Dr. Gabriel Antonio Suárez

THE TELEOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE

Grounding Consciousness, Meaning, and Morality in an Objective Reality

"We may be infinitely small,
yet never insignificant."

Reality has structured layers—physical, mathematical, logical—that exist independent of perception and are discovered rather than invented. The normative domain is likewise a candidate for discovery.

The Teleological Imperative

Grounding Consciousness, Meaning, and Morality in an Objective Reality

Reality has structured layers—physical, mathematical, logical—that exist independent of perception and are discovered rather than invented. Human cognition, though shaped by evolution, is not merely adaptive in a pragmatic sense; it is at least partially truth-tracking, as evidenced by the remarkable intelligibility of the world to reason. Across cultures and centuries, independent minds converge not only on mathematical and physical truths, but also on core moral intuitions and existential orientations. Unless there is a principled reason to treat the normative domain as uniquely unreal, the more parsimonious conclusion is that meaning and moral reality are likewise discoverable features of the structure of things.

This argument does not claim that moral or existential truth is verified in the same way as physics, nor that every human longing corresponds directly to a metaphysical object. It claims something more disciplined, and therefore more defensible: that our orientation toward meaning, moral obligation, and transcendence constitutes defeasible evidence that we are responding to something real, and that the burden of proof lies with those who would declare the normative dimension an illusion while preserving realism everywhere else.

Introduction: The Myth of the Meaningless Void

A common assertion in modern thought—often presented as sober realism—is that the human desire for meaning is merely a projection onto an indifferent universe. On this view, "purpose" is not discovered but invented; morality is not objective but negotiated; transcendence is not insight but emotional need. The universe simply is, and we, like trees or stones, simply happen to be in it.

There is an understandable appeal to this position. It seems modest. It avoids dogmatism. It offers relief from metaphysical burden. But its modesty is deceptive. It asks us to believe that consciousness, reason, moral seriousness, existential longing, and the persistent human orientation toward significance all arise within a reality that contains nothing corresponding to them except private preference and adaptive illusion.

That is not realism. It is a metaphysical claim of enormous scope.

The question is not whether human beings *desire* meaning. That is obvious. The question is whether this desire is best understood as a purely subjective construction, or whether it is evidence—fallible, partial, but real—that consciousness is responsive to an objective normative order. My argument is that the latter view is more philosophically serious.

We do not inhabit a meaningless void onto which minds accidentally project value. We inhabit a layered reality, one whose structure is progressively disclosed through reason, experience, and convergence across independent minds. Once this is recognized, the normative domain can no longer be dismissed as unreal by fiat. If mathematics and physical law are discovered rather than invented, then meaning and moral truth cannot simply be assigned to a separate category of unreality without argument. That exemption must itself be earned.

We may be infinitely small, yet never insignificant.

I. The Ontological Tension of Consciousness in a Purposeless Reality

If meaning, purpose, and moral value are entirely human constructions, then a profound tension emerges at the center of conscious life.

Human beings are not merely organisms that react to stimuli. We are beings who ask what things are *for*, what we are *for*, whether truth matters, whether love is real, whether justice is owed, whether suffering can be redeemed, whether death is final, and whether our existence answers to anything beyond itself. These are not ornamental features of consciousness. They are woven into its structure.

A fully disenchanted account of reality asks us to believe that this orientation is fundamentally misfired: that a universe containing no objective purpose nevertheless produces beings who cannot help but seek it; that moral seriousness emerges in a world containing no real "ought"; that reason reaches for truth in a system ultimately governed by survival alone; that consciousness opens onto questions for which reality supplies no corresponding depth.

This is not a formal contradiction. A purposeless universe could, in principle, produce beings haunted by purpose. But it is a deep explanatory incongruity. It would mean that some of the most central features of our mental life are not difficult truths pointing toward reality, but highly persistent forms of existential misalignment. This should not be accepted casually.

We already understand that faculties do not arise in total isolation from the world they engage. Eyes are not proof of light by themselves, but in a world where eyes successfully function, their existence makes sense because light is real. The faculty and the environment are intelligible together. Likewise, the human drive toward truth is not proof of truth's accessibility by itself, but it becomes intelligible because reality is, to a remarkable extent, answerable to reason. The world can be known.

The same principle does not prove teleology outright, but it does generate a serious presumption: when a feature of consciousness is stable, universal, deep, and structurally central, we have reason to ask whether it corresponds to something real rather than dismissing it as a mere accident. Meaning-seeking is not trivial. Moral experience is not trivial. Existential longing is not trivial. They are among the most persistent and defining aspects of human life.

To say this proves objective purpose would be too strong. To say it counts as no evidence at all would be far too weak. This is the first step of the argument: the structure of consciousness places the anti-realist under pressure. A reality wholly indifferent to meaning may be possible, but it is not obviously the best explanation of beings so persistently oriented toward it.

II. Relational Reality and the Intelligibility of the World

The deeper issue is not desire alone, but the relation between mind and world.

Human cognition appears to be oriented toward intelligibility, not merely toward survival in the narrow sense. Of course, evolution selects for fitness, not abstract truth as such. Yet if our cognitive faculties were only useful fictions, it would be difficult to explain the extraordinary degree to which reason discloses the structure of reality. We do not merely survive in the world; we uncover laws, infer invisible entities, formalize abstract relations, and build predictive systems of astonishing power.

The world is intelligible in a way that exceeds what blind pragmatism alone would lead us to expect.

This point matters because any serious naturalistic account must explain not only why we persist as organisms, but why minds shaped by natural history are capable of grasping truths that far outrun immediate survival needs. Mathematics, logic, theoretical physics, and philosophy itself all depend on the assumption that reason is at least partly answerable to reality as it is, not merely useful for local adaptation.

That assumption is not optional. Every worldview that argues against objective meaning still relies on it. The skeptic about moral reality must still trust logic, inference, evidence, coherence, and argument. They must still believe the mind is capable of tracking what is true. But once this is granted, a crucial door is opened. If the relation between mind and world is not exhausted by survival function—if cognition can genuinely disclose structures not invented by us—then there is no general reason to assume in advance that the normative domain is inaccessible or unreal. One may argue that morality is less precise than mathematics or less testable than physics. That is fair. But that is not the same as showing it belongs to an entirely different ontological category. Lower precision is not unreality.

This is the essential point: the intelligibility of reality makes realism about discovered structures plausible. Once that principle is established, the anti-realist must explain why it should suddenly fail exactly where human experience becomes moral and existential.

III. The Convergence Argument: Mathematics, Physics, and Meaning

At this point, the critic may object that the argument illicitly moves from a biological or psychological orientation to a metaphysical conclusion. Eyes and light are part of a causal system. Meaning and transcendence are not obviously so. Why think the analogy holds?

The answer comes from an unexpected but decisive source: the history of mathematics and science. One of the most philosophically astonishing facts about human knowledge is that independent minds, separated by geography, language, and centuries, converge on the same truths. Mathematical structures discovered in pure reason turn out to describe physical reality with extraordinary precision. Distinct thinkers arrive at the same geometric relations, the same logical identities, the same calculus, the same physical principles. This is not adequately explained as mere cultural coincidence. It is taken, correctly, as evidence that they are tracking structures that exist independently of the minds that discover them.

This is already a standard epistemic principle: persistent convergence across independent rational inquiry is evidence of discovery rather than invention.

Now consider the normative domain. Across civilizations, there is striking—though not perfect—convergence on a set of moral recognitions: that gratuitous cruelty is wrong, that betrayal is morally weighty, that justice matters, that human beings possess a dignity not reducible to utility, that courage and honesty are virtues, that love and sacrifice disclose something morally higher than domination and indifference. At the existential level, there is likewise a recurring orientation toward transcendence, obligation, ultimate concern, and the intuition that life is answerable to something beyond appetite.

This convergence is not as exact or formalized as mathematics, nor as experimentally constrained as physics. That difference must be admitted plainly. But difference in degree is not difference in kind. The relevant point is structural: independent minds repeatedly converge on normative claims as though they are responding to a reality not wholly of their own making.

The anti-realist often responds that such convergence can be explained by shared evolutionary pressures, social coordination, and common neural architecture. But this reply, while important, proves less than it seems. Similar explanatory moves are also available in principle against mathematics. One could say that human brains converge on geometry because our neural architecture favors certain spatial abstractions, not because geometry tracks anything real. One could say that logic is merely the shared operating grammar of one species. Yet we reject these fully deflationary accounts because the convergence is too stable, too fruitful, too answerable to a reality that pushes back.

The anti-realist therefore owes us a principled distinction. Why is convergence good evidence for objective structure in mathematics and science, but not even prima facie evidence in morality and existential life? Why should the normative domain be treated as the one realm where recurrent, serious, cross-civilizational convergence counts for nothing? No sufficient answer has been given.

The Formal Argument

The argument can be stated precisely:

- Human cognition is capable of tracking objective structures in reality.
- One standard sign of such tracking is convergence across independent minds.
- Mathematics and science are accepted as discovered, not invented, in part because of this convergence.
- The moral and existential domains exhibit their own forms of deep cross-civilizational convergence.
- Therefore, such convergence constitutes at least defeasible evidence that the normative domain is also responsive to objective structure.
- Anyone who denies this must provide a principled reason for treating the normative domain as uniquely exempt from a standard inference used elsewhere.

This is the heart of the essay. To be clear: this argument does not claim that moral realism is established *in the same way* as calculus or field theory. It claims that the pattern of convergence gives us reason to treat the normative domain as a candidate for discovery rather than dismissing it as mere projection. Moral and existential experience may be more difficult, more historically entangled, more susceptible to distortion. But difficulty of access is not evidence of non-existence. It may simply indicate that the domain is subtler, not unreal.

IV. Existential Longing as Evidence, Not Proof

Much confusion in this area arises because arguments from desire are often stated too strongly. It is easy to say: if humans long for transcendence, transcendence must exist. That formulation is rhetorically powerful but philosophically vulnerable. Not every desire corresponds to a real object, and not every persistent longing guarantees fulfillment.

But there is a more careful and more serious version of the claim.

There is a difference between arbitrary wants and structurally central orientations of consciousness. Hunger, curiosity, moral seriousness, the longing for permanence, the resistance to reducing love to chemistry or justice to preference—these do not function merely as passing appetites. They are part of the architecture of personhood. They shape civilization, law, religion, art, sacrifice, and self-understanding. They are not eccentric impulses at the margins of life. They are among its organizing centers.

The argument, then, is not that longing proves its own object. It is that existential longing is evidence—fallible but significant—that consciousness is responsive to dimensions of reality not exhausted by material description. If a feature of experience is universal, durable, normatively authoritative, and resistant to reduction, that gives us reason to take it seriously as disclosive rather than illusory.

This is where the old argument from desire can be reformulated without naïveté. The point is not "I want, therefore it exists." The point is that a species whose cognitive life is profoundly ordered toward truth, value, permanence, and transcendence is not well explained by a metaphysics that insists these are all elegant mistakes.

Existential longing does not force the conclusion of immortality, nor prove a specific theology. But it does undermine the easy confidence with which modern anti-realism dismisses teleology as fantasy. Longing may be ambiguous; it is not trivial. It belongs in our total evidence.

V. Flipping Sartre's "Paper Knife": Essence, Existence, and Discovery

Jean-Paul Sartre's famous "paper knife" analogy aimed to dismantle teleology. For artifacts, essence precedes existence: a paper knife is made according to a concept or blueprint. But for human beings, Sartre argued, there is no given essence; we exist first and only later define ourselves. Hence his famous slogan: existence precedes essence.

The force of the argument depends on a hidden assumption—namely, that unless essence is empirically given in an obvious and immediate way, it should be treated as absent. But that does not follow. An undiscovered essence is not the same thing as a non-existent essence.

In every field of inquiry, human understanding begins in partial ignorance. We do not conclude that there are no laws of nature because we have not yet discovered them all. We do not conclude that there is no objective structure to mathematics because only portions of it are currently known. Ignorance is not negation.

The more disciplined alternative is this: the question of human essence remains open, and our experience of reason, conscience, dignity, longing, and moral obligation may be evidence that essence is not fabricated ex nihilo by choice, but progressively discovered through life. Human freedom is real, but freedom need not mean self-creation without remainder. It may instead mean participation in a structure we only partly understand.

This preserves what is powerful in existentialism—namely, the seriousness of responsibility—while rejecting its unwarranted metaphysical leap. We are not forced to choose between rigid predestination and radical self-invention. There is a middle position, and a better one: essence may be real without being fully transparent; purpose may be objective without being mechanically obvious; teleology may guide inquiry without abolishing freedom.

This is where Viktor Frankl becomes indispensable. Frankl did not argue that meaning is arbitrarily projected by the self onto a neutral world. Quite the opposite: he argued that meaning is encountered, answered, and discovered within concrete reality, even under the most catastrophic conditions. What matters philosophically is not merely the therapeutic usefulness of this insight, but its phenomenology. Meaning presents itself not as fantasy, but as something that addresses us—as something to which we are responsible.

That does not by itself prove full metaphysical realism. But it is powerful evidence against pure constructivism. The lived structure of meaning is one of discovery, not invention. Sartre is right that human beings must act before final metaphysical certainty is available. But he is wrong to infer from this that there is no essence to be discovered. The more coherent conclusion is that our task is not to invent purpose from nothing, but to orient ourselves toward a purpose not yet fully comprehended.

VI. Why Preference Cannot Ground Morality

The most important practical issue is morality.

Many critics of teleology object that grand purposes are dangerous. History is full of ideologies that justified atrocity in the name of destiny, utopia, or the greater good. Better, they say, to abandon metaphysical ambition and settle for simple human kindness: be gentle, be present, alleviate suffering, ask for no cosmic guarantee. There is emotional wisdom in this response. But as a philosophical foundation, it fails.

Subjective preference cannot generate genuine moral obligation. At most, it can explain inclinations. If kindness is only something I happen to prefer, then it is not binding in any deep sense. It may be admirable to me, useful for social harmony, or emotionally satisfying. But it is not something anyone is truly *obligated* to uphold. The person who prefers cruelty, domination, or indifference is not wrong in a robust sense; they are merely different. This is the central weakness of moral subjectivism. It can explain taste. It cannot explain duty.

The problem is not solved by moving to collective preference, social contract, or evolutionary game theory. These frameworks may explain why cooperation emerges, why empathy has adaptive value, or why societies punish destructive behavior. But they explain coordination and prudence, not normativity in the full sense. They can tell us why communities discourage cruelty. They cannot tell us why cruelty is genuinely wrong even when it is useful, efficient, popular, or advantageous to the powerful.

This distinction matters. A morality grounded only in preference—individual or collective—will always be vulnerable when sacrifice is costly. What obligates a person to remain just when justice threatens their status, safety, tribe, or life? What binds the strong when cruelty is profitable? What condemns the majority when injustice is democratically affirmed? Without objective value, the answer is ultimately: nothing.

This is not merely an abstract concern. History is filled not only with purpose-driven fanaticism, but with moral collapse born of drift, silence, conformity, and convenience. Not every catastrophe begins with metaphysical excess. Many begin with the evacuation of duty.

The danger of false teleology does not disprove teleology any more than false science disproves science. Every powerful idea can be corrupted. The answer to distortion is not abdication, but discipline. If objective moral reality exists, our grasp of it will be partial, corrigible, and in need of humility. But that is an argument for moral inquiry, not for moral anti-realism.

Kindness deserves better than preference. Justice deserves better than consensus. Human dignity deserves better than utility.

VII. Teleology Without Fanaticism

One of the most persistent misunderstandings of teleological thinking is that it must produce obsessive futurism: the sacrifice of the present in the name of some imagined destiny. But this is a corruption of purpose, not its fulfillment.

An objective teleological order does not require us to worship outcomes. It does not license fanaticism. It does not mean every event is transparently meaningful, nor that any political project can baptize itself as history's final aim. Rather, it means that reality contains genuine norms—truths about flourishing, justice, dignity, love, and the proper orientation of consciousness—that are not reducible to appetite or force.

To say that human beings have a *telos* is not to reduce them to instruments. It is to affirm that they are the kinds of beings for whom certain forms of life are fitting and others are degrading. It is to affirm that truth is better than falsehood, love better than domination, courage better than cowardice, justice better than exploitation—not merely because we happen to like these things, but because they answer to what is real.

This kind of teleology should make us more humble, not less. If moral reality is objective, then none of us owns it. We stand under it. We discover it imperfectly. We can be corrected by it. Objective purpose, properly understood, is not a weapon for domination. It is a limit placed on domination.

VIII. Situating the Argument in the Philosophical Tradition

The central moves of this essay belong to an established philosophical lineage, though the synthesis here is distinct.

The claim that human desire may point beyond itself is most famously associated with C.S. Lewis. But Lewis often moved quickly from existential longing to a supernatural conclusion. The present argument is more restrained. It does not deny theology; it simply does not require it at the outset. Its first claim is philosophical rather than confessional: that human orientation toward meaning may be evidence of an objective normative order embedded in reality itself.

In that respect, the argument stands closer to a tradition of natural teleology. Aristotle argued that things possess ends by virtue of what they are. Teleology for him was not initially theological but metaphysical: nature is intelligible in terms of form, fulfillment, and proper development. An acorn is not merely a lump of matter; it is the kind of thing ordered toward oakhood. Modern thought often rejects this framework too quickly, assuming mechanism has replaced teleology rather than merely describing part of its operation.

Thomas Nagel, from a very different standpoint, reopened this problem in modern form by arguing that consciousness, reason, and value are not satisfactorily explained by standard reductionist accounts. His proposal of natural teleological laws remains controversial, but the controversy itself reveals the depth of the issue: once consciousness and normativity are taken seriously, a purely anti-teleological metaphysics begins to look less complete than advertised.

Alvin Plantinga's evolutionary critique of naturalism presses a related tension. If our cognitive faculties are selected solely for survival rather than truth, then confidence in reason becomes unstable. One need not accept Plantinga's full theological framework to appreciate the pressure of the argument: a worldview that undermines trust in the truth-tracking power of reason also undermines itself.

And the scientific parallel is perhaps most clearly expressed in the longstanding astonishment over the effectiveness of mathematics. Abstract structures generated through reason disclose the architecture of the physical world. This fact does not prove moral realism, but it decisively weakens the assumption that reason only invents. Again and again, it discovers.

What distinguishes the present synthesis is the insistence that these lines of thought converge. The argument from desire, the intelligibility of reality, the reliability of reason, the convergence of independent inquiry, the irreducibility of moral obligation, and the phenomenology of discovered meaning all point in the same direction: not to certainty, but to a serious cumulative case for objective teleology.

Conclusion

We are not arguing for a frantic, goal-obsessed life that sacrifices the present to a distant abstraction. Nor are we claiming that every human intuition is infallible, or that the moral order is already fully transparent to us. The claim is more disciplined, and more profound.

Human consciousness is not a trivial accident. It is structured by an orientation toward truth, meaning, value, and transcendence. Reason does not merely survive; it discovers. Reality does not merely happen; it discloses ordered layers that thought can progressively apprehend. Across civilizations and centuries, independent minds converge on truths that appear to precede them—mathematical, physical, moral, existential.

This convergence does not eliminate disagreement. It does something philosophically more important: it gives us a standard by which discovery is distinguished from invention.

Once that standard is acknowledged, the normative domain cannot simply be declared unreal because it is harder to measure. The burden falls on the anti-realist to explain why moral obligation, human dignity, existential longing, and the persistent intuition of transcendence should be treated as uniquely illusory while realism is retained everywhere else. That exemption is not self-evident. It is the very point that requires argument. No such argument has been decisively supplied.

The more coherent conclusion is that meaning and moral reality are not arbitrary projections cast onto an empty universe. They are features of reality imperfectly but genuinely disclosed through consciousness. We do not invent the good from nothing. We discover it haltingly. We do not create significance ex nihilo. We awaken to it.

The universe is not a meaningless void, and we are not merely clever organisms decorating emptiness with stories. We are participants in an intelligible order—finite, fallible, unfinished, yet answerable to truths that do not depend on our approval.

We are bound by an objective moral reality, and oriented toward a truth that, while infinite, ensures we are never insignificant.

What Teleology Suggests About Humans and the Universe

The universe is not neutral. It has structure—mathematical, physical, logical—that exists independently of any mind. That structure is progressively intelligible to reason. Minds capable of reason didn't arise *against* that structure; they arose *within* it and *through* it, which suggests they are in some sense continuous with it.

Consciousness is not an accident sitting on top of a meaningless substrate. It is the substrate becoming reflective.

Humans, then, are not merely clever animals. They are the point at which the universe begins to *understand itself morally*—begins to ask not just *what is* but *what ought to be*. That capacity for moral seriousness, for justice, for love that exceeds utility—these are not evolutionary noise. They are, on the teleological reading, the most advanced expressions of something that was always latent in the structure of things.

If that's right, then the meaning of human existence is not something humans invented. It's something they are progressively *discovering themselves to be part of*. The telos isn't a destination imposed from outside. It's an orientation built into the nature of conscious, reasoning, morally serious beings—one that becomes clearer as those beings develop.

— End of Manuscript —

Dr. Gabriel Antonio Suárez