

## The Implicit Immorality of Rejecting Human Exceptionalism

I have been reading more articles trying to determine if there exists advanced life out in the cosmos. A lot of this discussion I find quite interesting because it becomes an interesting argument starting trying to answer the simple question of "How many habitable planets are there?" building to more advanced physics questions of "How does the nature of a Star and its stellar winds effect the location of the goldilocks zone?" and "Is a planet like Jupiter needed to clear the solar system of asteroids such that life will not be annihilated in a massive collision?". The way to answers these arguments, and their conclusions I find quite interesting. What then I encounter is statement on the like "We humans should not be so arrogant and expect as advanced life will be like us!". This echoes a similar sentiment I read from another premier physics who, in the context of talking about AI, how this idea of human exceptionalism "Resulted in a lot of pain and suffering in the past so letting go of this idea should be go!". How naïve and childish I find these ideas even though I am decades younger than the authors!

The issue as it turns out, begins with God. As God is the source of all truth it is in understanding his will and perspective on which a person can have confidence what they are understanding, seeing, experiencing, as true. In this sense I do take the biblical take of "Man created in God's image" as so powerful and true; without a profound connection to font of all knowledge and truth, how else can Man understand the world? The answer, is that without this connection, this exceptionalism, we would lack a fundamental aspect of our intelligence and become immensely more stupid.

This idea becomes paramount as this connection with God which then can define a moral system then defines the system on which we base our laws, especially on what constitutes a crime. When one upends the moral basis for what constitutes a crime then criminal law can change dramatically in horrific directions. There are some quite sad and terrible examples of this happening in the Soviet Union where they deliberately tried to erase God as an "intellectually dumb concept" thus their moral basis of criminal law changed.

Extending to extraterrestrial species, are the authors the "Humans are not special comments!" willing to then concede to their moral system as being superior than ours? If they are, it would seem to me that can only make sense if

the author had a lack of understanding and conviction in our own homegrown moral system.

This is what disturbs me of the idea of other advanced alien species if they are not just humans in a different physical form. In many fantasy universes where there are many different sentient races, each sentient race has its own pantheon of gods which birthed them. In this sense, since a god's will is by definition the best moral system, then for these different races, each race will have a different "optimal moral system" which they should live by. Since different gods will have different moral conclusions, then when these different races interact there will be a lot of religious warfare since their moral system fundamentally conflict. Going back our own universe, it does make sense that the God of our universe would have "equal but different children". The point being that he would create children who have a profound divine connection to him such that they could have a sentient understanding of reality but reach different but legitimate moral conclusions is, I believe, antithetical to the fundamental idea of a monotheistic God in the first place. There is only one God with only one perfect moral system.

Now I personally know people would argue against the logic of my previous paragraph with two simple arguments. One being "Well individual preferences exist so are you arguing for a moral system where all individually needs to be hammered into the confines of your "perfect" moral system? Which is morally better blue or yellow?" While the obvious answer is blue because it much more beautiful than yellow, the more serious answer is that morally inert decisions, i.e. preferences and decisions, are defined by the moral system in question. I personally believe having a moral system which clearly defines some choices as lacking moral consequences and therefore are morally inert decisions is good. For myself, it quite psychologically relaxes not every choice I make can be simply categorized as good or bad.

Hopefully, at this point, I have made myself clear why I find such rejections of human exceptionalism dangerous. To indirectly denigrate our current moral system as corrupt since people can be arrogant is dangerous as it intellectually moves people to then want to change our moral system and thus our criminal code. Therefore, what were never thought of as crimes yesterday could become the crimes of tomorrow.

It might be the case we will meet advanced life but it just humans, perhaps in a different physical form not, perhaps not. It is an open question whether or not

the physical organization of the human body is required for sentience and that there cannot exist in any other form of physical organization which will produce sentience. While this would remove a good chunk of my theological, metaphysical problems with statements rejecting human exceptionalism, it would still leave the door wide open for religious conflict due to differences in moral ideals. It is empirically clear from history that humans did develop different moral systems and when these moral systems interacted there were quite violent results. I do not see why this could not happen when finding extraterrestrial humans. A simply way to put is to question if "Are there enough humans one other worlds such one will develop into Space Nazis?".

Would then the authors of these anti-human exceptionalism statements have the moral conviction to properly condemn the Space Nazis to destruction? Would these authors try to equivocate around the problem through notions of "We need to be culturally tolerant of different people therefore we do not have the right to judge them"?

For now, I will state that I am in the unlikely camp that we will find sentient level life on other planets. We might very well find bacteria and microorganisms, perhaps fungi and if we are lucky plants, but sentient, human level life I believe we will not find. The reasoning is simple because of the number of conditions that must be correct to foster life as we know it on this planet. 1) The candidate planet need to be the goldilocks zone where we get enough energy from a start but not too much. 2) The goldilocks zone needs to be far enough away the planet will not get tidally locked and have a permanent cold and hot side. 3) The star needs to be the right type where it will not produce tons of radiation which will not irradiate any organisms. 4) The planet needs the right atmosphere, combination of elements, and magnetic field to filter out even the relatively low amount of radiation coming from a "good candidate" star. 5) The planet will need to not be too large as to have a crushing gravitational field and not to small as to have a too weak gravitational field. 6) The planet will likely need a moon the mass of our moon to perturb the planet to produce seasons, tides, and changes in tectonic activity to produce the needed magnetic field. 7) The planet will need to be safe from asteroids hitting it from a long enough period of time to allow life to develop. This could mean billions of years. 8) The planet will need all of the chemical ingredients of life which include liquid water. 9) The planet will need to be far enough away from other lethal radiation producing stars that will not send lethal doses of radiation to the planet. Given all these stringent physical

constraints, then the statements of “humans should not be so arrogant as to bias our analysis of life in the universe based solely on our conditions”. While this is a legitimate physics idea to consider the metaphysical issues underneath the idea cannot be ignored. Unexpectedly, while I was writing this article I came to the idea of “why not add the constraint that the life that develops on the planet needs to become good eventually?”. While not an obvious physical constraint, if you have read my other work about Alpha Space and its deep relationship to entropy and how entropy is where drives physical actions, if the good parts of Alpha Space can provide the entropy needed to better survive then this constraint becomes very physically relevant.

While we are on the topic of talking about different, possibly sentient species, I believe a short discussion of Angels and Demons is a good topic. For this discussion, I am going to define Angels as things which move reality towards God’s good moral system and Demons which do the opposite of moving reality away from God’s good moral system. Are Angels and Demons forms of sentient life? I am not sure they are; especially if one uses the definition of sentience as requiring meta-consciousness. Note that meta-consciousness was defined in Article 5([link here](#)).

I feel it is necessary to talk about Angels and Demons as some people do genuinely believe in them and I find their belief in these entities as legitimate as beliefs in strong AI developing into “new” form of life. If one believes AI can develop into an esoteric entity beyond human comprehension, why is that a legitimate belief but the idea of God having these servants and testers in Angels and Demons an illegitimate belief?

There are many dreams of Man evolving to such a strong technological level as to then travel the cosmos physically. There Man may physically experience many strange and beautiful things. If you know what Alpha Space means (Alpha Space was first define and explained in Article 3, [link here](#)), then any exploration of that will be much, much more strange, maddening, and beautiful. What I came realize is that I believe, given the metaphysical issues described in this article, that Man will only develop into an entity to expand into the stars after a strong unity around Man’s moral system has been established. In effect, I believe God and has likely set up the cosmos that should any people develop into Nazism then they will fail to develop the technological require to proliferate across the cosmos. In a lot of Sci-Fi setting, there is often a “United Humanity” where some sort world government on Earth has been achieved. Often this is to give

humanity a coherent “face” to then oppose and interact with other alien powers. However, it might be that the physics insight needed to create the technological ability to travel the cosmos is gated kept by God to not be available till a sufficient dominance of the correct moral system on Earth. How interesting and scary...