The Why Before the How: Purpose as the Ground of Lawful Order

Bocharmer · October 22, 2026

Thesis

The question of *why* comes before the question of *how*. Evolution, physical law, and cosmic history describe how things unfold. They do not say why there is a lawful, intelligible, life-permitting order to unfold in the first place.

This paper argues that purpose is the best explanation for that order. Everything known, from atoms and stars to stardust, cells, and minds, developed through natural processes. But those processes run on laws, and lawful order does not arise from pure chaos. No case of pure chaos has ever been observed at any scale. On this view, purpose is the driving impetus behind the order seen everywhere, even where it is not yet understood.

The creator proposed here is not the God of any particular theological system. It is a source of order and purpose that cannot yet be defined. The biblical writings are read as allegory, proverb, and metaphor: moral teaching, and a way of conveying the idea of a creator to ancient peoples. This is not a literal cosmology.

In plain language: Science tells us how the machine runs. The bigger question is why there is a machine at all, and why it runs so well.

Science explains the how, but presupposes laws it cannot explain

Every scientific explanation shows that an event follows from laws plus prior conditions. So science cannot explain why there are laws at all without assuming still deeper laws.

This is a limit built into the method, not a gap waiting to be filled. Stellar fusion explains the elements, chemistry explains molecules, and natural selection explains the diversity of life. But each of those explanations assumes the laws are already there.

Two features of those laws deepen the question:

- **Intelligibility.** Eugene Wigner called it "unreasonable" that abstract mathematics describes physical reality so precisely (Wigner, 1960). Einstein said the most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensible.
- **Fine-tuning.** The constants and initial conditions fall within narrow life-permitting ranges (Barnes, 2012). The cosmological constant is about 10^{120} below its natural scale, and Penrose estimates the low-entropy beginning at 1 in 10 raised to the power 10^{123}.

The usual naturalist answers are that the laws are a "brute fact," or that a multiverse makes them inevitable. The first declines to answer. The second pushes the question back a step. Neither explains why there is lawful order rather than none.

Einstein's remark, as Esther Salaman recalled it, captures the priority: he wanted to know God's thoughts, and "the rest are details." (His own view of God was Spinoza's impersonal rational order.)

No pure chaos at any scale

No phenomenon in nature can be identified as pure chaos, meaning lawless, structureless, and unconstrained, with certainty. At every scale, apparent chaos turns out to be lawful.

Scale	What looks like chaos	The law underneath
Quantum	Individual decays and measurement outcomes are unpredictable; Bell tests rule out simple hidden causes (Hensen et al., 2015)	The Born rule fixes the probabilities exactly; conservation laws and symmetries constrain every outcome
Quantum vacuum	Fluctuations and virtual particles	Quantum field theory, confirmed to many decimal places
Dynamical systems	Weather, double pendulums, three-body orbits	Fully deterministic equations; trajectories settle onto structured "strange attractors" (Lorenz, 1963)
Thermodynamic	Maximum entropy, the far-future "heat death"	Conservation of energy and exact statistical distributions (Maxwell–Boltzmann)
Cosmic	Supernova debris, the scattering of galaxies	Grew from early fluctuations with a precise, nearly scale-invariant statistical signature
Mathematical	Sequences that appear random	Chaitin proved that a given sequence can almost never be *proven* random (Chaitin, 1974)

In plain language: From quarks to galaxy clusters, apparent chaos is either lawful randomness with exact rules, or lawful determinism too complex to forecast. Lawlessness has never been observed.

So order arises from order: from laws and structured initial conditions, never from pure chaos. That is the empirical premise of this paper.

Order from order: the history of the cosmos and of life

The story of the universe is one of developing complexity: hydrogen and helium, then stars, the elements forged inside them, stardust, planets, chemistry, cells, animals, minds. This paper

accepts that story fully. The point is that each step runs on a lawful framework the step itself does not supply.

Self-organization. Snowflakes, crystals, and convection cells form spontaneously. Ilya Prigogine's Nobel-winning work showed how structure can emerge in systems far from equilibrium. But self-organization is not order from chaos. It is order made possible by laws precise enough to produce it.

The Cambrian radiation. Most animal body plans appear in the fossil record over roughly 20–25 million years, beginning about 538.8 million years ago. That is rapid geologically, but it came after some 3 billion years of earlier life and the Ediacaran fauna. Erwin and colleagues argue that the developmental genetic "toolkit" (Hox genes, gene regulatory networks) was largely in place *before* it was used. Ecological opportunity came later: rising oxygen, predation, and new niches (Erwin et al., 2011; Marshall, 2006).

A capacity that existed before its expression fits a view in which potential is built into the system from the start. It does not prove that view, because the toolkit has its own evolutionary history. Stephen Meyer's *Darwin's Doubt* (2013) makes a stronger design case from the Cambrian; most paleontologists reject it.

In plain language: Every step forward in cosmic and biological history stands on lawful ground laid before it. Evolution builds the house; it did not lay the foundation.

From function to purpose

Functions are everywhere in nature, and this paper argues they may be components of a larger purpose. That step is the heart of the case, so it needs precise terms.

- **Teleonomy** (Ernst Mayr's term): a structure has a function. A heart pumps blood. Evolution can produce function without foresight.
- **Teleology**: a structure exists *for* an end. Aristotle called this the "final cause," the "for the sake of which." Modern science set final causes aside as a working method in the 17th century, but they were never refuted as metaphysics.

The argument here is that functions nest. Quantum fields make atoms possible; atoms make chemistry possible; chemistry makes cells possible; cells make minds possible; minds make understanding of the whole possible. A pattern in which each level enables the next, culminating in beings who can grasp the laws themselves, is what one would expect if the whole were directed toward an end.

This is not only a theistic view. The atheist philosopher Thomas Nagel argues in *Mind and Cosmos* (Oxford University Press, 2012) that nature probably contains a built-in teleology, a directedness toward life and consciousness, which standard materialism cannot explain.

Nor is the universe perfectly symmetrical. It runs on *precisely broken* symmetry. A perfectly symmetric universe could have no atoms or chemistry. The order observed is selective and specific, which strengthens rather than weakens the inference to purpose.

In plain language: Each layer of nature does a job that makes the next layer possible, all the way up to minds that can understand the whole. That looks less like an accident and more like a direction.

The multiverse and designed systems

The multiverse is itself a mechanism. If a universe-generating process yields life-permitting universes, that process needs its own finely set laws to do so. Robin Collins and Paul Davies both make this point. The multiverse moves the fine-tuning question back a step; it does not remove it. A system that reliably produces functional universes has the marks of a design that produces them.

The analogy with human creation. Everything humanity produces — plastics, cars, computers — is designed with a purpose. A living cell is more sophisticated than any of them. This is William Paley's watchmaker argument. David Hume's standard reply is that living things, unlike cars, reproduce with variation, and selection can build complexity without foresight. But that reply only works once a replicator exists and the laws make chemistry possible. At the first cell, and at the laws themselves, the analogy keeps its full force.

Artificial intelligence as a case study. Claude is a designed creation. People with a purpose chose its architecture, training goals, and values. But much of its internal structure was not drawn by any engineer. It emerged from an optimization process that no one controlled in detail, and its makers cannot fully read how it works. So AI shows *intended goals plus an undirected process* producing complexity no one designed by hand. That is the shape of the view argued here: a purposive source establishes the laws and the process, and the process does much of the building.

Occam's razor cuts both ways. Richard Swinburne argues that one creator is the simplest explanation of an ordered universe. The naturalist replies that positing an unobserved being is not simple. But a multiverse posits a potentially infinite number of unobserved universes, which is hard to call the economical option.

An undefined creator: the position and its company

The position defended here accepts natural cosmic and biological evolution fully and places purpose in the lawful framework itself. It is not a claim of miraculous intervention in biology. That makes it philosophically stronger than classical intelligent design, because it does not rest on biological gaps that future science might close.

It stands in respected company:

Thinker	Position	Relation to this paper
Aristotle	Final causes; an unmoved mover as the source of order	Purpose as a real feature of nature
Spinoza / Einstein	An impersonal rational order behind nature	Shares the intelligibility premise; this paper adds purpose

Thinker	Position	Relation to this paper
Paul Davies, *The Mind of God* (1992)	The laws' intelligibility points beyond brute fact	Close ally on the "why" of the laws
Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos* (2012)	Natural teleology, without a theistic God	Shows purpose can be argued for outside traditional theology
Richard Swinburne, *The Existence of God* (2004)	A Bayesian cumulative case for a creator	Supplies the probabilistic framework

The creator is described here by what it explains — order, intelligibility, and direction — not by doctrine. Ancient scriptures are read as allegorical attempts to convey that reality, and its moral implications, in terms their audiences could grasp.

Strongest objections, stated fairly

The weakest link is the step from "lawful" to "intended." The best objections aim there.

1. **Lawful is not the same as purposive.** The absence of chaos shows that nature is lawful everywhere. It does not by itself show that the laws were intended. A naturalist can accept every fact in this paper and hold that the laws are simply a brute fact.
   - *Reply:* A brute fact this precise, intelligible, and fruitful is less reasonable than a source behind it. "It just is" carries at least as heavy an explanatory burden as "it was meant."
2. **Function does not imply purpose.** Teleonomy can arise without teleology, as evolution shows for organs and behaviors. Nesting functions may only reflect the fact that later stages are built from earlier ones.
   - *Reply:* This holds within biology, but not for the laws that make functional nesting possible at all.
3. **Observer selection.** Only a life-permitting universe could contain observers asking these questions, so finding ourselves in one may not need further explanation (Elliott Sober).
   - *Reply:* A firing-squad survivor still rightly asks why every shot missed. Observing the improbable does not make it less in need of explanation.
4. **The probabilities may be ill-defined.** Over infinite parameter ranges no proper probability distribution exists, so fine-tuning odds may not be meaningful (McGrew, McGrew & Vestrup, 2001).
   - *Reply:* The intelligibility argument does not depend on numerical odds.
5. **Who designed the designer?** If order needs a source, does the source need one too?
   - *Reply:* Classical philosophy answers that a necessary, self-existent ground ends the regress. The naturalist faces the same regress with laws.
6. **Suffering and waste.** Extinction, pain, and cosmic indifference sit uneasily with purpose. This is the problem of evil.

- *Reply:* This is the hardest objection for any purposive view. An undefined creator avoids some of its theological sharpness, but not all of it. It deserves its own treatment.

Conclusion

The "how" of the universe — fusion, chemistry, evolution, even a possible multiverse — is increasingly well understood. The "why" is untouched by all of it, because every "how" presupposes a lawful order it does not explain.

The argument in its strongest form:

1. No pure chaos has ever been observed, at any scale from the quantum to the cosmic.
2. Everything known arises from lawful order: from laws and structured initial conditions.
3. Evolution, self-organization, and any multiverse all presuppose that lawful, intelligible, life-permitting framework.
4. That framework is either a brute fact with no reason behind it, or it has a source.
5. A purposive source is a coherent, non-arbitrary explanation. Its rivals are unexplained brute facts, or unobservable ensembles that face the same question.
6. Therefore purpose, the "why," is the most reasonable account of the order behind the "how."

This does not prove the conclusion. Step 4 to step 5 is philosophical, not empirical. But it is a reasonable inference that serious philosophers defend, and science has not refuted it.

In plain language: We can trace how everything grew from stardust. What we cannot trace, by science alone, is why there was a lawful order for anything to grow in. Purpose is the best answer to that question we have, even if the creator behind it is not yet understood.

Sources

- Barnes, L. A. (2012). The fine-tuning of the universe for intelligent life. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia* 29, 529–564.
- Chaitin, G. J. (1974). Information-theoretic limitations of formal systems. *Journal of the ACM* 21, 403–424.
- Davies, P. (1992). *The Mind of God: The Scientific Basis for a Rational World*. Simon & Schuster.
- Erwin, D. H., et al. (2011). The Cambrian conundrum: early divergence and later ecological success in the early history of animals. *Science* 334, 1091–1097.
- Hensen, B., et al. (2015). Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature* 526, 682–686.
- Lorenz, E. N. (1963). Deterministic nonperiodic flow. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 20, 130–141.
- Marshall, C. R. (2006). Explaining the Cambrian "explosion" of animals. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences* 34, 355–384.
- McGrew, T., McGrew, L., & Vestrup, E. (2001). Probabilities and the fine-tuning argument. *Mind* 110, 1027–1038.

- Meyer, S. C. (2013). *Darwin's Doubt*. HarperOne.
- Nagel, T. (2012). *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*. Oxford University Press.
- Swinburne, R. (2004). *The Existence of God*, 2nd ed. Oxford University Press.
- Wigner, E. P. (1960). The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 13, 1–14.
- Friederich, S. Fine-Tuning. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Ratzsch, D., & Koperski, J. Teleological Arguments for God's Existence. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.