

Dear Andrew Klavan:

I don't remember how long I have listened to your show. But it is my favorite show on Daily Wire, and though I am technically an atheist, I find your Christian insights full of wisdom. Some time ago you cited C. S. Lewis' *Abolition of Man* as confirming some of your insights. When I read it, I sympathized with his worries about science as control of nature. But I am writing to you in defense of what he said about naturalism in the end. I was also struck by the beauty of his writing, and you may also find my argument interesting because it is a naturalistic explanation of what you are getting at more recently in calling beauty a way of representing the perfection of God.

Like you, C. S. Lewis was a convert to Christianity. That is to believe in a transcendent God. But in the *Abolition of Man*, Lewis was pointing to the objectivity of the difference between good and evil on Earth. He was rightly denying that it can be reduced to emotions. Though I would not use the Tao to defend its objectivity, he was rightly debunking science as control over nature in favor of science as a deeper understanding of what is good. He insisted that his lecture was not meant as an "attack on science." His complaint was that science uses "numbers so much we tend to think of every process as if it must be like a numerical series," which is on target for a science based on physics. But in the last two paragraphs of his beautiful book, he imagined a "new Natural Philosophy," or what he called "regenerate science." It is a science that would "remember the whole" when it "spoke of the parts." Lewis was admitting that naturalism might provide the explanation of the difference between good and evil that supernaturalism promises, and I am writing you because there is a way that science can do that. The empirical method can be used to discover a deeper explanation of the regularities described by the mathematically formulated laws of physics, and

that will enable science to do what C. S. Lewis argued was possible. I have a reason to believe that science is on the brink of making such a discovery, and since it will also confirm what you are saying about the nature of beauty, I believe that you will find it interesting. It may even convince you that naturalism is a sufficient foundation for the wisdom that makes your advice so appealing to your audience.

This scientific revolution will be triggered by a discovery in the basic branch of science that solves all the problems of modern physics. It is not implausible because it is a discovery about space: the discovery that space is a substance that interacts with matter. The assumption that mathematically formulated laws of nature are the deepest possible knowledge about the natural world is what has caused the problems of physics and kept physicists from solving them, and when they discover that mathematics is true because it describes a basic aspect of all the regularities that can be generated by the interaction of space and matter, they will be able to think outside the mathematical box in which they are trapped. That explanation of mathematical truth will enable them to solve the problems of physics.

This may not seem likely, but C. S. Lewis, at least, would find it plausible because he complains about science using numbers too much. My reasons for predicting it imply that this discovery in physics will reveal a kind of efficient cause, not recognized by physics, that works together with physical causes in a way that fills all the explanatory gaps in specialized sciences. I call them geometrical causes because space gives the matter helping constitute atoms (and bodies made of them) the power to impose their geometrical structures on what happens by physical causes, the kind of efficient causes that are recognized by physics. It will clear up puzzles about the nature of entropy in thermodynamics in a way that enables science to discover a deeper and more

complete explanation of evolution. It will enable biologists to explain why life evolves on suitable planets throughout the universe, and it will reveal that a series of inevitable stages of evolution brings beings like us into existence.

The discovery of the origin of life is significant because it reveals the nature of life, and explains the nature of the good. Life begins when geometrical causes acquire the power to go through reproductive cycles, and since that depends on choosing between goals, life is basically a choosing machine. Thus, choosing goals that are good is what matters to living organisms. But this explanation of the nature of life implies that there are four forms of life. As each form of life evolves, it gives rise to a new form of life in basically the same way as the first form evolves, except that it is a choosing machine on a higher level of geometrical organization. First, there are prokaryotic cells, then eukaryotic cells, followed by multicellular organisms, and finally there are spiritual organisms. By spiritual organisms, I mean groups of language-using mammals whose only body is all the bodies of its members. These animals have a spiritual nature because they are the parts of the highest form of life that can evolve on suitable planets in this way. The use of language enables them to represent the causes of their behavior as part of the very process of causing it, and as reflective subjects, they can see into the minds of others and understand the causes of their behavior. Recognizing the equality of all reflective subjects is part of their spiritual nature, and since cooperation is essential to the way that spiritual organisms survive, obeying rules governing their treatment of one another that promote conditions under which they can cooperate is basic to their spiritual nature—as basic as cells following a genetic plan is to the development of a fertilized egg cell into a multicellular animal. In short, morality is an essential aspect of the spiritual form of life. Choosing good over evil is good for beings like us because that is what we must

choose to live the form of life we have. That is why we ought to be moral.

Let me also mention that this naturalistic explanation of the origin of beings like us explains our moral nature in a way that reconciles free will and determinism. Though every event in a world constituted by space and matter is completely determined, reflective subjects have a free will because their behavior is guided by a geometrical cause. As a choosing machine, its function is choosing between goals, including the basic function of choosing good over evil. And reflective subjects are responsible for what they choose because the ability to represent the causes of their behavior as part of the process of guiding it means that they can choose which desire to act on in any situation, and they have a spiritual desire that enables them to do what is required by moral rules (or other authoritative parts of culture) even when it is contrary to self-interest or opposed by strong animal desires. Since they can always have acted otherwise when they do wrong, they are justly held responsible for what they do. And since the spiritual desire derives from the desires constituting the dominance hierarchy in pack animals, public punishment for wrongdoing may be justified because it strengthens the spiritual desire in much the same way that alpha males who are defeated in challenging the leader of their pack acquire the desire to be a follower. By strengthening the spiritual desire, punishment, like tough love, makes it easier to choose good over evil—and increases the power to defer gratification in doing what is in one's self-interest.

My argument predicting this scientific revolution is presented in a trilogy that I am self-publishing, called *Naturalistic Reason*. The first volume, the *Unification of Physics*, gives my reasons for believing that the problems of modern physics will soon be solved, and the second volume, the *Unification of Science*, gives

my reasons for predicting a revolution in life sciences that would enable naturalists to explain the difference between good and evil in the way that C. S. Lewis admits is possible. This explanation of our spiritual nature would, at least, give you another way of thinking about basic issues in the meaning of life. But it might even convince you of naturalism. Recognizing that the world is constituted by space as well as matter will enable scientists to explain how consciousness is part of the natural world, and when they explain the origin of such a complete explanation of nature to philosophy, they will discover not only how the mind can be explained as the brain, but also how the Christian God can be explained as the natural world. Western civilization turns out to be a distinct stage in the evolution of life, and since metaphysics is at the core of philosophy, I call it the metaphysical stage. When that stage is complete, it will be clear that what exists in space and time has all the perfections attributed to God and shows what is true in Christian religious beliefs, such as the meaning of the crucifixion of Christ, the doctrine of the trinity, and the origin of our spiritual nature in the Garden of Eden.

Christian pantheism, as I call it, overcomes the main obstacle that keeps naturalists from believing in God. To be a rational being who created the natural world, God would have to be outside space and time, and naturalists do not see how that is possible. There can't be anything outside space because there is no end to space in any direction. And there can't be anything outside time because time is passing and only the present exists. That's why I am technically an a-theist. But I nevertheless believe that I am a Christian.

This is the relevant conclusion of the argument in the third volume of trilogy, the Unification of Science and Philosophy. The trilogy is called Naturalistic Reason because when everything found in the natural world is explained in this way, science will become

naturalistic metaphysics. Metaphysics is the belief that Reason knows Reality behind Appearance, but in the history of philosophy, it has been based on a mistake about knowledge that I call intuitionism. When science explains Western civilization as the metaphysical stage, science will be a cognitive power that knows Reality behind Appearance, and since it is based on the empirical method rather than intuitionism, it will be called naturalistic Reason. And since Reason knows the Beautiful as well as True and the Good, it explains the nature of beauty in way that you will appreciate.

There may be incomplete or mistaken arguments in this trilogy. But I am confident that the discovery about space will cause a scientific revolution, and since this sounds too good to be true, let me say something about its origin and scope. I have been working on this argument, pretty much on my own, for over 45 years, including 30 years teaching philosophy at American University and more than 20 years since retiring from teaching. As a philosopher, I have written my detailed argument with a rigor that justifies expecting it to stand up to scrutiny in the rational pursuit of truth, and I am prepared to defend it on all fronts. My reason for writing you and a few others is to make what I have discovered public. I am about to turn 83, and making what I have discovered public is, I believe, my duty because I have been given the leisure and privilege of spending my life in this exceptionally fulfilling way.

If you are interested in learning more, it is not necessary to take up the daunting task of reading an entire trilogy. The place to start is an executive summary of the argument that is presented in a short (150-page) book, titled *Sapere Aude* that I am also self-publishing now. I am including a free Amazon link to an eBook version of it. (See below.) And there is more information about this argument at natReason.com, including an introduction to the

trilogy, a Table of Contents for it, a bookstore, and more information about me. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have and very grateful to learn about any problems that you think casts doubt on it. You can reach me personally at philliphscribner@yahoo.com.