

# Review of: "[Commentary] Re: Teleology and the Meaning of Life"

Joseph Pitt<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Tech (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University)

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

My concern with the original paper and subsequent comments is that it commits the fallacy of simplification. First, by choosing one framework, biology, to base her accounts of survival on, the author ignores discussions of foundations in physics and other sciences such as chemistry. Second, The author buys into the general belief that the processes of the universe can be captured by relatively simple principles. There really is no evidence for this view. On the contrary, as we observe the discovery of new and currently unexplainable processes affecting the physics of the universe and its expansion, the acceptance of the view that everything will be explained by simple laws is increasingly under seige. It is not clear to me where this assumption that the activities we observe in the universe can be explained by seeking simplicity originated. It may be a feature of the human effort to survive - assume it all can be explained simply some day and we will be fine. But what if we accept the results of our sciences and try to understand the universe as basically a mess? That does not mean we have give up seeking order. Rather, it places the search for meaning where it belongs - on us. We have developed schools of thought, religions, etc. that help us find meaning, but it doesn't follow it is out there somewhere embedded in some scientific theory. There is nothing incompatible wit accepting that the universe is chaotic and the we can still strive to find the meaning of life. We just need to accept the fact that we are part of the universe and our attempt to put order (isn' that what meaning is all about) into it is a feature of our evolutionary history.