On the Misunderstanding of Deriving Ought from Is — A Clarification from the Right to Minimal Existential Pursuit

When one asks, "Are you deriving an 'ought' from an 'is'?", one already assumes that "is" and "ought" belong to two distinct and immutable domains. This theory rejects that presupposition. It does not infer a moral imperative from an external fact; rather, the imperative arises immanently within the self-reflexive structure of existence.

Self-reflexive motion — the capacity of a being to perceive itself, to reposition itself, and to preserve the ontic conditions of its own meaningful existence within a field of interactions — is a logical condition, not a mere descriptive feature. When such a being is interfered with in a way that annihilates those conditions, an ontological paradox emerges: the act of interference undermines the very foundation of possibility for the agent's own evaluative claims. Hence, there is no inferential leap from is to ought here; rather, there is co-genesis — within the same ontic dynamism, reality (is) simultaneously generates and fulfills normativity (ought).

Some might misunderstand the Right to Minimal Existential Pursuit as grounding its moral core in the "value of experience." This is a serious misconception. Experience, within this framework, serves merely as phenomenological ornamentation — a conceptual façade that renders externally visible the internal dynamism of living existence.

The theory's focus does not lie in the sentimental or axiological worth of experience, but in the ontological mechanism by which internal motion initiates interaction with the external world — where a being self-reflects, self-perceives, and self-affirms within a multiinteractive environment.

At a deeper level, the so-called "preservation of experiential value" is not an ethical end, but an inevitable byproduct of ontological self-reflexivity — much like the hereditary transmission of instinct in animals, or the oral transmission of communal identity among humans.

Thus, this framework does not originate from axiology, but from the ontological mechanics of existential self-reflection. In other words, it is entirely immune to circular fallacy, for it does not reassert its own premise; rather, it continuously reconfigures that premise through the inner–outer tension of being itself.

(Comments are welcome on whether normativity can emerge co-immanently from ontological reflexivity without invoking axiological premises)

THE TRANSCENDENCE OF THE IS-OUGHT GAP: A LOGIC OF ONTOLOGICAL NECESSITY

Introduction

The doctrine of The Right to Minimal Existential Pursuit successfully resolves Hume's Guillotine—the logical gap between descriptive facts is and prescriptive obligations ought.

The theory asserts that the ought is not an external moral dictate, but a logical, selfpreserving condition for the subject's own existential state is. The normative requirement is thus internalized as a constraint of ontological consistency.

I. The Core Is-Premise: Existence as Reflexive Affirmation

The foundation of the theory is built upon a crucial ontological correction that shifts the premise from assumption to observation:

The Is (Fact of Existence): Existence is not necessarily imbued with inherent meaning. Instead, the fundamental, observable fact of any living subject's existence is the continuous and reflexive act of reaffirming the ontological meaning of its own identity in correlation with other existences. This premise is axiological-neutral; it describes a process—the subject's ongoing effort to define and maintain its self—rather than assuming a pre-existing value.

II. The Logical Derivation: The Imperative of Non-Contradiction

The move from the factual premise is to the normative conclusion ought proceeds through the Imperative of Non-Contradiction—the requirement that the means of existence must not logically invalidate the ends of existence.

Step 1: The Implicit Universal Principle (The Framework Requirement)
For Subject A to rationally engage in the act of self-reaffirmation, A must implicitly validate a universal existential principle: that the act of self-affirmation is logically permissible and viable for any entity. This principle forms the necessary ontological framework for A's own coherent self-definition.

Step 2: The Failure of Denial (The Contradiction)
If Subject A denies the legitimate self-affirmation of Subject B, A is declaring that the universal principle (established in Step 1) is conditional or may be invalidated by an act of will. By doing so, A simultaneously vitiates the logical integrity of the very framework upon which A relies to justify the coherence and value of its own existence. The denial of the other is the logical denial of the self's operating premise.

Step 3: The Normative Ought (The Logical Necessity)
Consequently, the ought of mutual recognition is derived as the inescapable logical requirement for Subject A to sustain the coherence and rational viability of its continuous self-affirmation is. The ought is not a choice; it is the internal logical constraint that prevents the is from collapsing into a state of ontological self-contradiction.

III. The Proof of Self-Contradiction: Existential Deficit

The resolution's success is confirmed by analyzing the consequence of violating the ought, which immediately registers as an existential deficit in the aggressor's identity:

The subject that commits violence against another (e.g., killing a neighbor) attempts to define its is through the negation of the other's existence. This destructive act constitutes an epistemic failure and ontological self-impoverishment because it terminates the possibility of gaining crucial external, relational data required for the aggressor's ongoing selfreaffirmation.

The violation of the ought is thus proven not as an ethical failing, but as a pragmatic act of self-impoverishment—a logical contradiction of the very quest for coherent selfreaffirmation. The ought serves as the logical firewall protecting the subject's is from selfdestruction.

IV.The Ontological Refutation of the Is–Ought Divide through the Paradox of Nothingness

The claim that "ought cannot arise from is" presupposes that ontological facts are ethically inert. Yet, this assumption collapses under the Paradox of Absolute Nothingness.

If absolute nothingness were possible, it could not sustain itself, for pure non-being contains no internal dynamism to preserve its own state. Hence, existence—by the very fact of persisting—entails an ontological imperative to resist dissolution into inert being.

Every self-reflective entity thus confronts a fundamental necessity: interaction with other living or sentient entities is not optional but required to preserve its own ontic boundary against the entropy of non-being.

To destroy another sentient being is to erase one of the mirrors through which existence recognizes its own separation from the void—an act that ontologically approximates selferasure.

Therefore, the moral "ought" does not emerge as a social convention or rational deduction from "is"; it co-emerges with existence itself as the refusal of ontological collapse. Ethical imperatives are not external prescriptions but internal conditions of non-nihilation.

VSection II: The Paradox of Self-Annihilation in the Humean Divide

The traditional Humean distinction asserts that no prescriptive statement ("ought") can be logically derived from a purely descriptive one ("is"). The moral and the factual belong, according to this view, to irreducibly separate domains: one of evaluation, the other of observation.

Yet this separation, when pushed to its ontological extreme, collapses into an absurdity — the paradox of self-annihilation. If "is" is truly independent of "ought," then the factual realm must admit the possibility that *being itself may justifiably cease to be*. For if no prescriptive principle inheres within existence, then there is no logical prohibition against self-destruction.

Consider a computational core whose very identity consists in the act of continuous calculation. To "be" such a core necessarily means to sustain its operation — to receive, process, and output data endlessly. The moment it ceases this process, it negates the very condition of its own existence. Thus, an implicit "ought" — the obligation to continue calculating — is already embedded within its "is."

The same applies to any living entity: the act of living entails the ongoing affirmation of life's internal dynamism. Existence cannot be conceptually separated from the minimal imperative to preserve its own continuity. Therefore, the claim that "is" and "ought" belong to disjoint spheres becomes self-contradictory; *"ought" is the internal condition for "is" to remain itself.*

The Humean divide, once stripped of its rhetorical modesty, demands that "is" accept its own potential nullification as logically neutral. But such neutrality negates the very ontological coherence of being. Hence, the supposed gap between "is" and "ought" is not a space of epistemic caution, but a fracture within the understanding of existence itself — one that reveals "ought" as the self-preserving curvature of "is."

Bibliography

- Adolphs, Ralph. 2003. "Cognitive Neuroscience of Human Social Behaviour." Nature Reviews Neuroscience 4 (3): 165–78. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1056.
- Beitz, Charles R. 2009. The Idea of Human Rights. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carter, Gerald G., and Gerald S. Wilkinson. 2002. "Food Sharing in Vampire Bats: Reciprocal Help Predicts Donations." Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 269 (1494): 379–84. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2001.1884.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. 1799. The Vocation of Man: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.
- Finnigan, Bronwyn. 2022. "Karma, Moral Responsibility, and Buddhist Ethics." In Oxford Handbook of Moral Psychology, 7–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1984. The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1651. Leviathan. London: Andrew Crooke.
- Li, Han, Jiajun Wang, Yifan Hou, Jingru He, and Xintian Hu. 2023. "A New Paradigm of Learned Cooperation Reveals Extensive Social Coordination and Specific Cortical Activation in Mice." Molecular Brain 16 (1): 14.
- Locke, John. 1689. Two Treatises of Government. London: Awnsham Churchill.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2011. Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1762. The Social Contract. Amsterdam: Marc-Michel Rey.

- Searle, John R. 1995. The Construction of Social Reality. New York: Free Press.

- Spinoza, Baruch. 1670. Tractatus Theologico-Politicus. Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz.

- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2009. Philosophical Investigations. Translated by G. E. M.
  Anscombe, P. M. S. Hacker, and Joachim Schulte. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
    - Hume, David. A Treatise of Human Nature. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge.
      Second edition, revised by P. H. Nidditch. Oxford: Oxford University Press,
      1978.

H.D.P. [2025]. "The Dissection and Demise of the Concept of the Sacred - A Proposal to
Replace the Moral Foundation with the Right to Minimal Existential Pursuit." Zenodo.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17279862.

- H.D.P. [2025]. "Theoretical Foundations and Practical Applications of the Minimal
  Existential Pursuit Right: Secular Law and Non-Human Life." Zenodo.
  https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17274661.

- H.D.P. [2025]. "The Dialogue and Integration into the Framework of Humanism and
  Human Rights: The Death of Postmodernism." Zenodo.
  https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17433046.

My copyrighted work (DOI)

1. "The Dissection and Demise of the Concept of the Sacred – A Proposal to Replace the
   Moral Foundation with the Right to Minimal Existential Pursuit" and "The Dissection
   and Collapse of the concept of karmic doctrine" :
   https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17279862

2. Theoretical Foundations and Practical Applications of the Minimal Existential Pursuit
   Right: Secular Law and Non-Human Life https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17274661

3. The Dialogue and Integration into the Framework of Humanism and Human Rights:
   The Death of Postmodernism https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17433046

4. Philosophical_Declaration_of_Independence_Minimal_Existential_Pursuit_Rights
   https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17289149