

# Introduction

Perhaps the most significant question of this generation and all the generations beforehand is “What is the purpose of life” to make a meaning out of the indifferences amongst the world, to take a stand against the absurdity of cosmic even social insignificance.

Or Is it?

Is there something lurking beyond the “seeking of purpose”. Something so preliminary that it precedes the question and perhaps might not be the sole reason but inadvertently an important one nonetheless.

## Understanding Meaning

To trace out the genealogy of meaning, one must confront the attempts, in which we as a collective human society tried to generate meaning. Consecutively, What does the meaning itself mean?

In my personal view, I approached meaning by two simple questions. Meaning of what? And Meaning for what? In linguistics, up to Wittgenstein, meaning was largely defined using **reference-based semantics**. Basically, what the words are pointing towards, their truth conditions. Wittgenstein, however, proposed **use-based semantics**. Meaning is how words function in practice. Later in 1969, David Lewis, synthesised these two approaches and concluded that languages exist because communities coordinate on how to use words, and truth conditions arise out of those conventions.

Even as children, our first encounters with the world are guided by two simple questions: *What is this?* and *What is this for?* In Bengali, there's a common saying: “এটা খায় না মাথায় দেয়?” which roughly translates to “Is it for eating or for putting on the head?”

When presented with something unfamiliar, we instinctively ask these questions: ***What is it?*** and ***What is it for?***

Hence, moving forward, our ground truth will be, meaning arises from the dual questions:

1. ***of what?*** — concerning the entities or phenomena under consideration.
2. ***for what?*** — concerning their role, function, or significance within a system of interpretation.

These dual queries form the very foundations of understanding, guiding our exploration of objects, actions, and, eventually, concepts. The same basic structure underlies how humans construct meaning throughout life. It is the lens through which we begin to interpret reality.

# Reality as I see it

Reality, to me, is *nature*. And under nature comes everything the things we can see, feel and also the things we can't see or feel. It's everything and all encompassing. It doesn't possess any inherent quality of Good or Bad.

Growing up, in a poetic sense we were taught nature to be nourishing and caring. Comparing nature to mother, this has always bothered me. As I see it, nature is not caring at all rather it creates and destroys disregarding any outcomes. This became clearer to me when I was first introduced to Darwinism. Later, the more I explored neo-darwinism and then modern synthesis, this became more and more clearer and as a matter of fact it is backed by our current understanding of science.

But I must proclaim, asking nature's motive be it "caring" or something else, is not quite logically sound. Yet, we must ask questions and with enough information we might conclude something. Even questions that sound profound may also be unnecessary with enough information.

Onto reality we first ask questions to interpret it. That's the very essence of *philosophy* itself. Hence, any inquiry of reality, knowledge and value is a form of philosophy. Be it in the earlier ages religion, or later science. All the scientists, prophets can be seen as philosophers. Few might have a rigorous, disciplined framework and derive conclusions from statistical data under a disciplined process and few might have been purely from personal or collective experience within certain constraints. That doesn't simply state one must have been wrong. Both have their own values and societal influence. Hence, we must see them as that without diminishing others in absence of information from a purely belief stand point or superficial understanding.

Where science deals with reality in an objective manner, *religion* since the very beginning has dealt with reality in more of a subjective manner. To me it's not because they were willingly did that rather there wasn't any scope of objective understanding in the earlier days. But you may argue as society progressed as science grew we should've seen more objective version of reality. For that you must consider how a man's ideologies are shaped by their beliefs and religion played a huge role in shaping beliefs.

If you ask why? This is quite simple but first you have to understand the contemporary societal structures when a religion is being born. For any religion is not born out of a stable society rather a deeply troubled one. You should ask why won't if even god exists, doesn't send their prophet so that in later times the chances of nuances do not even arise? Isn't this like a plot convenience from a literature perspective! If god sent the prophets to uplift to unite atleast a particular society of humans in the time of such urgency isn't doing it before hand would make the society a better place?

But this is like plot inconvenience to show miracles, and forge into gullible minds of people who are already in troubled state. This was one of the query I had since childhood amongst many.

But if we take this critique aspect of emergence of prophets at the exact plot convenient moment, we can find a correlation with instability in society with emerging prophets. Every religion is created out of a traumatic situations nonetheless. But what is taught by these prophets doesn't last long before the religion collapse by someone else or from within.

This simply means God mustn't be omniscient, omnipotent as we often think or he just waits and watch in the name of freedom to choose to intervene at the worst moment, which more looks like narrative spectacle rather than active compassion.

Now we have to entertain both of these ideas without dismissing any of it. For if the first is true then the religion with all powerful omnipotent omniscient god is just our own invention out of despair.

And if the second is true then what's the difference between the god and a child who watches over a ant hill. Feeds it if he wishes, destroys it if he wishes, save it if he wishes if a danger comes (say another kid is trying to destroy it), it's then god's simply whimsical choice.