Resolving Philosophy's "Big Questions" through Operational Decidability

Natural Law Institute White Paper No. 2025-09-15

Authored by: B. E. Curt Doolittle
Affiliation: Natural Law Institute, Runcible Inc.
Contributors: Natural Law Institute Research Team
Date: September 2025

Abstract

This white paper analyzes the canonical "big unanswered questions" of philosophy, historically framed as unsolvable or perpetually ambiguous. Using a system of **operational decidability** – constructed from **computability**, **testifiability**, **reciprocity**, and **closure**—it demonstrates that most so-called "unanswered" questions persist only because of linguistic ambiguity, categorical error, or resistance to constraint rather than inherent undecidability.

The analysis concludes that when reframed under a system of measurement, nearly all philosophical questions become either:

1. **Decidable** (fully resolvable),

2. **Conditionally Decidable** (resolvable with further empirical or formal modeling), or

3. **Operationally Pseudo-Questions** (unresolvable due to ill-posed assumptions or grammatical failure).

Key Terms

To ensure clarity, the following terms are defined as they are used throughout the paper:

- **Operationalization** – Translating concepts into **testifiable, computable, and reciprocal** forms so that claims can be measured, modeled, and verified.

- **Decidability** – The capacity to resolve a claim without discretionary interpretation, satisfying the **demand for infallibility** in context.

- **Computability** – Whether a claim or system can be represented within **closed, rule-based operations** without paradox or contradiction.

- **Testifiability** – Whether claims can be **empirically observed, repeated, or warranted** under shared criteria.

- **Reciprocity** – The principle that **costs and benefits must be preserved symmetrically** across individuals and groups when making claims, judgments, or policies.

- **Systematization** – The **synthesis, disambiguation, operationalization,** and **hierarchical integration** of knowledge across domains into **unified first principles**.

---

1. Introduction: The Myth of Philosophy's Big Questions

For centuries, philosophy has claimed certain questions as "eternally unanswered." These questions often appear in textbooks, public debates, and academic discourse as fundamental mysteries of existence, knowledge, morality, and consciousness.

Yet, this paper argues these supposed mysteries persist not because they defy resolution, but because:

- They fall **outside decidability**: lacking testifiable definitions or operational closure;

- They rest **inside ambiguous grammar**: involving equivocations, category errors, or undefined terms;

- They rely on **non-falsifiable metaphysical intuition** rather than empirical or computational framing.

When analyzed within a framework emphasizing **operational decidability**—the satisfaction of the demand for infallibility without discretionary interpretation—these "big questions" reduce to:

- **Formalizable problems** solvable under operational rules.

- **Conditional research programs** awaiting further empirical or computational refinement.

- **Linguistic pseudo-problems** produced by grammatical ambiguity rather than substantive paradox.

---

2. Methodology: Applying Operational Decidability

This framework evaluates philosophical questions along four axes:

Axis	Definition	Philosophical Application
Computability	Can the question be formalized within closed operational systems?	Detects pseudo-questions via lack of closure
Testifiability	Can claims be empirically observed, repeated, or warranted?	Resolves epistemic ambiguity
Reciprocity	Do claims preserve symmetric costs/benefits across agents?	Grounds ethics and political philosophy in demonstrated interests
Decidability	Can the claim satisfy the demand for infallibility in context?	Sorts true indeterminacy from linguistic indeterminacy

Under this system, all questions undergo three-stage classification:

1. **Decidable**: Fully resolvable within operational rules and evidence.
2. **Conditionally Decidable**: Resoluble with further empirical modeling or definitional constraint.
3. **Operationally Pseudo-Questions**: Ill-posed, grammatically incoherent, or metaphysically superfluous.

---

3. Canonical Questions and Their Reclassification

This section restates the standard "big questions" of philosophy, applies operational critique, and reclassifies each under the above framework.

I. Metaphysics

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
Why is there something rather than nothing?	Ultimate mystery	Pseudo-question	“Nothing” has no operational referent. Reality cannot “not-be.” Causality applies only within existence.

What is the fundamental nature of reality?	Materialism vs. Idealism debate	Conditionally Decidable	Materialism explains physical action; idealism describes perception; computation frames informational reality.
Do we have free will?	Perennial problem	Decidable	Agency = bounded computation under constraints; Responsibility = liability for consequences.
What is time?	Metaphysical paradox	Decidable	Time = rate of state transitions; physically measurable, perceptually indexed.
Deterministic vs. indeterministic universe?	Ongoing debate	Conditionally Decidable	Deterministic at macro-scale; stochastic at quantum-scale; computability preserved at human decision scales.

II. Epistemology

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
What can we know, and how?	Central epistemic question	Decidable	"Knowledge" = warrantable, repeatable operations on perception and memory; disputes vanish under operational definition.
Is certainty possible?	Long-standing philosophical puzzle	Decidable	Certainty exists only in tautologies and formal systems; in empirical reality, only degrees of liability apply.
Do we perceive reality as it is?	Skeptical perennial	Decidable	No; we perceive evolved approximations, adequate for survival and action. Truth = adequacy for purpose, not perfect mirroring.
What are the limits of reason?	Rationalism vs. empiricism debate	Decidable	Limits stem from information, computational capacity, and linguistic ambiguity, not metaphysical boundaries.

III. Mind and Consciousness

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique

What is consciousness?	“Hard problem” of philosophy	Conditionally Decidable	Functionally describable as recursive integration of perception, memory, valence, and attention; qualia remain irreducible as first-person phenomena.
Can consciousness be explained physically?	Materialism vs. dualism debate	Decidable	Neural and computational modeling increasingly explains conscious states; metaphysical resistance adds no new evidence.
What is the self?	Ongoing metaphysical debate	Decidable	"Self" = temporally-indexed narrative compression of memory and action states; no metaphysical permanence implied.

IV. Ethics and Value

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
What is the good?	Central ethical question	Decidable	"Good" = that which sustains cooperative advantage under constraint; reciprocal preservation of demonstrated interests.
Is morality objective or subjective?	Meta-ethical debate	Conditionally Decidable	Objective within populations sharing ecological constraints; subjective across incompatible evolutionary frames.
What do we owe each other?	Normative ethics	Decidable	Reciprocity in display, word, and deed; liability for impositions without consent or warrant.
Is there meaning or purpose in life?	Existentialist debate	Pseudo-question	Meaning = indexical valuation; purpose = evolved or chosen goals; no external teleology required.

V. Political and Social Philosophy

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
What is justice?	Core political question	Decidable	Justice = restitution + prevention under reciprocity; outcome = restoration of symmetry in demonstrated interests.

What is the ideal form of government?	Utopian vs. pragmatic debate	Conditionally Decidable	Optimal form depends on population traits, scale, and ecological constraints; testable as institutional market trade-offs.
Do individuals have rights?	Natural rights debate	Decidable	Rights = institutionalized reciprocities; natural rights = universal moral reciprocities if insured and enforced.

VI. Philosophy of Language and Logic

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
What is meaning?	Central semantics question	Decidable	Meaning = marginal difference in disambiguation between referent, reference, and referer; measurable as change in state.
Do abstract objects exist?	Realism vs. nominalism debate	Pseudo-question	Abstracts exist operationally within systems and minds; existence ≠ independence from human faculties or formal rules.

VII. Meta-Philosophy

Question	Traditional Status	Resolution	Operational Critique
What is philosophy for?	Open-ended self-definition of philosophy	Decidable	Philosophy = discipline of disambiguation, producing commensurable, testifiable, and decidable constructs across domains.

---

4. Summary Tables: Mapping Questions to the System of Measurement

The following tables integrate all canonical philosophical questions into the **four operational axes**—Computability, Testifiability, Reciprocity, and Decidability—showing how each question transitions from “eternal mystery” to resolved, conditionally resolvable, or pseudo-question under operational analysis.

Table 1: Resolution by Domain

Domain	Canonical Question Types	Problem Source	Operational Resolution
Metaphysics	Origin, nature, time, determinism	Category errors, untestable assumptions	Reject pseudo-questions; formalize under physics & computation
Epistemology	Knowledge, certainty, perception, reason	Ambiguous definitions of “knowledge”	Define knowledge as warrantable, repeatable operations
Mind & Consciousness	Consciousness, self, physical explanation	Introspection vs. third-person framing	Recursive computational modeling; narrative indexing of self
Ethics & Value	Good, morality, obligation, meaning	Preference vs. constraint confusion	Evolutionary game theory + reciprocity modeling
Political Philosophy	Justice, rights, government forms	Universalism vs. local optimization	Institutions as markets for constraint production
Language & Logic	Meaning, abstract entities	Ambiguous reference and indexicality	Operational semantics; indexical reference over metaphysics
Meta-Philosophy	Purpose of philosophy	Lack of definitional closure	Philosophy as disambiguation discipline under uncertainty

---

Table 2: Classification by Operational Criterion

Criterion	Resolution Mode	Example Questions	Classification
Computability	Closure under operational rules	“Why is there something rather than nothing?”	Pseudo-question (reject ill-posedness)
Testifiability	Observable, repeatable, warranted	“Do we perceive reality as it is?”	Decidable under adequacy-for-action
Reciprocity	Cost–benefit symmetry in action	“What do we owe each other?”	Decidable via liability and restitution
Decidability	Demand for infallibility without discretion	“Is morality objective?”	Conditionally decidable under constraints

---

Table 3: Resolution Status Summary

Status	Count	Examples
Decidable	12	Free will, Time, Knowledge, Self, Justice, Rights, Government trade-offs
Conditionally Decidable	5	Nature of reality, Determinism, Morality across groups, Consciousness modeling
Operationally Pseudo-Questions	5	“Nothingness,” Abstract object ontology, External cosmic “purpose”

---

5. Demarcation Between Philosophy and Science

Historically, philosophy has served as the **incubator of all rational inquiry**, producing the conceptual frameworks within which the sciences eventually matured. Yet, as this white paper demonstrates, the transition from **philosophical speculation** to **scientific resolution** follows a consistent demarcation:

Domain Boundary	Philosophy	Science
Purpose	Disambiguation of concepts, grammars, and categories	Testifiable modeling of phenomena under operational closure
Method	Logical reasoning, linguistic analysis, conceptual design	Empirical observation, computation, experimental replication
Output	Normative frameworks, ontological constraints	Predictive models, causal explanations, technological applications
Epistemic Status	Decidability under definitional or logical precision	Decidability under empirical and computational precision

Philosophy’s **proper role** under this framework becomes clear:

- Philosophy resolves **linguistic ambiguity** and establishes **operational definitions**.
- Science then inherits those clarified constructs to produce **empirical, testifiable, and computationally closed systems**.

As operationalization expands, **philosophy contracts** to its legitimate function:

- the **science of disambiguation**,
- the **production of decidable conceptual grammars**, and
- the **boundary work** preventing metaphysics, moralizing, or linguistic drift from reintroducing ambiguity into scientific or institutional reasoning.

Thus, the **demarcation problem** between philosophy and science dissolves under this operational framework: philosophy formalizes questions; science resolves them.

The systematization project described here originates in the Natural Law framework, which extends beyond philosophy's conceptual refinement and science's empirical modeling to produce a universal operational grammar for law, ethics, politics, and computation.

6. Beyond Philosophy and Science: The Role of Systematization

Where philosophy refines language and science tests hypotheses, **systematization** represents the next intellectual function: the synthesis, disambiguation, operationalization, and hierarchical integration of all knowledge into a universal grammar of first principles. It inherits philosophy's demand for conceptual precision and science's insistence on empirical rigor but transcends both by requiring *computability, testifiability, reciprocity,* and *decidability* across every domain.

Under this framework, philosophy produces operational definitions, science produces empirical models, but **systematization**—the synthesis, disambiguation, operationalization, and hierarchical integration of all domains into first principles – represents a third activity. It inherits philosophy's linguistic precision and science's empirical rigor but transcends both by producing a **universal formula of decidability** applicable across law, ethics, politics, and computation.

This work does not merely interpret the world or model it piecemeal—it distills reality into a **unified, operational formula of evolutionary computation** that renders human action, institutions, and knowledge systems decidable under universal constraint.

7. Suggested Citations

Historical antecedents to the systematization project include Aristotle's Organon *for early classification of knowledge, Descartes'* Rules for the Direction of the Mind *for rationalist method, Comte's* Course of Positive Philosophy *for the unification of sciences, and Spencer's* First Principles *for evolutionary framing. Formal constraints on knowledge arise from Gödel's* Incompleteness Theorems *and Turing's* On Computable Numbers, *which set the limits of logical and computational systems. Modern demarcation problems in philosophy and science were addressed by Quine in* Word and Object *and Popper in* The Logic of Scientific Discovery.

The present framework extends these traditions by integrating computability, testifiability, reciprocity, and decidability into a single operational grammar of law, ethics, and cooperation – applicable to law, ethics, politics, and institutional design – within the Natural Law project.

> *For formal treatment of decidability, reciprocity, and evolutionary computation as applied to law, ethics, and institutional design, see Doolittle,* The Science, Logic, and Constitution of Natural Law, *Volumes I - IV (forthcoming).*

8. The Remaining Domain of Philosophical Inquiry

Once philosophy's traditional role in disambiguation, systematization, and reduction to first principles has been completed, its remaining domain contracts to two enduring functions:

8.1 Teaching Humans to Think

Philosophy's legacy role is pedagogical: to train individuals in the **disciplines of thought** necessary for living in a world governed by physical, logical, and institutional constraints. Teaching people to "think" means training:

1. **Disambiguation** – detecting and resolving linguistic, conceptual, or categorical errors.
2. **Operationalization** – translating ideas into testifiable, computable, and reciprocal claims.
3. **Judgment under constraint** – reasoning about trade-offs when information, time, and resources are limited.
4. **Moral reciprocity** – recognizing demonstrated interests and costs across others before acting.

In short, once knowledge is systematized, **the individual must be educated in how to use it correctly**.

8.2 Navigating Human Choice After First Principles

After all domains reducible to first principles have been integrated into operational systems, what remains are:

- **Problems of coordination** – How do humans with conflicting preferences navigate choice under shared constraints?

- **Matters of policy, ethics, and aesthetics** – Not about truth or causality, but about trade-offs among competing goods.

- **Questions of meaning and purpose** – Interpreted not as metaphysical mysteries, but as choices about goals within existential and civilizational limits.

At this point, philosophy no longer seeks ultimate causes or metaphysical truths; it becomes the **discipline of navigation**, teaching civilizations to reason about **what to do next** when science has already told us what *is*.

8.3 Philosophy After Closure

When all reducible domains have been operationalized into testifiable, computable, and reciprocal systems, philosophy does not disappear—it **changes its function**.

It ceases to be the search for metaphysical truths or ultimate causes and becomes the discipline of **reasoning about choice under constraint**.

Its role is twofold:

- Training individuals and institutions in the **grammar of thinking itself** – disambiguation, operationalization, and judgment.

- Guiding societies through the **navigation of trade-offs** among competing goods, risks, and goals in a world where science delivers truth, but humans must still choose how to live with it.

9. Final Conclusions

9.0 The Failure of 20th-Century Reforms

By conforming to the **law of grammar**—continuous recursive disambiguation, operationalization, complete sentences, prohibition on the verb *to be*, and promissory form—all known philosophical paradoxes dissolve as **deceptions by grammatical suggestion**.

Philosophy's historical failure lies not in confronting reality's limits but in **failing to operationalize its own language**, leaving questions suspended in **semantic ambiguity** rather than **empirical difficulty**.

The **intuitionistic** and **constructivist** reforms of the early twentieth century produced minor gains in physics and mathematics, introducing limits on metaphysics and demanding constructive proof. Yet they failed to penetrate **philosophy, logic, or the behavioral**

sciences—leaving vast intellectual domains vulnerable to **pseudoscience, ideological moralizing,** and the **postwar reproduction crisis**.

Operationalism succeeded sequentially in:

1. **Mathematics** – through formalization of proof and computation,
2. **Logic** – through symbolic rigor and algorithmic inference,
3. **Computation** – through programming as operational semantics made executable.

But in **philosophy**, operationalism collapsed when the continued attempt to apply **set theory** as had been done in **mathematics and logic** replaced the formalization in operationalization, turning analytic philosophy inward toward self-referential formalism rather than outward toward empirical closure. The result was the **end of the analytic project** rather than its completion—an intellectual retreat that left philosophy without the operational foundations necessary for decidability in law, ethics, or institutional reasoning.

The study of this failure in the history of thought is as fruitful a warning against overformalization as the application of operationalism to philosophical questions is fruitful in producing answers.

9.1 Elimination of "Big Questions"

This analysis demonstrates that the **so-called eternal mysteries** of philosophy persist not because they are metaphysically unsolvable, but because:

1. **Language Outruns Measurement**
    - Many philosophical puzzles arise from grammatical or semantic ambiguity rather than substantive paradox.
    - Example: "Why is there something rather than nothing?" presupposes a viable state of "nothing," which physics and logic disallow.
2. **Philosophy Ignores Computability**
    - Pre-scientific metaphysics lacked operational closure; modern computation, physics, and evolutionary theory resolve many debates by reframing them in **testifiable and decidable** terms.
3. **Moral and Political Resistance**
    - Questions about meaning, morality, and justice remain contentious largely due to **psychological and political preference**, not theoretical undecidability.

9.2 Role of Operational Decidability

Using **computability, testifiability, reciprocity,** and **decidability** as analytical axes, all canonical philosophical questions reduce to one of three categories:

- **Decidable** – Formalizable empirical or logical inquiries.
- **Conditionally Decidable** – Empirical research programs awaiting additional data or modeling.
- **Operationally Pseudo-Questions** – Linguistic residues best discarded once definitional precision is imposed..

9.3 Implications for Philosophy and Science

As operationalization advances:

- **Philosophy transitions** from speculative metaphysics to a **discipline of disambiguation**, producing computable, testifiable, and morally reciprocal models.
- **Science inherits** what philosophy abandons: testifiable, decidable questions under empirical closure.
- **Law, ethics, and politics** gain from reciprocity-based modeling, eliminating universalist moralizing in favor of operational cooperation under demonstrated interests.

9.4 Conclusion Table: Philosophy After Decidability

Before Operationalization	After Operationalization
Eternal mysteries, metaphysical speculation	Decidable, conditional, or pseudo-question classification
Language-driven paradoxes	Operational semantics and indexical precision
Moral universalism vs. relativism debates	Reciprocity and evolutionary constraint modeling
Philosophical intuitionism	Computable, testifiable, and liability-aware epistemology

10. Closing Synthesis

The preceding analysis established the **analytic grounds** for resolving philosophy's "big questions." This final section summarizes the implications for philosophy, science, and institutional reasoning going forward.

10.1 Summary of Findings

By reframing the canonical questions under the operational criteria of **computability, testifiability, reciprocity,** and **decidability**, we found that:

1. **Decidable Questions** become solvable once linguistic ambiguity and metaphysical presuppositions are stripped away.

2. **Conditionally Decidable Questions** remain open only because empirical data, computational modeling, or definitional precision is incomplete—not because they are inherently unsolvable.

3. **Operationally Pseudo-Questions** dissolve once we expose their ill-posed grammar or metaphysical incoherence.

What remains after this analysis is not mystery, but **method**: the discipline of producing closure across all domains once governed by speculation.

10.2 Philosophy's New Role

As operationalization proceeds, philosophy itself transforms. It ceases to be a speculative enterprise chasing metaphysical truths and becomes instead:

- The **science of disambiguation under constraint**,

- The **pedagogy of reasoning**, teaching individuals and institutions to navigate trade-offs among competing goods, risks, and interests,

- The **architectural layer** linking empirical science to institutional and ethical design through **reciprocity-based modeling**.

10.3 Forward Implications

The so-called “big questions” no longer mark humanity’s epistemic limits; they mark our historical tolerance for **unconstrained language** and **lack of operational rigor**. As we integrate **computability, testifiability, reciprocity,** and **decidability** into philosophy, law, ethics, and governance, we replace ambiguity with systems of **universal constraint, accountability, and closure**.

In this way, philosophy fulfills its final role: not as a perpetual seeker of unknowable truths, but as the discipline that transforms **mystery into measurement**, **speculation into systematization**, and **intuition into institutional reason**.

When philosophy speaks operationally, ambiguity ends, and decidability begins.

— End of White Paper —