
THE PANPSYCHIST WORLDVIEW

CHALLENGING THE NATURALISM-THEISM DICHOTOMY

Written by Edwin Oldfield

Master's thesis (E-level essay)

15 HP, Spring 2019.

Studies in faith and worldviews

Supervisor: Mikael Stenmark,

prof. Philosophy of religion

Department of Theology

Uppsala University

2019-06-03

Abstract

The discussion of worldviews is today dominated by two worldviews, Theism and Naturalism, each with its own advantages and problems. Theism has the advantage of accommodating the individual with existential answers whilst having problems with integrating more recent scientific understandings of the universe. Naturalism on the other hand does well by our developments of science, the problem being instead that this understanding meets difficulty in answering some of the essentials of our existence: questions of mentality and morality. These two views differ fundamentally in stances of ontology and epistemology, and seem not in any foreseeable future to be reconcilable. To deal with this issue, Panpsychism is presented here as the worldview that can accommodate for both existential issues and scientific understanding.

Table of contents

1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Questions	3
1.2 Limitations	5
1.3 Methodology	6
1.4 Previous Research and material	9
2.0 Worldviews.....	12
2.1 What is a Worldview?.....	12
2.2 What are the existing worldviews?	14
2.3 Naturalism	14
2.4 Theism	20
2.5 Do we need a third alternative?	25
3.0 Panpsychism.....	26
3.2 Different types of Panpsychism	28
3.3 Arguments for and against Panpsychism	30
3.4 Main contenders to Panpsychism in philosophy of mind.....	40
3.5 Panpsychism as worldview	43
4.0 A dichotomy becomes a trichotomy.....	44
4.1 Meta-discussion.....	46
4.2 Why adopt the Panpsychist worldview?.....	46
5.0 Conclusion.....	49
6.0 Bibliography	50

1.0 Introduction

Ever since the beginning of history humanity has created different ways to navigate the world we live in. Always have we asked ourselves what we are in this world to do, why we are here and how best to live. Based on the impressions we have of the world and our life we tackle these questions and give them answers that we gather together into our collected memory of knowledge and belief. This becomes the map in which our horizons are defined, and the compass to guide us within the edges. It is our understanding of the world, our worldview.

Nowadays we need not create this understanding all by ourselves. We are spawned into a world that already seems to be functioning perfectly fine without us. It is a world that to us appear as if it already has it all figured out. This is also a world that provides us with a given place if we ask for it. But when we look past the first glance we realise that quite the opposite is true. There is no single established understanding of the world that we work to uphold, most of what we have figured out is how best to fight amongst ourselves and run ourselves into the ground, and the place we are given for free is more often than not a place we do not want.

Based on these reasons we are for the sake of ourselves required to figure out a way to frame the perception of our environment in a way that conforms as well as possible to the world in reality whilst at the same time providing us with a place in it. Laying a foundation to our thinking in this way will perhaps not lead us to any absolute answers or paradigmatic truths, but it will ground our existence and might make our experience of this life more profound and worth the undertaking. This is the reason we engage in the discussion of worldviews, and is what this essay is about.

1.1 Purpose and Questions

The current debate is dominated by a dichotomy of two different worldviews that have been clashing for thousands of years. On the one side are the Theists who uphold the phenomenal significance of the mental aspect of life as fundamental to explaining our existence. On the other side are the Naturalists who with scientific progress as their champion maintain that nature is the only way to approach the fundamental explanation. For millennia these worldviews have contested back and forth, and since the enlightenment Naturalists have gained the upper hand among philosophers. But bottom line is that in the paradigmatic

questions neither worldview is able to satisfyingly convince the other that its explanation is superior. We have thus ended up with a certain set of questions to which there are always at least two different kinds of answers. And with that, both sides refuse to budge, mostly because the other side cannot provide the explanation they crave. This has left the debate in a deadlock, wherein both sides regard themselves as in the right. What is more, it seems here that changes within each position are unlikely to present great changes to the debate. Clearly then, there is need for new ways of tackling these paradigmatic questions, not only to give relief to a discourse in standstill, but to in the end provide us with a paradigm we can unite behind. So, what if there was a third alternative that could provide further nuance to the debate, and provide us with a worldview that handles the paradigmatic questions in entirely different ways?

In this essay I endeavour to present this third alternative to the debate: The Panpsychist worldview. Therein both the physical and the mental aspects of existence are pushed to the forefront. And by doing so we place a new worldview in between the two existing alternatives. I do this for two reasons. Firstly to give expression to a worldview that is naturalistic in the sense that it is up to date with modern science, but which can also provide the subject with answers equally satisfying to the existential questions as come with Theistic worldviews. In this respect, Panpsychism is set forth as a live, existential worldview to be lived by. Secondly, the purpose of this essay is as problematized above to provide the debate with further nuance. So even if one may not want to adopt the Panpsychist worldview for oneself, one can still appreciate that introducing a third alternative might bestow upon the debate some progression through diversification. For in creating a third way, old questions can be looked at from a new perspective, allowing us to think of answers that previously would not have been brought to mind. In addition, the Panpsychist worldview may come to pose new questions that previously had not been thought of, questions that might shine light on aspects of existence that help us understand the world and our place in it. In this way we may therefore by presenting a third alternative come to broaden the debate with new questions, and deepen it by providing new answers to old ones. Thus I present my philosophical questions:

Can Panpsychism provide an alternative to the already established worldviews Naturalism and Theism?

This first question is posed to investigate if a third alternative is even necessary. For the case might actually be that philosophers within the debate are entirely content with the current questions and their corresponding answers and have no need for a third alternative. To establish a Panpsychist worldview would in that case be entirely superfluous. However, if there is sufficient call for new perspectives to the current debate, then there is reason to pursue the second question:

How could such a Panpsychist worldview take expression, and how does it challenge the previous worldviews?

When such a worldview has been given expression, we can see if it indeed does provide a live alternative for people to live by. Moreover, we shall see if it serves to broaden and deepen the debate as stated above, and in that way provide further nuance to our discussion. Lastly, we shall investigate if the Panpsychist worldview can provide not only an alternative to live by, as there are many such alternatives, but also if it can provide a reasonable alternative within the discourse.

1.2 Limitations

There are a few philosophers, notably David Ray Griffin and Oliver Li, who combine their Panpsychism with process philosophy. Process philosophy is the view that reality is comprised of happenings or occurrences, which one could say places the dimension of time as primary explanatory dimension.¹ This is contrasted to substance philosophy, which instead places the spatial dimension as primary and time simply as the succession of physical states.² While these discussions are indeed interesting to the prospects of not only Panpsychism but all worldviews, it is not something that there is room for in this essay, and I will for that reason be forced to disregard it.

Another discussion highly relevant to all worldviews mentioned in this essay is that of free will. There are a few popular positions on this subject, such as determinism among Naturalist philosophers, probabilism among theoretical physicists, and ontological freedom among 20th

¹ David Ray Griffin, *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2001). P.6.

² Howard Robinson, 'Substance', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2018 (2018) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/substance/>> [accessed 7 May 2019].

century existentialists. This is a discussion of vast expansion as well as great ethical implications for us as subjects. However, it would either have to take up a large portion of the essay to be satisfying, or run the risk of being shallow and uninteresting if stated briefly, and I can therefore not justify its inclusion. And although the notion might be mentioned in passing, this should not be seen as a part of the discussion of free will, but merely as an exposition of worldview commitments. Lastly, free will should not be confused with discussions of mental causation, which is a separate but related discussion.

1.3 Methodology

Pragmatic justification

Pragmatic justification was invented by William James among others in the early 20th century, whence it was proposed that the functionality of a theory may be used as a means for comprehension.³ This can be interpreted as regarding the rationality of a theory as higher if its ethical implications have a positive impact on our lives. Accordingly, whereas the evidentialist will immediately discard a theory if its truthfulness cannot be established merely by use of notions or facts that we regard as true, the pragmatist will look beyond the factual evidence to see if the theory yields interesting implications on an ethical level. The call for such an evaluation is according to Ulf Zackariasson, a pragmatist, founded on the notion that we should try and understand the human as an actor in the world, rather than an objective third-party viewer.⁴ In this I commend Zackariasson, for how could we understand the world without considering our place in it? We shall get back to this, but I stress it here because there are voices on each side of the Naturalism-Theism debate that are genuinely troubled by worldviews that in a sense explains away our own place as actors and our phenomena that we deem important.⁵ The pragmatic method uses this dilemma to its benefit, and for this reason I adopt pragmatism as a method of evaluation in this essay.

³ Ulf Zackariasson, 'Att Arbeta Pragmatiskt: Vikten Av Att Förstå Skillnaden Mellan Teori, Metod Och Material; [Working Pragmatically: The Importance of Understanding the Difference between Theory, Method and Material]', in *Filosofisk Metoder i Praktiken; [Philosophical Methods in Practice]* (Uppsala, 2018), 49–63. P. 60.

⁴ Zackariasson, 'Att Arbeta Pragmatiskt: Vikten Av Att Förstå Skillnaden Mellan Teori, Metod Och Material; [Working Pragmatically: The Importance of Understanding the Difference between Theory, Method and Material]', 49–63. P. 51.

⁵ Notably, the philosophers Jaegwon Kim and Michael Lockwood see this problem as fundamental and problematic.

However, we should not think that the pragmatist alleges that we can simply choose what we believe based on our own whim. Rather, the pragmatic method may be used in cases where evidence is not clearly pointing us to the truth in one direction.⁶ But truth is always elusive, be it in the area of metaphysics or other areas with more evidence. We may therefore turn instead to rational beliefs, which are beliefs we have grounds for adopting but not enough so for them to be called truth. In this area, pragmatism can be used to compare theories to each other so as to come up with the most reasonable alternative.

Evidential justification

Evidential justification states that the only way of justifying a belief is by the use of evidence.⁷ The epistemologist Kate Nolfi takes the example of Bella who is offered a large sum of money if she can positively adopt the belief that there are an even number of stars in the galaxy.⁸ Since she has no conception of how many stars there are, and she moreover realises that to make such a claim would be stupendously difficult, it is impossible for her to regard such a statement as true. Thus, we cannot make do with only pragmatism as a means of assessing theories, because we do need at least some form of evidence or justification for belief. But whereas the pragmatist may act as if something was true, the hardliner of evidentialism will positively adopt as justified only those beliefs that can be proven and allegedly act only upon those confirmed beliefs. Anyway, we must in this case ask ourselves what constitutes evidence. While not going into the problematic epistemological details, the first and most obvious is the empirical sort of evidence. This is where we epistemically justify the rationality of a statement by testing how it conforms to experiential findings.⁹ Relevant data to be used in the case is when it may be used towards either conforming or disconfirming the hypothesis stated.¹⁰ This is a central notion of the scientific method which is clear to us all, and I will for this reason not delve into it further.

⁶ Zackariasson, 'Att Arbeta Pragmatiskt : Vikten Av Att Förstå Skillnaden Mellan Teori, Metod Och Material; [Working Pragmatically: The Importance of Understanding the Difference between Theory, Method and Material]', 49–63. P. 53.

⁷ Earl Conee and Richard Feldman 1948, *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology* (Oxford, 2004). P. 83.

⁸ Kate Nolfi, 'Why Only Evidential Considerations Can Justify Belief', in *Normativity: Epistemic and Practical*, ed. by Conor McHugh, Jonathan Way, and Daniel Whiting, 2018. P. 179.

⁹ Carl G. Hempel, 'Studies in the Logic of Confirmation', in *The Concept of Evidence*, ed. by Peter Achinstein (Oxford, 1983), 10–43. P. 10.

¹⁰ Hempel, 'Studies in the Logic of Confirmation', 10–43. P. 12.

However, when speaking of phenomenal properties as is done in this essay, no measure of justification in the above sense is technologically possible. The classical example used in this case is asking the subject seeing redness to prove that she is actually perceiving redness. It cannot be done, and should we in this case adopt only the scientific method as the sole epistemic tool to achieve knowledge, we would have to admit that we do not know if we are perceiving redness and thus cannot act upon it.

But we do want to be able to say that the existence of qualia (redness) is justified, because it very much seems to be. To try and provide justifications for this problem of perceiving, we can therefore resort to other areas of justification besides the empirical sort. And for taking into account mental states and indeed perceptions of redness, the introspective justification is applicable.¹¹ This method of justification merely states it is reasonable to believe that the way in which the world appears to us through perception is how it really is or at least something similar.¹² We can therefore assume that something is red because it looks red to us, or that it is reasonable to say that we see redness when it appears that we do indeed see redness.

But perception is fallible and not immune to error. I might for example claim that I have a justified belief in the existence of the spaghetti monster because I have had an inner experience in which it appeared to me. All other objections notwithstanding, the introspective justification provides grounds to accept this, however ridiculous it may sound. So to counter this, we may resort to some notions of Sosa, another epistemologist. He demands that for an introspective proposition to be regarded as justified, it must be both *safe* and *virtuous*. The safety appeals to the notion that it should not be easy to fathom how one would have such a belief without being right. This could for example appeal to notions with a proposition that appear entirely original while at the same time sensible in that they captivate our intuition. The existence of a spaghetti monster is a perfect example of an unsafe proposition in that it is fantastically counterintuitive and by simply combining two existing concepts (spaghetti and monster) is also entirely unoriginal. It is therefore quite easy to fathom how one could hold the spaghetti monster as true and be wrong.

¹¹ Matthias Steup, 'Epistemology', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2018 (2018) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/epistemology/>> [accessed 26 April 2019].

¹² Conee and Feldman, *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology*. P. 199.

The virtuosity in turn alludes to the proposition being

derived from a way of forming beliefs that is an intellectual virtue, one that in our normal situation for forming such beliefs would tend strongly enough to give us beliefs that are safe[.]¹³

What this means is not entirely clear, as always when referring to virtue. My interpretation of Sosa is here that we should be prudent in our judgments, using our intellectual capacity to our benefit. As a means of epistemological justification, this may indeed seem laughably insufficient. But the problem resides in the fact that we cannot in any other way positively prove the inner phenomena of the mind, and we must thus make do with this insufficient justification to be able to move on. For using this weak kind of evidentialism is our only alternative in discussing the phenomena of the mind, apart from to setting aside the task entirely and do something else.¹⁴ The only way to move on then, is to do our best to describe our inner phenomena and to see how the descriptions are received in discussion with others who make attempts at inner phenomena that seem similar.

Can they be combined?

In establishing a worldview, the notion that we can adopt both pragmatism and evidentialism may seem contradictory. These two methods need however not be mutually exclusive. When making use of both, we can use evidence as far as it is possible. And in the cases where evidence eludes us or is unsatisfactory, we resort to pragmatism. This does not allow us to make wild metaphysical speculations in the name of pragmatism. Rather, the larger claims made shall be to as great an extent possible be leaning on phenomenal evidence. And if these evidence cannot be established, we shall have to work around them and act *as if* we did have the evidence.

1.4 Previous Research and material

In this essay I make use of three different areas of research coupled with some miscellaneous articles for the more reflective parts. Firstly there is the debate on Naturalism, with expositions of the worldview and arguments against it. Secondly, the same debate exists for Theism,

¹³ Ernest Sosa cited in Conee and Feldman, *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology*. P. 209.

¹⁴ This latter course of action is not entirely unpopular. I object to it because it is a sure-fire way of not achieving any progress whatsoever in the matter.

whether it holds as a worldview and what weak points it has. These two areas of research are needed for the first scientific question, namely if there is call for a third way of approaching the debate. Thirdly, in the exposition of a Panpsychist worldview I make use of research made on the theory, also here with arguments for and against as well as competing explanations. As well as these areas, I make use of complementary literature for the methodological discussion.

On Naturalism there are many books and articles written, all of which cannot be mentioned. Therefore, I shall limit this chapter to an amount of literature that will suffice to understand the debate. *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* exposes the reader to a broad range of topics, many of which pertain to Naturalism.¹⁵ In it, with the article “Varieties of Naturalism”, Owen Flanagan provides us with a concise description of the different stances taken within Naturalism.¹⁶ In addition to Flanagan there is “Religious Naturalism and Science” by Willem B. Drees, in which the religious kind of Naturalism is put forth.¹⁷ Besides the *Oxford Handbook*, the book *Naturalism* by philosophers Stewart Goetz and Charles Taliaferro lays out more concisely the challenges of the worldview in a dedicated volume.¹⁸ To complement this, Goetz has written an article, “Naturally understanding Naturalism”, which lets us comprehend Naturalism as a philosophical stance rather than a research program as many may regard it.¹⁹ Furthermore, Mikael Stenmark has in his article “Naturalism versus Theism: What is at stake?” given us further questions to pose towards the Naturalists explanation.²⁰ As for the specific religious kind of Naturalism, Drees has already been mentioned, but two other articles worth noting are “On Religious Naturalism” by Eric Steinhardt and “Religious Naturalism: The current debate” by Mikael Leidenhag.²¹

¹⁵ Philip Clayton and Zachary Simpson, *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (New York, 2008).

¹⁶ Owen Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (2008), 430–53.

¹⁷ Willem B. Drees, ‘Religious Naturalism and Science’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (2008), I, 108–24.

¹⁸ Stewart Goetz and Charles Taliaferro, *Naturalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich, 2008).

¹⁹ Stewart Goetz and The Society of Christian Philosophers, ‘Naturally Understanding Naturalism’, *Faith and Philosophy*, 27/1 (2010), 79–90.

²⁰ Mikael Stenmark, ‘Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?’, in *A 21st Century Debate on Science and Religion*, ed. by Shiva Khalili, Fraser Watts, and Harris Wiseman (Cambridge, UK, 2017).

²¹ Eric Steinhardt, ‘On Religious Naturalism’, in *Alternative Concepts of God: Essays on the Metaphysics of the Divine*, ed. by Andrei Buckareff and Yujin Nagasawa (Oxford, 2015); Mikael Leidenhag, ‘Religious Naturalism: The Current Debate’, *Philosophy Compass*, 13/8 (2018).

The literature used to summarise Theism are mostly handbooks and introductions to the study of philosophy of religion. These provide comprehensive or concise overviews over subjects that serve well the introductory purpose I have. To mention some, there is William J. Wainwright's article "Concepts of God" in the Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy, as well as his collection of articles assembled together with William L. Rowe, *Philosophy of religion: selected readings*.²² Further introductions are Beverly and Brian Clack's *The philosophy of religion: A critical introduction* and Stephen C. Evans *Philosophy of religion: thinking about faith*.²³ I complement these handbooks with Plato's *Symposium* for some historical insight and Albert Einstein's "Science and Religion" for suggestions of change to Theism.²⁴

For Panpsychism, there are some good introductions to start with, such as "Panpsychism" by Goff et al. in the Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy, Seager's brief discussion on the subject in his paper with the same name in *The Oxford handbook to philosophy of mind*, and Thomas Nagel's essay, that too with the same name, in his book *Mortal questions*.²⁵ Some notable books on the matter are David Skrbina's *Mind that abides: Panpsychism in the new millenia*, David Ray Griffin's *Reenchantment without supernaturalism*, Michael Blamauer's *The mental as fundamental: new perspectives on Panpsychism* and *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, a collection of essays on the subject edited by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup.²⁶ Many of the important papers on the subjected are collected in the abovementioned books, but some others to mention are "Unity between God and Mind? A study on the relationship between Panpsychism and Pantheism" by Joanna Leidenhag, in which she discusses a variant of

²² William Wainwright, 'Concepts of God', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2017 (2017) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/concepts-god/>> [accessed 26 April 2019]; William L. Rowe and William J. Wainwright, *Philosophy of Religion: Selected Readings*, 2. (San Diego, 1989).

²³ Beverley Clack and Brian R. Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1998); C. Stephen Evans, *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking about Faith* (Downers Grove;Leicester,, 1985).

²⁴ Plato, 'Symposium', in *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. by Benjamin Jowett (New York, 1927); Albert Einstein, 'Science and Religion', in *Approaches to the Philosophy of Religion*, ed. by Daniel J. Bronstein and Harold M. Schulweis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J, 1954), I, 68–72.

²⁵ Philip Goff, William Seager and Sean Allen-Hermanson, 'Panpsychism', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2017 (2017) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/panpsychism/>> [accessed 27 March 2019]; William Seager, 'Panpsychism', in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mind* (2009), I, 206–21; Thomas Nagel, *Mortal Questions*, Canto (Cambridge; New York,, 2012), xv.

²⁶ David Skrbina, *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia,, 2009); Griffin, *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion*; Michael Blamauer, *The Mental as Fundamental: New Perspectives on Panpsychism* (New Brunswick;Frankfurt,, 2011); Godehard Brüntrup and Ludwig Jaskolla, eds., *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives* (New York, NY, 2017).

Panpsychism called cosmopsychism related to Pantheism and “Mental Chemistry: combination for pansychists” and “The real combination problem: panpsychism, micro-subjects, and emergence”, both by Sam Coleman.²⁷

For the methodological discussion I use Ulf Zackariasson’s essay on pragmatism “Working Pragmatically: the importance of understanding the difference between theory, method and material” in *Philosophical methods in practice* edited by Mikael Stenmark.²⁸ Some literature on evidentialism employed are *Evidentialism: essays in epistemology* by Earl Conee and Richard Feldman, “Studies in the logic of confirmation” by Carl G. Hempel and Ali Hasan’s, Richard Fumerton’s essay “Foundationalist theories of epistemic justification” and Mathias Steup’s “Epistemology”, the last two from the Stanford Encyclopedia of philosophy.²⁹

2.0 Worldviews

2.1 What is a Worldview?

Albeit a fairly fragmented field and with that the inclusion of varying definitions of the concept, the essentials are fairly constant. Since the purpose of this essay is to propound a worldview that has yet to be established, we shall first of all need a sufficient definition of the concept worldview so that we can grasp what follows. So, what philosophers seem to agree on is that the worldview is in some way “overarching interpretation of the world” (my translation).³⁰ That is, based on all thoughts and impressions that has ever been gathered by the individual, the actor in the world formalises a framework upon which she can act and make decisions. Simply put, a worldview is in that way a way to make sense of the world. To further give

²⁷ Joanna Leidenhag, ‘Unity Between God and Mind? A Study on the Relationship Between Panpsychism and Pantheism’, *Sophia*, Journal Article, 2018, 1–19; Sam Coleman, ‘Mental Chemistry: Combination for Panpsychists’, *Dialectica*, 66/1 (2012), 137–66; Sam Coleman, ‘The Real Combination Problem: Panpsychism, Micro-Subjects, and Emergence’, *Erkenntnis* (1975-), 79/1 (2014), 19–44.

²⁸ Zackariasson, ‘Att Arbeta Pragmatiskt : Vikten Av Att Förstå Skillnaden Mellan Teori, Metod Och Material; [Working Pragmatically: The Importance of Understanding the Difference between Theory, Method and Material]’, 49–63.

²⁹ Conee and Feldman, *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology*; Hempel, ‘Studies in the Logic of Confirmation’, 10–43; Ali Hasan and Richard Fumerton, ‘Foundationalist Theories of Epistemic Justification’, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Fall 2018 (2018)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/justep-foundational/>> [accessed 15 April 2019]; Steup, ‘Epistemology’.

³⁰ Carl-Reinhold Bräkenhielm, *Människan i Världen: Om Filosofi, Teologi Och Etik i Våra Världsbilder = [The Human Being in the World] : [On Philosophy, Theology and Ethics in Our Worldviews]* (Uppsala;Stockholm;, 1992). P. 9.

explanation of the concept, psychologist Koltko-Rivera calls the worldview a “set of beliefs” that shape our existence.³¹ We can herein conceptualise the worldview by encapsulating it in a series of statements that within contain information which is necessary for the individual to be able to live in the world. Without it, we would be like actors in a play that have not yet read the plot, resulting in incoherent, irregular and aimless behaviour. However, while the worldview is indeed founded on the totality of impressions the individual has gathered, philosophers refrain from attributing all beliefs to the worldview. Rather, we regard the worldview as the quite specific beliefs that are *paradigmatic*. What I mean by this are the sets of beliefs that span over the entirety of our realm. These relate to the “deep questions” such as ‘What is the world?’ and ‘How should I act?’.³² Expressed negatively, we can say that the belief that the walls of my office are white is not such a paradigmatic belief, because it is not a belief that concerns the entire realm. Would I on the other hand express the fundamentals of what the walls are made of we might get closer to an ontological belief of what is and thereby a paradigmatic belief.

With this definition in mind we can identify certain categories of questions that we brand as paradigmatic. Even if the categories that philosophers come up with could never capture the totality of the worldview, they should probably represent the essentials of the nature of the worldview. Exhibiting here only the essential categories, we can say that the most popular ones to bring up are of ontology (‘what is?’), epistemology (‘what is knowledge and how do we attain it?’) and axiology (‘what is good and bad?’) as expressed by philosopher of religion Mikael Stenmark.³³ In addition, another philosopher of religion, Carl-Reinhold Bråkenhielm mentions teleology (‘what is the purpose of it all?’) and soteriology (‘what is the point of suffering?’).³⁴ Lastly, we may mention an anthropology (‘what is humanity’s place?’), ethics (‘how should I live?’) and politics (‘how should we organise ourselves?’).³⁵ Although a few more categories can be added to these, I regard the aforementioned as sufficient to theorise on

³¹ Mark E. Koltko-Rivera, ‘The Psychology of Worldviews’, *Review of General Psychology*, 8/1 (2004), 3–58. P. 4.

³² Diedrik Aerts and others, ‘World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration’ (Brussels, 1994). P. 9.

³³ Mikael Stenmark, *Tankar Om Gud, Kristen Tro Och Livets Mening: En Samling Religionsfilosofiska Essäer* (Skellefteå, 2016). Pp. 11-14.

³⁴ Bråkenhielm, *Människan i Världen: Om Filosofi, Teologi Och Etik i Våra Världsbilder = [The Human Being in the World] : [On Philosophy, Theology and Ethics in Our Worldviews]*, P. 17.

³⁵ Annick De Witt and others, ‘A New Tool to Map the Major Worldviews in the Netherlands and USA, and Explore How They Relate to Climate Change’, *Environmental Science and Policy*, 63 (2016), 101–12. P. 102.

so as not to drown in too many parameters. In summary then, the worldview frames the life of its holder by defining its limitations, possibilities, thereby providing a way of conceiving the world and at best also a way of navigating it.

One thing to note before we move on is that the worldview should not in all cases be regarded as a coherent set of formalised belief. Conversely, the actual worldview of an individual is usually a fragmented and incoherent set of beliefs that have been founded on impressions that seem conflicting. It is as such probably the case that a worldview is more developed the more it is contemplated. Things such as age and level of sophistication should thereby contribute to the individual evolution of a worldview.

2.2 What are the existing worldviews?

The current debate of worldviews is dominated by two different categories of worldviews, Naturalism and Theism. While there are other ways of dividing and differentiating worldviews that yield other results, this is how the current debate is structured and I will in this essay conform to the classification. Notwithstanding other classifications, the current debate sheds light on the most important philosophical and scientific questions posed and this reason alone is sufficient to engage in the debate as it is. Anyway, the main difference between the two dominating worldviews is seen in their differing ontological stances. A Naturalist regards the fundamental ontology to be dead, physical matter, whereas the Theist poses the mental side of existence as the most fundamental.³⁶ A Panpsychist worldview would conversely try to incorporate both of these ontological features as fundamental. But before we get to that, we shall have to flesh out the differences between the current worldviews to see if there at all is call for a third alternative.

2.3 Naturalism

As stated earlier, there is not one worldview exactly similar to another, and this is true also for Naturalism. Instead of defining Naturalism, then, I shall in this chapter in broad strokes lay out the most common elements generic for all Naturalists, provide some differing views and lastly present the usual critique directed towards the worldview.

³⁶ See discussion in 4.1

The first and most fundamental position of Naturalism is that which derives its name. In the words of Stenmark:

There is nothing beyond or besides nature, and consequently everything that exists is part of nature.³⁷

And what is meant by nature is typically the physical reality.³⁸ We must not think this worldview a novelty, for such Naturalism has been along for as long as philosophers have made ontological claims. Notably, as an ontological claim it can at least be traced back to Democritus and Leucippus who were among the first to use the term “atom” as the indivisible bedrock of all.³⁹ As such, there is nothing new with this aspect of Naturalism. But to complement this requisite for Naturalism, perhaps even more important to note is the implied stance that there is within the worldview “no room or need, for the invocation of immaterial agents or forces”.⁴⁰ Accordingly, one cannot be a Naturalist and have a positive belief or faith in a god or gods, and we cannot omit that this point has been a defining feature of the worldview. In this regard, Naturalism is in some way seen as the positive description of atheism. What is meant by this is that since atheism is merely a term which describes a worldview negatively, that is, by saying that it is not a worldview with a belief in god, by Naturalism the atheists have gone a step further to flesh out a worldview that can give alternative explanations to Theism and instead of merely stating itself as the antithesis to the latter.

Such ontological Naturalism has been fairly static throughout its history. Since the enlightenment however, the worldview has come to put its epistemological stance as even more fundamental. This is namely that the scientific method should be the only, or at least the primary, way of acquiring knowledge.⁴¹ The staunch philosophical stance exposed here comes as a heritage of the success of the method in the last couple of centuries. Perhaps because of the successes in explanations since the enlightenment, this epistemological point has come to

³⁷ Stenmark, ‘Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?’ P. 37.

³⁸ C. Stephen Layman, ‘Natural Evil: The Comparative Response’, *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 54/1 (2003), 1–31. P.7.

³⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. by Robert Drew Hicks (Cambridge, MA, 2014), CLXXXIV–CLXXXV. 9:30, 9:44.

⁴⁰ Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, 430–53. P. 2/25

⁴¹ Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, 430–53. P. 1/25.

incorporate also the stance that one “should make no pronouncements about ‘everything there is’”.⁴² The Naturalist prefers allegedly instead to speak of things we know for certain. We might say then that the explanations and descriptions offered by the scientific method are held as sufficient for us to be able to navigate the world. As with the ontological position, we must here too add that there is an element of atheism within the epistemology in that there resides within Naturalism a mistrust in the ways of acquiring knowledge that were dominant before the enlightenment. The more mythological expositions by Plato as seen in *Phaedrus* and *Timaeus* as well as religious equivalents thus have no bearing in reality, they are merely stories.

Regarding the ethical aspect; norms, values and virtues can according to the Naturalist can be defended naturalistically.⁴³ According to Flanagan, explanations of such ethical notions will be explained through evolutionary terms. That way the Naturalist can through a genealogical method come to terms with how components such as empathy, egoism, etc. have been beneficial to the survival of the species.⁴⁴ As per the epistemological stance, all knowledge needed for an ethical life can purportedly be put forth through this or other Naturalistic methods, and we thus have no reason whatsoever to invoke anything outside nature to justify our values. What is more, any who commit this error are subjects of what Churchland brands with the derogatory term “folk psychology”, i.e. what we say about thoughts, desires, beliefs and perceptions in our ordinary language are probably wrong if they are not explained materialistically.⁴⁵

With the broad strokes in place, worth mentioning is that Naturalism is a broad movement with many different opinions and stances. Three differing views to take into account for this reason are strict or scientific Naturalism, liberal Naturalism and religious Naturalism.

Equating Goetz and Taliaferro’s strict Naturalism with Stenmarks scientific Naturalism, we can say that this view is the most extreme of the three. In its ontological positions, not only is the world comprised merely of nature, but of nature that the natural sciences can discover.⁴⁶ Albeit impossible to say exactly what natural science will consist exactly of in the future, what

⁴² Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, 430–53. P. 2/25.

⁴³ Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, 430–53. P. 10/25.

⁴⁴ Flanagan, ‘Varieties of Naturalism’, 430–53. P. 10/25.

⁴⁵ Paul Churchland, 1995, cited in Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. P. 1.

⁴⁶ Stenmark, ‘Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?’ P. 36.

is meant by natural science are according to Michael Rea the methods used in the departments of biology, chemistry and physics.⁴⁷ To this he adds reliance on mathematical, logical and conceptual truths, and thus are the constraints on epistemology. Concerning the prospect of these methods changing in character so much that they should not be described as the same, Sellars counters by stating that the description of the world that is stated by contemporary science is correct in its fundamentals, and future explanations will not differ greatly from this.⁴⁸

Expressing concern about some of the claims by strict naturalists are their liberal counterparts. Much with mental phenomena in their scope, which the naturalist reduces to physical processes, the liberals emphasise the need for other methods of investigation to fully capture nature.⁴⁹ Equipped with further epistemic methods as used in the social sciences and humanities in their arsenal, they state that nature cannot be limited to scientific nature, and that there are aspects of reality that cannot be sought using only the contemporary methods of the natural sciences.⁵⁰ This allows them to take a more modest epistemic stance when trying to explain complex phenomena such as mental phenomena.

The third position, religious Naturalism, can be combined with either the first two kinds of Naturalism or other kinds, keeping in all cases the ontology of nature as the only aspect of reality, and that this reality can be described through reliable inquiry (not revelation). However, what makes the religious naturalist distinct from the others is the claim that there is within nature the possibility of finding meaning or purpose similar to traditional religion.⁵¹ The religious naturalist may therefore report a “deep connection with nature” or claim a spiritual connection to the world.⁵²

Criticism from the religious naturalist is directed towards both strict Naturalism as well as Theism. Against the naturalists, they take hold of the “explanatory gaps” of science and its epistemic limitations, and claim that science cannot fully grasp reality; the religious naturalist

⁴⁷ Michael Rea, 2002, cited in Goetz and The Society of Christian Philosophers, ‘Naturally Understanding Naturalism’, 79–90. P.81.

⁴⁸ Stenmark, ‘Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?’ P. 37.

⁴⁹ Stenmark, ‘Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?’ P. 39.

⁵⁰ Drees, ‘Religious Naturalism and Science’, I, 108–24. P. 5/17.

⁵¹ Leidenhag, ‘Religious Naturalism: The Current Debate’. P.1.

⁵² Steinhart, ‘On Religious Naturalism’. P. 2/28.

is therefore at liberty to continue with a religious interpretation.⁵³ Towards Theism on the other hand, the religious naturalist could say that traditional Christianity is too anthropocentric, in which it might seem like the purpose of the world is to serve humanity. What is more, they think that nature has not been properly valued in previous religious tradition and want to correct this mistake with their spiritual version of Naturalism.⁵⁴

Why Naturalism?

Willem Drees states a number of reasons to adopt Naturalism. Firstly, and perhaps the most common argument is the scientific progress of the last couple of centuries as a result of Naturalism in its methodological sense. The technological advancement that is the result of this scientific progress is indeed astonishing, and is unprecedented in history in terms of cognitively understanding the world we live in.⁵⁵ This reason alone might be regarded as sufficient to adopt the naturalistic epistemology as the only which can really tell us anything of the world we live in.

Secondly, this has allowed us to act in ways that could not even have been imagined half a millennia ago. Drees argues thus that while actions can be either commendable or not, to acquire more knowledge on how to act is always a better choice than staying ignorant, notwithstanding how we act upon the knowledge. And allegedly, scientific inquiry is the counter to this ignorance.

His third argument is that we should welcome the impressive “integrity and coherence” of nature, and such a thought has bearing with or without God.⁵⁶ Nature need thus not be in any way detrimental to our existence, be regarded as something secondary to real existence, or indeed something temporary that we are meant only to pass through, but can rather be appreciated as it is without imposing on it other facets of reality.⁵⁷

His fourth and last argument is that the naturalist does not keep her religious convictions from philosophical or critical scrutiny. As such, there is no pre-philosophical religious point of view

⁵³ Leidenhag, ‘Religious Naturalism: The Current Debate’. P.4.

⁵⁴ Leidenhag, ‘Religious Naturalism: The Current Debate’. P.2.

⁵⁵ Drees, ‘Religious Naturalism and Science’, I, 108–24. P. 7/17.

⁵⁶ Drees, ‘Religious Naturalism and Science’, I, 108–24. P. 8/17.

⁵⁷ Drees, ‘Religious Naturalism and Science’, I, 108–24. P. 8/17.

like the one Stenmark puts forth as religious reason to take into regard.⁵⁸ Drees' response to adopting Theism for, say, soteriological reasons is that to do so is to submit oneself to wilful ignorance, to which the "intellectual price" is high.⁵⁹

Leaving these arguments as they stand for now, the main arguments used against Naturalism is its failure to give convincing explanations of mental phenomena. Stenmark states that there are two strategies the strict naturalist can adopt with regard to these phenomena: describe them scientifically or explaining them away.⁶⁰ With the second alternative, Douglas Hofstadter, himself clearly a naturalist, sees no problem whatsoever. Instead he revels at the might of his scientific reduction of the soul to "a myriad of ephemeral swirling vortices of nearly incomprehensible mathematical activity".⁶¹ And not only does this concern the elusive concept "soul", but also concepts such as purposeful explanations of activities, libertarian free will and all mental and psychological events and properties.⁶² In response to the dualistic view of Descartes of the brain communicating with the soul, Daniel Dennett, a prominent naturalist, puts forth his view that the mind

is the brain, or, more specifically a system of organization... Like many other natural wonders, the mind is a bag of tricks, cobbled together over the eons[.]⁶³

What he displays here is rejection of the existence of the soul, and his own employment of the second strategy for mental phenomena, that of explaining away, by the description of the mind as a "bag of tricks". But this statement alone does not deny the existence of consciousness of free will, as one might say that the brain gives rise to consciousness which is in turn physically impossible to distinguish from the material brain. This is what many religious and liberal naturalists do to allow for mental phenomena. However, the strict naturalist will rest on his argument for the causal closure for physical events. Consequently, all effects that are physical can only have causes that are physical, effectively eliminating the need for consciousness.⁶⁴ So for the strict naturalist, even if there is a consciousness or awareness, it will have no effect

⁵⁸ Stenmark, 'Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?' P. 48-49.

⁵⁹ Drees, 'Religious Naturalism and Science', I, 108-24. P. 8/17.

⁶⁰ Stenmark, 'Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?' P. 38.

⁶¹ Douglas Hofstadter, 1980, cited in Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. P. 25.

⁶² Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. P. 25.

⁶³ Daniel Dennett, 2006, cited in Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. P. 19.

⁶⁴ Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. P. 30.

whatsoever on the body. As such, there are no teleological explanations such as getting married because of love, buying a house because it had been examined and seemed appropriate; these are not choices that you have made based on your feelings, desires or beliefs, but are determined solely on physical processes. Conversely, many philosophers refuse to accept the non-existence of mental causation, since these are actually good explanations of actions. To say for example that I change a light bulb because I desire a reading light when indulging into some pretentious literature is at least *prima facie* the best explanation. To claim that it was not this desire that was the cause for my changing of the light bulb would demand heavy evidence. And so, if we cannot account for mental causation some philosophers will deem the stance inadequate (Jaegwon Kim) or even glaringly deficient (Michael Lockwood).⁶⁵

2.4 Theism

As with Naturalism, there is not one worldview that can be called Theism. What is more, Theism is not a worldview in itself, but a term of classification for many different religions and spiritual views that share similarities. We must therefore be wary of making the mistake of equating Theism with religion, for they are different terms. In this section I will for these reasons try to capture the most prominent similarities within the different worldviews that are categorised within the term Theism. And as has been done for Naturalism I shall follow up with some of the main critique and disputes in an attempt to provide nuance.

Michael Peterson states that the main belief of Theism is the notion of a

Supreme personal being, God, having neither beginning nor end, who is omnipotent, omniscient, and perfectly good and who created, sustains, and interacts with the universe and all it contains.⁶⁶

Yet this statement by Peterson is not entirely binding to Theism. There may be variations, wherein a few points (such as God being personal) may be taken away, and others may be added. Malcolm Diamond, for example, adds that with this spiritual feature of reality in mind we can trust that whatever happens and however bad our existence seems to us, there is always

⁶⁵ Goetz and Taliaferro, *Naturalism*. Pp.31-32.

⁶⁶ Michael Peterson, 'The Harmony of Science and Religion', in *Science, Evolution, and Religion: A Debate about Atheism and Theism*, ed. by Michael Peterson and Michael Ruse (New York, Oxford, 2017). P. 36.

hope.⁶⁷ And according to William James, the most important point to note for Theism is “a belief that there is an unseen order, and our supreme good lies in adjusting ourselves thereto”, effectively placing that behavioural alignment to the spiritual above its metaphysical existence.⁶⁸ We see then that while there are indeed similarities, the different conceptions and foci make it clear that Theism should not be characterised as one worldview, but an umbrella term for many different stances.

To the uninitiated, these thoughts and concepts may sound absolutely unworldly and unbelievable, for there seems not to be any *prima facie* evidence or reasons to adopt these beliefs when merely looking out the window. We must therefore delve into some history of the concept God. In the west our conception of the spirituality of the world has been greatly influenced by Greek mythology and philosophy.⁶⁹ For the mythological Greeks, the polytheistic gods (the belief in many gods, as opposed to the belief in one) were portrayed with human attributes and provided the puny humans with ideals to live by.⁷⁰ Each had their own virtue or quality that they possessed and through the stories these values were conveyed from the story teller to the listener. Some even stood with one foot in each camp, being both human and Gods, and therein displayed fallible qualities to complement the transcendental ideals, arguably making them more relatable.⁷¹ But philosophers to come, most prominently Plato, dismissed this mythological understanding and instead divided the world in two: one which is the world we live in and see, and one which is the ‘real’, transcendental world of perfection.⁷² He puts forth this world of ideas, which he called this transcendental reality, as something one must cultivate one’s virtue and art of vision to be able to contemplate. According to Plato, the individual must practice arts of state, creativity and knowledge so as to successively progress towards a higher level of perception. This then culminates in the vision of divine beauty:

what if man had eyes to see true beauty – the divine beauty, I mean, pure and clear and unalloyed, not clogged with the pollutions of mortality and the colours and vanities of human life – thither looking, and holding converse with the true beauty simple and divine?

⁶⁷ Malcolm L. Diamond, *Contemporary Philosophy and Religious Thought: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1974). P.1.

⁶⁸ William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (S.I., 1902).

⁶⁹ Clack and Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction*. P. 9.

⁷⁰ Evans, *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking about Faith*. P. 31.

⁷¹ Clack and Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction*. P.9.

⁷² Clack and Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction*. P.9.

Remember how in that communion only, beholding beauty with the eye of the mind, he will be enabled to bring forth, not images of beauty, but realities... and bringing forth and nourishing true virtue to become the friend of God and be immortal, if man may.⁷³

There seems thus to be an aesthetical element to these visions that Plato describes of the encounter with God, and we cannot expect to achieve them without persevering in this quest. It is this, among other things, by the stressing of the metaphysical ‘otherness’ as well as its monotheism, that has influenced the Abrahamic notions of God.⁷⁴ But the Abrahamic notion of God is clearly different from what we see in the above quote of Plato. Therein, God is a personal being with power, intentions and thoughts but he is also “being in itself”, or the ground of being, some notions of which we cannot note in Plato’s expositions.⁷⁵ Anyway, the thought that we can keep in mind that he guards and protects us humans in all that we do provides the religionist with a sense of calm, trust and in some cases even zeal towards the world. Paul Tillich describes this as the “ultimate concern” something that is so valuable to which all else in comparison is bleak and of negligible value.⁷⁶

With these expositions in mind we can account for ontology, epistemology, axiology, soteriology, teleology and many other aspects of reality that together combine into a worldview. To conclude this exposition of Theism it must be noted that this is by far not a complete exposition of Theism as a collection of worldviews. There are vast amounts of different beliefs and conceptualisations of the different notions stated above, as well as complementary theories and reduced theories. This should thus been seen only as a brief and statement of the essentials of Theism.

Why Theism?

Stating a few reasons to adopt a Theistic worldview, what should firstly be mentioned is the existential answers it seems to give to the individual as we have seen above. If one is willing to disregard the difficulties of the worldview, this reason alone is enough to accede to Theism. And it is a strong reason, for we can with the use of God as intellectual tool and as ideal establish objective moral values and ways of life that might lead the individual towards

⁷³ Plato, ‘Symposium’. 210-212.

⁷⁴ Clack and Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction*. P.10.

⁷⁵ Evans, *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking about Faith*. P. 35.

⁷⁶ Wainwright, ‘Concepts of God’.

fulfilment. A second reason is the religious experience, which is the experience of something transcendental, unworldly, that shows the individual an aspect of reality that one might not have encountered before. This experience is described almost univocally as one of the most important experiences of a human life.⁷⁷ What's more, this experience is not as uncommon as one might think, with as many as around 30% of the populous in America and England reporting experiences that they describe as religious.⁷⁸ And it is this experience that, according to John Dewey, has given rise to "a religious outlook" on life and is the foundation to all doctrinal and intellectual religion.⁷⁹ This too, then, seems to be a convincing reason to adopt Theism as worldview.

There is furthermore the first cause argument, put forth most prominently by Thomas Aquinas. It states that all events that we can observe have causes, and the causes of those effects have themselves been caused, creating a chain of cause-effect relationship. But if the Universe is not endless (or without beginning), then there must be a first cause on which all else is contingent. Formally, it can be stated as following:

Premise 1: There are effects.

Premise 2: Any effect eventually derives from a first cause.

Conclusion: There is a first cause.⁸⁰

Stating thus God as the necessary being that is the first cause, we therein have a reasonable argument for the existence of God.⁸¹

The last argument for the theistic case I shall bring up is an aspect of the teleological argument: that the Universe seems fine-tuned for life.⁸² The argument relies on the fact that it seems wholly unlikely that a Universe should spawn the existence of life. Scientists have detected

⁷⁷ Daniel L. Pals, *Nine Theories of Religion*, Third (New York, 2014). P. 211.

⁷⁸ David M. Hay, *Exploring Inner Space: Scientists and Religious Experience* (Harmondsworth, 1982). P. 116.

⁷⁹ John Dewey cited in Philip Kitcher, 'Militant Modern Atheism', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 28/1 (2011), 1–13. P. 8-9.

⁸⁰ Earl Brink Conee and Theodore Sider, *Riddles of Existence: A Guided Tour of Metaphysics*, New (Oxford; New York, 2014). See pages 63-65.

⁸¹ Michael Peterson, 'A Theistic Understanding of the Universe', in *Science, Evolution, and Religion: A Debate about Atheism and Theism*, by Michael Ruse (New York; Oxford, 2017), 54–68. P. 56-57.

⁸² Peterson, 'A Theistic Understanding of the Universe', 54–68. See p. 63-64.

over a dozen constants that each cannot vary by the tiniest of decimals or the possibility of carbon-based life would be eliminated. For example, if the gravitational pull varied by more than one part of 10^{40} , we would not be alive here today. Putting all these constants together, the chance that the Universe should be disposed in such a way as to create life is according to one cosmologist approximately one in $10^{10(124)}$, a number so stunningly minute that it cannot be conceptualized. To account for this minute chance of life existing, we can postulate the existence of an entity that purposefully gave rise to the Universe in such a way that it would spawn life. Therein we have an explanation for the fine-tuning as well as an argument for the existence of God.

To Theism there are a few objections. To start with, religious experiences seem not to be objectively viable, for one could then assert that all religious preachers should be proposing the same things (which they clearly do not). They are moreover not even intersubjectively coherent since it seems that descriptions of the experience vary to a degree. And most importantly for the Naturalist, these experiences are not empirical in that they are not open to Popper's theory of falsification.⁸³ They cannot therefore be seen as factual statements because a factual statement must be open to falsification by use of observable evidence as described above with help from Hempel. If one wants to apply such epistemic rigour on factual statements, much of religion would have to be defined as something else besides facts or be discarded.

There are also within Theism concerns over anthropomorphism and anthropocentrism. Darwin's evolutionary theory, for example, seems to prove that the world has not been created exclusively for humanity which some religions assert. Darwin's theory, with its exposition of the grim nature of the world's evolution filled with pain and suffering also gives further wood to the fire of the classical theodicy: Why, if God is all-powerful and entirely good, did he create a world of suffering? These contentions are however directed specifically towards the Christian version of Theism, a position which many theists do not endorse. Einstein, for example, proposed a move back towards the Platonic understanding of God to solve some of these

⁸³ Rowe and Wainwright, *Philosophy of Religion: Selected Readings*. P. 262.

difficulties.⁸⁴ Anyhow, to deal with the problems is not a question for this essay, so as they stand they comprise convincing arguments against Theism.

2.5 Do we need a third alternative?

Looking at the flaws and objections to each of the worldview, the objective in this part is to see if a third alternative is even necessary to complement the two established ones. However, this being an essay on Panpsychism as worldview, the object here is not to establish a conclusive case against the other two, for such a case has never been successfully produced. Instead, the object is to give enough reason for the laying out of a third alternative which might come to relieve the discussion from its stalemate. Therefore, the discussion here is a mere briefing of the different arguments, not a refutation of worldviews.

We note then that the problems in each of the worldviews are of quite differing character. To evaluate these paradigmatic problems, we can make use of Ganssle's *fittingness argument*. His argument is simply that the theory that connects best with our impression of the world should be regarded as the most fitting.⁸⁵ More elaborately, it states that given a certain theory of a paradigmatic theory, the world should adhere to the expected result from that theory if it is true. For example; if eliminative materialism is true, why do we appear to encounter mental phenomena? And if the Spaghetti monster created the universe, why is the world not more spaghetti-like? Put negatively, it also means that the theory that encounters the most counterevidence is less fitting, but it might as well mean that a theory which leaves out certain elements give us less reason to adopt it. Meeting these problems – what if we had a third alternative that could deal with some of them, but at the meantime certainly encounters other counters that would need to be dealt with? If these difficulties can be seen as less or even equally problematic, then this third alternative should be regarded as a real alternative in the debate.

As some of the problems with the established worldviews have already been stated above, I will not restate them. Furthermore, to reach definitively that there is call for a third alternative will be very difficult without knowing the nature of this third alternative. I will therefore state

⁸⁴ Einstein, 'Science and Religion', I, 68–72. P. 71.

⁸⁵ Gregory E. Ganssle, 'The Fittingness Argument', in *A Reasonable God: Engaging the New Face of Atheism* (Waco, Texas, 2009). P. 163.

the worldview first, and then continue with this evaluation. But to briefly state a reason for the establishment of this third alternative, we can note from the above problems that that Naturalism has difficulty incorporating the mental phenomena and moral character of human beings into their worldview. Some naturalists even go so far as to say that these phenomena are illusions or at best irrelevant. This goes starkly against the intuition of a great many philosophers, some of whom are mentioned above (Lockwood and Kim), thus leaving the worldview open to improvement or trying out another alternative. Theism on the other hand meets difficulty in conforming its postulates to physical observations of the Universe as done by modern science. The evolutionary theory displays a grim and harsh existence for the actors in the world, making the notion of an all-powerful and perfectly good guardian of the world less fitting and thus planting within Theism a seed of doubt. There are of course answers to these problems from both sides that I have left out, but many will agree that these are not compelling enough to place one of the worldviews as the most fitting. Herein we see call for an alternative that gives heed to the physical observations of the universe whilst at the same time allow for the moral and mental phenomena of humans. And as we shall soon see, the Panpsychist worldview might be able to face up to this task.

3.0 Panpsychism

Whereas Naturalism is the view that all of reality is composed of inert matter as opposed to Theism which is the belief that all is rather a part of or created by an all-encompassing mind like feature, Panpsychism stands on its own as the view that both mind and matter are fundamental aspects in a monistic universe.⁸⁶ This entails attributing mind-like properties to all entities of the world, even the most basic ones. While there are many kinds of Panpsychism which we shall soon get to, we must not think that all physical entities have the same level of consciousness that we as humans do, which is a common misconception and strawman argument against the Panpsychist. Rather, we must try and imagine how a low level consciousness could take its intrinsic expression. Clearly, an atom, a tree or whatever else does not think and act at the same level of complexity that we do. Now, it is seemingly impossible to imagine a consciousness that is different from ourselves, but we can conceptualise it

⁸⁶ David John Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Godehard Brüntrup and Ludwig Jaskolla (New York, 2016). P.179.

theoretically. William Seager uses what he calls the “intrinsic nature argument” to help us along. Accordingly, the conscious property of a physical entity is simply the intrinsic nature, i.e. the experiential nature, of a dispositional property.⁸⁷ It is as such ‘how it feels’ to be disposed, or to dispose oneself. There are for example plants that turn their leaves depending on the angle of the sunrays that hit it. This turning of the leaves is in this case the dispositional property which we can clearly regard, while the argument from the Panpsychist is that the intrinsic nature of the turning of the leaves is the low level conscious experience.

This may at first glance sound strange or even mad, but within the philosophy of mind Panpsychism opens up an interesting middle way between the stark nature of Naturalism and the supernatural Theism. Furthermore, as stated by David Ray Griffin in his book *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism* the theory can be used to yield a worldview that satisfies our phenomenal experience and need for values while conforming better to recent scientific progress than does Theism.⁸⁸

Before we go into the different kinds of Panpsychism, some initial conditions have to be made clear. As stated by David Skrbina, Panpsychism is neither equal to or necessitates idealism, dualism or supernaturalism.⁸⁹ As for the first, idealism is defined as a monism in which all things are ultimately reducible to mind, whereas Panpsychism is the view that all has mind but cannot be reducible as such.⁹⁰ This did not stop philosophers such as Plato and Schopenhauer to combine the two views, but we must not think that they entail each other.⁹¹ Secondly, we should not confuse Panpsychism with dualism, in which there are two fundamental substances, mind and matter. Rather, Panpsychism is a kind of monism to which mind and matter are simply two aspects.⁹² In this we must not either confuse Panpsychism with James’s neutral monism, wherein mind and matter are simply two aspects of a third more fundamental ingredient of reality.⁹³ Thirdly, Panpsychism in no way entails posing a supernatural entity that encompasses mind as besides or outside nature. As Skrbina puts it:

⁸⁷ Seager, ‘Panpsychism’, I, 206–21. Pp. 214–215.

⁸⁸ Griffin, *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion*. Pp. vii, 95.

⁸⁹ Skrbina, *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium*. P. xii.

⁹⁰ David Skrbina, ‘Beyond Descartes: Panpsychism Revisited’, *Axiomathes*, 16/4 (2006), 387–423. P. 390.

⁹¹ Skrbina, ‘Beyond Descartes: Panpsychism Revisited’, 387–423. P. 390.

⁹² Leidenhag, ‘Unity Between God and Mind? A Study on the Relationship Between Panpsychism and Pantheism’, 1–19. P. 6.

⁹³ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, ‘Panpsychism’.

“Panpsychism resides happily in a naturalistic, monistic, and even physicalist cosmos.”⁹⁴ It can be combined with some kinds of Naturalism as well as Theism, but necessitates neither.

Lastly, Panpsychism is in this essay used terminologically equal to Panexperientialism. While the former in most cases entails the latter, there are some who instead use Panpsychism as Pancognitivism, the notion that thought is fundamental rather than conscious experience.⁹⁵ Griffin argues that Panexperientialism is a superior term to deal with this confusion, but I shall stick to Panpsychism since it is the more received term.⁹⁶

Before we move on there are two terms which will be elaborated further on but need at this point be displayed only slightly for the sake of coming explanations. The first is the combination problem, the greatest challenge to Panpsychism, expressing the difficulty in combining two viewpoints into one as one must be able to in some versions of Panpsychism. The second is emergentism, which is the belief that consciousness in some way emerges when inert matter is put together in specific ways, something which has proved difficult to observe.

3.2 Different types of Panpsychism

The first distinction we must make is that between constitutive and non-constitutive Panpsychism. The former is the view that macro-phenomena are grounded in micro-phenomena; or that our human consciousness is not fundamental but are constituted by truths on a lower level, whereas the latter is the other way round; that the human or animal form of consciousness is of fundamental character.⁹⁷ The main reason to adopt constitutive rather than non-constitutive Panpsychism is that the latter in most cases encounters the same problems as with emergentism, namely the need to explain how this rather complex form of consciousness has evolved from something does not have the same qualitative complexity. As we shall see, constitutive Panpsychism encounters problems (the combination problem) in the same area but I choose to adopt this stance because these inherent difficulties are arguably easier to deal with. Again, I wish to emphasize that the point of this essay is not to state and argue between all forms of Panpsychism to see which is best, but to see how the theory can be turned into

⁹⁴ Skrbina, *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium*. P. xii.

⁹⁵ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, ‘Panpsychism’.

⁹⁶ Griffin, *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion*. P. 97.

⁹⁷ Chalmers, ‘The Combination Problem for Panpsychism’ P. 181. ; Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, ‘Panpsychism’.

worldview that is at least equally complete as its competitors. So if the reader wants to evaluate and discuss all the different stances within Panpsychism qua philosophy of mind I refer thus to the numerous texts cited here that do so.

The second distinction to be made is that between micropsychism and cosmopsychism, both in this case being constitutive. Cosmopsychists hold that our conscious experience and the facts it entails is a part of a grander consciousness of cosmic scale.⁹⁸ This view is closely related to Pantheism, the view that all is God.⁹⁹ Even so, this does mean that cosmopsychism entails cognitivism – that the universe has thought – for it can still be panexperientalist. Nevertheless, as put forth by Joanna Leidenhag, cosmopsychism combined with pantheism may indeed be a way forward for those who are willing to accept theistic propositions.¹⁰⁰ However, if the cosmopsychists do not want to ally with the theists, they have some explaining to do as to how we can know that the universe in some way has a unified experience. But the theory proposed as part of the worldview I choose to endorse here is the micropsychist view, not cosmopsychism. Also known as Russellian Monism from Bertrand Russell's book *Analysis of Matter* in which he tries to propose a solution to the mind-body problem, this view states as noted above that there is an intrinsic property to dispositional states, and this is what can be interpreted as mind.¹⁰¹ He calls this intrinsic property a 'quiddity', which in a sense is similar to the word qualia which is the phenomenal aspect of an experience, for example seeing redness when gazing at a scarlet dress or hearing the tone "Ahh" when the doctor asks you to open your mouth. In the case of quiddity, an example could be that which place the mass role in a particle. While we know that particles behave in certain ways, they accelerate, attract other mass etc., we cannot know the intrinsic nature of these dispositions, but they are anyhow what we can call quiddities.¹⁰²

Although Russellian monism, or constitutive micropsychism, is what I would say holds the best case, I would like to present one more alternative that is popular among panpsychists:

⁹⁸ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, 'Panpsychism'.

⁹⁹ William Mander, 'Pantheism', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2016 (2016) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/pantheism/>> [accessed 4 May 2019].

¹⁰⁰ Leidenhag, 'Unity Between God and Mind? A Study on the Relationship Between Panpsychism and Pantheism', 1–19. See especially the discussion of Karl Pfeifer on p. 7.

¹⁰¹ Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P. 181.

¹⁰² Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P.181.

panprotopsychism. This is the view that instead of fundamental nature having phenomenal properties, the panprotopsychists claim that it is more probable that it has protophenomenal properties.¹⁰³ Mainly because it is so difficult to fathom how and in what way fundamental nature has experience as well so to not having to deal with the combination problem, they claim that these protophenomenal properties are such that when put together they form conscious experience.¹⁰⁴ Not willing nor able to pinpoint these properties further, they are defined wholly by their eventual possibility of forming experience. A problem for the panprotopsychist is that it appears to be very close or exactly the same as the standard case of physicalism in that both seem to hold that matter is inert at a fundamental level but when put together in certain ways give rise to novel qualities. The difference, then, may lie in some of the panprotopsychists adherence to “mysterianism”, which states that we have no conception of the nature of these properties, whereas the physicalist will claim to at least have some knowledge of the properties of fundamental matter.¹⁰⁵ Anyhow, the reason I have chosen to endorse Russellian monism and not panprotopsychism is that the latter seems to me only as a haphazard way of dealing with the two main issues which we shall soon get to, the combination problem and the emergence problem. For we should not be looking for anything that could be called a compromise between explanations, but rather the best explanation that can stand wholly on its own. Nonetheless, as a worldview there will always be differing stances within, and any of these different versions may be employed equally if presented with sufficient argument.

3.3 Arguments for and against Panpsychism

The best argument for Panpsychism and the one that appears most prominently is that of Thomas Nagel. It goes something like this:

1. Commitment to materialism.
2. Mental states are not reducible to physical states.
3. Mental properties are real.

¹⁰³ Philip Goff, *Consciousness and Fundamental Reality* (New York, 2017). P. 166.

¹⁰⁴ David John Chalmers, ‘Panpsychism and Panprotopsychism’, in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2016). P.20.

¹⁰⁵ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, ‘Panpsychism’.

4. Novel qualities cannot emerge from something that did not already possess that property in some way: there is no radical emergence.
5. Therefore, mental properties are of fundamental character.

In other words, Panpsychism is true.¹⁰⁶ Let's go through the different elements of this argument. (1) Most philosophers today are committed to materialism, a kind of monism which states that what we see before us is the only fundamental part of reality that exists, for example the solidity that makes out the coffee cup is the coffee cup and is the only thing that makes up the coffee cup. This is a clear stance in opposition to Theism and all kinds of dualism, which state that there are immanent or transcendent qualities to the world that are more difficult or impossible to perceive. (2) Goes against many of the naturalists mentioned above, Dennet and Churchland among others. They would state that mental states *are* the physical states, and their entire nature can be described in physical terms. Nagel, on the other hand, argues that mental properties are not implied by merely physical processes. (3) Is hard to argue against, because to do so would require mental activity, which in turn implies that the mental activity used to put forward the argument is indeed real. Indeed, our own experience is, according to Galen Strawson who expresses the quite obvious, "the most certainly known concretely existing general natural phenomenon".¹⁰⁷ However, the main thrust of this argument comes from (4): the denial that experiential phenomena are in some way emergent from the non-experiential. The problem with emergence is the notion that something wholly novel can arise from something that has no resemblance with the emerged property whatsoever. More specifically, the physical nature investigated in science is believed to be inert and entirely non-conscious, but when combined in certain ways, conscious experience simply arises.¹⁰⁸ Yet, the difficulty lies in that it appears to be entirely impossible to imagine or conceptualise how such emergence would take place. Galen Strawson even goes so far as to say that emergence is impossible, and as such it cannot be explained or conceptualised.¹⁰⁹ Conversely, I think Strawson goes too far in his rhetoric here, and I would rather state the case as a dare to anyone

¹⁰⁶ Nagel, *Mortal Questions*, xv. P. 181-182.

¹⁰⁷ Galen Strawson, 'Mind and Being', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2016). P. 84.

¹⁰⁸ Galen Strawson, 'Realistic Monism: Why Physicalism Entails Panpsychism', in *Real Materialism and Other Essays* (2008), 53–75. P. 60.

¹⁰⁹ Strawson, 'Realistic Monism: Why Physicalism Entails Panpsychism', 53–75. P. 65.

who feels able to give a satisfactory explanation of emergence. If such an explanation could be stated by use of sound argument or appealing to evidence, then I would happily review my position towards Panpsychism. At the point of writing however, this seems highly unlikely.

What we see then is that this argument is very much the result of a rejection of emergentism. It is simply the case that we do not have any other alternatives than Panpsychism that can explain what Chalmers calls the ‘hard problem’ of consciousness, the need to explain how material substances give rise to phenomenal properties, without resorting to supernaturalism.¹¹⁰ And it follows as a consequence that if we are to accept Panpsychism as a way of tackling the hard problem of consciousness, we get with it explanations of a fundamental character. And because of this, we cannot stop at simply explaining consciousness, we must adapt our entire worldview based upon this fundamental explanation. And if we could then base this worldview in the other phenomenal and factual evidence that competing worldviews do well at explaining, then Panpsychism as worldview is superior because it does better at explaining consciousness, while being equally good at explaining other phenomena. And since that would make Panpsychism a better fit to reality, it would philosophically make it, in accordance to Ganssle’s fittingness argument, the better worldview.

A second argument to mention for Panpsychism is the “intrinsic nature argument”, which we have already touched upon. It merely states that the intrinsic nature of something with dispositional properties *could* have a mental character. Let’s make use of William Seager’s way of explanation:

For example, we say that an electron has a negative charge of about 1.6×10^{-19} Coulombs, but what this means is that the electron is disposed to move in such-and-such a way in an electric field of such-and-such a strength. The intrinsic nature of electric charge remains utterly mysterious.¹¹¹

This led some philosophers (notably Russell) to claim that science has nothing to say of the intrinsic nature of particles, and to therefore move towards views of Panpsychism. Another way of putting it is to say that dispositional properties must be grounded in intrinsic nature. And since we know nothing of the intrinsic nature anything else, while we do indeed know

¹¹⁰ David John Chalmers, *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory* (New York, 1996). P. xi.

¹¹¹ Seager, ‘Panpsychism’, I, 206–21. P. 215.

something of the intrinsic nature of ourselves (and call it consciousness), we could assume that everything else has a similar kind of intrinsic nature as we do since this is the only thing we have to go on.¹¹² Again, we seem to arrive at Panpsychism as conclusion only in virtue of our lack of other alternatives. And while this may seem unsatisfactory, it is still the least bad alternative.

There are of course also arguments against Panpsychism as well as inherent problems to the theory which makes it less attractive. The first to mention is what Goff et al. dubs “The Incredulous Stare”, because many philosophers find the view “deeply counterintuitive”.¹¹³ And rightly so, for it certainly seems outright mad to say that an electron or a pebble has consciousness. However, when accounted for with sound argument, theories that seem counterintuitive may be adopted despite of this, and hopefully this can be done with the arguments provided above for Panpsychism. What’s more, one could argue from an epistemological point of view that what seems intuitive is simply what fits into one’s worldview, and counterintuitive that which doesn’t. For example, I would bet that if you told a medieval farmer that in the future man would be able to fly in birdlike machines, and indeed that this would be a standard form of travel equal to his horse and wagon, this statement would be met by an equally incredulous stare. And it would be so simply because the medieval worldview did not make room for such technology. Thus we must always think of whether it is our worldview that is wrong or the encountered novelty. Most of the times it will be the latter, but sometimes the former, and if so, whether the novelty is an aeroplane or a theory of consciousness, the worldview must change to be able to account for it.

The second and most problematic objection to Panpsychism is the combination problem. This poses the question of how “microphenomenal properties [can] combine to yield macrophenomenal properties”.¹¹⁴ More specifically, the subject-summing problem, which is the most arduous aspect of the combination problem, demands: how can multiple viewpoints combine into one viewpoint? For it appears convincingly that several viewpoints put together

¹¹² Seager, ‘Panpsychism’, I, 206–21. P. 215.

¹¹³ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, ‘Panpsychism’.

¹¹⁴ Chalmers, ‘The Combination Problem for Panpsychism’. P. 182.

will still indeed only be several viewpoints, not joined as one. William James, one of the first opponents and later on followers of Panpsychism states the problem as follows:

Take a hundred of them [feelings], shuffle them and pack them as close together as you can (whatever that may mean); still each remains the same feeling it always was, shut in its own skin, windowless, ignorant of what the other feelings are and mean. There would be a hundred-and-first-feeling there, if when a group or series of such feelings were set up, consciousness belonging to the group as such should emerge.¹¹⁵

Here James asks us if team-spirit is indeed the fifth member of a four-person team; not an easy question for the Panpsychist to answer. But if Panpsychism is to be adopted as worldview, this crucial problem will undoubtedly need to be solved. Anyway, there are more aspects to this problem to mention. We have firstly the *quality* combination problem, of which the *palette* aspect is most pressing as well as most easily demonstrated: there are a great many different qualities that we experience the rich phenomenal quality of, such as taste, smell etc. And as we can assume that microqualities are of lower variety, how do these qualities combine into the complex phenomena that we experience?¹¹⁶

Secondly there is the *structural mismatch* problem: If consciousness is indeed the intrinsic nature of the brain, then consciousness should have a similar or the same structure as the brain, but it seems as if the structure of our experience is different from the structure of the brain.¹¹⁷ Michael Lockwood makes a good case for this problem in that experiences are smoother and more continuous than is the specific structure of brain properties.¹¹⁸ Imagine for example eating a marmalade sandwich: for you to have this experience countless neuronal firings need to occur back and forth in and around the brain. But this we do not experience when eating the sandwich, it seems instead to us only a simple way to stem our hunger.

Briefly, a third problem is the *boundary* problem: why is consciousness bounded? I.e. why are we conscious of exactly this subject, not less and not more?¹¹⁹ If the case of Panpsychism is

¹¹⁵ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, 'Panpsychism'. Their parenthesis.

¹¹⁶ Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P. 183.

¹¹⁷ Goff, Seager and Allen-Hermanson, 'Panpsychism'.

¹¹⁸ Michael Lockwood, 'The Grain Problem', in *Objections to Physicalism*, ed. by Howard Robinson (Oxford, 1993), 271–91. Pp. 274-279.

¹¹⁹ Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P. 183.

true, that all that is contains a mental aspect, how come that we are aware of this very particularly demarcated body of mass?

Together, all these listed subproblems of the combination problems compose a momentous challenge for the Panpsychist. And it might indeed be sufficiently troubling to discard the theory altogether. We would then have to keep in mind that the only alternative is the problem of emergence which seems even more perplexing. However, there is light at the end of the tunnel in that one solution to the combination problem should probably be able to provide reason to them all, which lessens the difficulties.

Proposed solutions to the combination problem

As we have stated, the combination problem is the most interesting and also the most challenging for Panpsychism. And to give exposition to the problem we made use of a quote by William James. There is however yet another perspective of this problem, also by James, that I think better explains the situation:

Take a sentence of a dozen words, and take twelve men and tell to each one word. Then stand the men in a row or jam them in a bunch, and let each think of his word as intently as he will; nowhere will there be a consciousness of the whole sentence. We talk of the 'spirit of the age,' and the 'sentiment of the people,' and in various ways we hypostatize 'public opinion.' But we know this to be symbolic speech, and never dream that the spirit, opinion, sentiment, etc., constitute a consciousness other than, and additional to, that of the several individuals whom the words 'age,' 'people,' or 'public' denote. The private minds do not agglomerate into a higher compound mind.¹²⁰

This exposition of the problem is far superior, highlighting how the existence of a macro subject cannot exist as the sum of several micro-subjects. The problem lies thus not in figuring out how the macro-subject emerges as it may seem from the previous quote of James, but instead how a compound mind could ever come together. It must be added here as well that dealing with this problem in the area of philosophy amounts to figuring out only phenomenologically how our consciousness can be constituted. For even if cognitive scientists and neurologists figure out empirically how the brain works, they would not be able to tell us how two phenomenal viewpoints can become one. Nevertheless, an interdisciplinary

¹²⁰ William James, cited in Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P. 180.

approach accommodating different areas of research should surely yield the most plausible solution to this problem. Thus, for everyone who do not ascribe to eliminative materialism, this phenomenal problem of consciousness poses an interesting and challenging predicament.

There are some proposed solutions to the combination problem, and following we shall see the most promising of them.

Phenomenal bonding

Philip Goff, the creator of this solution, bases his argument on the second quote of James stated here. He renames this specific predicament that two viewpoints are entirely separate from each other the *Metaphysical isolation of subjects* (MIS) and deems it sound enough to conclude that “certain subjects cannot sum merely in virtue of their existing”.¹²¹ To get round this, he coins the term *phenomenal bonding*, which means simply that subjects can be organised with certain relations that instantiate a distinct experience.

There is... some state of affairs of the forms <Subject of experience S1 with the phenomenal character x bears relationship R to Subject of experience S2 with the phenomenal character y> which necessitates <Subject of experience S3 with phenomenal character z>... [a relation which] bonds together subjects of experience to constitute other subjects of experience”.¹²²

This solution by Goff amounts to a form of weak emergence: a certain state of affairs among subjects of experience gives rise to a new subject of experience. Clearly preferable to radical emergence, wherein there is emergence of a qualitatively novel entity as opposed to Goff's notion which simply poses the emergence of a qualitatively equal entity, there are still a couple of issues with this proposed solution. Firstly, Goff has left out much detail as to the nature of these relations between subjects, which leaves us in the dark about how a relation between subjects could ever instantiate a subject. There could be hints as to these relations in other areas of research such as cognitive science and neurology, but these he has not made use of in his investigation. His solution must therefore be deemed slightly underdeveloped. And secondly, he does not specify whether these relations appear for all subjects (unrestricted composition) or if there are certain subjects that form these special relations (restricted

¹²¹ Philip Goff, ‘Can the Panpsychist Get around the Combination Problem?’, in *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium*, ed. by David Skrbina (Amsterdam; Philadelphia; 2009), 129–36. P. 131.

¹²² Goff, ‘Can the Panpsychist Get around the Combination Problem?’, 129–36. P. 132.

composition).¹²³ Nonetheless, Goff's *phenomenal bonding* solution lets us navigate around the metaphysical isolation of subjects and might therefore come to play a part in the final solution (if it ever comes).

Panpsychist infusion

Also dubbed combinatorial infusion, this solution by William Seager states that micro-subjects when cobbled together in certain ways produce a macro-subject that substitutes its precursors.¹²⁴ It is unclear here if Seager proposes that micro-subjects literally cease to exist (qua experiential viewpoints) ontologically, or if this happens merely phenomenologically. If the former, since micro-subjects are technically regarded as fundamental ontological properties, then Seager has posed the incredible possibility of fundamental properties disappearing. And since such a position seriously clashes with much of our physical understanding, it is for this reason very difficult to endorse. If on the other hand he means the latter, that of a phenomenal macro-subject effectively but not ontologically replacing the constitutive micro-subjects, then we might be well on our way towards a solution worth considering. Conversely, such a solution would itself demand inquiry. What, for example, is the *de facto* difference between the ontological and the phenomenological disappearance of a phenomenal experiential viewpoint? Since the intrinsic nature of the subject is either entirely hidden to us or extremely opaque in that we can regard it in ourselves only with great difficulty, it would be next to impossible to find a distinction between the ontological and the phenomenological intrinsic nature of a subject. And since it sounds as if the very ontology of an experience is the actual phenomenal point of view itself, we may simply have encountered another impossibility in solving the first one. With this critique in mind, Goff's solution must be regarded as more promising than this one.

Quantum holism

This holistic view starts from some insight from quantum mechanics, namely that fundamental entities not necessarily are local entities such as particles.¹²⁵ As proposed in

¹²³ Philip Goff, 'The Phenomenal Bonding Solution to the Combination Problem', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2017), 283–303. P. 296.

¹²⁴ William Seager, 'Panpsychist Infusion', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2017), 229–49. P. 238.

¹²⁵ Chalmers, 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism'. P. 197.

quantum mechanics, the fundamentals might actually instead take material expression as wave functions. Thus several entities can entangle with each other, creating a system that might be treated as fundamental. Such an entanglement would in turn entangle phenomenal viewpoints, effectively giving a combinatorial response to our problem at hand. In terms of our mind then, the proponents of this stance proposes that the brain is such an entangled system, and that the macro-experiential viewpoint that we hold as individuals therein becomes a fundamentally entangled property.

It is not as easy as that however, for to this view Chalmers states several contentions. Firstly, it is highly unclear whether the brain can be described quantum mechanically as an entangled entity. Therein arises an empirical problem whereby we need to find evidence of the mechanics of such an entangled brain. Secondly, the different stances within the field of quantum mechanics are themselves competing, some proposing that entanglement occurs on a universal level, others that entanglement happens only in passing, collapsing as soon as it appears. And since we cannot capitalise as philosophers on incomplete theories of another field, this solution faces theoretical difficulties. Thirdly and lastly, Chalmers puts forth the structural mismatch problem. For in Russellian Monism the fundamental micro-properties are limited and seem different from our macro-experience. This solution does not seem to solve this mismatch problem, which gives its less plausibility.

I think all three of these solutions provide interesting thoughts that could be useful or even ultimately correct. There is however one issue concerning all three, and indeed all forthcoming solutions to this problem: how do we know if we have reached the correct solution? Since the debate is concerned only with the phenomenological issues of the combination problem, even if we do find the right solution we would have no way of knowing if it is indeed the correct one. We encounter thus the same problem here as for metaphysical theories; the impossibility of validation. However, unlike metaphysical speculation, the intrinsic nature of the fundamental ontology should have a structural similarity as do the extrinsic nature. Therein may lie clues as to the correct solution to the problem. It is only that as the discourse is held now, comparisons to extrinsic natures are held at an absolute minimum, philosophers apparently preferring the phenomenological side of the debate. To meet this issue of validation then, there could exist avenues of knowledge production that may come to assist the

philosophers in the quest for a solution to the combination problem. I think conclusively that the solutions to the combination not only can exist by use of other areas of research, but most do so, because without any confirmation whatsoever we could not know if we have ever solved the problem.

Lockwood's Introspective predicament

A last problem to mention when dealing with introspection is Michael Lockwood's objection to the introspective method as epistemological enterprise.¹²⁶ It runs approximately as follows. We have no sensory organs that let us perceive within, as we do of the world without. Therefore, introspection cannot function as way of getting knowledge of the brain processes, because we cannot perceive inwardly, and how could we ever get data to analyse without perception? Anything we regard as perception within would therefore amount to sheer imagination.

This, however, is a failure of Lockwood of defining introspection. It clearly does not entail literally gazing within, nor does it entail imagining how the brain works, even if such an endeavour would be classified as a kind of introspection. What introspection entails as epistemic foundation to getting to know the brain is rather the analysis of behaviour and thought that arise within. For example, when you are hungry you do not obtain information of the brain processes work to spawn this feeling. No such information of physical brain states can be revealed through introspection, since as Lockwood says we do not have sensory organs directed within. But can deduce by introspection is that there is something in my brain that creates hunger. And by use of deeper such introspection one can start to separate feelings from each other and pitch them against themselves. Therein we start to obtain information of the different drives and instincts that control us. Thus, there is knowledge to be gained from introspection, but not in such a direct way as Lockwood argues against. Nonetheless, we must keep Lockwood's objection in mind when thinking of the combination problem, for otherwise we might simply be creating false solutions in our imagination.

¹²⁶ Lockwood, 'The Grain Problem', 271–91. P. 278.

3.4 Main contenders to Panpsychism in philosophy of mind

Eliminative materialism

Eliminative materialism, popular among naturalists, is the stance that consciousness will be exhaustively explained in neuroscientific and psychological terms.¹²⁷ This view regards what is usually seen as mental phenomena such as beliefs, desires, thoughts etc. is branded with the somewhat derogatory term “folk psychology” qua explanations that are being made obsolete when better, scientific explanations replace them. These propositional attitudes, as the mental phenomena are called, are thus seen as “deeply mistaken” and the eliminative materialists rest easily on the assumption that they will in the future be explained away by science.¹²⁸ By making use of this version of tackling mental phenomena, the followers need not be concerned by anything that is encountered through introspection or inner phenomenology, because in the end, it does not exist.¹²⁹ The eliminative materialist thus contends premise 2-4 of Nagel’s argument for Panpsychism: there are no mental properties, therefore they need not be reduced to physical states, and there is also no need for emergence or Panpsychism. As such, according to this stance the panpsychist worldview stated in this essay is entirely nonsensical because it makes use of introspection method as way of providing evidence. And it must of course be so because there is according to the eliminativist no evidence to be had by way of introspection, since what is discovered through introspection does not exist. Clearly taking an opposing stance to eliminativism in this essay, I must still admit that the advance of neuroscience as way of exploring the brain is still of great import, and comprises a method of investigation which will be of equal value to Panpsychism. However, there is a vast amount of philosophers who claim that mental phenomena or conscious experience is indeed real, many of whom have already been mentioned in this essay. Instead of stating a series of arguments for this stance, we may simply take a measure of phenomenal conservatism and say mental phenomena are real because it *very much* seems so.¹³⁰ And until the opponents to this have proven that these phenomena are not real, we can keep this stance. Now, the eliminative

¹²⁷ Paul Churchland, ‘Eliminative Materialism’, *Encyclopedia of the Mind*, 1/Generic (2013), 277–81. P. 278.

¹²⁸ William Ramsey, ‘Eliminative Materialism’, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2019 (2019).

¹²⁹ Churchland, ‘Eliminative Materialism’, 277–81. P. 279.

¹³⁰ ‘Phenomenal Conservatism | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy’ <<https://www.iep.utm.edu/phen-con/>> [accessed 7 May 2019].

materialists may use rhetoric that make it appear as if they have already done this and that we for this reason should immediately concede our conservatism. However, as the biologist and science-heretic Rupert Sheldrake makes clear, their proof is not factual but “promissory”.¹³¹ That is, their stance rests on the assurance that proof will in the future be provided through the methods they employ. One could answer this by stating that we have been assured by priests for the last two millennia of the imminent resurrection of the Messiah, but we are still waiting for it to happen. But such a response would of course be infantile, and we can instead simply say that we shall await their proof before we accept their conclusion.

Emergentism

Although we have already touched upon this subject many a times already, it would not do to withhold a more elaborate account of the stance. Difficult to define because of the different stances within, we can say initially that emergence entails distinct properties or entities arising from a system that reaches a sufficient amount of complexity to amount to this occurrence.¹³² From this we must differ the positions, and in this there are two dichotomies: weak and strong; epistemological and ontological. On the one hand, weak and epistemological emergence are similar in that they both claim ignorance to the process.¹³³ Specifically, epistemological emergence entails the impossibility of predicting how these complex systems give rise to novel features for the finite as well as the infinite knower.¹³⁴ It is the weaker position because it makes no claim as to the radical aspect of emergence, but chooses instead to shine light on the infinite complexity of the systems handled. On the other hand, strong and ontological emergence hold that

The physical world [is] entirely constituted by physical structures, simple or composite. But composites are not (always) mere aggregates of the simples. There are layered strata, or

¹³¹ R. Sheldrake, ‘The Credit Crunch for Materialism’, *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 5/3 (2009), 135–36. P. 135. Sheldrake has as of late been discarded from mainstream science and is now branded as a “heretic” for investigating areas which are deemed non-scientific. See <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/feb/05/rupert-sheldrake-interview-science-delusion>. The notion “promissory materialism” he borrows from Karl Popper.

¹³² ‘Emergence | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy’ <<https://www.iep.utm.edu/emergenc/>> [accessed 7 May 2019].

¹³³ ‘Emergence | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy’.

¹³⁴ Jason Megill, ‘A Defense of Emergence’, *Axiomathes*, 23/4 (2013), 597–615. P. 598.

levels, of objects, based on increasing complexity. Each new layer is the consequence of the appearance of an interacting range 'novel qualities'.¹³⁵

This is what Galen Strawson brands as "brute", because there is a qualitatively novel property or entity that arises from entities that did not hold that same property.¹³⁶

Since ontological emergentism is that which is most discussed among emergentists, this is what I will regard as the largest threat to Panpsychism and continue the discussion of. Their arguments run in similar lines as those for Panpsychism: in showing the dissatisfactory solutions of competing positions they conclude that their stance is the superior. Against Panpsychism then, the problems considered are discussed above and I will not repeat them. There arises clearly a problematic instance here in which we as philosophers disregard trying to solve problems within the held position because it is much easier to engage in refutation of others. This, however, is a dependable way of limiting all progress whatsoever, and leaving us nihilistic as to whether any solution is possible. Therefore, this being an exposition of a Panpsychist worldview and not merely a refutation of all else, I will limit my argumentation against emergentism to the essentials.

The first argument has already been mentioned above as it was expressed by Galen Strawson: that there seems to be impossible to imagine how entirely novel properties or entities can ever emerge. The objections grows in its potency by the notion of most emergentists that the emergent property *must* have causal power towards its base.¹³⁷ So even if we could conceptualise the actual emergence, we must now also deal with the causal power of the emergent property toward the foundational property.

Secondly, there is the point that there seems not to be any scientific evidence of emergence.¹³⁸ Of course then, the same goes for Panpsychism, for which there is not exactly empirical evidence. So on this point they could be regarded as equal. However, for emergentism there arises a happening that *should* be observable, for the emergence should possibly be observed

¹³⁵ Timothy O'Connor and Hong Yu Wong, 'Emergent Properties', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Summer 2015 (2015) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/properties-emergent/>> [accessed 7 May 2019].

¹³⁶ Strawson, 'Realistic Monism: Why Physicalism Entails Panpsychism', 53–75. P.65.

¹³⁷ McGill, 'A Defense of Emergence', 597–615. P. 599.

¹³⁸ McGill, 'A Defense of Emergence', 597–615. P. 607-608

wherever one draws the line between conscious and non-conscious. The same obvious point does not exist for Panpsychism, since it is clearly of vast difficulty to pinpoint the bedrock of reality. So, even if neither relies on scientific support, emergentism seems easier to affirm using scientific method, and since we have not been able to locate the point of emergence, emergentism ends up less plausible. On the other hand, if we by use of the scientific method would find this point of emergence and describe it, then it would clearly be favourable. Anyway, as it stands today, Panpsychism is for this reason slightly more plausible.

3.5 Panpsychism as worldview

As stated in the definition, the worldview is what frames the life of the individual, defining its horizon and providing a way of navigating the world. But it is not abundantly clear from the expositions of the three worldviews stated here how the individual herself can draw conclusions as to how to live her life. This follows from the theoretical narrowness of the concept worldview, which is a mere abstraction of the reality of what a worldview is. The paradigmatic questions are formed into a worldview when interweaved together with the rest of the actor's intuition of the world, coming together thus into a semi-coherent whole. Only when done as such in the practice of the human life can we conceptualise a worldview wholly. Hence the conception of Panpsychism stated above is a mere frame into which an individual can insert her experiences and beliefs.

Panpsychism as frame of knowledge is here a monism that is entirely natural in that it does not necessitate any supernatural entities as part of its explanations. This way Panpsychism conforms well to the scientific understanding of the universe, and we have all reason to believe that future scientific discoveries will support Panpsychism at least as well as Naturalism. What is more, by posing mind-like properties for all the world, and regarding these as not only real but fundamental, we allow for a spiritual streak in the worldview. Even if Panpsychism does not postulate (immaterial) souls in animals and plants as done in animism, similar descriptions pertain well to this worldview. The result here is a frame of understanding that accounts for both spiritual and scientific impressions of the world.

4.0 A dichotomy becomes a trichotomy

What this discussion boils down to is if the dichotomy of worldviews that resides is the most adequate to characterise the debate. The nature of the debate is certainly a product of how professional philosophers see the world. And how they see the world depends upon the tools they employ in investigating the world. In this discussion there is no question that the scientific method is a successful and popular such tool to be used for acquiring a view of the world. That we make use of the methods employed in science to investigate the world should today therefore be seen as a given. The question is then not if the scientific method should be used but whether, as many naturalists hold, it should be the only method to be used.

Rather more debatable and controversial is the religious experience as way of getting to know the world. As we see from Plato's allegory of the cave, an example of a specific religious experience, how these experiences may come to give rise to dualistic notions.¹³⁹ Without strictly endorsing dualism, we can note that these experiences appear to induce the subject with doubts as to whether the world that we see before us is ultimate, for what is encountered in the experience is in a sense *more real*. Some will even go so far as to endorse idealism because of their conviction, denouncing the material reality as secondary or even non-existent. In that case, the ontological position is that there is something so to speak underneath or above that we cannot get at. It is an aspect of reality underlying and predominating all, and which perhaps could be called mind for want of a better word. Keeping these experiences in mind, a version of Theism appears not at all unfounded.

We see from the differing analyses of the religious experience how a distinct dichotomy of ontologically separate worldviews would spawn from two differing epistemological positions. And the taxonomy makes sense when debating the paradigmatically different worldviews as they appear among philosophers. But how do we place Panpsychism in relation to this

¹³⁹ This point is disputed by for example Peter Adamson who makes the point that it is a misconception that the allegory of the cave should have any mysterious feature. Instead he thinks that the 'new knowledge' the Philosopher has attained is the method of dialectic, a sure way of acquiring knowledge. This point by Adamson is so palpably false that it is barely worth discussing. Clearly, as Socrates makes clear in the dialogue itself, the discussion would end in ridicule of the proponent of this "other side", which Adamson now exemplifies by being chained to his own dogma and disregarding those who say he is so with the back of his hand. Therefore, I will simply take it as clear enough that the allegory concerns religious experience. For the opposing opinion see Peter Adamson *Classical Philosophy: A History of Philosophy without Any Gaps* (New York, 2014). Pp. 157-159.

dichotomy? Many Panpsychists see the scientific method as a good way of acquiring knowledge of the world, and hold materialism to be true. However, some also hold that to get to know the intrinsic nature of the world we need analyse the inner dynamics of our mind and body from a phenomenological perspective.¹⁴⁰ We reach thereby a dual-aspect monism in which the spiritual sentiments of the convinced theists are combined with the naturalist's staunch endorsement of the scientific method; both facets epistemology plausibly employed for getting to know the world. The Panpsychist could even make use of Plato's experience as something that reveals the spiritual depth of his stance.

Accordingly, Panpsychism conforms ontologically to Naturalism, and epistemologically to Theism.¹⁴¹ And since these are the two parameters lay the foundation to the dichotomy, we cannot place Panpsychism on either side. It follows that we must place Panpsychism as worldview in between Naturalism and Theism, effectively turning the dichotomy into a trichotomy.

But here we must mention the different natures of Panpsychism. For the theory can be presented as a mere dual-aspect monism that could possibly be combined with Naturalism and Theism. As worldview, however, Panpsychism states that the ultimate reality is made out of this dual-aspect matter. It cannot therefore be combined with either Theism or Naturalism. Not Theism because one of its core commitments of ultimate reality is the existence of an all-encompassing God or something similar, a commitment which follows from no argument stated here in favour of Panpsychism. Additionally, looking at the definition of Theism stated above, if the Panpsychist dual-aspect monism as ultimate reality is to be held as true, there cannot be any unseen order, God or Supreme Being that is in any way more or equally ultimate, for that would take away the ultimacy of this dual-aspect matter. There cannot be two things ultimate in a monistic Universe. A combination of Theism and Panpsychism cannot therefore be called a Panpsychist worldview, for just as there can be naturalistic Theism, such a combination would just end up being a Theistic worldview with Panpsychist tendencies.

¹⁴⁰ Eric Hiddleston, 'Dispositional and Categorical Properties, and Russellian Monism', *Philosophical Studies*, 176/1 (2019), 65–92. See p. 66.

¹⁴¹ Semi-ontologically in fact, Panpsychism changes the nature of materialism, from inert to mental, and in that aspect it does not conform to Naturalism. It conforms epistemologically to the many Theists that accept the scientific as a method of investigation, not those who reject it.

Neither can it be classified under the term Naturalism, for the position of mental as fundamental aspect of the physical reality is such a clear breach against both the ontological and epistemological stance of the worldview that it cannot be justified.

4.1 Meta-discussion

From the arguments in 4.0 we see that the nature of the debate changes. Although the same argumentation will exist between Theism and Naturalism, it will not be applicable towards the Panpsychist worldview. We see that the arguments for Theism displayed earlier – the religious experience as revelation of a metaphysical entity, the teleological argument and the first cause argument – can be used only for Theism or by inserting Theistic postulates into another worldview. Simultaneously, the arguments against Theism – anthropocentrism and theodicy – can only be used against Theism, while the argument of impossibility of falsification might be used against both Panpsychism and Theism. The same goes for the arguments that are specifically made for Naturalism (not including the arguments for atheism) such as the awe-inspiring success of the scientific method as reason to adopt it as only knowledge-productive method. Arguments against Naturalism – that it cannot account for mental and moral phenomena – can also not be used against Panpsychism, as it allows for these. Instead, even if some points made for other worldviews may be shared, there will ultimately need to exist arguments specifically designed for and against Panpsychism when arguing over Panpsychism.

We arrive then at a point where even if one regards one of the three worldviews as refuted, there will still remain two others to choose from. And since these arguments run in a triangular fashion, if a change of mind occurs one need not move through another worldview to get to the third, but move straight to whichever from wherever.

4.2 Why adopt the Panpsychist worldview?

Certainly, we should always crave a worldview that is as close to the world in reality as possible. Therefore, worldviews are always changing and morphing into different stances. So the question is not really that we need to adapt our stances to new discoveries, for the existing worldviews already do so. Rather, I ask here: when do we reach the point where we should disband our old view completely and adopt another? Two conditions must be fulfilled for such

a radical switch to take place: firstly a notable dissatisfaction with the current worldview, and secondly the promise of an existing, live alternative. Until both of these conditions have been fulfilled, no change of worldview will occur.

It must be noted however that the version of a Panpsychist worldview stated here is only one of a few to choose from. So to endorse Panpsychism does not entail being compelled to this exact version; each individual is free to construct their own commitments. Nonetheless, this version of Panpsychism still serves the purpose of demonstrating that Panpsychism can indeed constitute an entire worldview and not only a theory of mind. It makes the case that such a worldview can be constructed from a very small amount of basic postulates, and that this can constitute a live alternative to existing worldviews. But the main thrust of this version of Panpsychism is not that it is merely a live alternative. No, in this version of Panpsychism we have a worldview that conforms well to a Naturalistic world whilst at the same time fulfils much of the existential wants that Theism provides. So as long as the postulates of Panpsychism can be accepted, it should arguably constitute a live alternative. What is more, these are exactly the points where we find disappointments with the current worldviews, as we now shall see.

Nagel coins in his paper “Secular philosophy and the religious temperament” a certain disposition towards or craving for meaning.¹⁴² This is what he calls the religious temperament: the demand for a place as an individual in the world. He then goes on to state his dissatisfaction with the naturalistic worldview:

The universe revealed by chemistry and physics, however beautiful and awe-inspiring, is meaningless, in the radical sense that it is incapable of meaning.¹⁴³

It seems then that those who are constituted with this religious temperament are doomed to be dissatisfied with Naturalism. Now, Nagel himself alleges that this temperament is distinct; some have it and some lack it. Those who don't simply have no need to fill this gap of meaning, whilst some possess a strong craving for it that does not go away. It is difficult to say if the situation is as polemical as Nagel makes it look, but we can nevertheless deduce that there is

¹⁴² Thomas Nagel, ‘Secular Philosophy and the Religious Temperament’, in *Exploring the Meaning of Life: An Anthology and Guide*, ed. by Joshua W. Seachris (Malden, MA;Chichester, West Sussex, 2013), 262–72.

¹⁴³ Nagel, ‘Secular Philosophy and the Religious Temperament’, 262–72. P. 265

a great many individuals who do indeed have this demand for meaning. And we see from the quote by Nagel that it is the method employed in the natural sciences, ultimately the epistemology, that bar these people from experiencing meaning. It appears that beauty and awe, as seen through the lens of physics lacks its deeper aspect as opposed to seeing the same qualities in religious art. Herein we see a great dissatisfaction with the Naturalistic worldview, and if Theism is not a live option for them, then perhaps Panpsychism can fill this gap of meaning.

As for Theism, we see dissatisfaction as with Nagel closer to the middle of the spectrum. As we saw Einstein contend earlier, the problems lies much in anthropomorphic conceptions of God. Gordon D. Kaufman, Professor Emeritus at Harvard Divinity school states:

It is no longer possible, I contend, to connect in an intelligible way the traditional conception of God – constructed, as it is, in thoroughly anthropomorphic terms – with today’s scientific cosmological and evolutionary understandings of the origin of the universe and the emergence of life, including human life.¹⁴⁴

From the side of the theist there lies apparently then the exact opposite problem of Naturalism: that it focuses too much on creation of meaning whilst neglecting to conform to understandings that have become established truths within the scientific community. Jack R. Sibley states this point more eloquently:

[A]lthough there is a great deal of value in the aesthetic and traditional views of religion (and conceptions of God), they are probably quite insufficient to the truth of the matter.¹⁴⁵

There are with these expositions cries for reform within Theism; calls for a religion (a theistic worldview) that at least does not contradict science, or indeed the switch to another worldview might be necessary.

It looks from these dissatisfied followers of both Theism and Naturalism that a third kind of worldview, one with mind and matter both as basis holds its rightful place in the philosophical community. Panpsychism here presents us with a worldview which provides a way for the

¹⁴⁴ Gordon D. Kaufman, ‘A Religious Interpretation of Emergence: Creativity as God’, *Zygon*, 42/4 (2007), 915–28. P. 917.

¹⁴⁵ Jack R. Sibley, ‘A Defense of Naturalistic Theism’, *Encounter*, 68/2 (2007), 33–38. P. 36.

world to retain its inherent spirituality whilst simultaneously conforming to developments in science.

5.0 Conclusion

In this essay we have seen how the dichotomy of Naturalism versus Theism represents inadequately the discourse of worldviews. By presenting a third alternative, one that could be seen as an extrapolation of either, a combination of opposing epistemologies and ontologies or even a synthesis of the two pre-existing worldviews, we reach the conclusion that Panpsychism does not fit in the current dichotomy. Furthermore, with the growing interest in Panpsychism as well as clear dissatisfaction with established worldviews, we have seen that there is sufficient call to extend the model of worldviews so that Panpsychism does indeed fit. Thus it follows naturally to make use of a trichotomy of worldviews as representing the debate, each with a different core ontological commitment: Naturalism with matter; Theism with mind; Panpsychism with mind and matter.

In addition to cementing the place of Panpsychism in the discourse, we have also seen a few arguments on why it should be endorsed over the other worldviews: it is a worldview that conforms to modern science as well as filling the gap of meaning. For what we encounter with this worldview is a cosmological understanding that directly relates to every single action of the human. By binding together all parameters of the worldview, meaning is created as the natural sum of its parts.

6.0 Bibliography

- Adamson, Peter, *Classical Philosophy: A History of Philosophy without Any Gaps* (New York, 2014)
- Aerts, Diedrik, Leo Apostel, Bart De Mooer, Staf Hellemans, Edel Maex, Hubert Van Belle, and others, 'World Views: From Fragmentation to Integration' (Brussels, 1994)
- Blamauer, Michael, *The Mental as Fundamental: New Perspectives on Panpsychism* (New Brunswick;Frankfurt;, 2011)
- Bråkenhielm, Carl-Reinhold, *Människan i Världen: Om Filosofi, Teologi Och Etik i Våra Världsbilder = [The Human Being in the World] : [On Philosophy, Theology and Ethics in Our Worldviews]* (Uppsala;Stockholm;, 1992), 1
- Brüntrup, Godehard, and Ludwig Jaskolla, eds., *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives* (New York, NY, 2017)
- Chalmers, David John, 'Panpsychism and Panprotopsychism', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2016)
- , 'The Combination Problem for Panpsychism', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Godehard Brüntrup and Ludwig Jaskolla (New York, 2016)
- , *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory* (New York, 1996)
- Churchland, Paul, 'Eliminative Materialism', *Encyclopedia of the Mind*, 1/Generic (2013), 277–81
- Clack, Beverley, and Brian R. Clack, *The Philosophy of Religion: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge, 1998)
- Clayton, Philip, and Zachary Simpson, *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (New York, 2008)
- Coleman, Sam, 'Mental Chemistry: Combination for Panpsychists', *Dialectica*, 66/1 (2012), 137–66
- , 'The Real Combination Problem: Panpsychism, Micro-Subjects, and Emergence', *Erkenntnis* (1975-), 79/1 (2014), 19–44
- Conee, Earl Brink, and Theodore Sider, *Riddles of Existence: A Guided Tour of Metaphysics*, New (Oxford;New York, 2014)
- Conee, Earl, and Richard Feldman 1948, *Evidentialism: Essays in Epistemology* (Oxford, 2004)
- De Witt, Annick, Joop de Boer, Nicholas Hedlund, and Patricia Osseweijer, 'A New Tool to Map the Major Worldviews in the Netherlands and USA, and Explore How They Relate to Climate Change', *Environmental Science and Policy*, 63 (2016), 101–12

- Diamond, Malcolm L., *Contemporary Philosophy and Religious Thought: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (New York, 1974)
- Drees, Willem B., 'Religious Naturalism and Science', in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (2008), I, 108–24
- Einstein, Albert, 'Science and Religion', in *Approaches to the Philosophy of Religion*, ed. by Daniel J. Bronstein and Harold M. Schulweis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1954), I, 68–72
- 'Emergence | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy' <<https://www.iep.utm.edu/emergenc/>> [accessed 7 May 2019]
- Evans, C. Stephen, *Philosophy of Religion: Thinking about Faith* (Downers Grove, Leicester, 1985)
- Flanagan, Owen, 'Varieties of Naturalism', in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and Science* (2008), 430–53
- Ganssle, Gregory E., 'The Fittingness Argument', in *A Reasonable God: Engaging the New Face of Atheism* (Waco, Texas, 2009)
- Goetz, Stewart, and Charles Taliaferro, *Naturalism* (Grand Rapids, Mich, 2008)
- Goetz, Stewart, and The Society of Christian Philosophers, 'Naturally Understanding Naturalism', *Faith and Philosophy*, 27/1 (2010), 79–90
- Goff, Philip, 'Can the Panpsychist Get around the Combination Problem?', in *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium*, ed. by David Skrbina (Amsterdam; Philadelphia, 2009), 129–36
- , *Consciousness and Fundamental Reality* (New York, 2017)
- , 'The Phenomenal Bonding Solution to the Combination Problem', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2017), 283–303
- Goff, Philip, William Seager, and Sean Allen-Hermanson, 'Panpsychism', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2017 (2017) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/panpsychism/>> [accessed 27 March 2019]
- Griffin, David Ray, *Reenchantment without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2001)
- Hasan, Ali, and Richard Fumerton, 'Foundationalist Theories of Epistemic Justification', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Fall 2018 (2018) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/justep-foundational/>> [accessed 15 April 2019]

- Hay, David M., *Exploring Inner Space: Scientists and Religious Experience* (Harmondsworth, 1982)
- Hempel, Carl G., 'Studies in the Logic of Confirmation', in *The Concept of Evidence*, ed. by Peter Achinstein (Oxford, 1983), 10–43
- Hiddleston, Eric, 'Dispositional and Categorical Properties, and Russellian Monism', *Philosophical Studies*, 176/1 (2019), 65–92
- James, William, *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (S.I., 1902)
- Kaufman, Gordon D., 'A Religious Interpretation of Emergence: Creativity as God', *Zygon*, 42/4 (2007), 915–28
- Kitcher, Philip, 'Militant Modern Atheism', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 28/1 (2011), 1–13
- Koltko-Rivera, Mark E., 'The Psychology of Worldviews', *Review of General Psychology*, 8/1 (2004), 3–58
- Laertius, Diogenes, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. by Robert Drew Hicks (Cambridge, MA, 2014), CLXXXIV–CLXXXV
- Layman, C. Stephen, 'Natural Evil: The Comparative Response', *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 54/1 (2003), 1–31
- Leidenhag, Joanna, 'Unity Between God and Mind? A Study on the Relationship Between Panpsychism and Pantheism', *Sophia*, Journal Article, 2018, 1–19
- Leidenhag, Mikael, 'Religious Naturalism: The Current Debate', *Philosophy Compass*, 13/8 (2018)
- Lockwood, Michael, 'The Grain Problem', in *Objections to Physicalism*, ed. by Howard Robinson (Oxford, 1993), 271–91
- Mander, William, 'Pantheism', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2016 (2016) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/pantheism/>> [accessed 4 May 2019]
- Megill, Jason, 'A Defense of Emergence', *Axiomathes*, 23/4 (2013), 597–615
- Nagel, Thomas, *Mortal Questions*, Canto (Cambridge; New York; 2012), xv
- , 'Secular Philosophy and the Religious Temperament', in *Exploring the Meaning of Life: An Anthology and Guide*, ed. by Joshua W. Seachris (Malden, MA; Chichester, West Sussex; 2013), 262–72
- Nolfi, Kate, 'Why Only Evidential Considerations Can Justify Belief', in *Normativity: Epistemic and Practical*, ed. by Conor McHugh, Jonathan Way, and Daniel Whiting, 2018

- O'Connor, Timothy, and Hong Yu Wong, 'Emergent Properties', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Summer 2015 (2015) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/properties-emergent/>> [accessed 7 May 2019]
- Pals, Daniel L., *Nine Theories of Religion*, Third (New York, 2014)
- Peterson, Michael, 'A Theistic Understanding of the Universe', in *Science, Evolution, and Religion: A Debate about Atheism and Theism*, by Michael Ruse (New York; Oxford, 2017), 54–68
- , 'The Harmony of Science and Religion', in *Science, Evolution, and Religion: A Debate about Atheism and Theism*, ed. by Michael Peterson and Michael Ruse (New York, Oxford, 2017)
- 'Phenomenal Conservatism | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy' <<https://www.iep.utm.edu/phen-con/>> [accessed 7 May 2019]
- Plato, 'Symposium', in *The Dialogues of Plato*, trans. by Benjamin Jowett (New York, 1927)
- Ramsey, William, 'Eliminative Materialism', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2019 (2019)
- Robinson, Howard, 'Substance', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2018 (2018) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/substance/>> [accessed 7 May 2019]
- Rowe, William L., and William J. Wainwright, *Philosophy of Religion: Selected Readings*, 2. (San Diego, 1989)
- Seager, William, 'Panpsychism', in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mind* (2009), I, 206–21
- , 'Panpsychist Infusion', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2017), 229–49
- Sheldrake, R., 'The Credit Crunch for Materialism', *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 5/3 (2009), 135–36
- Sibley, Jack R., 'A Defense of Naturalistic Theism', *Encounter*, 68/2 (2007), 33–38
- Skrbina, David, 'Beyond Descartes: Panpsychism Revisited', *Axiomathes*, 16/4 (2006), 387–423
- , *Mind That Abides: Panpsychism in the New Millennium* (Amsterdam; Philadelphia, 2009)

- Steinhart, Eric, 'On Religious Naturalism', in *Alternative Concepts of God: Essays on the Metaphysics of the Divine*, ed. by Andrei Buckareff and Yujin Nagasawa (Oxford, 2015)
- Stenmark, Mikael, 'Naturalism versus Theism: What Is at Stake?', in *A 21st Century Debate on Science and Religion*, ed. by Shiva Khalili, Fraser Watts, and Harris Wiseman (Cambridge, UK, 2017)
- , *Tankar Om Gud, Kristen Tro Och Livets Mening: En Samling Religionsfilosofiska Essäer* (Skellefteå, 2016)
- Steup, Matthias, 'Epistemology', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Winter 2018 (2018)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/epistemology/>> [accessed 26 April 2019]
- Strawson, Galen, 'Mind and Being', in *Panpsychism: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Ludwig Jaskolla and Godehard Brüntrup (New York, 2016)
- , 'Realistic Monism: Why Physicalism Entails Panpsychism', in *Real Materialism and Other Essays* (2008), 53–75
- Wainwright, William, 'Concepts of God', in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2017 (2017)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2017/entries/concepts-god/>> [accessed 26 April 2019]
- Zackariasson, Ulf, 'Att Arbeta Pragmatiskt : Vikten Av Att Förstå Skillnaden Mellan Teori, Metod Och Material; [Working Pragmatically: The Importance of Understanding the Difference between Theory, Method and Material]', in *Filosofisk Metoder i Praktiken; [Philosophical Methods in Practice]* (Uppsala, 2018), 49–63