on quantum electrodynamics (in which he explains this most complex of theories simply and without the use of a single equation!) Feynman[26] emphasizes:

> In order to calculate correctly the probability of an event, one must be very careful *to define the event clearly.*"

4a. Defining the Event

Following Feynman's advice, we shall clearly define the event described above which immediately leads to the conclusion that there is a probability of 100

that the dollar note pulled from the wallet has G65538608D for its serial number! Why? Because this number was chosen *by looking* at the serial number on the $1 note. In other words, one was simply asking, "What is the probability that the serial number on the note *is* the serial number on the note?" And the answer to this question, clearly, is 100%. Since the event was not improbable at all — but certain — there is no reason whatever to be surprised by its occurrence.

One may now apply the same logic to invalidate Falk's argument. What was the probability that Falk wrote his article on his kitchen table, using a dull yellow pencil held in his left hand, on the third floor of a specific Jerusalem address? The answer is: 100%! Why? Because Falk *chose* these unusual conditions on the basis of what he *already knew* to have happened. In other words, Falk simply asked, "What is the probability that what I know to have happened, really did happen?" The answer — by definition — is clearly 100%.

A rare, extremely improbable event occurs if one defines the conditions *before* knowing what will happen. For example, if one chooses a serial number *before* pulling the $1 note from the wallet, and then finds that the number chosen is exactly the same as the number on the note, we would all be absolutely astonished — and with good reason! Similarly, if Falk had guessed correctly all the conditions under which *someone else* had written an article, then we would all be flabbergasted — and rightly so.

4b. Events in Context — Playing the Lotto

We now turn to the second important aspect of Feynman's statement — *events must be defined in context*. An example will illustrate this point.

Among the popular national lotteries in Israel is "Lotto." Say, for concreteness, that one million people buy a Lotto ticket each week. If I am informed that this week's winner is Haim Cohen from Afula, I will certainly not get very excited about it. But why not? The chances that Haim Cohen would be the winner were only one in a million — and it happened! The reason for my lack of excitement is the following. I could not care less if the Lotto winner is Haim Cohen from Afula, Sarah Levi from Be'er Sheva or Shmerel Berel from Ramat Gan. In other words, each of the one million Lotto players is completely equivalent in my eyes to Haim Cohen from Afula (the technical term for this in statistics is "equivalent microstates"). Although the chances were only one in a million that the winner would be Haim Cohen from Afula, there exist one million "equivalent" Haim Cohens. Therefore, the substance of what I heard is that *someone* won the Lotto this week. And the

chances for that event happening —
have no reason to be surprised.

Now consider the following week. I
won the Lotto, I would most certainl
But why? The chances of Haim Cohe
exactly the same as his chances of w
the *context* is entirely different. In t
out of a million equivalent Lotto play
a *unique* individual — the fellow wh
second week, there exists only *one* H
winner — and the chances of this uni
therefore truly one in a million. W
genuinely surprised.

Finally, we turn to the third wee
from Afula had *again* won the Lotto
that *suspicion*, not surprise, would
little doubt that the fraud division
paying Haim Cohen a visit to disc
Haim won the Lotto for three con
Haim Cohen winning the Lotto in
his chances of winning the first wee
the event. In the third week, Haim
— the fellow who has already wo
chances that this same person will
to be only one in a million million.
not occur. Therefore, the police de
hand was behind Haim Cohen's tri
the universe means the intercessio
the determination of the Lotto wi

4c. Events in Context — Playing

We next consider card games, begi
(in particular, five-card poker wit
dealt five cards from the deck, a
as a pair, three-of-a-kind, a flus
ranking, and the game is won by
ranking combination.

The highest ranking combinati
(it is not necessary to know wha
rare that one can play poker all

someone winning — are 100%. Hence, I

f I were informed that Haim Cohen *again*
y be amazed, and so would everyone else.
n winning the Lotto the second week were
inning the first week. The answer is that
he first week, Haim Cohen was just one
ers. But in the second week he has become
ho won last week. In other words, in the
Haim Cohen — only *one* previous week's
que individual winning the Lotto again are
hen such a rare event occurs, we are all

k. If we were to learn that Haim Cohen
, for the *third* consecutive week, it is clear
be the natural reaction. Indeed, there is
of the police department would soon be
cuss with him just how it happened that
secutive weeks. But why? The chances of
the third week were *exactly the same* as
k. The answer again lies in the *context* of
Cohen is an *extremely* unusual individual
n the Lotto for two weeks running. The
win the Lotto *once again* are easily shown
Such events are so rare that they simply *do*
partment correctly suspects that a guiding
ple win. A guiding hand in the creation of
n of the Almighty, but a guiding hand in
nner means five years in Ramla Prison!

Cards

nning our discussion with the game of poker
hout a draw). In this game, each player is
nd these cards form a combination (such
h, etc.). Each combination has an agreed
the player whose cards form the highest

on of cards in poker is the straight flush
t a straight flush is). A straight flush is so
day every day of his life and never see one.

And if a poker player should ever get a straight flush, he will never forget it. There is nothing more wondrous in poker — the dream of every poker player!

We now turn to a different card game — bridge. In this game, each player is dealt thirteen cards, but we will consider only the first five cards to enable us to make a comparison with poker. If a bridge player's first five cards were to be the combination that constitutes a straight flush in poker, *he would probably not even be aware of it* because, in bridge, a "straight flush" has no value or meaning whatever. This combination of cards is not even defined in bridge, hence I put quotation marks around the words "straight flush." Thus, we see that the *exact same combination of cards* is considered a wondrous combination in poker because of its rarity and value, but is considered a meaningless combination in bridge, *in spite of its rarity*, because it has *no value*.

5. THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE AND THE BELIEVING JEW

The preceding examples and discussion pave the way for the answer to our central question: What conclusions may one draw from the anthropic principle? The answer depends on one's views regarding the significance of human beings. In our example about poker and bridge, we explained why the extremely rare straight flush was a wondrous event in a poker game, but a meaningless event in a bridge game. In other words, the *same rare event* can be either wondrous or meaningless — it all depends on the importance that one attributes to the event itself.

Returning to the subject of our essay — human beings — we saw that many extremely unlikely events ("a staggeringly improbable series of events...quite unrepeatable"[27]) had to occur to make possible the appearance of human beings on Earth. Thus, the extreme rarity of the events leading to human existence is well established. Indeed, that is the scientific content of the anthropic principle. But before we can decide on the *meaning* of these events, we must first decide on the *meaning* of the end product — human beings.

If human beings are assumed to be just another species in the Animal Kingdom (as the secularists believe), not more important or meaningful than any other of the approximately 2,000,000 species discovered so far, then the anthropic principle has no meaning. We have seen that rarity by itself is unimportant. It is a "straight flush" in bridge, rare and interesting, but without any meaning. If, however, one believes that human beings are the most important species in the world and that mankind is the entire reason for the creation of the universe — as the Torah and the Sages of the Talmud repeatedly emphasize

chances for that event happening — *someone* winning — are 100%. Hence, have no reason to be surprised.

Now consider the following week. If I were informed that Haim Cohen *agai* won the Lotto, I would most certainly be amazed, and so would everyone else But why? The chances of Haim Cohen winning the Lotto the second week wer exactly the same as his chances of winning the first week. The answer is tha the *context* is entirely different. In the first week, Haim Cohen was just on out of a million equivalent Lotto players. But in the second week he has becom a *unique* individual -- the fellow who won last week. In other words, in th second week, there exists only *one* Haim Cohen -- only *one* previous week winner — and the chances of this unique individual winning the Lotto again a therefore truly one in a million. When such a rare event occurs, we are a genuinely surprised.

Finally, we turn to the third week. If we were to learn that Haim Cohe from Afula had *again* won the Lotto, for the *third* consecutive week, it is cle that *suspicion*, not surprise, would be the natural reaction. Indeed, there little doubt that the fraud division of the police department would soon paying Haim Cohen a visit to discuss with him just how it happened th Haim won the Lotto for three consecutive weeks. But why? The chances Haim Cohen winning the Lotto in the third week were *exactly the same* his chances of winning the first week. The answer again lies in the *context* the event. In the third week, Haim Cohen is an *extremely* unusual individu — the fellow who has already won the Lotto for two weeks running. T chances that this same person will win the Lotto *once again* are easily sho to be only one in a million million. Such events are so rare that they simply *not occur*. Therefore, the police department correctly suspects that a guidi hand was behind Haim Cohen's triple win. A guiding hand in the creation the universe means the intercession of the Almighty, but a guiding hand the determination of the Lotto winner means five years in Ramla Prison!

4c. Events in Context — Playing Cards

We next consider card games, beginning our discussion with the game of po (in particular, five-card poker without a draw). In this game, each playe dealt five cards from the deck, and these cards form a combination (s as a pair, three-of-a-kind, a flush, etc.). Each combination has an agr ranking, and the game is won by the player whose cards form the hig ranking combination.

The highest ranking combination of cards in poker is the straight fl (it is not necessary to know what a straight flush is). A straight flush i rare that one can play poker all day every day of his life and never see

And if a poker player should ever get a straight flush, he will never forget it. There is nothing more wondrous in poker — the dream of every poker player!

We now turn to a different card game — bridge. In this game, each player is dealt thirteen cards, but we will consider only the first five cards to enable us to make a comparison with poker. If a bridge player's first five cards were to be the combination that constitutes a straight flush in poker, *he would probably not even be aware of it* because, in bridge, a "straight flush" has no value or meaning whatever. This combination of cards is not even defined in bridge, hence I put quotation marks around the words "straight flush." Thus, we see that the *exact same combination of cards* is considered a wondrous combination in poker because of its rarity and value, but is considered a meaningless combination in bridge, *in spite of its rarity*, because it has *no value*.

5. THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE AND THE BELIEVING JEW

The preceding examples and discussion pave the way for the answer to our central question: What conclusions may one draw from the anthropic principle? The answer depends on one's views regarding the significance of human beings. In our example about poker and bridge, we explained why the extremely rare straight flush was a wondrous event in a poker game, but a meaningless event in a bridge game. In other words, the *same rare event* can be either wondrous or meaningless — it all depends on the importance that one attributes to the event itself.

Returning to the subject of our essay — human beings — we saw that many extremely unlikely events ("a staggeringly improbable series of events...quite unrepeatable"[27]) had to occur to make possible the appearance of human beings on Earth. Thus, the extreme rarity of the events leading to human existence is well established. Indeed, that is the scientific content of the anthropic principle. But before we can decide on the *meaning* of these events, we must first decide on the *meaning* of the end product — human beings.

If human beings are assumed to be just another species in the Animal Kingdom (as the secularists believe), not more important or meaningful than any other of the approximately 2,000,000 species discovered so far, then the anthropic principle has no meaning. We have seen that rarity by itself is unimportant. It is a "straight flush" in bridge, rare and interesting, but without any meaning. If, however, one believes that human beings are the most important species in the world and that mankind is the entire reason for the creation of the universe — as the Torah and the Sages of the Talmud repeatedly emphasize

— then the anthropic principle is o
flush in poker, the most meaningful

In summary, the scientists have di
beings, the universe has dealt out th
agrees with that; the anthropic princi
fact. But the nonbeliever is "playi
principle means nothing to him. By
poker" and the anthropic principle
harmony that exists between moder

NOTES

* Lecture to the Third Torah and Scienc

1 J. D. Barrow and F. J. Tipler, *The An*
Press, 1986).

2 G. Gale, *Scientific American*, Decembe

3 P. C. W. Davis, *Journal of Physics*, vo

4 J. Audouze et al., eds., *The Cambridg*
1985), pp. 124–149.

5 Ibid., pp. 70–81.

6 J. F. Kasting et al., *Scientific America*

7 Ibid., p. 53.

8 J. Audouze et al., loc. cit., note 4, p. 6

9 F. J. Dyson, *Scientific American*, Sept

10 J. Horgan, *Scientific American*, Febru

11 H. P. Klein, ibid., p. 104.

12 F. Crick, ibid., p. 109.

13 W. Alvarez et al., *Science*, vol. 223, M

14 L. W. Alvarez, *Physics Today*, July 19

15 D. M. Raup, *Acta Geologica Hispani*

16 S. J. Gould, *The Flamingo's Smile* (W

17 G. U. Yule, *Philosophical Transactio*
p. 24.

18 D. Jablonski, quoted in *National Geo*

19 L. W. Alvarez, loc. cit., note 14, p. 33

20 Ibid., p. 29.

21 S. J. Gould, *Wonderful Life* (W. W.

22 Ibid., pp. 14, 289, 319.

23 R. Falk, *Alpai'im*, vol. 9, Spring 1994

24 Ibid., p. 136.

25 G. N. Schlesinger, *Tradition*, vol. 23,

26 R. P. Feynman, *QED* (Princeton Univ

27 S. J. Gould, loc. cit., note 21, p. 14.