

# **THE HUMAN AND THE NOTHINGNESS: THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTION DERIVED FROM ASSUMING NOTHINGNESS**

**Héctor Sevilla Godínez**  
University of Guadalajara

## **Abstract**

The reader will find a proposal of anthropological conception derived from philosophically assuming nothingness. The intention of this article is to express nineteen concrete consequences derived from being a committed nihilist in the contemporary world. Among other things, the anthropological conception proposed along these lines is congruent with the fact that man is because of his own nothingness and can only believe that he knows, that he is hurled into the world, that his will is imaginary, and that he is un-created, finite, contingent, timely, and light, without certainties and without sense. The article likewise explains the human need of creating gods and what man lives after knowing himself to be mobile in a world that is inserted simultaneously into chaos and the cosmos.

## **Introduction**

The conception of Nothingness supposes, in an inalienable manner, an implied form of understanding that which is human. The anthropological conceptions derived from a metaphysics centered on the Being are to find in a metaphysics centered on Nothingness an obvious repercussion and inalienable change of anthropological paradigm. To make a noun out of Nothingness, at least in a cognitive manner, supposes also an alteration of the conventional models on which are founded the anthropological definitions from which we have generated the systems that direct human institutions today.

All of this can be understood from the perspective sustained throughout each and every one of the following pages: that Nothingness is; and that due to the fact that it *is*, it is then to be taken into

account; not only for intellectual appreciation but for the praxis of he whom has dared to delve into Nothingness, under the risk of ceasing to be as he is.

Hence, it is clear that the issue of Nothingness is implied in the life of the person who understands it, and this directly affects his or her anthropological perception. Therefore, to conceive man based on Nothingness will ineludibly propitiate the reconsideration of the conception that he has about what is better for the human itself; in other words, the ideas about what human Development or improvement mean.

What is set forth in the following pages generates a direct, upfront, clear, and argued critique toward perceptions unmistakably centered on the Being, toward the comprehension of life based on tangible and measurable parameters, toward the quantification of the senses of life, and toward the search of complete certainty. We are to doubt such centralisms in order to comprehend Nothingness; alter the rigid structures from which we have built ourselves up. It is about not denying our uncertainty; about the impossibility of Truth; about the limits of love.

The modification of our conception of the Being, noting its dependence to Nothingness, also implies the change, in a proportional manner, of the anthropological vision from which all remaining construct is erected. Following, I will demonstrate such implications of Nothingness for humans.

### **A Man that Is, Due to His Own Nothingness**

Since Nothingness is, the remaining things that are not Nothingness are what they are. Not only the obvious things but, also, including man. Such man as a being that contains the Being, also evolves Nothingness, in the sense that this Being implies its corresponding Nothingness. Death is not equivalent to Nothingness, at least in what refers to life; death is always an adjoining part that is not possible to elude. Analogically to the death that exists due to life, the Being also exists due to Nothingness. Man's Being is supported on the Nothingness that sustains it.

Only to the extent that man comprehends his own Nothingness, can he establish a more real connection with himself. This "oneself"

that he connects to himself is not really "himself"; for if it is a part of himself that he wants to connect to himself, then that part, upon taking up the option of connecting it to himself is already, due to it, connected. When an individual affirms that he "must contact himself" he is referring to a part in him that is not his own self and which, however, constitutes him. That is why if such "other part" did not exist, an affirmation like that one would have no sense for it supposes an implicit duality that is unsustainable. When I say that I know myself, am I he who knows or am I the known one? Naturally both, and at the same time, neither.

The Nothingness present in each man and woman is the most emphatically demonstrated fact due to the existence of such man and woman. Nothingness precedes existence; if later the existence *is*, it will always be after Nothingness, without this fading, for now it forms a limit with that which has been forged. The being has a limit due to its Being; beyond its limit is its own Nothingness. Above it is also the Nothingness which is latent, possible, its not-being. Outside of it is also its Nothingness, and prior to it is also Nothingness. The Being *in* Nothingness—not the being and nothing—is the manner in which we are conformed.

To try to incorporate an absolute notion of the Being that sustains our anthropological entity is nothing more than the own need of some psyches. We have believed it for entire generations. Certainly, there is something absolute behind and above us though it is not the Absolute Being but, precisely, Nothingness.

### **A Man that Believes He Knows**

A second anthropological implication of a perspective centered on Nothingness is constituted by the fact that true knowledge, or the real and objective contact with what surrounds us, is made impossible for us. The context will never be interiorized such as it is, for we are to distort it in our personal explanations, always rooted in linguistic parameters and structures of suppositions with which we form the paradigms of our daily hermeneutic.

The absolute valuing of scientific issues is a paradigm that we can also play down, since it is usually conformed from consensual legitimizations that a group of individuals have established as true

parameters. The ineludible symbolic construction of which we are part of makes the supposition that Truth is something within reach, considerably unworthy of trust. The man believing to know is only capable of interpreting; and this, he does exclusively, based on his suppositions. He acquires them to the extent that he turns the dominant cultural ways of thinking of his time and context, into his own ones.

In this perspective, Nothingness has implied that our own perceptions can be modified, since—including all bodies of reason, abstractions, or monads in the style of Leibniz—everything can be modified and enter into Nothingness' shell upon being able to cease to be. In this ever-changing panorama of perceptions, a single posture before reality cannot be constant for it is still—reality—changing. Just as perceptions change, the positions of the perceivers can also change; this is to say that those who contemplate also change their position before the world, changing with it their own posture over that which exists. Upon changing these perceptions, the communications about that which is done by he who perceives, are also feasible of change; thus transmitting to others information that is distinct, according to his own modified perception. In the end, we have that the sum of perceptions always totals a distortion. Even when science is a supposedly unifying context, it will always be made subjective by the same parameters which suppose that something is or isn't scientific, clearly according to the scientists' opinion.

No knowledge is anything more than a supposed belief, due to greater or lesser consensus. Or, this knowledge can be verified and supposedly proven by experience; only that, as we will see, even the same experience or the repetition of events about something specific does not imply the truth about it, but only the repetition of facts that reinforce our opinion in that regard.

### **A Man Cast Into the World that Is Cast Into Nothingness**

The Stoics assumed that Nothingness is found around the world and that the world is sustained in that Nothingness. The world is then, in some way, simply cast over Nothingness, wrapping itself in it. Man, likewise, is cast into the world that had previously been cast into Nothingness. Man is found, then, immersed in a world that is also finite, that has been forged from causative chance, and that has no

other manner of being than surrounded by the same space that does not belong to it. We know, naturally, that above the earth, around it, are found the troposphere, stratosphere, ionosphere, and exosphere. But beyond that which we know, or maybe even in that above which space itself is found, or beyond space itself, Nothingness is found. The Stoics have probably not mistaken their suppositions.

All human being (man or woman) cast into the world, in reality has not had someone to cast him or her, nor even "Someone" in the manner in which scholasticism wanted to convince us. Neither is man protected by a force, nor defined by any destiny; his is found in the middle of something that is in the middle of Nothingness. We cannot be greater than the Universe that surrounds us; never will the louse be larger than the head on which it lives. Hence, the recognition of the smallness of one's own corporality, of the fragility that this supposes, and of the impossibility of overcoming such a limitation, in spite of the vainglorious and arrogant efforts of individuals with inflated egos, is a first step for the comprehension of Nothingness. And it is because in no manner—in spite of any attempt to safeguard the supposed human grandeur—can we be greater than the Universe; and this can neither be greater (due to it being) than the Nothingness which has been and will be before, during, and after the Universe. This is why in no way will this same Universe be exempt from Nothingness.

It is not attempted here to invite pessimism or self destruction due to the smallness that configures us; understanding that is to not understand well. What we are speaking of here is the necessary humility that living in such conditions must carry with it. Such an attitude can allow us to comprehend the other person who shares the same condition. Under these circumstances, there is no social class or appearance that defines or distinguishes. Small we are as humans; and every human being shares the due smallness, in spite of the attempts to hide it behind lineage.

### **Man as a Being of an Imaginary Will**

Due to the impossibility of cognition and the smallness into which we have been poured, we find ourselves in a maelstrom of possibilities, due also to Nothingness which conditions everything. Our perceptions of reality are conditioned to the movements of such supposed

reality, or to the always variable interconnections, of the things before our eyes. We become accustomed to these mistaken eyes and later on, through them it is that we form our judgments from which we emit our decisions. It is true that we think, that we make decisions, and we may probably see our life partners in the world make their decisions, but we lie to ourselves in reality. We believe we decide; we believe we emit judgments that are pure, natural, objective, phenomenological, when in reality we only show our diminutive vision of the world. All vision, in fact, is already in itself a distortion. Now, if the will consists in desiring something specific by ourselves, it would have to be said that the will, as an appetitive faculty, is never ours in itself.

If we understands the world as a fictitious representation that we humanly create, then the will is dependent on such representations. For these representations are not true but distortions—not only ours but also collective and cultural; therefore, the real decision and the preceding will are always sustained by something that is not properly ours, though it is in us.

Considered so, the exercise of the will is only fiction. The will, more than the distinctive that enables freedom, is nothing more than the evidence of the programming to which we have been objects. Due to the impossibility of knowing, and that only from knowledge—that is generated from representations—is it believed that the will is possible, it is definite that it is not real for the will to be one's own, but that it is simply one more representation.

### **A Man without God, But with Gods**

Another of the implications of our conception of Nothingness is the acceptance that this Nothingness itself is superior to everything that is. If God is, then it is not superior to Nothingness, for it is prior to God itself in the sense that God couldn't not-be, or be Nothingness; for, upon being so, He would naturally not be God. Now, since Nothingness would be prior to God, then God—understood as the highest point, or the Being that is anterior to everything, or the supreme omnipotence never overcome—evidently is not. We couldn't prove this in all lines of knowledge, but only effectively *believe* he doesn't exist. On the contrary, Nothingness is more evident by the fact in itself of not being evident. Neither can we demonstrate the inexistence of

Nothingness for this would suppose that it is nothing and, even so, it would be Nothingness itself, no matter how paradoxical this could turn out. Being so, either God is Nothingness, or it is simply nothing.

Man without God has needed *to create* gods that provide a greater sense to his life. It is because life without Nothingness loses its sense; if Nothingness is not assumed, one will have to turn to the heavens in search for someone who will never respond. And that is the reality of millions of people in the world. Since the heaven or supernatural instances do not present themselves, then we have required interveners; representatives of God on earth that speak on behalf of him, and of those to whom the rest have given the power of defining the will of the Deity itself. In other words, since the divinity we have created is autistic and cannot express itself, we suppose that it requires translators which, from their language, usually mundane, can manifest that which God wants through the intervention of some specific gift or grace. These characters usually undergo such supposed clairvoyant events in sites specifically constructed for such sacred occasions. Certainly there are free theaters all over the city, and it is not that one must pay to observe a failed representation. Hurtfully, we don't see fall the curtain to end, once and for all, with the religions that have generated so much harm and venom in the world.

These created gods have been a sample of the human need to find sense, and the supposed un-sense that could, for some, represent the fact of finding sense in Nothingness. So avid we are of metaphysical absolutes centered on the Being, in the Western style, that we cannot grasp that which is not only in front of us but also below and above us. It has been an error to assume that we must name a Deity, when the Absolute has neither form nor name. Certainly, this requires courage: the courage of searching for answers and finding silence; the courage of turning to the sky and only receiving air; the courage of thinking for oneself, of assuming oneself contained in Nothingness.

### **The Man Contained in Nothingness**

Let us suppose that the following question arises in us: where was I before being born? There is no satisfactory manner in which to respond to such a question that does not imply, at least to a certain extent, the idea of the containing Nothingness.

Prior to existing—not only of being who I am but of being in itself—evidently I was not, for everything that precedes the Being is included in the lap of Nothingness. If that Nothingness contained me, then I return to that Nothingness upon dying, but this time in the manner of not-being what I was upon being alive. Dying is not the not-being, lets clarify it; instead, the not-being comes after the death that is, in any case, only the deriving event of the not-being of what has died. Before and after the temporary space of life, is Nothingness. Further yet, I don't need to die in order to experiment Nothingness' reality for it is found in the ordinariness of life. How many of the things that are now, were previously not? Evidently, all of them. But, furthermore, are all the things that are or all the acts that I have undergone; are, perhaps, these the ones that had the possibility of being or of having been fulfilled? Once again: no. Where are these realities—possible people, things, or acts—that did not come to be? Not in alternate worlds, but in the Nothingness that will not come to be. Let us think for an instant about what happens when a person dies: additionally to its Being having been already possessed by Nothingness, also everything that that person could have kept on doing with his life, now has been reduced in the same manner to impossibility.

Because of it, one does not have to die or attempt to remember what he was prior to being born—certainly an improbably thing for he didn't yet have neurons that contained such a memory—but open his eyes to what is not seen; therefore, open another type of eyes: eyes with which we discover also that we have no creator.

### The Un-Created Man

Man has been cast into the world, as I previously cited. Now I am to reiterate that same idea, adding that *nobody* has cast him but only causality. That man has not been created also supposes the denial that he is an image and likeness of something superior, unless he is, naturally, an image and likeness of Nothingness. Since this is also improbable, for the Being is only a dependent counterpart of Nothingness, there is no possibility of him being a similarity in any manner, in spite of his evident interaction. In such a way that, the un-created man must also assume the inexistence of a will over his own life and the need to

construct; even in the pathetic manners in which, in a precarious way, we are to believe in something: a motive by which to live.

The un-creation of man does not subtract his own possibility of creating. That is why, precisely, he has dedicated himself to the task of creating a story of creation. More of man's novel creations have to do with his own problems, traumas, holdings, attachments, fantasies, moralities, prejudices, fears, failures, and hopelessness. We have also needed to create love, illusion, and the ideas of unconditionality. Now, not all of these creations are to be banished from the possibility of being lived; moreover, we must also clearly understand that every individual that assumes Nothingness must also assume the implicit fiction in such creations. There are fictions that are necessary in order to live better; this is true, as long as the script-writer, creative in his personal neurosis, has it under control, at least a bit. The risk of putting on the mask must be assumed, as long as the mask is not encrusted into the flesh until it cannot be made out.

### **The Finite Man**

There is nothing more certain for man than his own death. The finiteness of individual life—for life, as a fact in itself, continues on in others even after the termination of the individual life—supposes that the man who does not think about death will find himself scarcely prepared for it. It could be argued that one is never prepared to die, to which would correspond the reply that neither is one ever prepared to live. Both life and death are not subject to our preparation, or to the waiting, for them.

Mainly, the desirable implication that supposes life's conclusion is the recognition of the present moment as the only personal possession. The present is the only thing which is truly possessed; we are the present's consciousness, or the conscious present, of things. It can be assumed that concentrating on the present implies a greater perception of the moment, in which is found part of the virtue.

The only thing that remains is Nothingness. Everything that is human is finite; and, due to it, one's own humanness is even more finite. This finite human that writes—as he who reads—is in reality only a finite consciousness of things; and among such things is the concept of the self found. Now, the *self* is a creation of consciousness

for that to which corporality is referred to; which, in turn, keeps consciousness in a single place. So subject are we to consciousness that we even depend on it, though we are not essentially it. Ours is a consciousness that is not only limited in the sense of not being able to grasp it all, but also a consciousness that is temporarily delimited.

### Human Contingency

The consciousness of which I have previously spoken is also a contingent consciousness for it is need of things, the body, or something external in order to be conscious of something. If the conscience is not something's conscience, it is the nothing's conscience and is Nothingness. In that sense, the conscience itself is contingent, making man contingent as well in an implicit manner.

Man is subject to many events over which he has neither power nor control, which is why he is contingent. If our intention is to maintain life, we are to recognize that we depend on air, food, water; on the null falling of meteors; on not being murdered by others, before whom we are also related; and many other things as well. To continue on with life is the result of a series of connections between events, to which we cannot deny a direct relation with contingency. It is undeniable that, in this panorama, the idea of the lightness that living supposes is once again reinforced. And it is because, in fact, to live supposes contingency. To be a human is to be contingent, among other things, due to corporality.

Nothingness is related to human contingency since it is thanks to some circumstances not being that we are still alive. In the same manner, as a function of some things that were not and then were, it is that, in effect, we are still alive. I have been able to exist as a direct function of my contingency to my mother who, due to the event of meeting my father, whose existence was also contingent due to other circumstances, allowed my birth to be possible. I have remained alive as a function of many other connections. But also, thanks to that which is not, or has not been, it is that I keep on being. For example: the fact that there was no car crossing in this same instant in which I carelessly crossed the road—since I was thinking about what I write—allows me to keep on being. This is in such a way that not only do we hold a contingency relationship with that which is and

we see, but also with much of that which we don't see, or with that which never comes to be shown.

In the end, contingent relationships are a reproduction of the interaction between the Being and Nothingness. As long as such an interaction exists, time will also exist. The human is the demonstration of such interaction; hence, the human is time.

### **The Inevitable Temporariness of Humanness**

I have already stated that man is finite, that life has an ineludible ending and that, before that reality, man's only corresponding option is to accept it. And regarding the human entity in itself, the issue is not very different. Man, the human, everything that is human, is only a tiny portion in the history of the Earth and an even smaller portion in regard to history and the existence of the Universe. To be born is an opportunity; a tiny bit of time we have stolen from Nothingness in order to attempt to discover it.

That which is human has a temporariness which supposes that the civilization that we have gestated will disappear; that Nothingness will be; that in the end, everything will come to not-be; and that any worry, project, construction, interest, motive, or sense will have its disappearance upon the termination of that which is human, or when that which is human is no longer in the Universe.

I do not say here that that which is human is the only existent life form in the Universe. It suffices to observe the plants and the rest of the animals in the same world we inhabit to convince oneself of the contrary. But even these other life forms have temporariness; certainly not yet determined, but definitely foreseen in an obvious way.

We have all seen the reference to other planets which, due to their miles of extension, are made impossible of sheltering life. Some changes on the earthly atmosphere are sufficient enough for this plane that we live on to not admit life either, for it to be impossible to continue existing here. Let us imagine the earth for a moment as an inhospitable place—it isn't difficult to think of it—that life has been lost on this planet. The possible existence of other living beings would continue on anyhow: they would continue to be the same other planets, the sun would continue to emit its rays and heat, the moon would continue to light the night, Jupiter would continue to be in its

same location, and Mars would remain the same kilometers' distance away. Concretely, the inexistence of that which is human, and the inexistence of human life, would not modify, other than in favour of it, the existence of the other material entities of the Universe. And the benefit would be exclusively less pollution and atmospheric contamination. Nobody would care any longer about such circumstances but, certainly, it would be a lesser effect.

To believe that if that which is human disappears the Universe will also disappear, is a solipsist error that we do not commit here. If, in fact, we have admitted that what we conceive of reality is socially constructed in the forms of meanings, this does not suppose that the meaningfulness not be something in itself without the intervention of he who gives it the meaning, which is man. There may not be meanings of the Universe upon there not being anyone to give it a meaning, but the Universe would evidently continue. The meaning is distinct to he who provides it.

The temporariness of that which is human encompasses man's finiteness, but in a collective sense. If at the end of that which is human, Nothingness would remain, the portion of that which is individual is definitely similar: Nothingness. This, without a doubt, comes to remake itself in the understanding of man's lightness.

### **The Lightness of Man**

In contrast to the recognition of the Absolute Nothingness, what yet remains for man is his own lightness. In the contemplation of the Absolute, the only remnant is the evidence of one's own smallness; lost in Nothingness, borne to it, desiring it until disappearing, with the heart to not-be and be, finally, at one damn time. The most profound devotion is only to that which is not.

What is this Nothingness that possesses me without the need of undressing me? Perhaps it makes me hers without having clothes over the sofa? Obviously, yes, for it usually possesses me from within, it doesn't make love; it usually makes Nothingness. And making Nothingness is to submerge oneself in her; to lose the anxiousness about any absolute and, in it, obtain it, for even anxiousness is subdued by Nothingness itself. I could never reproduce Nothingness for myself, which is why no contraceptive is necessary; only the ethereal in my

own mind of what she produces in me. This is why: "self-identity is not an enhancement of an element or attribute of reality, but simply the manner of affirming the fact that, if every thing has its own identity, it is not due to something internal—a substantial principal—but, rather, is based on the localization of the being's relative world in Nothingness' absolute" (Heisig 2002, 100).

In such a manner that the location of this lightness, or identification, of man's Being, is only possible in the visualization of that same man in, and within, Nothingness' absolute; a visualization that, naturally, is not undergone with the eyes but, rather, implies a greater level of consciousness.

There is no implicit essence in the human either; rather its presence, contained in Nothingness, is what constitutes its greatest identity. That man adapts to circumstances, just the same as the rest of the living beings, is a fact shown by evolution itself. This evolution is, at most, the most evident demonstration of the category, neither univocal nor predetermined, of what is essential in man. Such essence, in the case of existing, is only the capacity of filling a manner of being, of adaptation. Hence the true essence of all beings is their not-being; this is to say, the nothing in Nothingness. The manner in which men not only adapt to environmental circumstances but also to the same cultural schemes, determining their cosmo-visions and paradigms based on language, and the schemes which are socially defined and reproduced, is a clear demonstration of an essence not essentially centered on the immobile being, but rather on the Nothingness that promotes change and adaptation: the hollow that is constantly filled in diverse manners. We are not filled, we are hollow; and these hollows are filled in diverse ways. There is no human nature as such; there is a human condition and this is mainly malleable, adaptable, and modifiable—even by change, by context.

If man is modified according to contexts and schemes, it would follow to question if there does exist a correct scheme, or correct culture, or correct moral idea; which remits us to a new consistent implication in the need to assume the impossibility of certainties in that which is human.

### Man without Certainties

Nothingness supposes the impossibility of certainties. The implication of this for man is very broad. Firstly, it implies that discussions are to turn into more of a dialogue, and less of an innocent dispute in which both people believe to be correct. This, correctness, is nothing more than the completely human way of calling that which we consider to contain greater certainty. But since certainty is impossibility, then there are no products of correctness which have to be *one* certainty in itself. We men use reason, but the products of reason are not *the correct reason* but, rather, suppositions. That is where we have fallen into a very common mistake of interpreting language when we suppose that to be correct is to have certainty; or, that correctness is certainty. It is as if we were cooking something and we called the final product of our cooking act, *kitchen*. Obviously, it is not so; what we do is to call that final product garlic prawns or grilled fish. Being so, why must we call the conclusions obtained after a rational exercise, *certainties* or *correct reasoning*? This is not correct reasoning; reason is what brought us to it, but *those* are our concluding suppositions about a specific topic. In the same manner, when we speak of *being correct* we err once again, for we are under the supposition that what is rational is truly certain. More than being correct, we should ask ourselves about the certainty of that which we affirm. And, in any case, the question is if we have Truth in what we say, more than correctness. Now, since Truth is only a univocal construction—and therefore *truth* not *Truth*—we then have that there is no possibility of certainty over having Truth. This supposes the understanding that one does not possess the correct reason but, rather, makes use of a partial reason, which would imply *my* reasons.

However, considering that I reason based on my reasons, it's obvious, following the same terms, that not because of that will I have the universal reason in my individual conclusions; and, that these are not called *reasons*, but simply personal conjectures based on one's own rational elements. We would have to refer to the rules of Logic in which the syllogisms suppose the possibility of truth, or not. If we have two suppositions before arriving at a conclusion and one of them is false, the conclusion may be logical but not true. For example, in the affirmations: "Luis is a shrimp; shrimp walk on the ocean floor; therefore, Luis walks on the ocean floor", we have that

the conclusion is correct according to the suppositions. But the suppositions don't coincide with something that we suppose to be true; in other words, that Luis *is not* a shrimp—unless, obviously, we have named our pet this and it happens to be a shrimp. Hence, the rational product is not necessarily infallible; and since there isn't any, then any element which supposes syllogistic conclusions (and, in fact, they are the majority) is called to be a failure and erred, so nullifying our possibility of all certainty.

We could trust our conclusions a little bit more if they were generated by the total knowledge of existence, which is evidently scarcely probable. But, even so, if we were, or could generate, an individual that would accumulate all knowledge about what exists; even so, we would have to assume that the knowledge he has acquired is rooted in previous traditions and in symbolic constructions of other men who have written, or transmitted, such wisdom from their own paradigmatic vision. Which is why such general knowledge could be a non-knowledge or a falseness we have believed. Furthermore, we would still have to deal with the fact of this individual's *manner* of discerning; for knowing data is one thing but *how* to associate them in order to generate conclusive products based on that knowledge, is another.

I can conclude at this point that not even the eventual possession of all possible knowledge would exempt the possibility of error in the discernments. And it is because precisely the essence of our discernments is its own possibility of being erred. And with it has to do Nothingness; for if a rational product *is*, then by that fact it is including Nothingness; this is to say, the possibility of its not-being. I assume that each affirmation has in itself its denial. Just as I have said that every Being is rooted in Nothingness, in the same manner, each affirmation is rooted in the error that is supposed by its same human construction, from the always limited and scarcely certain human reasons, apart from being based on inevitably tendentious discernments.

Naturally, from this perspective I have demonstrated, any clever opponent could refute also that the whole idea of Nothingness which I have developed is a product of a tendentious discernment (in this case, mine) and generated based on limited knowledge (in this case, obviously, mine). Though both premises are correct, they do not suppose anyhow the falseness of my affirmation; for if it can be pre-

cisely denied, it is because it *is true*, in part. So it would work exactly inversely. To deny or argue contrary to what I have said, does nothing more than prove the partial veracity (at least) of my own argument. And this is because one can only be in disagreement with that which has the possibility of being as was described. There is no need to deny the impossible for it is not disputable as such, unless it is to argue against its possibility, which would suppose—anyhow—its implied possibility. In the end, we would agree that there is more certainty in silence than in words.

### **Man and What Is Possible before Him**

Sartre defended human liberty as a fundamental aspect from which decisions are made. Not so in tune with the French philosopher must we recognize that to contemplate Nothingness, more than to enable a free decision, is a way to understand the Nothingness of freedom; the impossibility of it due to the impossibility of seeing it All. Even within the limitations of the options that we do see, there is always a multiplicity of possibilities that can be equally valid if we want to see them under that perspective. If multiple possibilities exist and we prefer some over others due to our perspectives, there is certainly no sustainable liberty for there are no better options over other ones necessarily, or in themselves; and, due to it, our evaluating conditioning governs us. The options that we take are elected as a function of our expectation that they be, in effect, the better options; this is to say, the possibility that what we elect is the ideal choice. However, even our consideration over these possibilities of eligibility is centered on the manner in which we conceive what is ideal, which is also under constant modification. It leads us to the acceptance of the impossibility of always thinking in the same way and to the fact that what is possible—that always exists before our eyes—not be completely conceived, causing partially blind decisions by this.

There are many possibilities, not only one, of acting. It is not even the problem of affirming that many manners may be the correct ones but that, in an obvious manner, there is no correct *one*. We have culturally generated such a concept for that which we consensually have supposed is the most desirable in a determined context and situation.

From this perspective, and in a scarcely avoidable manner, life is unpredictable. We are slaves to our own expectations; and such expectations, at times covered by the halo of illusion, are centered on new possibilities. We decide not only as a function of facts but also as a function of possibilities. For example, we get married as a function of our expectation of being happy with that; we love the possibility that the fact of getting married brings us, not the marriage in itself. We take up a profession based on the illusion that the expectation of being successful professionals nourishes us with (whatever that may be) and, centered on that possibility, we forget the fact of truly studying. Universities sell illusions, possibilities of materializing the expectations of professional success. More than other things, we buy as a function of a gap; a gap that we attempt to fill ourselves with our illusion that we suppose is solidified in an institution, whichever one this may be.

To recognize that we live based on possibilities and that these may be varied, almost unending, is to assume that things can be in many manners. It is then about breaking the reflexive stillness, widening perspectives, modifying inscrutabilities in ones own vision. To the extent that this is done, it can also be assumed that life is not only a blank page on which one has to write, but is also a long scroll upon which many pens (not only ours) write without us noticing. This broadens possibilities, without a doubt. And upon everything being possible, there isn't a sense either, for these are many and, out of all of them, none is univocal.

### **Man as a Being with "No-Sense"**

Camus referred to man being a useless passion, but now we are to recognize that man is a passion of Nothingness. The issue is less complicated if we assume that man can be a passion for Nothingness, which would evidently be different. When we speak of sense we refer to a place to arrive at, a port of arrival, a line towards which to direct the compass of our life. But, if we have recognized that there is no greater force than ourselves to determine the way, then there is no marked way. If, furthermore, we recognize that there is no certain knowledge and that everything can be and not be later, and even at that same moment, then less possibilities remain in terms of a univocal sense to follow.

In any case, sense—understood as the direction towards which we direct ourselves—can be gestated by our own involuntariness; in other words, by the belief of what we want. This sense, in turn, due to the impossibility of certainties and to the reality of the equality of possibilities, can be eliminated or changed in a constant and gradual manner. Sense ends up being that which we fictitiously create and which we suppose provides a direction to the multiplicity of possibilities that life supposes. In spite of it, we can live naively thinking that we have one only sense and that, furthermore, we suppose has been freely marked and defined by us. We strive to follow it in a linear fashion and we firmly believe that we are the ones who opt for liberty with each step. But due to there not being liberty, there is neither certainty nor a univocal nature of sense—additionally to us being utterly contingent—so we must recognize that sense is only another illusion to try to endow life with reason. However, even the option of dedicating life to reason does not suppose a reasonable life.

Sense can be chaos. Sense is not what we see. Certainly, life leads in a direction and that direction is everywhere. We are scared; we feel vulnerable of considering ourselves to be fickle people, of not having foundations to make us stand firm on our own ground; but such issues are the proof of what we have created in ourselves with our life expectations. We suppose that we are free when we move as a function solely of our will, but we cease to see that in reality, liberty is not to cling to liberty itself, which doesn't even exist since the will that would found it is pejoratively reactive. To allow the swaying is something better resolved, such as the stoic that remains as a rock before the swaying of the waves in his daily ocean. Even the most beautiful sunny day inevitably ends in a dark night. Life's senses can collapse; which is why to want to build an immovable structure when the ineludible structuring is the swaying itself, is nothing more than the evidence of our fears.

### **The Ineludible Structure of the Being**

The Being that invades our being is invaded, in turn, by Nothingness. How can we desire to be independent from our environment, self-sufficient from contextual events, distant from the swaying of interconnected circumstances, if deep within us our foundation is a

stable Nothingness which destabilizes? At the basis of our invisible foundations is Nothingness, which opens up the possibility of everything. To suppose that we have taken decisions which are maintained for the duration of life in a firm and decidedly manner (impregnating those adjectives with virtues) is the incomprehension of the real nature of what is human. Such nature is, in any case, malleability; itself a product of the Nothingness that is.

There is no manner of un-structuring this manner of being, for everything that *is*, is rooted in itself in order to be. The only prerequisite for contingency is to exist; hence, how to expect to be incontinent humans? Only Nothingness escapes contingency. It will be said to me that Nothingness is not; and, certainly, it is partly so, only that it is a Nothingness that, upon not being, *is*.

To make lifelong commitments is not something merely natural, for it looks to un-structure structure by structuring. And there is no worse idea than the expectation of un-structuring the un-structured. In the same manner, it isn't sane to assume a lifelong plan, for if it very well may be always maintained, it would be as a function of self-castration; or, to say it in a friendlier fashion, as a function of the obliged structuring that doesn't accept new structures later on. It is like hoping that Nothingness becomes a Being when, rather, this would lead to structure it without understanding that it is un-structure in itself. Nothingness is another way of being distinct to the one we have supposed throughout all the history of humanity, at least in the West. We are to return to the original Emptiness and let go of all supposedly un-structured structures that are simply human vanity and don't un-structure anything, for Nothingness is still Nothingness.

Man must not fill his gaps with structures (dogmas, schemes, rules, models, paradigms) in order to try and stifle fear, for they are the same structures that have generated the most fear for man who, in himself, was estranged to them. That is why, precisely, structures overwhelm us, since they are humanly created yet inhumanly forced as well. Something in us does not connect to such structures due to our original un-structuring. Obviously I don't state here that humans are essentially un-structure the moment we are not something; rather, that we are something due to us also being essential Nothingness. What I

affirm is that un-structure is the most original way to be for it implies the act of being primogenial, which is natural to us.

I do not propose here the idea that we must not, as humans, construct anything since we essentially are un-structure. Rather, it is about destroying that which we haven't really constructed, and constructing from a more intimate base in order that, later on, assuming the new situations of our contextualized life, we may be able to reconstruct and modify the previous structure.

Man is not the constructor of one single building, rather he is to destroy as well in order to construct once again, but always in the understanding that all construction is destroyed; and, in fact the most intimate function of the construction is to be destroyed. The latter, precisely, is what leads to accept the mobility of that which exists, and leave aside the possibility and yearning of constructing immovable constructions which only demonstrate partial, and bothersome, neuron immobility. If an individual understands that he has constructed buildings within himself that are bothersome to him and which prevent his spontaneity, he will have to destroy them little by little, even in the understanding that this supposes a slight self-destruction. This is because, in the end, if that is the intention, a little self-destruction can really be constructive. Furthermore, it is always preferable to partially self-destruct oneself with the intention of reconstructing oneself, prior to being completely destroyed and without any possibility. Stated in this manner, it must be assumed that change is possible, including our perception about the impossibility of changing.

### **The Mobile Man in a Mobile World**

Such as Heraclitus used to affirm, the only permanent thing is change. Unless we childishly deny it, or attempt to direct our energy towards the contrary argument, we are to recognize in palpable life events or with simple observation, that the passing of time also implies the movement of things, or the reconfiguration or de-configuration of things themselves. No flower remains open all the time; everything that is cannot be and some things that aren't could be.

What does it imply, for man, that the only permanent thing is change? Apart from the fact—already previously commented—that man is finite and that everything is temporary, it also implies that—

before man ends and undergoes a substantial change in his own life—modification is a constant reality. From it is drawn that there is no possibility of a univocal sense of life, as has been warned, for change supposes the multiplicity of possible graspings of sense; but not a sense that is not contingent to the man that thinks it.

Furthermore, that man is immobile prevents him to be rooted in something and to find himself ontologically obligated to deposit himself in something, whether this be a belief or a custom derived from it. Man changes because he changes his manner of observing reality, which changes because the reality that he usually observes also changes. Everything changes, then, due to which time exists in the world of the tangible. This is where we assume the consideration of time that Aristotle makes; in the sense that time is the measurement of movement. Upon man being a mobile being in a mobile world full of mobile things and situations, time is then an undeniable reality generated by that in itself. In a situation of movements like this one, there is only one thing that doesn't change and that doesn't become temporarily measurable: Nothingness. This also allows for the constant of movement, for Nothingness supposes the movement of everything that is, in its distinct categorical modes of change. So, if the only constant in a tangible world is change, in regard to Nothingness the only constant is that there is no change possible, since Nothingness, upon being it, enables the constant of the tangible world: change. This is the manner in which Nothingness is related with the mobile man's mobile world, and that the Heraclitan rule has been, now, complemented with the affirmation that there is something more constant than change, which is the Nothingness that permits it.

### **Man in Chaos**

The constant change that supposes specific changes observed or not, generates for us the impression of a chaotic world. In reality, this chaotic world is only part of what we perceive. Chaos occurs due to our incapacity of perceiving all of the connections between the events and what it is.

Submerged in this occurrence, that we see chaotically, is man found; delimited between his own Being and the Nothingness that surrounds him. Chaos is not avoidable; it is part of what man has to

include in his own life. To not accept chaos, to search for an explanation, to deny what occurs, are all evasive forms that scarcely favour the contemporary individual. We can spend life denying imperfection due to our fear of not having it all under control. But this control has never been human because humans have never had the real possibility of controlling everything; unless we deceive ourselves, in which case the deceit would be controlling man, man wouldn't be controlling the deceit. It is precisely this deceit that is utilized by the person when he believes that "everything happens for a reason". Though it is clear and obvious that everything, in effect, happens for a reason, it isn't that it happens in the intention that such expression is said, as though supposing (or affirming) that there is a plan behind what occurs, that the Universe has a strategy or unexplainable force behind occurrences. If, perhaps, there is a plan behind what happens, a plan that we do not conceive, this would suppose that there is a Great Planner and this is merely unsustainable. We look to escape randomness, causality; but in the end, things happen due to issues which are far simpler than the explanations we look to give them. With sense or without it, what occurred is a past event. There is no manner of avoiding the past; not because "there is a motive" but, rather, every individual, in the same chaos of a supposed disorder, must construct the sense with which he can dress the events that occur with reason.

Life is chaotic to our perception. Due to this, disorder can only be the effect of our interpretation; which, furthermore, is an interpretation that tends to consider control as that which is desirable. Hence it is that we see the incontrollable as chaos, when in reality, for man everything is out of his control and those things that he controls are only illusions of control. To make chaos evident—and the personal chaos in which we live—can be beneficial for the necessary awakening; for certainly it is not probable to assume the acceptance of the cosmos if chaos isn't previously contemplated. On occasion, darkness allows us to see and confusion orders ideas. This is why, before the naïve eagerness of controlling it all, we are to place in front the idea of the cosmos: a cosmos that isn't destroyed due to chaos, but rather that chaos is part of order itself. It is in the existence of order that chaos is.

### Man in the Cosmos

An event occurs due to having the circumstantial (involuntary) or decided (voluntary) connections for it to occur. Personal decision is not enough, for a favourable circumstance, which is not always in human hands, is also necessary. Now, that things occur is not something that responds to a future plan of someone superior, but that supposes the coinciding present that implied that determined event. This leads to the thought that, in effect, what has occurred responds to an almost unending series of connections between people, things, and events. This contributes to the strengthening of the idea of the cosmos, in what circumscribes humans, and even outside of it. Things are as they are because, in order to be as they are, they had to be other things. There are no isolated events, de-contextualized, separated or expelled from the everyday. Even the extraordinary is connected to ordinary events.

To assume the cosmos means, for man, the acceptance that there is an order without an ordering being; that there are events that occur in themselves due to the possibility of Nothingness between things, space, gaps, and the emptiness that are filled by things, people, or realities in an unending manner. The separation that there is between things, the space between them, what distinguishes them amongst themselves, is the work of Nothingness. And based on this distinction it is that relationships are established; connections and interdependencies that, multiplied to a greater number, suppose that this or that event must occur. There is no ordering being behind that; only a cosmos that exists due to the *being* of the rest of what exists. There is an existing cosmos in each thing, occurrence, or person, even though it doesn't always coincide with our desired order of that which exists. Before and after man there is a cosmos in which we participate in very temporary and limited manners.

When we say that "things must run their course", we slightly err; for we suppose that, precisely, there is *a* specific, due, and correct course that things or people must take, when it isn't exactly so. There isn't one established course of things. The only line that could be understood as such a course of things is the course of destruction, of its death, annihilation or disarticulation. The only course, just like the sense, is the Nothingness that embraces us in the end with its ethereal yet condensing arms. Before it, outside of it, excluding it, there is no

course of things; there isn't even a minimal must-be in the exclusive sense of being obligatory. If this were so and there were a *must-be*, this would completely place the world of diversity in doubt, since such diversity supposes that there are many manners of being in that which exists and not one obliged or exclusive one. Diversity cannot be denied since it is so observable, so present and tangible, that we can't suppose that things lead an obliged course. Prediction turns into a complex art with regard to the totality of things. Certainly, there is a cosmos, in spite of it usually seeming chaotic to us.

I haven't said here that man's attitude before Nothingness is then that of apathy or of rejoicing in its inaction. It isn't so. It is about making an effort so that events, the future, or our projects prosper as we would like; but as long as we understand that if what we are looking for isn't accomplished, or what we hope for doesn't occur, this isn't necessarily due to something that is exclusively incumbent to us. Furthermore, it would also have to be considered that any route which we suppose things must follow is not necessarily the unordered course of order, the order of what it is as a function of Nothingness. There isn't anything that must be in an obligatory manner because, to begin with, the same Being itself doesn't necessarily always have to be.

To assume the cosmos supposes, for man, an attitude of *letting* the cosmos *be*, allowing things to take the course of the unknowable cosmos, and identifying when personal efforts are in vain or unnecessary. To not externally exert an effort doesn't exempt the interior effort of containment, so necessary at times in order to permit (or accept) that what is, is as it is. In the end, to understand that the things that happened have occurred because their course (the one taken by causality and not by destiny) was that one is to understand the dialectic between Nothingness and the Being; an ineludible dialectic that, well understood, can lead to superior vivifying experiences.

### The Vivified Man

To vivify oneself in Nothingness is not to let go of the Being; rather, it is by the Being that one is vivified and it is by Nothingness in the Being, or by the circumference of the Being in Nothingness, that such a vivification is possible. We are to distinguish this type of vivification—centered on the dialectic between the Being and

Nothingness—from the shattering vivification which implies death as a disconnection from the Being. This, the disconnection from the Being, must occur anyhow; though not by our own means but, rather, it will occur because our natural tendency—and that of the rest of all living things—is towards it.

The vivification of which I speak of here, supposes being alive. One must not die in order to vivify Nothingness; it is not necessary to absolutely be Nothingness in order to comprehend that Nothingness is. The experience of Nothingness certainly supposes a partial disconnection from the things of the world. This is neither to inhabit other worlds nor to travel astrologically. It is about—far from the impulse of any hallucinogenic—a personal vivification with the part that is behind nausea; in other words, the implicit tranquility that one is not only nausea, or that the nausea at least had the sense of partially testifying to something. To vivify Nothingness is to go beyond the conventional explanations; it is precisely not to believe in explanations.

To vivify Nothingness is not to connect with the Truth; rather, it is to precisely assume the inexistence of truths. To vivify Nothingness is not to suppose happiness but, rather, the identification of fictitious constructions that we have generated in order to attempt to be happy; forgetting that such happiness, the form of achieving or being it, is already in itself something that we learn and culturally form but never something inherent, in the ontological sense, of our Being. There is no possible happiness to be achieved as a goal for one is *already* that in itself. If happiness is possible, it is because we are it already. To vivify Nothingness is not for one to deposit oneself in what it is, but to assume that it is without being; that the duality has only been apparent and we are connected to everything in the same manner that everything has been connected to us. To vivify Nothingness is not for one to liberate oneself, but rather to assume the emptiness that this supposes; it is to liberate oneself from the need to be free. It is to control upon letting go of control; it is to allow prior to obstructing. To vivify Nothingness is not to search for the answer but to allow it to already be itself. To vivify Nothingness is not for one to connect oneself to our ideas of God, but rather to connect to the idea of Nothingness.

To vivify Nothingness is not to act according to the essence but to assume the fact of permanent non-essence. To vivify Nothingness

is to touch the limit, to caress the border of the Absolute with the trembling hands of imagination. To vivify Nothingness is to arrive at the limit of oneself, to let oneself be seduced by the silence that afflicts the bowels; it is to not distinguish life and death, good and evil, craziness and geniality. To be at the limit is to let Nothingness be. It is to understand that there are no limits and that everything is One. To vivify Nothingness is, at most, to understand that even the comprehension of Nothingness, that it possesses everything, is also nothing in the sense that it is not necessarily as we suppose it to be.

### **Conclusion: Man Who Knows Nothing about Nothingness**

Why are must we believe that Nothingness is linked to human life in the manner that we have previously described? The only admissible response is: because of *the* Nothingness.

And in it is found a complete response, the most complete one possible. The motive by which it must be as has been described has to do with the possibility of it being so. I have not proposed an arbitrary posture; rather, I proposed to assume the originating un-structure and relegate to a secondary aspect all of the structures that we have created as a human genre. And this is because, in the end, all of the institutions to which we have given our beliefs, our time, effort, value, credibility, and money, are nothing more than fiction. They have no implicit value; they have no value in themselves, for they are something that we have symbolically built through our subjectification of reality. Our religious, educational, political, and economical systems have been constructed based on utterly human aspects: interest, benefit, gain of any type. Institutions certainly search for objectives, but this simple fact of searching is in itself an allusion to the motive for which they have been created: only human motivation, crude manipulation, control, exercise of power, idealization. In the end, the institutions are the best proof that humans have attempted to intervene against Nothingness; and this is in turn its most intimate verification.

Our fictions, philosophies, and cultural elucidations are nothing more than mental edifications which, from our need to escape emptiness, we have equally constructed. Little do we know of the things that are; and, worse yet, nothing do we know of Nothingness. And since we know nothing of Nothingness, we have constructed everything as

a function of a not-knowing more than as a function of knowing or knowledge. Man knows by not knowing; and it is while not knowing that he does what he does. Things are more than what we know of them; man is more than what we have discovered of him; the world is not what we have supposed. The Being is not the only thing there is and it is time to break such structures that have left little for our well-being.

We don't know more than nothing of Nothingness. Man doesn't really know Nothingness for Nothingness envelops him such as the darkness envelops the moon. My explanation is only a speculative effort to make such reality noted. Whether or not that is reality, must be defined by the reader from his own Nothingness; but at least—if he perhaps manages to contact it—this which I affirm will have some part of Nothingness, and in it lies that it has Everything.

### Works Cited

- Heisig, James. 2001. *Philosophers of Nothingness*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Heisig, James. 2002. *Filósofos de la nada*. Barcelona: Herder.