Note that physicalism implies that purely physical devices can collect, in principle, all the data that form the assumed reality. Therefore, methodological naturalism equates the real with the physical. Of course, what is real ought to be the totality of all that can be "detected" directly by human beings together with data collected with the aid of purely physical devices, the latter data encompassing only the subject matter of science and not the whole of reality.

In evolutionary theory, one applies the results of the experimental sciences to construct a temporal development, connecting cosmic evolution and biological evolution supporting the appearance of human beings. However, it is hard to understand how Lewis would subscribe to such a theory that leaves out the true essence of human beings, namely, their ability to "detect" God, which is Lewis's "argument from reason." The "detection" is based on the supernatural nature of human reasoning in which the inferior supernatural being "detects" the infinitely superior supernatural Being. Purely physical devices cannot accomplish that. Accordingly, one can do experimental science and develop theories summarizing the data without invoking God; however, the true nature of humans, who are the doers of science, will remain hidden from studies that assume methodological naturalism.

Peterson indicates, "ID views itself as reviving and updating the eighteenth-century argument for God which assumes that science can discover traces of a designing intelligence in the natural world" (p. 256). The enterprise of science involves using collected physical data together with prior information that allows humans to make Bayesian inferences. Of course, if one begins with physical data, then such inferences relate to the physical aspect of reality only and not to the supernatural aspect. The whole of reality, that is nature, involves, in addition to the purely physical data, nonphysical data "detected" by humans. Note that human (supernatural) reasoning is used to make scientific inferences from purely physical data, that is, the doing of science itself requires the supernatural.

It is clear that attempts to answer questions of what constitutes nature must be based on the kinds of knowledge one uses to make sense of the whole of reality. William Oliver Martin characterizes kinds of knowledge as being autonomous or synthetic.[2] The latter are reducible to two or more of the autonomous (or irreducible) kinds of knowledge. Martin considers six autonomous kinds of knowledge: history (H), metaphysics (Meta), theology (T), formal logic (FL), mathematics (Math), and generalizations of experimental science (G). Metaphysics and theology constitute two domains of the ontological context. Martin indicates the role that autonomous kinds of knowledge play in synthetic kinds of knowledge, namely, instrumental, constitutive, and/or regulative. For instance, historical propositions are constitutive of G, metaphysical propositions are regulative of G, and propositions in formal logic and mathematics are instrumental to G. Theological propositions are not related to G.

Notes

[1]C. S. Lewis, *Miracles* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), Appendix A.

[2]William Oliver Martin, *The Order and Integration of Knowledge* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1957).

Moorad Alexanian
ASA Member
Department of Physics and Physical Oceanography
University of North Carolina Wilmington
Wilmington NC 28403
alexanian@uncw.edu

Taking Neuroscience Seriously

Mihretu P. Guta accuses me of neuroscientism, claiming that I assert that the proper knowledge of human nature is only attainable via neuroscience (*PSCF* 63, no. 1 [2011]: 69–70). This was most certainly not the intention of my article ("Peering into People's Brains," *PSCF* 62, no. 2 [2010]: 122–32), and I am surprised that he considers this to be my position. More importantly though, we cannot dismiss neuroscience and the role of the brain in human life as readily as Guta does. The thrust of the developments outlined in my article is that neuroscience, in some circumstances, is beginning to claim that it can provide something akin to first-person descriptions. The adequacy of these is a matter for debate, and I questioned some of the claims.

However, Guta's example of the hurtfulness of pain is not entirely convincing. I readily accept that neuroscience can tell us only a limited amount about how I (or someone else) experience pain. Nevertheless, when sitting in the dentist's chair, it is comforting to know that the dentist has an intimate knowledge of nerves such as the inferior alveolar, when injecting an anaesthetic into the appropriate one prior to working on my tooth. Pain is objective, regardless of whether my experience is slightly different from yours, and neuroscience is indispensable in understanding some aspects of it and controlling it, at least to a degree.

The dramatic, and sometimes appalling, pathologies that result from brain injuries or drug-based manipulations of the brain, show that the gulf between first- and third-person descriptions can become exceedingly murky and ill defined. Whether we like it or not, neuroscientists can peer into ever more intimate aspects of our thought life, and on occasion, can even manipulate it. Christians should not close their eyes to what is going on all around them in neuroscience laboratories.

Similarly, my description of the color "blue" may or may not be the same as someone else's, but this does not make redundant attempts to determine which parts of the visual cortex are responsible for the perception of color. There is a powerful personal element to all our conscious responses and reactions, but this in no way invalidates the point I made in my article about the centrality of the brain (and other parts of the nervous system) for many facets of what makes us what we are.

D. Gareth Jones
ASA Fellow
Bioethics Centre
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand