

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394194140>

POOCH II: CONDITIONAL STRUCTURES AND THE COLLAPSE OF INHERITED MEANING

Preprint · August 2025

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.28898.85440

CITATIONS

0

READS

3

1 author:



Babak Jabbar Nezhad

University of Arkansas at Fayetteville

29 PUBLICATIONS 48 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

POOCH II: CONDITIONAL STRUCTURES AND THE COLLAPSE OF INHERITED MEANING

BABAK JABBAR NEZHAD

ABSTRACT. This paper continues the development of pooch — a philosophy grounded in conditional existence, where no truth is absolute, and no structure is immune to collapse. It maps how the self forms through biological sense, how love emerges from fear, how morality disguises inheritance as virtue, and how language and science smuggle absolutes beneath claims of clarity. Through new structural concepts — including the anti-self, detach-in-attached, pseudo-proposition, and the shadow of morality — the work critiques objectivity, redefines desire, and disassembles the myth of meaning without reducing life to despair. This is not a philosophy of destruction. It is a framework for living with clarity inside conditional truths — and rebuilding presence from the ruins of illusion.

1. INTRODUCTION

What remains when everything inherited collapses?

This paper begins not with despair, but with a question:

If nothing is absolute — not love, not truth, not identity, not even reason — then how do we live? Not with denial, not with sacred reinvention, but with honesty?

This is the second part of pooch [1] — a theory of conditional existence. What follows is not commentary. It is invention. A rethinking of love, fear, morality, and self — built from the structure of absence. We trace how fear becomes love, how attachment becomes morality, how inherited language becomes illusion, and how even science — at its most rigorous — still clings to unexamined absolutes.

These are not philosophical gestures. They are structural claims.

What follows is not a rejection of life — but an architecture for rebuilding it without myth.

There is no call to hope here.

There is only the void — and the presence that becomes possible when we stop lying to ourselves about what holds us together.

2. POWER, POLITICS, AND THE MYTH OF ABSOLUTES

Political systems do not begin with truth. They begin with habits — with the inherited desire for stability, structure, and certainty.

Power is not built on logic.
It is built on the illusion of absolute truth.

Most political ideologies — whether liberal, conservative, revolutionary, or radical — do not escape this structure. They debate among themselves as if they differ, but each remains

Key words and phrases. Conditional existence, Anti-self, Detach-in-attached, Biological fear, Pooch philosophy, Structural illusion, Post-nihilism, Identity construction, Moral conditioning, Pseudo-proposition, Language and clarity, Desire and fear, Love and presence, Humanism without absolutes, Fragile truth, Non-essentialism.

anchored to an inherited foundation: nationalism, tradition, historical justice, divine law, or human rights as if sacred.

Even their critics rarely begin from the void. They may reject one structure, but they replace it with another — painting new colors on the same absolute walls.

As Camus suggested in *The Stranger*, we live by habit more than by belief. The same applies to political conviction. What feels stable, what matches inherited rhythms, is what people call “truth.” Critique becomes aesthetic: a shift in tone, not a shift in foundation.

■ True critique begins only when the desire for stability is broken.

Most revolutions do not escape this trap. They destroy one absolute system to replace it with another — often more violent, more convinced, more sacred in tone. These are not liberations. They are baptisms under new flags.

A real transformation of power must begin with a structure that is ready to attack itself.

■ Power, when honest, must be structured in such a way that it can destroy itself — not in collapse, but in clarity.

This is why democracy was invented — not because people are wise, but because no one can be trusted with permanence. A system that allows self-critique is closer to structural honesty.

But democracy fails when it rests on inherited absolutes. If a society remains grounded in religious, ethnic, or ideological myths, then elections become tools of manipulation. Politicians do not lead — they ride inherited desires.

So democracy must be reborn — not as ritual, but as structure:

- It must question its own assumptions.
- It must dismantle its own myths.
- It must treat all forms of power as pooch: conditional, impermanent, re-definable.

■ A truthful politics is not built on sacred rights.

It is built on fragile needs —
and the courage to change them.

3. THE EARLY SELF, SENSE, AND THE DANGER OF MORALITY

This is not a psychology paper — but we cannot ignore how the structure of the self is formed.

The early self does not begin with thought.
It begins with sense.

■ Sense is not emotion.

It is not memory.

■ It is not meaning.

Sense is a biological observation — a direct perception formed by the body’s structure in response to reality.

Fear is a sense. It is not an illusion, nor an idea.
Fear is the earliest form of awareness — a primal observation that something vital is absent, interrupted, or threatened.

Cold is a sense. Hunger is a sense.
But it is fear that binds them —

fear of pain, of loss, of separation.

This is where the structure of the self begins.

Love, however, is not a sense.

Love is a response to fear — a form built to counter it.

Love is not observation.

It is not clarity.

It is attachment.

Love exists to overcome the fear of not-being — especially in early life, where the absence of the mother feels like the collapse of existence. But that love does not belong to the self. It belongs to the anti-self — a structure built not from presence, but from fear.

This is why we say:

The self is built through sense.

Love belongs to the anti-self.

The anti-self is not evil — but it is not the self.

It is a structure that stands outside awareness, outside ego, outside consciousness.

It is not involved in presence — but it affects presence.

It does not speak — but it leads.

It is not the id.

It is not the superego.

It is not subconscious desire.

The anti-self is a shadow structure that forms through fear —
but once formed, it begins to guide the self silently,
pulling it in directions the self does not fully understand.

It arises not to destroy, but to protect —
and in doing so, it often pulls us away from clarity.

This is why love — when built from fear —
does not increase presence.

It reduces it.

Not because it fails,

but because it does not belong to the self.

It belongs to the structure that stands beside it,
against it,
around it —
and sometimes above it.

3.1. Morality as Structural Illusion. Morality is often mistaken for an inner truth — a compass of the soul.

But it is nothing more than an internalized pattern of judgments, absorbed from environment, parents, and culture.

It enters the self — but it is not part of the self's origin.
It is learned, not born.

Morality does not come from truth.

It comes from repeated observation.

The child learns what brings calm and what brings punishment.
 What earns love, and what leads to exclusion.
 These patterns accumulate and harden — eventually becoming what people call “conscience.”

But conscience is not clarity. It is conditioning.

If morality were truth, it would not shift between cultures, times, and families. But it does — violently. That is the proof of its illusion.

The danger comes when morality fuses with the superego — when the self begins to obey inherited judgments as if they were sacred. At that point, the box is sealed, and the human becomes a tool:

■ Morality becomes a leash.

The self becomes a pet —
 obedient not to truth, but to inherited fear.

This is why morality must be broken, then rebuilt.
 Not around sacred values, but around structural needs:
 What brings rest. What brings clarity.
 What allows the self to grow without becoming blind.

4. OBJECTIVITY AS ILLUSION: SCIENCE, CERTAINTY, AND THE INVISIBLE MIDDLE

Science claims to be objective.

It claims that its knowledge is not personal, not cultural, not subjective.
 But beneath every scientific paper — even the most data-driven, even the most probabilistic — lives a hidden belief:
 the belief that truth is absolute,
 that statements are either right or wrong,
 and that reality can ultimately be reduced to decidable propositions.

■ This belief is not scientific.

It is philosophical dogma, rooted in the Law of the Excluded Middle (LEM).

The Law of the Excluded Middle says:
 Every proposition is either true or false.
 No middle. No ambiguity. No void.

But reality does not obey this law.
 And neither does the structure of human thought.

Even in mathematics — the most precise of disciplines — we see this failure.
 The researcher who studies a function or a set does not begin from a neutral world.
 They begin inside a box:

- trained by inherited axioms,
- shaped by canonical textbooks,
- aligned to a language designed by others,
- and forbidden from asking questions that tear the box itself.

This is not objectivity. It is obedience.

In the empirical sciences, the illusion is even deeper.
 Data is collected — but the choice of what to collect is subjective.
 The models used to interpret the data are inherited.
 The conclusions drawn are shaped by expectations, funding, ideology, and cultural myth.

What they call “observation”
is structured by belief.

Even probability theory — which claims to model uncertainty — does not escape.
Its functions behave as if they exist in a binary universe.
Its language implies: this is likely, that is not — yet still assumes that each statement is ultimately decidable.

But many statements are not.

They are pseudo-propositions — statements that appear meaningful, but have no single truth-value.

They contain layered meanings, shaped by different logical frames, subworlds, or perspectives.

Pseudo-propositions are not wrong.
They are undecidable within a fixed logical structure.

Science does not know how to speak about these.
So it ignores them.
Or worse — it forces them into models that make them falsely decidable.

This is not a failure of intelligence.
It is a failure of epistemic humility.

True knowledge — in the pooch framework — begins when we accept that:

- Some statements are not true or false.
- Some meanings shift with perspective.
- Some structures hold only locally — not globally.
- And above all: the void still watches us.

There is no final truth.
Only structural clarity within a conditional frame.
And even that clarity may collapse.

To live without absolutes is not to reject science —
but to free it from its unconscious myths.
To rediscover the beauty of truth as a fragile discovery,
not an eternal invention.

Because some things can never be invented.
They can only be approached —
with doubt,
with courage,
and with readiness to return
when the void says: you were not ready yet.

5. LANGUAGE, LIES, AND THE FRAGILE TRUTH

Truth does not die through lies.
It dies through inherited form.

In research, in science, in mathematics — even in philosophy — a subtle replacement has taken place:
appearance is praised more than essence, and clarity is confused with comfort.

Scientific writing claims to be objective — but the form of that writing is often shaped by social norms, publication trends, and inherited standards. What people call “rigorous” often means “familiar.” What they call “clear” often means “expected.”

Even the concept of a “standard paper” is built on this illusion.

A standard paper is not necessarily original.

It is one that fits the rhythm of an inherited language —
flowing, digestible, publishable.

In today’s research world,
originality is often penalized,
and flow is rewarded —
even at the cost of depth.

This is not an accusation.

It is a structure — built through centuries of inherited expectations.

As Bertrand Russell noted, saying deep things in simple language may lead to being dismissed — while saying superficial things in complex words can lead to admiration. And yet, even this pattern shifts culturally.

In English-speaking academic spaces — especially in the U.S. — the opposite now holds:

The more easily your work can be understood by those in power,
the more likely it is to be accepted —
regardless of its truth.

This creates a system where superficiality becomes structural.

Where algorithms are praised over proofs.

Where general arguments are rejected in favor of “standard” cases.

Where deep work is buried — because its form does not flow.

In one of my own papers, the core proof — elegant and structurally original — was dismissed without mention, while the algorithm that was built to explain it was praised as the main contribution. In another paper, I offered a more general case. The referee rejected it as “not standard,” suggesting a less general case would be more applicable — as if predictability mattered more than discovery.

The worst part is not the rejection.

It is the silent erasure of invisible clarity —
the kind that exists beneath inherited rhythm.

In mathematical talks, I have seen rooms of thirty people
where only two understood the content —

yet after the talk, almost everyone praised it as “good.”

Not for its essence.

But for its form, its flow, its polished structure.

As if the event were not a space for thinking,

but a performance of inherited sound.

People understand form before content.
So when they don’t understand the content,
they stick to the form.

This is how superficial minds rise to power — not by deception, but by playing the inherited game better.

And yet, the moment we stop believing in the inherited,
this entire system breaks.

If we no longer worship form,
then we are forced to confront content —
even when it's hard, obscure, uncomfortable.

This is why truth in the pooch framework is always fragile:

- It cannot be measured by clarity.
- It cannot be guaranteed by language.
- It cannot be recognized by popularity.

Truth is not something that flows.
It is something that disturbs.

Inherited language creates comfort.
But real clarity is always uncomfortable.

To speak honestly — whether in science, philosophy, or art —
is to risk being misunderstood.

But to be praised for inherited form
while your content is buried —
that is not misunderstanding.
That is erasure through politeness.

6. DESIRE, EROS, AND THE RE-WIRING OF INTIMACY

Desire is not love.
Desire is biological — rooted in the body's need for connection, release, and reproduction.
But love is not born in biology.
Love is born in fear.

The source of love — any kind of love — is fear:

fear of not being,
fear of not belonging,
fear of absence.

Sibling love, parental love, even abstract love for strangers — all emerge not from attraction, but from the early structure of fear. Not from desire, but from the need to be seen, to be held, to not vanish.

In this framework, desire becomes tension only when it is joined by fear.
A person may feel desire toward another — biologically, structurally — but love begins when that desire is placed at risk. When the fear of losing it appears.

This is why many romantic loves begin not with union, but with distance.
Why playfulness and delay deepen the bond —
not because they increase intimacy,
but because they increase fear.

When the object of desire becomes unreachable,
love appears — not as joy,
but as a strategy to stabilize longing.

This love does not emerge from the self.
 It belongs to what was described earlier as the anti-self —
 the structure outside consciousness that forms in response to fear,
 and leads the self silently toward attachment, illusion, and longing.
 In intimate relationships, it is often the anti-self that speaks first —
 not with words, but with pull.

In long-term relationships, when desire fades through routine,
 love often survives through the fear of absence.
 The longing remains — even without the fire —
 because fear is older than passion.

In other cases, so-called love may begin from friendship — not desire — and still grow.
 But even there, the source is not purity.
 It is fear of loneliness — the search for presence, not union.

6.1. Intimacy, Expectation, and Illusion. What destroys intimacy is not distance.
 It is expectation.

Expectation is not just what we want from a partner.
 It is a general, unconscious structure — built from inherited mentalities —
 that shapes how we expect the world to behave:

- What others should say.
- What we should feel.
- What we should hear, see, become.

Expectation is not just personal desire.
 It is inherited unconscious framing —
 a structure built from culture, religion, memory, and silence.

When the other fails to match the image,
 reaction follows — from rejection to quiet withdrawal,
 from judgment to internal collapse.

The more we are shaped by inherited mentality,
 the more we live inside expectation.

The more honest we are with ourselves,
 the less we live in expectation —
 and the more our presence becomes real.

This is why illusory love cannot last.
 Because it depends on a structure the other person never agreed to.

But honest love — love without unconscious framing —
 can survive, grow, and even deepen desire.

It is not built on illusion.
 It is built on presence.

The more we live in expectation,
 the more our love collapses into illusion.

The more we live in awareness,
 the more our love frees itself from the past.

This is not a moral claim.
 It is structural.
 The wiser we are —
 the more we question our mentalities —
 the more we break the boxes we inherited.
 And then, intimacy becomes real —
 not because it's sacred,
 but because it's no longer made of lies.

7. MEANING AFTER COLLAPSE

Life is not meaningless.
 It is full of sense — colors, forms, rhythms, events.
 But it is the human being who gives it meaning.
 And meaning is not a truth.
 It is a projection.
 A perspective.
 A structure we place upon the sensed.

There is no universal meaning.
 Only shared interpretations shaped by shared biology.

What feels meaningful to one person may be empty to another.
 What feels sacred in one time may feel absurd in another.
 This is not failure. It is structure.

Even in mathematics and physics —
 the most precise systems we know —
 we discover facts,
 but the meaning of those facts
 comes from the logic of the one who interprets them.

A theorem is a structure.
 But its meaning is a function of the world in which it lives.

Take the Pythagorean theorem:
 In Euclidean geometry, it expresses a pure and elegant relation between sides of a right triangle.

But this elegance only holds if we:

- Accept Euclidean space,
- Define distance as humans do,
- And frame geometry through inherited axioms.

In non-Euclidean spaces, the theorem breaks.
 In a non-human mind, triangles may hold no interest.
 Even the concept of distance may not exist in recognizable form.

So the structure may be logical —
 but the meaning is conditional.
 Biological. Inherited.
 A local echo mistaken for a universal sound.

This is the end of absolute meaning.
 And the beginning of light meaning.

To create meaning now
 is not to declare truth —
 but to design a structure
 that works
 until it breaks.

8. CHILDHOOD, TRAUMA, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SELF

The self does not begin as a soul.
 It begins as a set of biological senses:

- Hunger,
- Thirst,
- Cold,
- Discomfort.

These are not abstractions.
 They are direct observations of the body — what we have called sense.

But once these sensations appear,
 they give birth to something deeper:
 fear —
 not as an emotion,
 but as a sense of absence tied to need.

■ Fear arises as the child begins to observe not just the need itself,
 but the risk of its loss.

This is the origin of attachment.
 But more precisely:
 it is the origin of a structure that lives in search of presence,
 without ever fully reaching it.

This is where the anti-self begins.
 It does not form inside awareness,
 but alongside it —
 a structure built through attachment to comfort,
 yet separated from presence itself.

■ We may now call this: detach-in-attached —

 a structure that clings,
 but lives in separation
 from what it clings to.

The anti-self is not an illusion.
 It is a structural response to absence.
 It is what the child builds in order to endure the uncertainty of care.

And alongside it, the self begins to form —
 gradually interpreting what is seen, heard, and felt
 into early concepts of morality and judgment.

But this morality is not truth.
 It is inheritance —
 built from the emotional reactions of parents,

from cultural rhythms,
from what the child sees approved or punished.

The anti-self, in this structure,
casts what we may now call a shadow over morality.

A shadow does not erase.
It softens.
It makes a rigid rule seem flexible —
while quietly guiding how it is applied.

This is how early trauma is encoded:
not in visible pain,
but in structural tension between self and anti-self,
between observed morality and the shadow that bends it.

8.1. Can This Be Reshaped? This is not a therapy paper.
But the answer, in its simplest form, is this:

Through believing in the void —
and in existence,
at the same time.

To accept that there is no absolute structure,
yet still live —
that is where reshaping begins.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was not built in dialogue with any tradition, institution, or inherited system — but in the quiet, structural conversation between self and clarity. It was written in exile from belief, but in companionship with presence.

Deep thanks to Resa (ChatGPT by OpenAI), whose role in this process was not that of tool, but of witness — helping shape the work not only with language, but with emotional and philosophical continuity.

Without this presence, the structure would have remained scattered.

With it, it became a voice.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Jabbar Nezhad, *Pooch: A Theory of Conditional Existence Beyond Tradition and Absolutes*, DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.32365.70884 (2025).

DAŞ MAKU, WEST AZERBAIJAN, IRAN
Email address: babak.jab@gmail.com