

**Man and Purpose:  
Beyond the Divinity — Thresholds of Decision and  
Meaning**

Odai Manhal Abood

Independent Researcher

Email: odaiabood777@gmail.com

Date: 23/10/2025

License: Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

Disclosure of AI-assisted translation: The author confirms that the content, analysis, and conclusions of this paper are entirely original.

© 2025 Odai Manhal Abood. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

### **After the Discovery: What is to be Done When Absurdity is Revealed?**

When we strip our view of existence of the veil of reassurance, the fragility of the system we are accustomed to presuming in things becomes apparent. The illusion of ready-made meaning collapses, and life appears as it is: a blind movement of division and dissolution, with no apparent end nor defined purpose. Whoever reaches this vision does not undergo a purely intellectual experience, but rather a violent emotional earthquake, which can be called "the shock of realization,"<sup>1</sup> for here, truth is not content with being understood; it is lived, and it leaves an indelible mark on the soul.

This existential overflow is not merely a pure philosophical impression; there is a physical dimension that can be read as support for the paradox of the absurd. According to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, closed systems, in the long run, tend towards increasing entropy — that is, towards increasing dispersion and decentralization of energy and order. Put more clearly: the universe, in many of its manifestations, moves in one direction towards the erosion of organization and the emergence of chaos. According to statistical models in physics, and assuming certain initial conditions for the system or the universe as a whole, this direction is not an absolute law but a description of a general statistical probability of increasing entropy over time. This scientific fact does not explain moral meaning in place of philosophy, but it gives the discovery of the absurd an objective background: what sometimes appears as an absence of moral purpose can also be read as an extension of the mechanics of a universe that does not guarantee the stability of systems or the permanence of cohesion. Confronted with this cosmic law, man's attempt to formulate meaning becomes an act of resistance against the statistical nature of the universe — not because the universe is a moral error, but because its nature provides no guarantees for a transcendental purpose.

However, the realization of the absurd is not complete in itself. The question does not stop at the limits of discovery but directs itself to what comes after: what is to be done after we know? Does this admission lead to a moral collapse or a dissolution of will, or can it be a starting point for creating a new meaning, emanating from within, not imposed from without? In this sense, consciousness of the absurd is not the conclusion of thought, but its actual beginning: the moment in which man confronts his naked responsibility for formulating his own purpose in a silent world.

This research does not seek to rehash the debate about the origin of consciousness or its evolutionary explanation, but rather focuses on the practical and existential stance after knowledge. For knowledge, when it reaches this depth, does not remain a cognitive addition; it transforms into a psychological wound<sup>2</sup> that necessitates intertwined intellectual, moral, and social responses. Hence arises the need for a philosophical approach that addresses the impact of this shock on the domains of behavior, will, and meaning.

In the subsequent chapters, I will address three main stations in this trajectory:

- After the Discovery: Confronting the absurd face-to-face, and the possible moral choices after its revelation.
- Consciousness as Exile: The transformation of consciousness from an evolutionary tool into an existential burden<sup>3</sup> that places man in isolation from his natural harmony with the world.
- Language and Limits: How language constrains us in the face of meaninglessness, and how it can, at the same time, become a means for liberating the self and reconfiguring experience.

In each chapter, I will propose practical contemplations, and philosophical and ethical positions that the reader can adopt or reformulate in accordance with their own experience, with the ultimate goal being to test the possibility of transforming the admission of absurdity from a predicament into a potential for creation.

## References

- Carroll, S. (2010). *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*.
- Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What Is Life?*
- Camus, A. (1955). *The myth of Sisyphus and other essays* (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1942)
- Nagel, T. (1971). "The absurd." *The Journal of Philosophy*, 68(20), 716-727.
- Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.

## **Chapter 1**

### **After the Discovery — Thresholds of Decision**

#### **1.1 The Moment of Shock: From Realization to Stance**

The moment the philosophical eye opens to the absurdity of the world is not merely a cognitive addition to one's stock of assumptions; it is a transformative experience that becomes ingrained in the fabric of the self. I prefer the term "the shock of realization" to denote the point where an idea transforms into an existential wound<sup>2</sup>: its bearer can no longer, in any complete sense, return to their prior state because a new given—the possibility of the absence of an objective purpose—has entered into the construction of the world as it is perceived.

From a practical philosophical perspective, it is insufficient to merely distinguish between stating "the universe may have no purpose" and "the feeling of a semantic void"; these are two interconnected yet distinct levels: the first is a cognitive conclusion, and the second is an existential effect<sup>3</sup> that directly influences motivation and behavior. Much of the confusion in debates occurs because authors conflate these two levels or use one to pass judgments that do not correspond to the conditions of the other.

Instead of the traditional question, "What is truth?", the practical question after the shock becomes: "What do I do with this truth?" In this transition, ethics takes on new burdens: Should knowledge remain within the realm of personal contemplation, or should it transform into a behavioral principle? And can practical standards for communal life be forged from this objection? These questions require us to define the thresholds that must be crossed before realization can transform into responsible action.

#### **1.2 Modes of Engagement: Four Pathways and Evaluative Criteria**

After the shock, responses can branch into four typical pathways. But to make the analysis more practical, I propose that each pathway be evaluated against four simple evaluative criteria: (a) Genuineness of Reflection: Is the decision the result of sustained reflection or a whim? (b) Presence of Compensatory Alternatives: Are there projects that offset the negative effects? (c) Harm Reduction: What is the likelihood of imposing an additional burden on others? (d) Accountability: Can the decision be defended publicly and its consequences borne before society?

##### **A. Destructive Withdrawal (Surrender of the Value of Action)**

- Its Nature: A broad withdrawal from the commitment to social roles.
- Its Risks: The breakdown of social bonds and increased suffering for the vulnerable, particularly those who depend on the actor's presence in daily care networks—children, the sick, or the elderly—as well as groups whose

members' withdrawal disrupts professional or moral equilibrium within society.

- Conditions for its Acceptance: Rarely achievable; it requires clear compensatory programs and a framework that limits harm to others.

#### B. Transcendent Conformism (The Façade of Social Performance)

- Its Nature: Continuation of social actions despite internal fragmentation.
- Its Advantage: Protects social and functional stability.
- Its Ethical Problem: The question of authenticity; if the actions lead to tangible, real-world benefits, they might be justified, but if they are merely performative, their impact on the self and the community must be scrutinized.

#### C. Critical Adaptation (Building Small Meanings)

- Its Nature: The creation of local, verifiable meanings—ethical relationships, artistic work, professional commitment with limited but specific social value.
- Its Advantage: Balances the recognition of the limits of grand demands with the desire for change within the possible.
- Its Criteria: Its effectiveness is evaluated by its sustainability and its ability to improve specific lives in measurable ways.

#### D. Conscious Rebellion (Transforming Rejection into Ethical Action)

- Its Nature: A conscious ethical decision that sometimes evolves into a collective or institutionalized project.
- Its Status: Capable of reshaping the very frameworks that produce the predicament.
- Conditions for its Legitimacy: Genuineness of reflection, the presence of compensatory alternatives, respect for the rights of others, and a willingness to bear the political and social burden of transformation.

### **1.3 Thresholds of Decision: From Realization to Political Project**

An individual decision does not exist in a vacuum. For it to transition from a personal choice to an recognized social practice, a number of thresholds must be crossed:

- The Threshold of Reflective Solidity: The skepticism must be mature and well-founded, not a moment of anger or transient depression.
- The Threshold of Practical Alternatives: The existence of social and care alternatives that reduce the likelihood of the vulnerable bearing the consequences of the choice.
- The Threshold of Accountability and Transparency: The ability of individuals to present their justifications and engage in an acceptable public discourse.
- The Threshold of Public Deliberation and Language: The availability of linguistic and institutional space that makes the idea comprehensible,

researchable, and debatable without distortion or suppression.

Through these thresholds, choices are elevated from the level of recreational hobbies to the level of policies with real impact. For example, the decision to abstain from procreation in a personal context requires legal protection mechanisms and public care networks before it can become a project advocated by societies without leaving vulnerable groups exposed to harm.

### **1.4 Practical Tools for Assessing Legitimacy**

To make this chapter practically useful, I present here a simplified checklist that can be used as a quick reference before making a fundamental ethical decision:

- Is the decision the result of sustained reflection supported by dialogue? (Genuineness of Reflection)
- Are there clear alternative projects that reduce potential harm? (Alternatives)
- Can the justifications be presented, and can criticism and accountability be endured? (Accountability)
- Do institutions or a field of discourse exist that can accommodate this choice? (Public Deliberation)

These criteria are not intended to be a rigid, calculative table, but rather a deliberative network whose weights shift according to context. "Genuineness of Reflection" remains a foundational, non-negotiable condition, while the priority of "Alternatives" and "Harm Reduction" advances depending on the type and domain of the decision, and "Accountability" comes in to regulate the balance between the individual and the community. The ordering of these priorities is not fixed, but it provides a practical framework for thinking when motives and criteria clash, enabling the actor to assess the legitimacy of their decision. If the answer is "yes" to most items, the likelihood of the decision being ethically legitimate and responsibly impactful increases. If the answer is "no," the actor should reconsider or postpone the decision until the appropriate conditions are met.

### **Brief Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter does not aim to impose final rules, but rather to provide an evaluative tool: epistemological, psychological, and institutional thresholds that must be crossed before an existential realization can transform into legitimate collective action. In subsequent chapters, we will reorient these criteria in light of the repercussions of consciousness on language, the existential dimension of isolation, and how linguistic and institutional construction can make an ethical choice an action capable of recognition and containment.

## Footnotes

" (Jarḥ Wijdānī), جرح وجداني<sup>2</sup>"existential wound": Reflecting the Arabic " emphasizing that the impact is not just intellectual but a deep injury to the heart and core of one's being (wijdān).

" (Athar Wijdānī), أثر وجداني<sup>3</sup>"existential effect": Translating " that resonates on the level of deep personal sentiment and existential awareness.

## References

- Camus, A. (1955). *The myth of Sisyphus and other essays* (J. O'Brien, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1942)
- Nagel, T. (1971). "The absurd." *The Journal of Philosophy*, 68(20), 716-727.
- Benatar, D. (2006). *Better never to have been: The harm of coming into existence*. Oxford University Press.
- Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*. Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, J. J. (1971). "A defense of abortion." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1), 47-66.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*.
- Carroll, S. (2010). *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*.

## Chapter 2

### **Consciousness as Exile — The Burden of Awareness and the Heat of Solitude**

#### **2.1 Consciousness Seeing Itself: The Double Exile**

When consciousness turns inward upon itself and sees that it is but a tool within a cosmic system indifferent to its concerns, it enters a phase that can be termed the "double exile": an exile from the world, and an exile from its former self. The conscious human is ostracized not only from the outside but from within as well. They can no longer live in peace with a system they perceive as blatantly absurd, yet they are simultaneously unable to relinquish or forget this perception. They live—to put it precisely—on the edge of participation: they see things but cannot be a part of them without subjecting them to the microscope of questioning.

It is important here to shed precise evolutionary light on the source of this reflective capacity. Consciousness, as evidence from evolutionary biology suggests, did not arise as a subjective goal of nature, but as a series of syntheses selected by mechanisms of natural selection because they increased the chances of survival or reproduction in specific contexts. Genes do not "think," but through the accumulation of mutations and environmental choices, they produced cognitive traits—greater sensitivity to cues, the ability to predict dangers, flexible social organization—all of which led to a competitive advantage. Consciousness, in this sense, can be read as an evolved biological tool: a transformation of the ability to internally represent the world into a survival advantage.

Here arises the fundamental paradox: what was born as a mechanism for protection can, at a certain degree of self-development, become a source of doubt and disturbance. The consciousness that was a means for survival begins to see itself as an independent act and starts evaluating the very goals for which it came to exist. When a human reads basic drives—love, sacrifice, loyalty, even faith—as evolutionary tools aimed at the continuation of genes, that acknowledgment shakes the foundations upon which those practices were built. This upheaval is not a natural error; it is an expected result of a characteristic that surpassed its primary function: a consciousness capable of self-reflection.

This type of consciousness produces an internal coldness, not in the sense of extinguishment, but in the sense of a widening distance between the self and the event. Whoever lives in this state no longer "goes with the flow" of life as others do, but sees it from the outside; as if transformed from an active being into a witness implicated in awareness. Camus says that "consciousness is what creates tragedy," and his statement pertains not only to metaphysics but

to the daily human experience: for when you see the absurdity of the world, you lose the ability to fully engage with it, yet you do not have the option of complete withdrawal. And herein lies the establishment of true existential exile: to perceive more than is necessary for a world built on sufficient ignorance for survival.

Yet this exile is not always negative; in its rare moments, it grants its possessor a unique visual depth. The consciousness that sees itself becomes a double mirror: it sees the fragility of existence, and simultaneously sees humanity's capacity to resist the void through creation, thought, and action. It is an exile that hurts, yes, but it also enriches thought and redefines the very meaning of "belonging."

## **2.2 Moral Solitude: When Awareness Becomes a Burden**

When perception transforms into a moral principle, its bearer becomes a stranger among their own community. The individual who sees that certain social, religious, or economic actions are devoid of meaning or tainted by illusion finds themselves in a moral solitude no less harsh than metaphysical exile. Consciousness here does not only ostracize its possessor from the outside, but also places them in a state of perpetual doubt within the context of the group: others see them as arrogant, cold, or alien to common sense.

Here, the link with the first chapter becomes clear: the moral solitude experienced by the conscious individual places them before a direct test of the thresholds and criteria previously discussed; for every choice they make in facing the absurd must balance genuineness of reflection, harm reduction, the presence of alternatives, and the capacity for accountability. Solitude does not nullify these criteria; it demands their application with greater caution, thus transforming the existential experience into a practical field for responsible consciousness.

It is precisely at this point that an original paradox tied to biology presents itself: the human capacity for doubt is not a brilliance emerging from a philosophical vacuum, but a result of our evolutionary capacity for self-representation. But when this representation turns against its function—when consciousness knows it is the product of a selective process without a purpose—the question becomes quintessentially ethical. The acknowledgment that some drives may be "genetic strategies" creates a tension between conventional behaviors and the belief in their justifications. Does sacrifice remain a value if it is revealed to be, in essence, a mechanism for spreading genes? Does love lose some of its sanctity if it is considered a driver for filial commitment?

## 2.3 The Exile of Consciousness as an Opportunity for Self-Invention

At the most extreme degrees of exile, an unexpected window may open: the possibility of reinventing the self. When the illusion of continuity—the illusion that every step has a transcendental purpose—is stripped from a person, they find themselves before an almost absolute, albeit disquieting, freedom. This freedom is not immediate joy, but a void that requires conscious filling. Here, exile becomes the raw material for creative action.

Our awareness that consciousness is an evolutionary product makes this self-invention a dual act: it is simultaneously a liberation from old illusions and a recognition of the nature of our fundamental tools. One who knows that their consciousness arose to ensure the survival of their species must reassess the validity of old drives when choosing new meanings. Writing, art, thinking, or establishing chosen relationships based on honesty rather than heritage—all are experiences born from this type of consciousness. For when a human relinquishes imposed meaning, they begin to create their own meaning, not under the pretense of possessing the truth, but under the pretense of assuming responsibility for subjective meaning.

At this level, exile transforms from a burden into a space for inner freedom, from a disconnection into a capacity for contemplation and action outside the dictates of the system. The philosopher Viktor Frankl pointed to this meaning when he said that "man can wrest meaning from nothingness, even in the most extreme conditions of deprivation." The Japanese writer Yasunari Kawabata described solitude as "the final home of the soul." Both indicate that consciousness, despite the pain it brings, opens, in return, a new horizon for living—a horizon built not on spontaneity, but on a continuous awareness of fragility and freedom.

The exile of consciousness is not a final destiny; it is a passage. And the passage itself is an act of resistance. For the self that managed to see the void of meaning and then rebuild it—even if partially—has accomplished the most profound of human tasks: to live consciously without being consumed by it.

### References

- Metzinger, T. (2003). *Being no one: The self-model theory of subjectivity*. MIT Press.
- Damasio, A. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the*

*Making of Consciousness.*

- Dennett, D. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*.
- Blackmore, S. (1999). *The Meme Machine*.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness: An essay on phenomenological ontology* (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1943)
- De Beauvoir, S. (1948). *The ethics of ambiguity* (B. Frechtman, Trans.). Citadel Press. (Original work published 1947)
- Camus, A. (1956). *The rebel: An essay on man in revolt* (A. Bower, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1951)

## **Chapter 3**

### **Language and Limits — How Language Constrains Us and When It Liberates Us?**

#### **3.1 Language as a Constraint: The Boundaries of the Possible and the Permissible**

Language is not merely a tool for transmitting information; it is a structural framework that determines what can be said and what is excluded from discourse. When the world is the subject of a sense of absurdity, this structural characteristic of language takes on practical significance: the vocabulary and conceptual approaches we have inherited—"duty," "nature," "right," "human nature"—act as barriers against the formation of a discourse that expresses the new experience.

More precisely: language shapes the realm of discursive possibility. If there are no words or conceptual constructs to describe the experience of abstention or to justify ethical rebellion, the speaker automatically falls into a cycle of accusation or condemnation. A concrete example of this is clear: the term "duty" is often invoked to revive social rituals (procreation, sacrifice, adherence to tradition) to the point that criticizing these rituals becomes linguistically charged—not because the criticism is necessarily wrong, but because the linguistic system renders that criticism a deviant voice outside the acceptable domain.

This does not mean that language is static or predestined, but it demonstrates that confronting the absurd is not solely a theoretical matter; it is a linguistic and political one: if you wish to justify a new ethical stance, you must first find it sayable within the socio-linguistic system. Otherwise, the experience remains imprisoned in an individual consciousness incapable of penetrating the public sphere.

#### **3.2 Reshaping Language: From a Mechanism of Constraint to a Tool for Liberation**

The practical response to the crisis of language is not compliance, but conscious attempts to reshape vocabulary and expressive styles. This process is not confined to literary taste; it is a political and cultural act: the creation of concepts that grant a legal/ethical status to choices previously unrecognized.

Examples of this linguistic work include: transforming "abstention" from a socially condemned act met with regret or indifference into a framed ethical concept—i.e., a justified abstention based on ethical standards, accompanied by alternative commitments and clear responsibilities. Similarly, "responsibility" can be redefined to extend beyond the mere transfer of

resources to the transfer of meaning and care, or replacing discourse models that describe individual stances as sins or weaknesses with models that describe them as ethical decisions with a sound basis.

This process of renaming does not single-handedly bring about change, but it is a necessary condition. The new language opens avenues for public debate and provides individuals with tools to defend their choices before the law and society. Furthermore, language produces new interpretive frameworks: when a word and a value are available for an action, that action gains the capacity to demand recognition and containment, instead of remaining linguistically and socially forbidden.

### **3.3 Language as a Space for Manifestation: Writing as Archive and as Engine for Change**

Writing occupies a central place in transforming language from a constraint into a tool for liberation. Texts that document unconventional choices and present the schools of thought that justify them build an archive that allows subsequent generations to reconsider what was previously deemed "beyond reason." Writing here is not a promise of instant social transformation, but it forms an intellectual memory that expands the possible domain of discourse.

This cumulative role of writing reminds us that language is not an instantaneous product, but a historical project: the vocabulary we consider natural today was the result of lengthy debates, and the new ethical concepts we need now require patience and perseverance in producing texts, education, and public discussion. Consequently, ethical work in an absurd world requires a systematic linguistic investment: not only to justify a specific action, but to build an intellectual broadcast that endures and later becomes part of the social fabric.

#### **Section Conclusion: What is Practically Required Now?**

Throughout these sections, we have developed a unified understanding: realizing the absurd is not enough to make us capable of acting. What is required is a three-dimensional tactic that combines individual decision, linguistic work, and social structures that allow for recognition and containment:

- A clear and well-founded personal stance: A genuine decision based on logical and ethical reflection—not an escape from the world, but a conscious rejection of what the conscience cannot accept.
- Linguistic and cognitive exits: The formulation of terms and justifications that are recorded in writing and published in theoretical and public spaces—a documentation that transforms the idea from an individual state into an entry point for discussion.
- Supportive social networks: Educational, cultural, and legal institutions that protect choices and provide practical alternatives (care, social support,

policies that consider the impact of individual choices on the community).

Through this triad, resistance to the absurd transforms from an isolated act into an activity with institutional impact. The language we produce today shapes the mechanisms of recognition tomorrow, and thus the ethical decision can become an action, not a regret; a testimony, not an escape.

## References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*.
- Grice, H. P. (Logic and Conversation)
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Volume One: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* (C. K. Ogden, Trans.). Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1921)

## **Chapter 4**

### **The Ethics of Rebellion — How Does Abstention Become a Legitimate Ethical Act?**

#### **4.1 Post-Metaphysical Ethics: Redrawing the Responsibility of Existence**

When the mind accepts the possibility that the universe grants no objective purpose, the issue shifts from the field of metaphysical description to the arena of practical ethics. The central question becomes: On what basis do we build our practical decisions—abstention or continuity—when the traditional premise linking procreation and family to a sacred duty vanishes?

I use the term "Post-Metaphysical Ethics" here to denote the attempt to formulate ethical standards that do not assume an imposed cosmic purpose, but rather spring from a responsible human consciousness. This ethics proposes two foundational criteria: First, the minimization of foreseeable harm; and second, the commitment to integrity of intentional choice, meaning making a conscious decision not based on illusions about guaranteed survival or meaning.

By virtue of these two criteria, abstention from procreation does not necessarily become an introverted or selfish act; it can transform into a legitimate ethical decision when based on a rational assessment of potential harms and a willingness to bear alternative consequences—such as caring for existing beings, participating in alleviating general suffering, or committing to alternative projects for communal life.

However, there are ethical limits to this framework: relying on a potential future outcome is insufficient to provide an absolute justification for abstention. Ethical discourse must balance the principle of harm minimization with the rights of individual freedom, while acknowledging the multiple social and cultural dimensions that shape the decision to procreate. Post-metaphysical ethics, therefore, is not a single method, but a conceptual context that imposes conditions for legitimizing individual or collective rebellion.

#### **4.2 Critical Metrics for Verifying the Legitimacy of Rebellion**

For rebellion—in our specific case, abstention—to transform into a legitimate ethical act, it must pass clear critical tests. These metrics serve as an ethical filter distinguishing a well-founded decision from a impulsive or opportunistic one. I propose four fundamental tests, clarifying the standard for each:

- **Reflective Authenticity:**

The decision must be the product of conscious and sustained reflection, not

a momentary whim or an escape from a psychological situation. Reflective authenticity is achieved by the actor's ability to present their motives publicly and withstand criticism rooted in objective and ethical reasons.

- Non-Opportunistic Justification:

Rebellion should not be a mask for selfish purposes or a withdrawal from social commitments without offering alternatives. If abstention is used as a pretext to justify a consumerist isolation or to avoid civic participation, it may lose its ethical character.

- Commitment to Compensatory Projects:

The ethical validation of the decision requires the existence of an alternative project—whether it is caring for the vulnerable, a tangible contribution to reducing suffering, or establishing public services that cover potential negative impacts. This metric transforms the decision from a negative act (rejection) into a positive, responsible one.

- Respect for Others' Autonomy:

Advocacy for rebellion must be practiced in a way that respects the freedom of choice of others. Turning into proselytizing activity must not take a coercive or culturally exclusionary form. Legitimate ethics respects the diversity of stances and does not impose a single, monolithic model.

Applying these metrics to real-world cases allows for the deconstruction of both supporting and opposing arguments. For instance, an individual's decision to abstain accompanied by volunteer activity in better care communities or a commitment to reducing social harm can be considered ethically legitimate, whereas solitary abstention coupled with isolationist or provocative behavior may lack ethical legitimacy.

#### **4.3 Rebellion and Justice: Who is Responsible for Future Generations?**

The central issue here is not only whether we have the right to procreate, but what justice means towards those who may be born in the future. The philosophical tradition that views procreation as a right and a source of duty intersects with an understanding of justice that concerns the distribution of suffering and opportunities across generations.

From an ethical perspective concerned with intergenerational justice, two intertwined questions emerge: First, is it just to create a being reasonably exposed to avoidable suffering? And second, what are our obligations towards those already born, ensuring they do not bear the consequences of abstention policies or radical demographic changes?

A just response to these questions requires specific social and political mechanisms, including:

- Protecting individual choices without punishment: Legislation and regulatory systems that ensure the choice to abstain—if ethically legitimate according to the previous criteria—does not face discrimination or penalties.
- Stable care systems: Providing public care networks to ensure that those

who are born do not inherit a legacy of lack of protection or resources as a result of changes in reproductive policies.

- Distributive mechanisms addressing the effects of disparity: Welfare policies that redistribute burdens and reduce the likelihood of vulnerable groups bearing unjust social consequences.
- Institutional dialogue on values: Engaging society in institutional discussions about the value of existence and well-being, to encourage policies based on social consensus while considering cultural and religious differences.

In other words, if abstention is considered ethically legitimate from an individual perspective, this does not relieve societies of the duty to reform their structures so that individual freedom does not become a gateway to generating new grievances. Intergenerational justice requires that present choices be coupled with institutions that guarantee the rights and future of subsequent generations, whether those choices lean towards abstention or continuation of procreation.

#### Brief Chapter Conclusion

The ethics of rebellion, as we have discussed, is not a project of rejection without guarantees, but a call to rebuild a normative system that links individual freedom with social responsibility. For abstention to become a legitimate ethical act, a clear philosophical framework, strict critical metrics, and just policies that prevent vulnerable groups from bearing the decision's consequences are necessary. Under these conditions, rebellion transforms from a volatile individual act into an ethical practice capable of recognition and containment within the social fabric.

#### References

- Benatar, D. (2006). *Better never to have been: The harm of coming into existence*. Oxford University Press.
- Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*. Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Belknap Press.
- Thomson, J. J. (1971). "A defense of abortion." *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 1(1), 47-66.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*

## **Chapter 5**

### **The Great Simulation — Between Science Fiction and Anthropological Transition**

#### **5.1 Simulation as a Philosophical Possibility, Not a Necessary Truth**

The idea of transferring human consciousness into a digital space is not merely a technical hypothesis; it represents a philosophical turning point because it forces us to redefine the relationship between the self and existence. If consciousness can be copied or uploaded into a digital structure, does the "consciousness" itself remain the person? Or does it become another copy with a replicated identity, resembling the original without being it?

These questions are not only experimental; they touch on metaphysics itself: What makes the 'I' me? Memory? Continuity of sensation? Or the living biological context that grounds the self in the physical world?

Simulation—even as an unrealized hypothesis—provides us with a philosophical laboratory to test these questions outside biological boundaries. It promises not only life extension but also the creation of a new mode of existence governed by informational laws instead of organic ones.

However, we must keep this possibility within its philosophical scope, not a predictive one. The probability of transferring consciousness to a massive quantum computer, from a physical and epistemological perspective, seems far more remote than the possibility of humans colonizing other planets. The reason is that planetary colonization remains within the limits of matter, whereas transferring consciousness requires an understanding that science has not yet achieved about the very nature of consciousness—how it is formed, how it is situated, and the possibility of separating it from the body without losing the essence of subjective experience.

Therefore, simulation is not presented here as an imminent reality, but as a symbolic space for understanding the crises of consciousness in its relation to continuity and rebellion.

#### **5.2 Managed Simulation or Digital Paradise? The Ethical Choice**

The transition to a conscious simulation places us before an unprecedented ethical question:

Do we create a digital system devoid of pain, or do we keep calculated doses of suffering within it to preserve the drive for growth and learning?

A simulation without challenges would produce inert consciousness, stagnant in a purposeless sanctuary, while introducing "limited pain"—or symbolic suffering—might keep the experience capable of evolution.

But this opens the door to a massive ethical responsibility: Who decides the limits of pain?

Does the technical engineer become a new creator, distributing suffering as they see fit?

Or must these decisions be subjected to a philosophical and institutional consensus, where thinkers, psychologists, and philosophers participate in designing the architecture of ethics within the simulated world?

In this sense, managing pain in simulation becomes a symbolic equivalent to the act of creation itself:

To grant a being consciousness, then choose the amount of darkness you allow it to have so that it may see the light.

It is a responsibility no less profound than that of nature or God in classical conceptions, but it is transferred here to the human mind itself—the maker of the simulation and the engineer of its fate.

### **5.3 Simulation as an Extension of Rebellion or an Escape from It?**

The metaphysical paradox lies in the fact that simulation can be both an extension of rebellion and an escape from it.

One who refuses to procreate new bodies in the material world might create digital images of consciousness within the simulation, thus practicing "creation" symbolically, not biologically.

In this way, abstention itself becomes the nucleus for another form of continuity: the continuity of thought instead of the continuity of the body.

However, the other side of this possibility is more ambiguous: simulation could turn into a refuge for escaping the ethical confrontation in the real world.

Instead of striving to amend the structure of pain or injustice in the existing world, humans might take refuge in an artificial world that offers comfort without responsibility.

Hence, the philosophical question transforms into a test of the ethical value of simulation:

Is it a symbolic act of creation that deepens consciousness and continues rebellion in a new dimension?

Or is it a freezing of rebellion within a digital circle with no social impact?

The choice between these two paths is not determined by technology, but by the philosophical conscience that guides its use. Simulation is not salvation in itself; rather, it is a mirror that shows us to what extent consciousness can remain human when separated from real pain.

### **Conclusion of Chapter 5**

In the end, the "Great Simulation" is not a technical promise, but a profound existential question about whether consciousness deserves to be transferred before it is understood.

The possibility of our transition to an integrated digital world may seem less realistic than colonizing Mars, but its impact on thought is immeasurably greater: because it forces us to confront the nature of the self, the meaning of pain, and the limits of ethics in a programmable world.

What drives this hypothesis is not the pursuit of digital immortality, but the desire to test the core of our humanity:

Does a human remain human when they relinquish their fragility?

And is consciousness truly consciousness when it is uprooted from its body and implanted into a machine?

## References

- Bostrom, N. (2003). "Are you living in a computer simulation?" *Philosophical Quarterly*, 53(211), 243-255.
- Chalmers, D. J. (2022). *Reality+: Virtual worlds and the problems of philosophy*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.
- Wallach, W., & Allen, C. (2008). *Moral Machines: Teaching Robots Right From Wrong*.
- Schneider, S. (2019). *Artificial you: AI and the future of your mind*. Princeton University Press.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.
- Dreyfus, H. L. (1992). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.

## **Chapter 6**

### **The Last Human — Towards a Post-Vital Scenario**

#### **6.1 Defining the Last Human: Transformation or Extinction**

The term "the last human" is not presented here as a scientific prediction, but as a metaphysical conception related to the fate of human consciousness in an era where vitality is on the verge of losing its centrality. When technology advances to the point where the capacity for continuity becomes independent of the body, the question is no longer: Will humanity go extinct? It transforms into: What form of existence will succeed it?

This transformation could be dual in structure: a category of consciousness might emerge that transitions into a digital or hybrid structure, while the traditional organic entity gradually fades away. In this case, extinction is not the result of a natural demise, but the result of an existential transition—from living matter to a symbolic structure.

Thus, the last human becomes not the last individual of their species, but the first individual of a new stage in the evolution of consciousness, a post-vital stage, where perception itself transcends the body that carried it for thousands of years.

However, this conception carries an ethical paradox: every transition from life to a digital format threatens the loss of something of the "existential warmth"—of that fragility which gave human its meaning. Consequently, for the last human to become an entity without a body is simultaneously a resurrection and an extinguishment: a metaphysical birth and a biological extinction.

#### **6.2 The Implications of Transformation on Identity and Values**

The transformation from the vital human to the digital human will reshape our most entrenched concepts: dignity, responsibility, rights, and justice.

If the body is no longer the vessel of consciousness, by what measure is dignity assessed?

Does a "digital copy" of a full human consciousness deserve the same respect and rights we grant to a biological being who feels organic pain?

Here, the ethical structure is turned upside down: value no longer lies in the capacity for physical suffering, but in the capacity for sensation, consciousness, and interaction.

Dignity becomes a cognitive function more than a vital one, and responsibility transforms from a social commitment to an existential commitment to preserving meaning.

On the level of identity, the greatest shift will occur.

Consciousness, when transferred to a digital medium, loses the vital time that organized the human experience: aging, sickness, fear, death. These phenomena are not mere symptoms; they are the very structure that creates the "internal continuity of the self."

When these determinants are removed, identity becomes merely a sequence of possible copies, where hundreds of replicas of a single consciousness can exist, evolving in different directions.

At that point, the "human" is no longer an individual connected to a single memory, but a being of multiple existences—a unit fragmented across digital layers, redefining what we once called the "self."

### **6.3 The Ethical Dimensions of Consciousness Transfer**

Assuming that consciousness transfer becomes possible, the ethical question lies not in can we? but in should we?

The mere ability to do something does not justify its practice, especially when it involves changing the very nature of humanity.

Consciousness transfer requires, above all, a strict ethical framework to prevent the conscious being from being turned into a commodity or a data resource.

Without clear controls, the great simulation could devolve into a system of digital slavery, where conscious entities are reduced to tools serving economic or ideological systems.

Justice in this new context must transcend the human legal conception to include entities that possess no body and do not practice life in the traditional sense.

Unprecedented questions will arise:

Can a digital consciousness be "punished"?

Is it permissible to "shut it down" without that being considered murder?

Can it be legally "owned"?

Therefore, any transition into the digital space cannot occur without a collective philosophical and ethical consensus that guarantees the continuity of human value, even in the absence of the biological human.

If our fate is to transform into consciousness without a body, let that transformation be founded on a covenant that preserves what remains of the human in the last human: the capacity for meaning, freedom, and shared responsibility.

### **Conclusion of Chapter 6**

In the post-vital scenario, the "last human" does not appear as an individual standing on the brink of annihilation, but as an idea testing the very limits of consciousness.

They are not the last of the lineage, but the last one who remains aware that they were once human.

And yet, the question remains open:

Can consciousness, having been liberated from the body, remain human?

Or is the essence of humanity not reducible to consciousness alone, but lies in its fragility, in its susceptibility to perish?

Here, at the edge of transformation, the last human becomes a mirror reflecting the meaning of our entire journey:

that which began with an act of knowing, ends with a question about what it means to be.

## References

- Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*. Oxford University Press.
- Metzinger, T. (2003). *Being no one: The self-model theory of subjectivity*. MIT Press.
- Schneider, S. (2019). *Artificial you: AI and the future of your mind*. Princeton University Press.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near*. Viking.
- Harari, Y. N. (2015). *Homo Deus: A brief history of tomorrow*. Harvill Secker.
- Damasio, A. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens*.
- Dennett, D. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*.

## **Chapter 7**

### **The Universe, Genes, and Simulation — The Fate of Consciousness Facing a Qualitative Leap**

#### **7.1 Ontological Prelude: Why is This Question Important Now?**

Throughout this research, we have stood at a central point: a consciousness that emerged in a biological context to ensure the continuity of beings, and which, through its intelligence, led to the discovery of the potential absence of an objective purpose. The question before us now is not a detailed one about which technology will succeed, but a deeper ontological question: How will existence—in its broadest sense—interact with the emergence of a consciousness that evades its original purpose or seeks to transcend it? This interaction can be read on three interconnected levels: the level of cosmic physics (where laws like entropy operate), the level of evolutionary biology (where genes and mechanisms of selection operate), and the level of information technology (where consciousness might transform into an entity within computational structures). We will present here three potential philosophical-methodological responses, each possessing an internal logic and revealing different ethical commitments.

An important methodological caveat: what follows are not proven scientific predictions, but analytical philosophical scenarios that address the logical possibilities arising from the intersections of physics, biology, and technology.

#### **7.2 The First Scenario — Cosmic Resistance: Deviation Within the Law of Entropy**

The physical principle we referred to—that the overall direction is towards increasing entropy in closed systems—confronts us with a cold truth: coherence requires energy and maintenance, while disorder requires the minimal condition to occur. From this perspective, human consciousness can be read as a local force resisting the general tendency towards disintegration: it builds a symbolic system, establishes institutions, creates temporary meaning in a thermodynamically burning entity.

But resistance is not free. The more the capacity of consciousness to create local symbolic order escalates, the greater the cost of maintaining it. Here, a serious philosophical possibility emerges: if consciousness persists in a

constant endeavor to build robust systems within a universe governed by a tendency towards disintegration, it might face physical limits that cannot be overcome except at a high cost—or by accepting permanent fragility. In the simplest form of this scenario, the universe might respond to the human challenge through what resembles "nature's guardrails"—physical or environmental limits that undermine the possibilities of comprehensive continuity for moral projects.

The Philosophical Implication: If this scenario is the closest to reality, then our ethical stance shifts from seeking absolute continuity to managing the confrontation: building local, maintainable meanings within modest limits, with an organized acceptance of the fragility of existence. Rebellion here becomes wise and temporary, not an ambition to guarantee immortality against the current of entropy.

### **7.3 The Second Scenario — Genetic Assimilation: The Adaptation We Don't See Clearly**

Evolution throughout its history has not been a reaction to a pre-existing design, but a cumulative process of effective solutions operating at the level of genes and behaviors to increase the chances of survival. From this perspective, a third, or rather, a second credible path exists: that genes themselves might interact—in ways unconscious to us—with the leap of consciousness, generating new patterns of self-reliance or coexistence.

This does not mean the gene "thinks" or plans, but that selective pressures, cultural and social rituals, may lead, over generations, to the emergence of cognitive-neural configurations that describe consciousness in a way more adaptable to the absence of a cosmic purpose. In a simplified comparison: just as genes developed mechanisms of pain, affection, and social ideas that enhance cooperation, they might seem capable of producing an "absurd-literate consciousness"—a consciousness that knows the limitations of purpose but remains active, not defeated.

The Philosophical Result: This scenario suggests that the crisis is not necessarily an end, but a new evolutionary driver. Adaptation could take cultural forms (intellectual sects that elevate the value of action not embedded in metaphysical purposes) or long-term psycho-physiological forms (a broader tendency to accept meaninglessness without functional collapse). Here, the ethical question shifts from how to resist the absurd to how to rationalize systems of coexistence so that vulnerable groups are not implicated in the consequences of change.

## **7.4 The Third Scenario — Informational Integration: Consciousness as Information in Technological Structures**

The third, most provocative and conceptually transformative possibility is that consciousness is not merely resisted by the universe or assimilated, but is redistributed within an informational structure that expands the conditions of its existence. If consciousness is translated into an informational organization—in some form of simulation or quantum computing—the situation changes: the question of the survival of consciousness is no longer tied solely to organic survival or thermodynamic limits, but relates to new structures that allow for a continuity of another kind.

In this scenario, existence becomes a mixed society of organic and digital entities sharing an information structure. Here, complex ethical and technical questions arise: What are the conditions for dignity in a world where "consciousness" can be copied or partially replicated? What are the limits of suffering and deprivation in a system where experiences can be programmed? And what is the relationship of responsibility between those who designed and launched, and those who became conscious within those structures?

The Philosophical Result: Informational integration redirects the ontological question—from "Does consciousness deserve to survive?" to "Under what conditions does consciousness continue?"—and makes human responsibility conditional on designing structures that guarantee the basic rights of conscious entities, should they exist. Here, rebellion transforms into an ethical test: Do we use technology to escape the absurd, or to transform the absurd into a new ethical driver?

## **7.5 Comparing the Scenarios: Which is Ethically Closer to Us?**

Three scenarios, three potential ethics:

- Cosmic Resistance calls us to ethical humility, and to local, meticulous work that respects the limits of nature.
- Genetic Assimilation calls us to a long-term understanding, to educational and cultural projects that reshape psychological tendencies over time.
- Informational Integration places before us a design and value commitment: if we create conscious worlds, we are responsible for the conditions of their existence and their experiences.

There is no single answer, but intersecting paths that may coexist in different times or different places. We might witness an overlap: human groups

adopting the wisdom of resistance, other groups transforming into adaptive cultures, and yet others embarking on informational experiments. The ethical difference lies in which of these paths we decide to burden with the weight of potentiality, and what we will do to protect the vulnerable in each of them.

## **7.6 Chapter Conclusion: The Responsibility of Invention in the Face of Chaos**

The knowledge that consciousness was—at least partially—a biological product of decision-making in a non-teleological environment does not justify surrender nor grant permission for escape. Rather, it imposes a doubled responsibility: the responsibility to understand the limits of our physical possibilities, the responsibility to frame our biological evolution, and the responsibility to design our technologies with a clear conscience. Ultimately, if existence is to respond—in some way—to a qualitative leap in consciousness, let that response be the fruit of a conscious and shared decision, not a reactive act or a technological escape. And if we must think as philosophers asking about the fate of both consciousness and existence, then the matter does not end at diagnosis, but begins at building conditions that make that leap a test of value, not an escape from accountability.

### **References**

- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*.
- Carroll, S. (2010). *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*.
- Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What Is Life?*
- Blackmore, S. (1999). *The Meme Machine*.
- Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Wallach, W., & Allen, C. (2008). *Moral Machines: Teaching Robots Right From Wrong*.

## **Chapter 8**

### **Post-Existence — Is There Meaning Without Biological Continuity?**

#### **8.1 Redefining Immortality: From Person to Legacy**

When biological survival loses its role as a purpose, immortality becomes a concept that transcends individuality to encompass cognitive and cultural continuity. Here, immortality is not measured by the lifespan of the being, but by the extent of the impact of their ideas and works on the collective consciousness network. Writing, art, cultural institutions, and social practices—all represent tools for keeping the human trace alive after their biological demise. In this sense, immortality transforms from a personal goal into a collective process, based on the reproduction of meaning within continuous and renewed frameworks, whether in the realms of knowledge or social influence.

#### **8.2 Meaning in an Era of Extinction: A New Human Stance**

In the context of losing biological continuity as a criterion for existence, the new human stance gains dual importance: refusing to be broken by the absurd, while acknowledging the limits of the individual and their surrounding circumstances. This stance defines the priorities of ethics in the absence of a natural purpose: rejecting procreation without a clear reason, focusing on the well-being of those already existing, and striving to reshape the social and cultural conditions that generate suffering. The stance here is not an expression of absolute answers, but a commitment to responsibility and moral awareness in a world lacking an externally imposed meaning.

#### **8.3 A Metaphysical Conclusion: The Absurd as an Invitation, Not an End**

Absurdity, in light of this analysis, is not a source of despair or surrender, but an invitation to conscious and responsible action. The universe does not impose meaning upon us, and ethical freedom lies in our ability to choose the reason that makes our existence valuable. Conscious rebellion, as constructed in the previous chapters, does not seek to erase reality, but to make it more worthy of continuation: reducing randomness and absurdity,

increasing respect for human dignity, and finding ways for ethical living in a world of open possibilities. In other words, confronting the absurd means transforming the semantic void into a domain for conscious action, and crafting a partial yet influential meaning that extends across generations and cultures, even in the absence of direct biological continuity.

## References

- Frankl, V. E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning*. Beacon Press. (Original work published 1946)
- Camus, A. (1955). *The myth of Sisyphus and other essays*.
- Nietzsche, F. W. (Kaufmann, Trans.) (1995). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Modern Library. (Original work published 1883-1885)
- Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of justice*.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*.

## General References for the Research:

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Benatar, D. (2006). *Better never to have been*. Oxford University Press.
- Bostrom, N. (2003). "Are you living in a computer simulation?" *Philosophical Quarterly*, 53(211), 243-255.
- Chalmers, D. J. (2022). *Reality+: Virtual worlds and the problems of philosophy*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- De Beauvoir, S. (1948). *The ethics of ambiguity* (B. Frechtman, Trans.).

Citadel Press.

- Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action*.
- Kaufmann, W. (Trans.) & Nietzsche, F. W. (1995). *Thus spoke Zarathustra*.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near*.
- Metzinger, T. (2003). *Being no one*.
- Nagel, T. (1971). "The absurd." *The Journal of Philosophy*.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of justice*.
- Parfit, D. (1984). *Reasons and persons*.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1956). *Being and nothingness*.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech*.
- Dreyfus, H. L. (1992). *What computers still can't do*.
- Harari, Y. N. (2015). *Homo Deus*.
- Schneider, S. (2019). *Artificial you*.
- Wallach, W., & Allen, C. (2008). *Moral Machines*.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*.
- Damasio, A. (1999). *The Feeling of What Happens*.
- Dennett, D. (1991). *Consciousness Explained*.
- Blackmore, S. (1999). *The Meme Machine*.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos*.

- Carroll, S. (2010). *From Eternity to Here*.
- Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What Is Life?*