

Dear Ben Shapiro:

I learn a great deal from your commentaries on the *Ben Shapiro Show*, and I admire your work there and elsewhere. You assume that moral values are objective, and though you admit that your belief in them comes from being an orthodox Jew, you wisely don't try to defend belief in God. I agree with you about the objectivity of the difference between good and evil. But there is a naturalistic way of defending that belief that I believe you would find interesting and useful, even if you don't agree in the end with what it implies about the nature of God.

This explanation of the nature of goodness depends on a scientific revolution that I predict will be triggered by a discovery that physicists are on the verge of making. It implies that choosing to be moral is the condition of the goodness of all other goals that we may pursue, and as you believe, this explanation depends on our spiritual nature. But our spiritual nature is explained naturalistically, by our being parts of a form of life. A sketch of the argument justifying this prediction explains what I mean.

The basic assumption of physics is that mathematically formulated laws of nature are the deepest possible empirical knowledge of the natural world. Though it has enabled physics to make many discoveries, modern physics faces puzzles about the nature of what exists that it cannot solve, and I predict that they will all be solved when physicists discover that laws of physics describe regularities about change that are generated by interactions of substances (where *substances* are self-subsistent entities that exist in definite ways as they endure through time interacting with one another). The basic nature of what exists is hidden from physics by its use of mathematics as a language for describing regularities about change. That is to assume that mathematics is known by a faculty of rational intuition,

independently of perception, and that is false. Mathematics is true because it corresponds to a world constituted by substances, and I predict that physicists will soon infer the kinds of substances constituting the natural world as best explanation of what Eugene Wigner called the “unreasonable effectiveness” of mathematics in discovering laws of physics. The substances constituting the natural world turn out to include space as well as matter, because given the essential natures of space and matter, their interactions can generate only quantitatively precise regularities. And knowing how mathematics corresponds to the natural world, physicists will discover more specific powers of space and matter that enable their interactions to generate the regularities described by laws of physics. That will solve the problems of modern physics because we understand the geometrical structure of space, and we can picture not only how space gives bits of matter spatial relations, that is, like their container, but also how bits of matter act on parts of space in ways that affect other ways that space acts on matter. No one, to my knowledge, has ever defended this ontological theory, and the intractable problems of modern physics are caused by using mathematics in ways that blind physics to the latter role of space in helping generate regularities about change.

I predict that the reduction of physics to ontology will reveal a kind of efficient cause, not recognized by physics, called *geometrical causes*, which works by constraining what happens by physical causes. This discovery will fill all the explanatory gaps in specialized sciences. The recognition of geometrical causes will enable biologists to explain the origin of life in a way that shows how goodness is part of the essential nature of life, and it will reveal that distinct forms of life evolve at a series of four levels of geometrical organization (prokaryotes, eukaryotes, multicellular organisms, and spiritual organisms). Since this reveals a series of inevitable evolutionary stages that brings beings like us into existence, we are parts of the form of life that evolves on the level

of geometrical organization higher than multicellular animals. I call them *spiritual organisms* because they have no body except all the bodies of mammals using language to coordinate their behavior in pursuit of goals on both the individual and group levels, and when language enables mammals to reflect on their psychological states and see into one another's minds, they are reflective subjects who recognize their equality. Since culture evolves the "natural" selection of linguistic representations, their culture includes moral rules governing how they treat one another that promote conditions under which they can cooperate in pursuit of shared goals. They have a spiritual nature in virtue of sharing in the life of a spiritual organism, so it is good for them to follow moral rules. That is what they must choose to lead lives as parts of spiritual organisms. They are justly held responsible for choosing good over evil because they have a free will. Though mammalian brains are completely deterministic, reflective subjects could always have done otherwise because *choosing* what to do is the function of the geometrical cause that guides their behavior and it constrains what happens by physical causes.

Such a scientific explanation of moral goodness would enable you to defend your commentaries without having to defend the belief in God. But you will find it interesting because it also confirms your own view in a much deeper way. As you argue in *The Right Side of History*, Enlightenment values are a product of the cultural evolution in Western civilization that began in Jerusalem and Athens. The belief that we are all rational beings with a free will derives from the belief that we are all created in the image of God, and what justifies political institutions that respect individual freedom is the assumption that rational beings take responsibility for choosing good over evil. This is what makes the West different from other civilizations on Earth, and I predict that science will explain Western civilization as a stage in the evolution of life that

follows the stage represented by them. What causes culture to evolve in this way is the exchange of metaphysical arguments, and the foundation for the Enlightenment was laid by a religion that was metaphysical. This is a deeper and more complete explanation of Western civilization than your own because it depends on an explanation of how consciousness is part of the natural world. Ontological scientists will show how an illusion that is inherent in consciousness enables the exchange of metaphysical arguments to cause culture to evolve by *rational* selection, rather than *pragmatic* selection, that is, by the requirement that beliefs correspond to reality, rather than merely requiring that they work in pursuing shared goals. The exchange of metaphysical arguments is what you mean by *Athens*, and Jerusalem was equally responsible for the culture that evolved after the fall of Rome because the marriage of Platonic metaphysics with the Judeo-Christian religion during the ancient era is what laid the foundation for culture to evolve in the modern era, and that is what gave metaphysics its profound insight into the nature of the good for beings like us: being moral is the condition of the goodness of all other goals we may pursue. And you will find this scientific explanation of how good is different from evil interesting, if not compelling, because it explains what Western religion meant by God by showing how the natural world itself is the perfect being in which they believed.

This is the gist of my reasons for predicting a scientific revolution that will explain the objectivity of the difference between good and evil. But that is just part of the scientific revolution I predict, and since it is triggered by a basic discovery in physics, this argument has a unity and completeness that makes it stand out among explanations on offer these days. The details are all spelled out in a trilogy, called *Naturalistic Reason*, that I am self-publishing as I send you this message. The first volume, *Unification of Physics*, defends the prediction that physicists are on the verge of a

discovery about space that will solve the problems of modern physics and uncover an efficient cause not recognized by physics. The second volume, the *Unification of Science*, defends the prediction that the recognition of geometrical causes will show how interactions of space and matter generate all the regularities studied by specialized sciences, including the necessary existence of reflective subjects. And the third volume, the *Unification of Science and Philosophy*, shows how this ontological explanation of how consciousness is part of the natural world will enable ontological scientists to explain Western civilization as the metaphysical stage of spiritual evolution. Since that will depend on discounting the illusion of intuitionism, they will find themselves knowing Reality behind Appearance, but since their knowledge of Reality depends on the empirical method, rather than intuitionism, they will insist that their cognitive power be called *naturalistic Reason*. All these predictions are defended in enough detail that, if this ontology is on the right track, they will cause the scientific revolution that they predict.

You will be skeptical of this prediction because it sounds too good to be true, and since you will wonder about anyone who asks you to consider such an unlikely argument, let me say something about myself and its origin. I have been working on this argument, pretty much on my own, for over 45 years, while teaching philosophy at American University for 30 years and since retiring from teaching over 20 years ago. As a philosopher, I have written this argument with a care that justifies expecting it to stand up under such scrutiny. There may be incomplete or mistaken arguments in it. But I am confident that the discovery that space is a substance that interacts with matter will eventually cause the scientific revolution I predict, 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 I believe that it is my duty to tell others about my discoveries because my

society has given me the leisure and privilege to enjoy a life spent in such an exceedingly meaningful way.

Even those, like you, who still believe in the rational pursuit of truth will find the prospect of reading a detailed all-inclusive explanation of the natural world in three volumes daunting, so I am offering an easier way of learning more about it. An executive summary of the argument 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](http://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 may cast doubt on it. You can reach me personally at [philliphscibner@yahoo.com](mailto:philliphscibner@yahoo.com).