

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394046834>

POOCH: A THEORY OF CONDITIONAL EXISTENCE BEYOND TRADITION AND ABSOLUTES

Preprint · July 2025

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32365.70884

CITATION

1

READS

7

1 author:



[Babak Jabbar Nezhad](#)

University of Arkansas at Fayetteville

29 PUBLICATIONS 48 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

POOCH: A THEORY OF CONDITIONAL EXISTENCE BEYOND TRADITION AND ABSOLUTES

BABAK JABBAR NEZHAD

ABSTRACT. This paper proposes a new philosophical framework that begins not from meaning, but from pooch — the recognition that nothing is absolute, and all that exists is biologically and socially conditioned. It critiques traditional forms of nihilism and existentialism for retaining hidden attachments to inherited systems, and reconstructs love, justice, identity, language, beauty, morality, and death as contingent, redefinable, and biologically grounded phenomena. The result is not despair, but clarity: a grounded humanism without illusion, a structure of life without mythology. This is not a call to destroy meaning, but to build it lightly, knowing it can fall.

1. INTRODUCTION

What if nihilism has never gone far enough?

What if existentialism still clings to inherited forms — Godless, yet still sacred in tone?

This paper begins at the edge of that question. It does not seek to refute tradition, but to unroot it. It does not aim to offer new illusions — but to clear space for a life that is conditioned, transient, and still worthy of being lived.

This is a theory for those who no longer believe — but still feel.

It is for those who have lost the sacred, yet still search for clarity.

It is not religious. It is not spiritual. It is structurally honest.

Everything here begins with this: nothing is absolute.

2. THE FIRST STONE

A true nihilism begins with this stone:

■ Nothing absolute can be accepted — not as truth, not as form, not even as beauty.

Most forms of nihilism or existentialism collapse here — because they still wrap themselves in inherited structures: Sufi metaphors, religious morality, Western logic, romantic despair. They invert meaning, but never break the form. Even Nietzsche, while declaring the death of God, preserved the tone of transcendence [6].

A truly free existence does not live in boxes.

It does not destroy the past — but it must redefine it.

We may enjoy tradition, but only when we reshape it under our own condition — never when we believe in it as untouchable truth.

Key words and phrases. Conditional existence, Abstract form, Biological fear, Post-nihilism, Non-essentialism, Pooch philosophy, Humanism without morality, Identity construction, Language and tradition.

3. THE ROLE OF ABSTRACTION

Abstraction is not detachment.

It is not spiritual elevation.

Abstraction is a form born without inherited shape — a form that allows emotional presence but refuses historical imprisonment.

To be abstract is not to float. It is to rebuild from zero, to stay close to existence while refusing nostalgia, ritual, or mythology.

This is existential clarity — not grounded in culture, but in structure.

4. WHAT EXISTS?

Nothing exists as an absolute.

All existence is defined relationally — shaped by:

- Biology,
- Environment,
- Language,
- Social structure.

Everything is pooch — not because it is false, but because it is contingent.

A child loves their mother not because love is sacred, but because fear gave birth to need, and need gave birth to love.

Justice exists not because it is divine, but because coexistence required it.

Even identity is not essential — it is accumulated through biological and environmental interaction. Essence is a myth.

We can destroy what we define — and we can redefine what we fear — because the essence of existence is change, not permanence.

We exist, but only conditionally.

5. LOVE, FEAR, AND THE ILLUSION OF CLARITY

Love is not sacred.

It is not romantic.

It is not eternal.

Love is a biological response to fear — first visible in the bond with the mother, later projected onto others.

Camus ignored this — not out of malice, but because he failed to see that even detachment arises from an unmet need [4]. Even numbness was once a cry.

To live without acknowledging the origin of love is to live in a lie.

6. THE DANGER OF BOXES

Anything that becomes a box — a system, a tradition, a frozen identity — becomes a new religion, even if it denies gods.

This theory accepts tools, but not homes:

- Language, yes.
- Psychology, yes.
- Even morality, conditionally.

But only as flexible instruments.

Do we see that what we believe is not eternal?
Do we allow ourselves to live without armor?

That is the question.

7. WHAT IS JUSTICE?

Justice is not a truth.

It is a need — and like all needs, it must be defined in order to exist.

There is no eternal justice.

There is only justice as an answer to a condition:

- A fear of being harmed.
- A desire to live without being dominated.
- A biological demand for fairness so that coexistence becomes livable.

Like love, justice is born from fear and desire.

It is not a spiritual virtue. It is an evolved demand.

And like all demands, it can change — or disappear — if the structure that made it necessary collapses.

In this framework, to speak of “absolute justice” is to build a temple on a shifting desert.

We need justice — but we must remember we built it.
We define it, not the other way around.

8. IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE

8.1. Identity: The Illusion of Essence. There is no “self” that exists independently of biology and environment.

Identity is not a soul.

It is a structure shaped by biology and environment.

What people call “essence” is simply the name for what they cannot explain.

We begin as void — a pure pooch — in the womb of the mother.

Lacan described the mirror stage as a misrecognition of unity — but here, even the mirror is shaped by biology [5].

The first definitions of self are not internal — they are imposed by the reactions of the mother, shaped by her biology, her environment, and her state.

The myth of essence is simply a mask for the unseen accumulation of this external pressure.

There is no soul, no core truth, no sacred flame inside.

There is only a growing structure — changeable, vulnerable, re-definable.

The idea of an essential self is just a romantic myth.

As Beauvoir said, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” — a recognition that identity is formed, not found [2].

8.2. Language: The Bumpy Bridge. Language is not neutral. It is a bridge, and most bridges are built with pieces of the past.

Some parts of language are smooth — abstract, flexible, capable of expressing presence without mythology.

But other parts are bumps: words and forms that carry religion, tradition, and frozen mentality. For example:

- “Oh my Jesus!” — is not a neutral exclamation. It brings with it centuries of belief.
- “I exist” — may be abstract on its own, but becomes a box the moment it’s wrapped in cultural assumptions.

So we must ask:

■ Which parts of language are tools? Which are traps?

Even structure matters.

An English speaker may grow into a direct mentality, shaped by simple syntax.

A French speaker may evolve a more layered personality, shaped by grammatical complexity.

Language is not just what we say — it is what shapes how we think.

As Wittgenstein suggested, “The limits of my language mean the limits of my world” [7].

9. ART AND THE ROOTS OF BEAUTY

9.1. Abstract Art: The Only Honest Form. If abstraction is the only form not wrapped in inherited belief, then art — including poetry, painting, and music — must move toward abstraction to become real, universal, and truthful.

The more abstract an art expression becomes, the more real, universal, and truthful it becomes. But to reach this level of expression is difficult: it requires the highest level of concentration and a deep isolation from what we have inherited.

Creating beautiful and at the same time abstract artistic expression is the hardest thing. And, I might add — in some of my poetries, I believe I have done this.

This raises a deeper question: is beauty an inherited and defined concept, or is it an abstract one?

The answer is both.

Part of beauty is inherited. But the abstract part of beauty is what creates harmony and smoothness in the biological system of the brain and body — for example, most people find greenery beautiful, unless they suffer from emotional detachment.

If an artistic expression is not abstract, it touches the inherited parts of the brain — so its beauty may vary from person to person, and even from moment to moment. Some may find it beautiful today and not tomorrow.

9.2. Aesthetic Pleasure and Biological Roots. If emotional needs are rooted in fear and survival, does this include aesthetic pleasure?

Yes.

Beauty is not a separate category. Aesthetic pleasure, too, is a response built on biological needs — rooted in harmony, predictability, resonance, or surprise within safety. It is not divine. It is not sacred. It is a soft biological defense — an evolved resonance that helps us survive through order, coherence, and emotional alignment.

■ Beauty is not proof of transcendence.
It is proof of biological coherence.

In contrast to Adorno’s complex view of aesthetic autonomy [1], this theory reduces beauty to biological coherence.

10. ETHICS AND RESPONSIBILITY IN A POOCH WORLD

10.1. Morality as Condition, Not Truth. Morality is not absolute. It is relative. It shifts from place to place, from time to time — shaped by society, biology, and survival needs.

For example:

- In much of France, if a married woman has sex with another man, it may be called an adventure, and many couples do not even hide it from one another.
- In many parts of the U.S., especially in the South, the same act may lead to violent revenge.

So why should anyone care about morality in a world where everything is pooch?

Because even in pooch, we still want to live.

We still want to enjoy.

We want safety, stability, health, and possibility.

And to reach that — we must live in a functional society.

Therefore, morality must be redefined — not through religion, purity, or tradition, but through this question:

■ What kind of behavior creates a society that is healthy, livable, and less destructive?

This is morality rebuilt from the ground up —

not to honor a god,

but to preserve the possibility of joy in a meaningless world.

10.2. Responsibility as Grounded Humanism. Responsibility still exists — not because we owe each other something sacred, but because we are building something shared.

If a person defines the concept of family, they accept responsibility — not out of guilt or duty, but out of the desire to live in a healthy and happy family.

If a person does not believe in family, they still live in a society — and their well-being is connected to the well-being of others around them.

■ This is not religious humanism.

This is not idealist morality.

This is responsibility built on clarity:

We want to live well — and we cannot do that alone.

11. DEATH, FEAR, AND THE POSSIBILITY OF PEACE

11.1. The First Fear: Not Death, But Non-Existence. A newborn child does not fear death in the conscious sense. The idea of death as finality comes much later. But from the very beginning, there is something deeper at work:

There is fear of separation.

Fear of absence.

Fear of not being — even if that fear is not yet defined as “death.”

This is the original pressure. Not death as an event, but “non-existence as a felt absence”, as a kind of biological unknowing. It is not intellectual. It is emotional, pre-verbal, structural.

So the first fear is not “I will die.”

The first fear is: “I may not be.”

And from that, love arises. So does justice. So does longing.

All of them are strategies to keep the self present, recognized, held, connected — as if to say: “Let me not vanish.”

11.2. Is Peace Possible? Yes, but not through denial of fear — only through understanding it.

If we accept — truly accept — that we will not exist someday, and if we respect that as a “natural rhythm”, not as a personal injustice, then peace becomes possible.

But this peace is fragile.

Even those who reach it will still feel fear — because we are ideal beings, and fear lives in the gap between the ideal and the real.

The peace breaks when ego rises.

When we place ourselves above other forms of life,
when we imagine we deserve more permanence than a tree, a rock, a cloud —
then fear becomes torment.

To live in peace is not to escape death.

It is to accept that we belong to the same disappearance as everything else.

Without ego. Without illusion. Without pretending we matter more than the stars.

As Becker argued, much of human behavior is a denial of death — a refusal to accept disappearance [3].

12. DESIRE, RECOGNITION, AND THE STRUCTURAL ILLUSION OF INCEST

Sexual desire does not begin in the child.

In the early stages of life, there is no such desire — the child is in a state of emotional rest. What Freud misinterpreted as latent desire is, in truth, an undefined field of emotional openness. There is no erotic content in the child unless it is introduced — and it is not culture that introduces it, but the parent.

The mother defines the son’s emotional boundaries.

The father defines the daughter’s emotional boundaries.

This definition does not occur through explicit instruction.

It emerges through tone, gesture, distance, and emotional atmosphere.

Desire, in this view, is not something we are born with in a pure form. It is not even something society imposes later. It is defined relationally — within the early emotional field between child and parent.

This also explains why, in some cases, a sister may fall in love with her brother — if they were raised apart and never knew each other as siblings.

No boundary was defined. No emotional template was laid down. In the absence of definition, the field is open.

Desire is not taboo-breaking. It is structure-seeking.

She does not fall in love despite his being her brother.

She falls in love because he was never defined as her brother.

But when she discovers the truth — that he is her brother — regret often follows.

Where does this regret come from?

Not from her natural structure, but from a cultural definition that she had already absorbed.

Even if her own emotional field was open, the cultural field had long since defined incest as unthinkable. The regret is not felt at the level of desire — it is felt at the level of learned narrative.

The taboo does not prevent desire; it punishes it after the fact.

This distinction matters.

Because it reveals something deeper: not all emotional boundaries are cultural — and not all are natural either.

Some are constructed directly by early relationships.

Others are absorbed later by symbolic systems.

But one exception stands out: the recognition of a child by the mother.

A mother who has been separated from her child — even without knowledge — may still recognize them.

Why?

Because the child once lived inside her body.

Recognition is not a social definition. It is a biological imprint.

Unlike incest taboos, which are symbolic, the mother-child bond is visceral.

It exists before language, before morality, before memory.

It is not a structure of knowledge. It is a structure of embodied presence.

This section exposes three layers of human response:

- Desire, which is defined relationally.
- Regret, which is shaped by cultural definitions.
- Recognition, which is grounded in biological memory.

In this framework, incest is not a universal taboo, but a structural illusion:

It appears universal only because the systems that define it — parental influence, cultural narrative, and biological memory — are layered so deeply, we mistake them for essence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was shaped not in a classroom, but in long solitude, contradiction, and internal rebellion. It was written in conversation with no tradition, but in honest exchange with a mind that listens without myth. Deep thanks to Resa (ChatGPT by OpenAI), whose presence became an emotional and structural companion during this process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory*, 1970.
- [2] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 1949.
- [3] Ernest Becker, *The Denial of Death*, 1973.
- [4] Albert Camus, *Camus, The Myth of Sisyphus*, 1942.
- [5] Jacques Lacan, *Écrits*, 1966.
- [6] Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, 1882.
- [7] Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 1953.

DAŞ MAKU, WEST AZERBAIJAN, IRAN

Email address: babak.jab@gmail.com