

THE UNIVERSE OBSERVING ITSELF

Juan Segurola

2026

© 2026 Juan Seguro
All Rights Reserved.

The Universe Observing Itself

Contents

Introduction	4
PART I What Is an Observer?	9
Chapter 1: Not Outside Looking In	9
PART II What Does It Mean to Be a Temporary Living Individual?	14
Chapter 2: Life as Maintained Organization	14
Chapter 3: The Biosphere	17
Chapter 4: Every Organism Dies	20
Chapter 5: What Persists in a Changing Body?	23
PART III What Is Conscious Life?	26
Chapter 6: From Sensitivity to Experience	26
Chapter 7: The First Person	28
Chapter 8: Other Conscious Animals	31
Chapter 9: Other Possible Observers	33
PART IV What Changes When an Observer Knows It Will Die?	36
Chapter 10: The Animal That Knows It Will Die	36
Chapter 11: Why Finitude Changes the Observer	39
PART V What Makes a Person?	43
Chapter 12: Memory, History and Relationships	43
Chapter 13: When Experience Stops	46
Chapter 14: When the Story Breaks	48
Chapter 15: What Makes Me the Same Person?	51
PART VI What Ends When an Observer Dies?	54
Chapter 16: When Does an Observer Die?	54
Chapter 17: The End of the First Person	57
Chapter 18: What Is Lost and What Remains of the Body	60
PART VII How Do We Live Knowing We Will End?	63
Chapter 19: Before Birth and After Death	63
Chapter 20: The Future We Will Not See	65
Chapter 21: A World After Us	68
Chapter 22: Would Endless Life Solve the Problem?	70
PART VIII What Remains After the Observer?	74
Chapter 23: Consequences Without Survival	74
Chapter 24: A Temporary Observer	77

Introduction

The Observer Is Not Outside the Universe

There is no evidence that the universe as a whole is conscious.

Physics describes the observable universe in terms of matter, energy, fields and the interactions among them. Most ordinary matter is hydrogen and helium, although ordinary matter itself is only a small fraction of the total content of the universe, far outweighed by dark matter and dark energy.

Consciousness, as far as current evidence shows, appears in certain living systems. On Earth, biological evolution produced organisms with nervous systems capable of perception, memory, learning and, in some cases, conscious experience. Consciousness is not uniquely human. Evidence supports its presence in different forms and degrees in many animals. What is exceptional in our species is the combination and extent of several capacities: reflective awareness of the self, symbolic language, cumulative culture, abstract reasoning and the ability to construct explicit models of reality.

These capacities allow human beings to do something remarkable. We can reconstruct events that occurred billions of years before our species existed. We can estimate the age of the universe, investigate the origin of chemical elements, reconstruct the history of life, study the brain that makes these investigations possible and ask how consciousness itself arises and ends.

Consciousness should therefore not be described as a property of the universe as a whole. It is a property, or a process, that has emerged locally in some of the living systems produced within its history.

The same may have happened elsewhere. If life has arisen on other worlds and evolution there has produced systems complex enough to process information and to be conscious, those beings could also become observers of the universe. They would not need to share human biology, or even to use DNA as their hereditary chemistry. Either way, observation did not enter the universe from outside. It arose within it, and after billions of years of physical and biological history the universe now contains local systems capable of reconstructing the history from which they themselves emerged.

The remarkable fact is not that the universe has a mind.

It is that a universe with no known mind of its own has produced beings capable of asking where they came from.

What this book asks

This book brings together questions that are usually treated in different disciplines: what kind of universe can contain observers, how living organisms become conscious, what makes a person persist through time, and what death takes away.

Important predecessors already connect some of these questions. Carl Sagan gave memorable expression to the idea that beings made within the cosmos can come to know the cosmos. Brian Greene places life, mind and even our awareness of death within the full span of cosmic history. Sean Carroll develops a naturalistic account in which meaning, mind and mortality belong within a physical description of the world. Philosophers including Derek Parfit, Thomas Nagel, Mark Johnston, Samuel Scheffler and Bernard Williams have examined identity, deprivation, survival, the future of others and the desirability of indefinite life.

The emphasis here is different. This book begins from the position of the observer who already exists, knows that it is temporary and understands that the universe will continue when its own perspective ends. Its central concern is not simply that organisms die, nor that consciousness is temporary. It is what ends for an

observer when a particular conscious perspective disappears: access to the future, the role of witness and the experience of reality from that singular point of view, while the universe, life and other observers continue.

It joins an outward perspective, toward a universe that contains observers, with an inward one, from an observer who knows that its own capacity to observe is temporary.

The detailed cosmic and evolutionary history by which observers arose belongs to the CHO series, *Cosmic History and Its Observers*. This book uses that history as background rather than retelling it. Its structure is organized by questions, not by chronology.

Individuality without separation

A living organism is a genuine biological individual. It maintains boundaries, regulates internal conditions, repairs damage and preserves enough continuity to remain recognizably the same organism through change. Yet biological individuality does not imply physical separation from the rest of nature. Organisms continuously exchange matter and energy with their surroundings, depend on other organisms and are embedded in larger ecological and planetary processes.

The same caution applies to human personal identity. A person is not merely a bag of atoms, but neither is the body irrelevant. Some bodily constituents turn over rapidly, some slowly and some can persist for decades. Neural activity, memory, ongoing conscious experience, biological integration and relationships with other people have different kinds of continuity. Later chapters will ask whether any one of these is sufficient for personal identity or whether what we call a person depends on several overlapping forms of persistence.

This book therefore uses a simple part and whole relation. A human being is part of the universe. It is not identical with the universe as a whole, and it is not external to it. During life, that part can become conscious of itself, of other beings and of the wider reality from which it arose.

The first-person problem

Experience is always experienced from somewhere. A conscious organism does not encounter the world from an abstract point outside nature. It has a body, sensory systems, a history and a present point of view. Human beings can add something further: they can make that point of view itself an object of reflection.

This ability creates a peculiar problem. We can understand intellectually that the world existed before us and can continue after us, but we can never experience our own absence as another episode of experience. We can imagine a future in which other people live, discoveries are made and questions are answered, while also understanding that our own perspective will no longer have access to that future.

That concern is distinct from the claim that death deprives a person of goods they otherwise would have had. It is also distinct from what psychologists call anticipatory nostalgia, which usually concerns longing for a present experience before it has been lost. The concern examined here is narrower: longing for the unwitnessed future, the knowledge that there will be later chapters of the world that one will not occupy as a witness. This book does not claim that the phrase names an established psychological category. It uses it to identify a philosophical and emotional problem that will be examined against work by Nagel, Scheffler, Batcho and others.

Five questions hidden inside fear of death

Fear of death is not one thing. A person may fear the process of dying, the state of being dead, the loss of a future they might otherwise have lived, separation from other people, or the ending of the first-person perspective itself. These concerns overlap but are not equivalent, and arguments that address one do not automatically answer the others.

Epicurus and Lucretius ask why non-existence should trouble us. Nagel asks what future goods death removes. Scheffler asks why the continuation of humanity after our own deaths matters to us now. Kagan separates several ways in which death might be bad. This book adds no new philosophical category merely by listing these concerns. Its task is to hold them apart long enough to ask which one is active when an observer says: I know that the world will continue, but I will no longer be there to see it.

What science can and cannot settle

The book adopts a scientific and naturalistic framework. There is no established evidence of consciousness continuing independently of a living nervous system. At the same time, the explanatory problem of consciousness remains open. Strong dependence between brain state and conscious state does not by itself explain why there is subjective experience at all.

The same discipline applies to death. Medicine requires operational criteria, but terms such as permanent and irreversible have technical meanings and may depend on available interventions. James Bernat's distinction between permanent cessation and irreversible cessation is therefore relevant. BrainEx and OrganEx further show why loss of organism-level function, loss of consciousness and loss of every cellular function should not be treated as a single instantaneous event. These issues will be addressed only to the extent necessary to clarify what it means for an observer to end.

The book will not become a medical manual, a history of cosmology or a textbook of neurobiology. Each scientific topic is included only when it changes what we can responsibly say about the temporary observer.

What remains after an event

The end of an event does not necessarily mean the end of its consequences.

The early universe no longer exists in the state in which it once existed, yet traces of that history remain accessible. The cosmic microwave background, released when the universe became transparent hundreds of thousands of years after the Big Bang, still reaches us after more than thirteen billion years and allows us to reconstruct properties of a much earlier cosmos.

A human life operates on an incomparably smaller scale, but the general causal principle is similar. While alive, every individual changes the world. Matter is displaced and transformed, energy is exchanged, other nervous systems are altered through words and actions, objects are made, decisions affect later decisions and information can be transmitted across generations.

The human body continuously emits thermal radiation, almost entirely in the infrared. Under an open sky, some of those photons can pass through the atmosphere and continue into space. Most are absorbed nearby, but the energy they carry is eventually incorporated into the Earth's own thermal radiation and leaves the planet as part of its infrared glow. None of this preserves the person, the person's consciousness or a readable record of a life. It simply illustrates that living organisms are never physically isolated from their surroundings.

The consequences of a life can follow many paths. Some dissipate rapidly. Others can be amplified through complex causal chains. Many become entangled with innumerable other causes until attribution to the original event becomes impossible. A word may alter another person's decision. A discovery may influence later work. A child may change the lives of people not yet born when the original individual was alive. When the individual dies, these causal chains do not all terminate at the same instant.

The observer ends.

The consequences of the observer may continue.

This is not personal immortality. A surviving book is not a surviving consciousness. A memory stored in another brain is not the original first-person experience. A photon emitted by a living body is not the person who emitted it. A life can cease as conscious experience while remaining part of the causal history from which later states of the world emerge.

There is a reason why a life leaves traces behind it and none ahead of it. The asymmetry between past and future is not only psychological. Physical records point toward the past because the universe has a thermodynamic arrow of time. Memories, fossils, photographs and traces exist within a world in which entropy has increased from an extraordinarily low entropy past. The existence of records is therefore connected to the same temporal asymmetry that distinguishes what has happened from what has not yet happened.

This does not mean that the past continues to exist as a present reality, nor does it require an eternalist or block universe interpretation of spacetime. Viktor Frankl repeatedly emphasized the irrevocability of what has been: once something has genuinely occurred, it cannot be turned into something that never occurred. The point here is compatible with that insight but does not depend on any metaphysical claim that the past still exists.

The identifiable traces of an event may disappear. Its information may become inaccessible. Its consequences may be dissipated, amplified or absorbed into later complexity. But the later history of the universe is reached through a causal history that includes what actually occurred. A human life is such an event.

It is temporary as a first-person perspective.

It can be persistent as a cause.

Structure of the Book

Map of the book

The book is organized around eight questions.

Part I asks what an observer is and why the observer is not outside the reality being observed. Part II asks what it means to be a temporary living individual, including biological organization, the biosphere, mortality and persistence in a changing body. Part III asks what conscious life is, how first-person experience differs from mere detection and what we can infer about other conscious animals or possible observers elsewhere.

Part IV asks what changes when an observer can explicitly anticipate its own death. Part V asks what makes a person persist when experience, memory and biological continuity can diverge. Part VI asks what ends when an observer dies. Part VII asks how a reflective observer lives with finitude, including the asymmetry between past and future, the future that will not be witnessed and the value of a world after us. Part VIII asks what, if anything, remains after the observer: material constituents, causal consequences, records, other observers and the fact that the individual was always part of the same universe it observed.

Introductory references

Bernat JL. How the distinction between irreversible and permanent illuminates circulatory-respiratory death determination. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*. 2010;35(3):242-255. doi:10.1093/jmp/jhq018.

Greene B. *Until the End of Time: Mind, Matter, and Our Search for Meaning in an Evolving Universe*. Knopf; 2020.

Johnston M. *Surviving Death*. Princeton University Press; 2010.

Kagan S. *Death*. Yale University Press; 2012.

Nagel T. Death. *Noûs*. 1970;4(1):73-80.

Parfit D. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press; 1984.

Sagan C. *Cosmos*. Random House; 1980.

Scheffler S. *Death and the Afterlife*. Oxford University Press; 2013.

Williams B. The Makropulos case: reflections on the tedium of immortality. In: *Problems of the Self*. Cambridge University Press; 1973.

Albert DZ. *Time and Chance*. Harvard University Press; 2000.

- Andrijevic D, Vrselja Z, Lysy T, et al. Cellular recovery after prolonged warm ischaemia of the whole body. *Nature*. 2022;608:405-412. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05016-1.
- Batcho KI, Shikh S. Anticipatory nostalgia: Missing the present before it's gone. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2016;98:75-84. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.088.
- Carroll SM. *The Big Picture: On the Origins of Life, Meaning, and the Universe Itself*. Dutton; 2016.
- Carroll SM. *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*. Dutton; 2010.
- Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. In: Inwood B, Gerson LP, eds. *The Epicurus Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 1994.
- Frankl VE. The Case for a Tragic Optimism. In: *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press; 2006. Postscript first published 1984.
- Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by Martin Ferguson Smith. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 2001. Book III.
- Vrselja Z, Daniele SG, Silbereis J, et al. Restoration of brain circulation and cellular functions hours post-mortem. *Nature*. 2019;568:336-343. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1099-1.

PART I

What Is an Observer?

Chapter 1: Not Outside Looking In

1. The observer belongs to the world observed

Science often separates the system being studied from the observer studying it. The separation is methodologically indispensable, but it should not be mistaken for a division between two kinds of reality. The instrument, the sensory system, the nervous system, the record and the theory are all instantiated within the same physical universe as the object of study.

Human observers are therefore not spectators placed outside nature. They are biological systems within nature that can detect, represent and interpret other parts of it. The fact is elementary, but its implications are unusual. A species that appeared very late in cosmic history can infer events that occurred billions of years before that species existed. The observer can also turn its methods inward and make the organism that observes into an object of observation.

This is the restricted sense in which this book uses the title *The Universe Observing Itself*. As noted in the Introduction, the idea has important precedents. The title here does not imply that the universe as a whole possesses a mind, intention or point of view. There is no evidence that it does. It means that local living systems have arisen within the universe that can experience parts of it and, in humans, construct explicit and testable models of it.

The part-and-whole distinction established in the Introduction will remain fixed throughout the book: the observer belongs to the universe it investigates without being identical with the universe as a whole.

2. A late observer can reconstruct an earlier world

The universe is about 13.8 billion years old according to the standard cosmological model. Humans appeared extremely late on that timescale, but contemporary observations allow us to reconstruct much earlier states. The cosmic microwave background, elemental abundances, stellar populations and large-scale structure contain information about periods long before Earth formed. The Planck mission provides one of the major observational foundations for the parameters of the current standard model of cosmology.

The cosmological chronology itself is not the subject of this chapter. CHO provides the detailed historical account. What matters here is the epistemic fact that direct presence at an event is not required in order to know something about it later. Records survive. Causes leave effects. A geologist can reconstruct a mountain's formation, a paleontologist can infer the anatomy of an extinct organism, and a cosmologist can infer conditions that existed before any human observer was present.

Scientific observation is therefore not limited to witnessing. It can be reconstructive. A temporary observer can extend its knowledge far beyond the interval of its own life by using physical traces, instruments, mathematics and records produced by earlier observers.

Human beings occupy a particularly reflexive position. We can investigate stars, planets and biological evolution, and then use the same empirical methods to investigate perception, memory and the brain that performs those investigations. The observer can become an object of observation without ceasing to be the observer conducting the inquiry.

3. Detector, observer and conscious subject are not the same thing

The word *observer* is used for very different functions, and the differences matter. A physical detector can register a signal without conscious experience. A bacterium can alter its behavior in response to chemical gradients. An animal can perceive, learn and remember. A conscious subject has experience from a first-person point of view. A reflective subject can represent itself as the subject of that experience. Scientific observation adds measurement, explicit concepts, records, inference and procedures that can be examined by other observers.

Thomas Nagel's formulation that there is something it is like to be a conscious organism captures one important distinction between mere functional response and subjective experience. The exact boundary between non-conscious information processing and conscious experience remains scientifically disputed, particularly across species, but the distinction itself cannot be removed simply by using the same word for both.

This ambiguity is especially important in quantum physics. The word *observer* in discussions of quantum measurement does not normally mean a conscious human mind. Quantum systems become correlated with measuring devices and with their environments. Decoherence theory explains how interaction with the environment suppresses interference between macroscopically distinct alternatives and helps account for the effective emergence of classical behavior. Decoherence by itself does not explain why a single definite outcome is experienced or recorded in every interpretation of quantum mechanics; that interpretive problem remains open. None of the major physical approaches, however, requires a conscious human observer for a detector to interact with a system or for a measurement record to exist.

Historically, some interpretations have assigned consciousness a special role in measurement, but those interpretations are not the framework adopted here. John Archibald Wheeler's participatory language and his image of a self-excited circuit are an important precedent for discussions of observers and the universe, but this book does not adopt Wheeler's stronger participatory interpretation. Its claim is simpler: observers are physical systems within the universe, and conscious observers are a subset of living systems, not agents required to make physical reality exist.

Consciousness itself is not uniquely human. The 2024 New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness, signed by a large and growing group of researchers, states that there is strong scientific support for conscious experience in other mammals and birds and a realistic possibility of conscious experience in all vertebrates and many invertebrates, including at minimum cephalopod mollusks, decapod crustaceans and insects. The boundaries remain uncertain, but treating humans as the only organisms capable of experience is not supported by current evidence.

Human distinctiveness lies elsewhere: in the unusual combination and degree of reflective self-awareness, symbolic language, cumulative culture, abstraction and explicit theory building. A human can observe a star and also ask what a star is, compare rival theories, record evidence, teach those theories to someone not yet born and connect stellar nucleosynthesis to elements in the observer's own body.

4. The existence of observers does not establish purpose

Describing human cognition as remarkable can easily turn into a story of progress in which evolution climbs toward intelligence. That is not how biological evolution works. Microbial life dominated most of Earth's biological history and remains extraordinarily diverse and successful. Complexity has increased in some lineages and decreased in others. Natural selection acts under local conditions, and evolutionary change does not require a predetermined destination.

Stephen Jay Gould emphasized contingency and warned against reading the history of life as an inevitable march toward increasing complexity. Simon Conway Morris, from a different perspective, has emphasized evolutionary convergence and the repeated emergence of similar solutions under similar constraints. The debate matters because contingency does not imply that every evolutionary outcome is equally improbable, and convergence does not imply a goal. Neither position establishes that human intelligence was an intended endpoint.

A related question appears in cosmology. Some physical constants and initial conditions appear to fall within ranges compatible with complex structure and observers, a family of issues often grouped under fine tuning. Brandon Carter's anthropic reasoning emphasizes an observational selection effect: any observer necessarily finds itself in conditions compatible with the existence of observers. Competing attempts to explain apparent fine tuning include deeper physical principles, selection effects in a multiverse, chance and other proposals. The issue remains disputed.

That dispute does not need to be resolved here. The presence of observers establishes that the universe has conditions under which observers can arise. It does not by itself establish why those conditions hold or that the universe had a purpose in producing observers. Historical dependence is not the same as intention. A sequence of events can be necessary for a later result without the earlier events having occurred for the sake of that result.

5. The observer is embodied

A human observer often experiences itself as a stable subject looking outward from a body. Biology reveals a more dynamic system. Living organisms take in matter and energy, transform them, regulate internal conditions, repair damage and maintain organization despite continuous exchange with their surroundings.

This view has a substantial intellectual history. Erwin Schrödinger framed life as a physical problem of maintaining organized states while obeying thermodynamic constraints. Ilya Prigogine developed the theory of dissipative structures and non-equilibrium organization. Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela developed the concept of autopoiesis. Hans Jonas emphasized metabolism in philosophical accounts of organismic identity. More recently, Daniel Nicholson and John Dupré have argued for a processual philosophy of biology grounded in metabolic turnover, life cycles and ecological interdependence.

These traditions do not make personal identity a solved problem. They establish something more limited: a living observer is causally dependent on the maintenance of a living body. Perception is shaped by sensory organs, bodily regulation, movement and neural integration. The body is causally indispensable to ordinary human observation.

Whether the biological organism is also constitutive of personal identity is a separate question. Later chapters will examine thought experiments and clinical cases that test biological and psychological accounts of persistence. This chapter does not decide them in advance.

6. First-person experience inside a publicly describable world

Science describes organisms from the outside. It measures behavior, electrical activity, blood flow, anatomy, molecular concentrations and responses to stimulation. Conscious experience is lived from the first person. A pain can be correlated with neural activity, but the measurement is not the pain itself. A visual experience can be studied experimentally, but the experimental record is not identical with what the subject sees.

The relationship between brain state and conscious state is nevertheless exceptionally strong. Brain lesions can alter perception, memory, personality and awareness. Anesthetic agents can abolish reportable consciousness and later allow it to return. Sleep, seizures, coma and neurodegenerative disease can alter different dimensions of conscious function. The weight of established evidence supports the dependence of ordinary human consciousness on organized nervous-system activity.

That dependence does not solve the explanatory problem. Nagel asked how an objective account relates to what an experience is like for the subject. David Chalmers later distinguished functional and behavioral problems of consciousness from what he called the hard problem: why physical processing is accompanied by subjective experience at all. There is no consensus solution.

The framework of this book is therefore naturalistic but epistemically limited. It will work from the evidence linking consciousness to living nervous systems. It will not claim that subjective experience has been fully explained, nor will it invoke consciousness independent of such systems without evidence.

The first person is part of nature, but our present description of nature does not yet explain everything about the first person.

7. Temporary individuals can build knowledge that outlasts them

A single observer is limited in time and space. Human science extends observation by externalizing it. Measurements can be recorded. Methods can be described. Instruments can be calibrated. Results can be challenged and repeated. Mathematical and linguistic representations can survive the people who produced them.

This accumulation allows short-lived individuals to investigate a history vastly longer than any individual life. No human observes the cosmos for more than a tiny interval, yet generations of observers can combine records to produce increasingly constrained accounts of events that occurred billions of years ago.

Shared knowledge is not shared subjectivity. A scientific community does not become one first-person consciousness merely because its members exchange information. But collective records alter what any one temporary observer can know. An individual can inherit observations made before birth and contribute observations that will remain available after death.

This distinction becomes important later in the book. Records, theories and causal effects can persist after the observer who produced them has died. Their persistence is not survival of that observer's consciousness.

8. Other observers may exist

Earth supplies one confirmed example of a world in which life produced conscious animals and a species capable of explicit science. We do not know whether life, consciousness or scientific intelligence has arisen elsewhere.

The possibilities should be stated conditionally. Other living systems would not have to reproduce terrestrial biochemistry in every detail. Hereditary chemistry need not necessarily use DNA, and conscious information processing need not reproduce a mammalian nervous system. If other evolutionary histories have produced conscious systems capable of reflective model building, those systems would be other local observers of the same universe.

Whether intelligence is extremely contingent or favored by convergent constraints remains open. That question does not need to be resolved here. One confirmed case is enough to establish the point relevant to this discussion: the universe contains at least one lineage of organisms capable of asking what produced them and of knowing that their own opportunity to ask is temporary. Chapter 9 will return to other possible observers in greater depth.

9. What this changes for a temporary observer

The observer considered in this book is not an external spectator, not a synonym for any detector and not a necessary ingredient of quantum measurement. It is a living system capable of conscious experience, and in the human case capable of reflective and scientific observation. It belongs physically to the reality it investigates.

That embeddedness changes the problem of finitude. The observer is not an entity visiting the universe for a time and later departing from it. Its biological existence, its conscious perspective and the material processes that sustain both occur within the same world from beginning to end. The later question is therefore not where the observer goes when observation ends. It is what form of organization, continuity and first-person access is lost when this particular observer can no longer experience the world.

The next chapters begin with the biological side of that question: how a living individual can remain itself while continuously exchanging matter, energy and causal influences with its surroundings.

References

1. Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results. I. Overview and the cosmological legacy of Planck. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*. 2020;641:A1. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833880.
2. Planck Collaboration. Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*. 2020;641:A6. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201833910.
3. Sagan C. *Cosmos*. Random House; 1980.
4. Nagel T. What is it like to be a bat? *The Philosophical Review*. 1974;83(4):435-450.
5. Chalmers DJ. Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. 1995;2(3):200-219.
6. Wheeler JA, Zurek WH, eds. *Quantum Theory and Measurement*. Princeton University Press; 1983.
7. Zurek WH. Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. *Reviews of Modern Physics*. 2003;75:715-775. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715.
8. The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness. 2024.
9. Andrews K, Birch J, Sebo J, Sims T. Background to the New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness. 2024.
10. Bar-On YM, Phillips R, Milo R. The biomass distribution on Earth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2018;115(25):6506-6511. doi:10.1073/pnas.1711842115.
11. Gould SJ. *Full House: The Spread of Excellence from Plato to Darwin*. Harmony Books; 1996.
12. Conway Morris S. *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe*. Cambridge University Press; 2003.
13. Carter B. Large number coincidences and the anthropic principle in cosmology. In: Longair MS, ed. *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*. Reidel; 1974:291-298.
14. Schrödinger E. *What Is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell*. Cambridge University Press; 1944.
15. Prigogine I. Time, structure, and fluctuations. *Science*. 1978;201(4358):777-785. doi:10.1126/science.201.4358.777.
16. Maturana HR, Varela FJ. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Reidel; 1980.
17. Jonas H. *The Phenomenon of Life: Toward a Philosophical Biology*. Harper & Row; 1966.
18. Nicholson DJ, Dupré J, eds. *Everything Flows: Towards a Processual Philosophy of Biology*. Oxford University Press; 2018. doi:10.1093/oso/9780198779636.001.0001.
19. Brown EN, Lydic R, Schiff ND. General anesthesia, sleep, and coma. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010;363:2638-2650. doi:10.1056/NEJMr0808281.
20. Koch C, Massimini M, Boly M, Tononi G. Neural correlates of consciousness: progress and problems. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2016;17:307-321. doi:10.1038/nrn.2016.22.

PART II

What Does It Mean to Be a Temporary Living Individual?

Chapter 2: Life as Maintained Organization

1. What makes a living individual persist?

A living organism changes continuously, yet it does not dissolve immediately into its surroundings. It maintains internal conditions, repairs damage, acquires matter and energy, removes waste, responds to perturbations and preserves enough organization to remain a recognizable individual through time.

This persistence is active. A stone can remain much the same because little is happening to it. A living organism remains itself because a great deal is happening all the time.

The contrast matters for this book because an observer must persist long enough to have a point of view, integrate information, remember and act. Consciousness is not suspended in an abstract space. It depends on a living system that continuously maintains the conditions under which conscious activity is possible.

The question is therefore not simply what matter an organism contains. It is how a changing collection of material components can sustain a living individual.

2. Open systems and continuous exchange

Living organisms are open systems. They exchange matter and energy with their surroundings and remain far from thermodynamic equilibrium while alive. Food, oxygen, water and other materials enter. Heat, carbon dioxide, waste products and other outputs leave. Molecules are synthesized, modified and degraded. Gradients are created and maintained. Membranes regulate exchange rather than eliminate it.

This does not make the organism unreal. On the contrary, the ability to regulate exchange is part of what makes it an organism.

Erwin Schrödinger drew attention to the physical problem of how living systems maintain organized states while remaining subject to thermodynamics. Later work in non-equilibrium thermodynamics, especially that associated with Ilya Prigogine, provided a more general language for systems that maintain ordered structures through flows of energy and matter. Biology adds layers of regulation, heredity, repair and adaptive response that make organisms much more than simple dissipative structures, but the thermodynamic point remains basic: life depends on throughput.

The same body can therefore persist while much of the matter participating in it changes. Persistence is not equivalent to material immobility.

3. Metabolism is not merely fuel consumption

Metabolism is often described as the set of reactions by which organisms obtain and use energy. That description is correct but incomplete. Metabolism also continually rebuilds the organism.

Proteins are synthesized and degraded. Lipids are remodeled. Membranes are repaired. DNA is copied or repaired. Ion gradients are restored. Cellular structures are replaced at different rates. Tissues respond to injury and use signaling networks to coordinate local activity with organism-level needs.

Hans Jonas emphasized this unusual relation between organism and matter. A living being remains itself not by retaining exactly the same material but by continually replacing and transforming material within an organized process. Contemporary process philosophy of biology develops related arguments in more explicit scientific terms. Nicholson and Dupré point to metabolic turnover, life cycles and ecological interdependence as major reasons to treat living entities as dynamically maintained processes rather than inert substances.

The process language must be used carefully. Saying that an organism is a process does not mean it is vague or unreal. A process can have boundaries, causal organization and persistence conditions. A hurricane is not unreal because its constituent air changes, and a living organism is vastly more structured than a hurricane. Biological individuality is maintained by specific mechanisms that constrain what enters, what remains, what is rejected and how parts cooperate.

4. Boundaries are maintained, not absolute

The skin and other epithelial surfaces make individuality visible, but the boundary of a living organism is not a perfectly sealed wall. Gas exchange occurs in the lungs. Nutrients cross the intestine. Water and ions move across membranes. Microorganisms live on and within animal bodies. Signals from the external environment continually alter physiology.

Thomas Pradeu has argued that immunology provides one of the clearest ways to understand biological individuality. The immune system does not simply distinguish a fixed self from everything foreign. It helps maintain cohesion among heterogeneous components while tolerating many non-genetically identical elements, including members of the microbiota. Biological boundaries are therefore actively regulated and context dependent.

This does not imply that the organism has no boundary. It implies that the boundary is functional rather than absolute. The individual is defined partly by the processes that preserve its organization while allowing selected exchanges with what lies outside.

For the human observer, this is a useful correction to intuition. Subjective experience can make the self feel sharply separated from the world. Biology shows that the organism supporting that experience is continuously coupled to the environment.

5. Autopoiesis and self-maintenance

Maturana and Varela introduced the concept of autopoiesis to describe living systems as networks of processes that produce and maintain the components required for the network itself to continue. The concept has been

influential and controversial, but it captures an important feature: living organization is recursively maintained.

A cell does not simply contain a membrane. Cellular processes produce and repair the membrane that helps maintain the conditions in which those processes continue. Enzymes participate in reactions that sustain the cell that produces those enzymes. Regulatory systems preserve variables within ranges compatible with continued activity.

No single molecule carries the identity of the organism. Identity is distributed across interacting structures and processes. Yet that does not mean every component is replaceable or that material continuity is irrelevant. Some components may persist for long periods and play indispensable roles. The point is that organismic persistence cannot be reduced to possession of one permanent material core.

This distinction will become important in Chapter 5, where the actual lifetimes of cells, molecules and structures are examined. For now, the conceptual lesson is enough: biological persistence is achieved through coordinated maintenance across many levels.

6. Organization is causal

The word *organization* can sound abstract, as if it were merely a description imposed by an observer. In living systems, organization has causal consequences.

A heart cell behaves differently when integrated into functioning cardiac tissue than when isolated. A neuron participates in networks whose activity depends on connectivity, synaptic state, neuromodulation and metabolic support. A liver is not simply a collection of hepatocytes, because tissue architecture and circulation matter. At the organismal scale, endocrine, neural and immune signals coordinate distant tissues.

The arrangement of components therefore changes what the components can do. Organization is physically realized and causally effective.

This is why the death of an organism cannot be described simply as the disappearance of matter. The matter remains, but the coordinated processes that sustained organism-level integration cease. Later chapters will ask how the failure of integration relates to the end of consciousness. At this stage, it is enough to recognize that living individuality depends on active causal organization.

7. The organism is not necessarily the whole person

It would be tempting to move directly from biological individuality to personal identity: if the organism persists, perhaps the person persists. That conclusion is not assumed here.

Clinical and philosophical cases complicate it. Memory can be profoundly altered while the organism remains alive. Conscious experience can disappear temporarily under anesthesia. Severe neurological injury can preserve some biological functions while eliminating or radically changing capacities that matter to personhood. Thought experiments about duplication or transfer challenge the intuition that bodily continuity settles every question of identity.

Biological persistence is therefore one continuity among several. It is foundational in an ordinary human life, because the living nervous system depends on the living organism. But the later question, what makes me the same person, requires more than an account of metabolism.

This book will keep the levels separate long enough to see where they coincide and where they diverge.

8. Temporary does not mean unstable

A finite organism can be remarkably stable over its lifetime. Homeostatic systems hold temperature, pH, osmotic conditions and energy availability within constrained ranges. Development can produce durable

anatomy. Memory can preserve information for decades. Bones can persist while remodeling. Some neurons can survive for most of a person's life.

The fact that an organism will eventually die does not make its individuality fictional. It means that individuality is maintained for a finite interval.

This distinction is central to the book's treatment of mortality. Human beings are not separate substances temporarily inserted into the universe. They are living organizations within it. Their individuality is real because the organization is real, causal and maintained. Their individuality is temporary because maintenance does not continue indefinitely.

For an observer, that temporary biological organization is the condition that makes a temporary point of view possible.

References

1. Schrödinger E. *What Is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell*. Cambridge University Press; 1944.
2. Prigogine I. Time, structure, and fluctuations. *Science*. 1978;201(4358):777-785. doi:10.1126/science.201.4358.777.
3. Jonas H. *The Phenomenon of Life: Toward a Philosophical Biology*. Harper & Row; 1966.
4. Maturana HR, Varela FJ. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Reidel; 1980.
5. Nicholson DJ, Dupré J, eds. *Everything Flows: Towards a Processual Philosophy of Biology*. Oxford University Press; 2018. doi:10.1093/oso/9780198779636.001.0001.
6. Dupré J, Nicholson DJ. A manifesto for a processual philosophy of biology. In: Nicholson DJ, Dupré J, eds. *Everything Flows*. Oxford University Press; 2018:3-46. doi:10.1093/oso/9780198779636.003.0001.
7. Pradeu T. Immunology and individuality. *eLife*. 2019;8:e47384. doi:10.7554/eLife.47384.

Chapter 3: The Biosphere

1. No organism lives alone

A living individual maintains itself, but it does not maintain itself in isolation. Every organism depends on flows that cross its boundaries and on environments already shaped by other organisms. A human breathes an atmosphere whose composition has been profoundly influenced by life, eats organisms or products derived from them, depends on microbial communities and returns matter to larger cycles.

This chapter is not a history of how the biosphere arose. That chronology belongs elsewhere, including the CHO series. The question here is conceptual: what does it mean for a temporary observer to exist inside a planetary system in which living and non-living processes are continuously coupled?

The answer weakens any picture of the individual as a self-sufficient unit. Biological individuality is real, but it is sustained inside networks of dependence.

2. Vernadsky's biosphere

Vladimir Vernadsky used the concept of the biosphere to describe life as a geological force. His work helped establish biogeochemistry by emphasizing that organisms participate in the movement and transformation of chemical elements through the atmosphere, hydrosphere and lithosphere.

The importance of the concept is not that Earth itself is alive. It is that living processes alter the chemical and physical environment at planetary scales. Photosynthesis moves carbon and releases oxygen. Respiration consumes organic matter and oxygen. Microorganisms transform nitrogen, sulfur, iron and other elements. Plants move water from soils to the atmosphere. Marine organisms affect carbon transport through the oceans. Decomposition returns elements from dead organisms to circulation.

The biosphere is therefore neither a decorative layer of organisms on an otherwise independent planet nor a single superorganism. It is the total domain in which living systems interact with one another and with air, water, minerals, radiation and climate.

For this book, Vernadsky's insight matters because an observer is not only inside the universe in the broad cosmological sense. It is also inside a dense planetary network of material exchange that made its individual existence possible.

3. Energy flows, matter cycles

Life on Earth's surface is sustained primarily by a continuous input of solar energy. Photosynthetic organisms capture a small fraction of incoming radiation and convert it into chemical free energy. That energy moves through food webs and is eventually dissipated as heat.

Matter behaves differently. Carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sulfur, oxygen, hydrogen and other elements are repeatedly transferred among organisms, oceans, soils, sediments and atmosphere. The atoms in a living body therefore participate in cycles that began before the individual existed and will continue after the individual dies.

This distinction between energy flow and material cycling is basic. Energy passes through the Earth system and is degraded toward forms less available for biological work. Matter is repeatedly rearranged and reused.

The individual organism temporarily intercepts these flows. It takes in molecules, uses them in metabolism and structure, and returns products to the environment. The body is not a closed inventory accumulated once at birth. It is a maintained configuration within larger fluxes.

This physical fact should not be turned into a metaphor of personal survival. Carbon leaving one organism and entering another does not transfer the consciousness or identity of the first. Material continuity across the biosphere is continuity of constituents, not continuity of persons.

4. Interdependence does not erase individuality

Ecological dependence can be so extensive that the boundary between individual and environment becomes difficult to describe cleanly. Animals depend on microbiota. Plants depend on fungi and microorganisms. Pollinators and flowering plants can become mutually dependent. Hosts and symbionts may influence one another's development, metabolism and defense.

Some philosophers and biologists have used concepts such as holobiont to ask whether the host plus its associated microorganisms should sometimes count as a larger biological individual. The debate is useful because it shows that individuality is not always located at one obvious physical boundary.

But interdependence does not mean that all distinctions disappear. Organisms still have different histories, regulatory systems, reproductive relations and degrees of integration. The fact that a human body contains microbial partners does not make the human individual identical with the entire biosphere.

A useful formulation is therefore relational rather than absolute. An organism is an individual because certain processes are more tightly integrated with one another than with the surrounding world, while still depending on exchanges across that boundary.

For the conscious observer, this creates an important contrast. Subjectively, the world can appear divided into a self here and an environment there. Biologically, that self is maintained through continuous interaction with what lies beyond its boundaries.

5. The biosphere is not a planetary mind

Because Earth contains globally coupled biological and geochemical processes, it is tempting to speak of the planet as though it were a single organism. James Lovelock and Lynn Margulis developed the Gaia hypothesis to explore the possibility that life and environment form feedback systems capable of maintaining conditions favorable to life.

Some weak forms of this claim are uncontroversial: biological processes strongly influence biogeochemical cycles, atmosphere and climate, and feedbacks link organisms with their environment. Stronger versions, in which the biosphere is treated as an adapted self-regulating entity, remain controversial. Evolutionary biologists have long questioned how planet-level adaptation could arise under ordinary natural selection when there is no population of competing and reproducing Earths.

Nothing in the argument requires a strong Gaia hypothesis. The biosphere can be deeply interconnected without being a superorganism, an agent or a conscious subject.

That distinction parallels the title of the book. Many conscious observers can exist inside a shared physical system without their consciousnesses combining into one larger consciousness. Interconnection is not identity.

6. The body is made from current and ancient environments

Every human body is assembled from materials acquired through an environment. The carbon in tissue comes through food webs ultimately tied to carbon fixation. Water is continually exchanged. Oxygen used in metabolism comes from the atmosphere. Nitrogen in amino acids passes through biological and geochemical pathways before incorporation into the body.

The exact history of any one atom is usually inaccessible, but the general dependence is unavoidable. Biological individuality is constructed from shared reservoirs.

This helps clarify what it means to say that a person is part of the universe. The claim is not mystical. It is materially literal. The body consists of chemical elements produced in cosmic processes and cycled through terrestrial ones, organized temporarily through metabolism and development. The surrounding world is not an external stage on which the organism acts. It is part of the causal history of the organism's continued existence.

At the same time, material origin does not erase first-person individuality. Two people can be composed of matter drawn from overlapping environmental reservoirs and still have entirely different memories, nervous systems and conscious perspectives. Shared matter does not imply shared subjectivity.

7. Life modifies the conditions of later life

Organisms do not merely occupy environments. They alter them. Plants change light, humidity, soil structure and atmospheric exchange. Microorganisms alter chemical gradients. Animals move nutrients. Coral reefs create physical habitats. Forests influence local and regional water cycling. Human societies now alter planetary processes at extraordinary rates.

This means that the environment inherited by one generation is partly the product of previous life. A later organism exists in conditions modified by organisms that are already dead.

The point is relevant to mortality. Biological consequences can outlast the individual organism. A tree can alter soil after it falls. A microbial community can transform a habitat. Human actions can change institutions, ecosystems and knowledge long after the individuals responsible are gone.

Persistence of effects is not persistence of the observer. The distinction must remain strict. But a temporary organism can become a cause in processes that continue beyond its lifetime.

8. A planetary context for a temporary observer

The biosphere changes the scale at which individuality should be understood. The observer is an individual, but an individual sustained by planetary flows that it did not create and cannot control alone.

This does not make the individual less real. It places individuality in context. The living body is maintained through exchange with air, water, food, microorganisms and ecosystems. Its constituents have histories older than the organism. Its outputs become inputs to other processes. Its actions can alter conditions experienced by later organisms.

The observer who reflects on mortality can therefore recognize two facts at once. Its first-person perspective is singular and temporary. Its biological existence has always depended on a network of processes extending far beyond that perspective.

The next chapter turns from interdependence to duration. If every living individual must maintain itself actively, how long can such organization persist, and what does the immense diversity of biological lifespans tell us about finitude?

References

1. Vernadsky VI. *The Biosphere*. Copernicus/Springer; English translation 1998. Original Russian publication 1926.
2. Lovelock JE, Margulis L. Atmospheric homeostasis by and for the biosphere: the Gaia hypothesis. *Tellus*. 1974;26(1-2):2-10. doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1974.tb01946.x.
3. Kirchner JW. The Gaia hypothesis: can it be tested? *Reviews of Geophysics*. 1989;27(2):223-235. doi:10.1029/RG027i002p00223.
4. Free A, Barton NH. Do evolution and ecology need the Gaia hypothesis? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 2007;22(11):611-619. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.007.
5. Gilbert SF, Sapp J, Tauber AI. A symbiotic view of life: we have never been individuals. *Quarterly Review of Biology*. 2012;87(4):325-341. doi:10.1086/668166.
6. Dawkins R. *The Extended Phenotype: The Long Reach of the Gene*. Oxford University Press; 1982.

Chapter 4: Every Organism Dies

1. Mortality is not the same as aging

Every known organism is vulnerable to death, but organisms do not all age in the same way. That distinction is easy to blur because human experience joins the two so closely. We age gradually and, if no external event intervenes, aging eventually contributes to the failure of the organism. Across life, however, mortality and senescence are not equivalent.

Aging usually refers to systematic changes with age that alter survival, reproduction or physiological performance. Jones and colleagues showed that age-specific mortality and fertility trajectories vary strikingly across animals, plants and algae. Some species show the familiar pattern of rising mortality with age, while others show nearly constant mortality, declining mortality over part of the life course or other trajectories that do not resemble human aging [1]. The diversity itself is biologically important. Evolution has not produced one universal aging program.

Hydra are a useful counterexample to the intuitive assumption that all multicellular organisms must show obvious senescence. Long-term demographic work found little evidence of increasing mortality with age in some hydra populations under protected conditions [2]. This does not make hydra indestructible. They can still die from predation, environmental stress, infection or other causes. Similarly, the hydrozoan historically described as *Turritopsis nutricula* was shown experimentally to reverse its life cycle from the medusa stage back toward a polyp stage [3]. Later taxonomic work associated the widely discussed life cycle reversal with *Turritopsis dohrnii*. The biological phenomenon is extraordinary, but "immortal jellyfish" remains a misleading phrase. Reversal of a life stage is not exemption from death.

The same caution applies at the microbial level. Binary fission complicates the question of where one individual ends and another begins, but even apparently symmetric division is not necessarily ageless. In *Escherichia coli*, cells inheriting an older pole showed reduced growth and increased mortality relative to cells inheriting newer poles, revealing physiological asymmetry beneath morphological symmetry [4], although later microfluidic work reported stable growth across many old-pole generations and reopened the interpretation of bacterial aging [9].

The scientifically safer conclusion is therefore simple: no known organism escapes death, although some show little measurable senescence and some have life histories that make the boundaries of individual aging difficult to define.

2. Evolution does not optimize for indefinite survival

Why should organisms age at all if natural selection favors survival and reproduction? Evolutionary biology has developed several influential answers.

Medawar argued that the force of natural selection declines at ages that relatively few individuals in natural populations reach. Harmful effects expressed late in life can therefore escape strong elimination by selection [5]. Williams extended this logic with antagonistic pleiotropy: a genetic effect can be favored if it improves survival or reproduction early in life even when it produces harmful effects later [6]. Kirkwood's disposable soma theory emphasized allocation. Organisms have finite resources, and selection can favor investment in growth and reproduction rather than indefinitely perfect maintenance and repair of somatic tissues [7].

These theories differ in mechanism and emphasis, and modern aging biology contains many additional levels of explanation. Their shared lesson is more important for this book: evolution does not work toward indefinite preservation of the individual. Natural selection shapes organisms under ecological constraints and tradeoffs. A body can be maintained with remarkable effectiveness for a period without being maintained forever.

This helps explain why longevity varies so widely. Lifespan is not a simple measure of biological success, intelligence or complexity. Different species occupy different ecological niches, face different risks and allocate resources differently. A short-lived organism is not a failed version of a long-lived one.

Longevity is therefore best understood as an evolved life-history strategy rather than a measure of biological worth. Selection acts within particular ecological conditions. Where external mortality is high, heavy investment in maintenance that matters only at advanced ages may yield little reproductive advantage. Where organisms are protected by size, armor, flight, social structure or relatively safe habitats, longer-term maintenance can become more advantageous. This ecological perspective reinforces the point that lifespan is not a ladder of biological advancement.

3. Life operates on radically different temporal scales

The range of individual lifespans is enormous. Some adult insects live for minutes or hours. The adult female mayfly *Dolania americana* is among the shortest lived adult insects documented, with adult mating, oviposition and death occurring within less than an hour [10]. Humans usually live for decades, and exceptional individuals exceed a century. Some large tortoises have documented or historically reported lifespans approaching two centuries, although exact ages in old individuals can be uncertain.

The Greenland shark provides a striking vertebrate example. Radiocarbon dating of eye lens nuclei led Nielsen and colleagues to estimate the largest shark in their sample at 392 plus or minus 120 years, with a minimum lifespan for the species of at least 272 years [8]. At the other extreme, individual bristlecone pines can remain alive for several millennia. Great Basin bristlecone pines include individuals more than four millennia old; Schulman's classic dendrochronological work documented trees exceeding 4,600 years [11]. Clonal organisms can persist even longer, but a clonal colony should not be confused with one continuously surviving trunk or body.

These examples are useful only if they are not turned into a ladder. They show that living systems solve the problem of persistence in many different ways. None establishes a natural "correct" lifespan.

The contrast also warns against confusing duration with individuality. A mayfly living for less than an hour as an adult is no less an individual because its interval is brief, and a pine living for thousands of years is not less temporary because its interval is long. Lifespan changes the scale of an individual's existence, not the basic fact that the individual is maintained for a finite interval and can cease.

4. Finitude precedes the awareness of finitude

For almost all organisms, death is a biological event without evidence that the organism represents its own future nonexistence conceptually. Some animals respond in complex ways to dead conspecifics, and later chapters will examine that evidence. Those behaviors should not be projected automatically into a human concept of personal mortality.

The distinction is crucial. Mortality is ancient. Reflective knowledge of mortality is much more recent and, as far as current evidence allows us to say, exceptionally developed in humans.

A human being therefore participates in a biological condition shared across life while experiencing it in an unusual way. The body belongs to the same world of finite organisms as every other body. It must maintain itself continuously, and nothing in evolution guarantees that maintenance indefinitely. What changes is that the human observer can anticipate the end of its own observation.

The observer inherits this biological condition rather than choosing it. It develops projects, attachments and expectations inside an organism already subject to metabolism, damage, repair and mortality. That is where mortality becomes more than a biological fact. It becomes a problem for a first-person perspective.

References

- [1] Jones OR, Scheuerlein A, Salguero-Gómez R, et al. Diversity of ageing across the tree of life. *Nature*. 2014;505:169-173. doi:10.1038/nature12789.
- [2] Schaible R, Scheuerlein A, Daňko MJ, et al. Constant mortality and fertility over age in Hydra. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2015;112:15701-15706.
- [3] Piraino S, Boero F, Aeschbach B, Schmid V. Reversing the life cycle: medusae transforming into polyps and cell transdifferentiation in *Turritopsis nutricula*. *Biological Bulletin*. 1996;190:302-312. doi:10.2307/1543022.
- [4] Stewart EJ, Madden R, Paul G, Taddei F. Aging and death in an organism that reproduces by morphologically symmetric division. *PLoS Biology*. 2005;3:e45. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0030045.
- [5] Medawar PB. *An Unsolved Problem of Biology*. London: H. K. Lewis; 1952.
- [6] Williams GC. Pleiotropy, natural selection, and the evolution of senescence. *Evolution*. 1957;11:398-411. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1957.tb02911.x.
- [7] Kirkwood TBL. Evolution of ageing. *Nature*. 1977;270:301-304. doi:10.1038/270301a0.
- [8] Nielsen J, Hedeholm RB, Heinemeier J, et al. Eye lens radiocarbon reveals centuries of longevity in the Greenland shark (*Somniosus microcephalus*). *Science*. 2016;353:702-704. doi:10.1126/science.aaf1703.
- [9] Wang P, Robert L, Pelletier J, et al. Robust growth of *Escherichia coli*. *Current Biology*. 2010;20:1099-1103. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.04.045.
- [10] Sweeney BW, Vannote RL. Population synchrony in mayflies: a predator satiation hypothesis. *Evolution*. 1982;36:810-821. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1982.tb05447.x.
- [11] Schulman E. Bristlecone pine, oldest known living thing. *National Geographic*. 1958;113:354-372.

Chapter 5: What Persists in a Changing Body?

1. The body is neither fixed nor completely replaced

A human body changes continuously, but the familiar claim that it becomes an entirely new body every seven years is false. Different components persist for radically different periods. Some are renewed quickly, others slowly, and some can remain with the individual for most or all of a lifetime.

That unevenness matters philosophically because personal continuity is often described as if it had to choose between two extremes: either the same material remains, or the body is completely replaced. Biology shows that neither picture is correct.

Sender and Milo estimated that about 0.33 trillion human cells are turned over each day, close to 330 billion, with blood cells accounting for nearly 90 percent of the cells replaced by number. In mass, they estimated approximately 80 plus or minus 20 grams of cellular turnover per day, dominated by blood cells and gut epithelial cells [1]. These values are population-level estimates assembled from multiple cell types, not a daily replacement of a fixed fraction of every tissue.

A body therefore contains intense renewal and deep persistence at the same time.

2. Cells have very different histories

Retrospective carbon 14 birth dating made it possible to estimate the age of human cells by exploiting the atmospheric pulse created by above-ground nuclear testing in the twentieth century. Spalding and colleagues used this approach to show that neurons in the adult human occipital cortex were generally as old as the individuals themselves [2]. In contrast, other cell populations renew repeatedly.

Cardiomyocytes provide an intermediate case. Bergmann and colleagues estimated that human heart muscle cells do renew, but slowly. Their analysis suggested an annual renewal rate of about 1 percent at age 25, declining to about 0.45 percent at age 75, with fewer than half of cardiomyocytes exchanged across a normal lifespan [3].

These findings immediately weaken any simple claim that identity is either carried by one permanent set of cells or continuously rebuilt from scratch. Some cells persist for decades. Others do not. The organism remains one organism across both conditions.

3. Molecules can persist for decades

Cellular persistence is not the only relevant level. Molecules within cells and tissues also have very different lifetimes.

Most proteins are synthesized and degraded repeatedly, but some human proteins persist for extraordinary periods. The lens of the eye provides one of the clearest direct examples. Lynnerup and colleagues used radiocarbon dating of human lens crystallins and found essentially no carbon turnover in the central lens proteins after their formation [4]. These proteins therefore preserve a molecular record from early life.

Other long-lived proteins include components of tissues with very low turnover. Work on exceptionally long-lived proteins has identified persistent structural proteins in systems such as nuclear pore complexes, although some of the strongest mechanistic evidence comes from animal models and should not be silently generalized to humans [5]. Human extracellular matrix proteins can be extremely persistent. Articular cartilage collagen has been estimated to have a half-life of roughly 117 years, whereas skin collagen turns over much faster [6]. Human lung elastin also shows marked longevity, with biochemical and radiocarbon evidence indicating very slow turnover [7].

The useful lesson is not that long-lived molecules are the seat of identity. It is that molecular replacement spans a much wider temporal range than slogans about a constantly renewed body imply.

4. Atoms also have different residence histories

The atomic level is often described too loosely. Water, carbon, oxygen, nitrogen and other elements enter and leave the body continually through respiration, food, drink, excretion and metabolism. Yet it does not follow that every atom is rapidly exchanged.

Carbon 14 dating works precisely because some atoms incorporated into stable biological structures remain there for long periods. The genomic DNA of cells that do not divide preserves carbon incorporated around the time those cells were formed. Lens crystallins preserve carbon from early life. Dental enamel also provides durable isotopic records because it is not remodeled after formation.

This means that the correct picture has four distinct levels:

1. **Atomic exchange:** extensive but heterogeneous.
2. **Molecular turnover:** from very rapid to multi-decadal persistence.
3. **Cellular turnover:** from hours or days in some populations to lifetime persistence in others.
4. **Organizational continuity:** the integrated living system persists across changes at all three lower levels.

These levels interact, but they are not interchangeable.

5. Persistence does not identify the person by itself

The discovery that some cortical neurons can last a lifetime invites an obvious question: perhaps those persistent neurons are what make a person the same person.

That possibility cannot simply be dismissed. Long-lived neurons participate in networks that support memory, perception and behavior. But cellular longevity alone cannot explain personal continuity. Neurons alter their synaptic connections, gene expression, molecular composition and functional relationships throughout life. A persistent cell is not a frozen cell.

Conversely, extensive replacement does not automatically threaten identity. Blood, intestinal epithelium and many other components are renewed while the organism remains recognizable as the same living individual. Rapidly renewed components can even be indispensable to the persistence of slowly changing structures: short-lived blood cells sustain circulation, and circulation sustains the long-lived neural tissue on which conscious life depends.

Persistence alone is therefore not enough. Lens crystallins can outlast many other molecules without preserving autobiography. Dental enamel can retain isotopic information from childhood without carrying a point of view. A cortical neuron can survive for decades while its synaptic relationships and functional role change. This suggests a distinction between material persistence and functional continuity. The two interact, but neither maps perfectly onto personal identity.

The evidence therefore pushes us away from a simple material criterion. Personal continuity cannot be read directly from the age of atoms, molecules or cells.

6. A changing body can still be one body

Biological individuality depends on maintained organization. Boundaries are regulated, energy is used, damage is repaired, internal variables are controlled and information is transmitted across multiple scales. None of these processes requires that every component remain unchanged.

Nor does this imply that matter is irrelevant. Organization is always physically instantiated. Damage to particular structures can destroy capacities that matter profoundly to the person. Later chapters will examine cases in which these continuities separate: anesthesia can interrupt ongoing conscious experience while biological organization remains; severe amnesia can preserve wakeful consciousness while damaging

autobiographical continuity; dementia can transform memory and personality while many long-lived cells remain physically present.

The point here is narrower. A living body is temporally layered. It contains components that have been present for hours, years or almost a lifetime. Its continuity is neither complete material permanence nor complete material replacement. The body persists through a structured mixture of renewal and retention, and the observer ordinarily experiences that changing body as its own without perceiving most of the turnover that makes continued life possible.

For the observer, that fact changes the identity question. The first-person perspective usually presents itself as continuous while its physical basis is maintained, modified and partly replaced. Understanding that tension requires biology, but biology alone does not settle what makes the observer the same observer through time.

References

- [1] Sender R, Milo R. The distribution of cellular turnover in the human body. *Nature Medicine*. 2021;27:45-48. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-01182-9.
- [2] Spalding KL, Bhardwaj RD, Buchholz BA, et al. Retrospective birth dating of cells in humans. *Cell*. 2005;122:133-143.
- [3] Bergmann O, Bhardwaj RD, Bernard S, et al. Evidence for cardiomyocyte renewal in humans. *Science*. 2009;324:98-102.
- [4] Lynnerup N, Kjeldsen H, Heegaard S, Jacobsen C, Heinemeier J. Radiocarbon dating of the human eye lens crystallines reveal proteins without carbon turnover throughout life. *PLoS ONE*. 2008;3:e1529. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001529.
- [5] Toyama BH, Savas JN, Park SK, et al. Identification of long-lived proteins reveals exceptional stability of essential cellular structures. *Cell*. 2013;154:971-982.
- [6] Verzijl N, DeGroot J, Thorpe SR, et al. Effect of collagen turnover on the accumulation of advanced glycation end products. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2000;275:39027-39031. doi:10.1074/jbc.M006700200.
- [7] Shapiro SD, Endicott SK, Province MA, Pierce JA, Campbell EJ. Marked longevity of human lung parenchymal elastic fibers deduced from prevalence of D-aspartate and nuclear weapons-related radiocarbon. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*. 1991;87:1828-1834. doi:10.1172/JCI115204.

PART III

What Is Conscious Life?

Chapter 6: From Sensitivity to Experience

1. Responding is not the same as experiencing

Living systems detect and respond to their surroundings in many ways. Bacteria move along chemical gradients. Plants alter growth in response to light and gravity. Immune systems discriminate among molecular patterns. None of those capacities, by itself, establishes conscious experience.

Chapter 1 distinguished several levels that must remain separate: physical detection, biological response, perception, conscious experience, reflective self-awareness and scientific observation. This chapter focuses on the transition between the middle levels. What would justify moving from a system that responds adaptively to one for which there is something it is like to undergo a state?

No single behavioral test answers that question.

2. Nervous systems create new forms of integration

The evolution of nervous systems allowed organisms to integrate information over distance and time, coordinate multiple sensory channels, select among competing actions and modify behavior through learning. Those capacities matter because consciousness, in every case currently known with strong evidence, is associated with organized nervous system activity.

But nervous system complexity does not provide a simple threshold. Some small nervous systems support sophisticated behavior. Some complex neural processing can occur without reportable conscious experience. Human visual processing provides direct examples. Blindsight can preserve discrimination of visual events without acknowledged visual awareness [8], and work on dorsal and ventral visual pathways shows that visually guided action and conscious perceptual identification can depend on partly distinct processing streams [9].

The scientific problem is therefore not to find one anatomical switch labeled consciousness. It is to identify combinations of functions and mechanisms that provide evidence for experience.

3. Competing evolutionary proposals

Several researchers have proposed frameworks for thinking about when consciousness may have emerged.

Feinberg and Mallatt argue that basic forms of sensory consciousness arose relatively early in vertebrate evolution and perhaps in some invertebrate lineages, based on integrated neural representations of the environment and body [1]. Peter Godfrey-Smith has emphasized the independent evolution of complex nervous systems, especially in cephalopods, as a natural experiment in how subjective organization may arise in very different bodies [2,3].

Ginsburg and Jablonka propose unlimited associative learning as a possible transition marker. Their idea is not that learning itself proves consciousness, but that a sufficiently open-ended form of associative learning may require an architecture associated with conscious processing [4]. Birch, Ginsburg and Jablonka have formulated testable predictions around this proposal [5].

These approaches disagree in detail. That disagreement is valuable because it prevents the history of consciousness from being reduced to one speculative threshold. They also differ in how much weight they give to affect and value. If pain, pleasure, hunger, fear or attraction are consciously experienced, information is not merely processed; events acquire significance for the subject. That evaluative dimension is one reason consciousness cannot be inferred from behavioral complexity alone.

4. Indicators rather than a ladder

For comparative work, a multidimensional approach is safer than ranking animals along a single scale. Birch, Schnell and Clayton argue that animal consciousness should be considered across dimensions rather than as one quantity in which species are simply "more" or "less" conscious [6]. Different species may show different combinations of perceptual richness, evaluative processing, integration, temporal depth and self-related processing.

This matters for the architecture of the present book. The distinctions introduced in Chapter 1 are conceptual categories, not an evolutionary staircase. Physical detection is not "lower consciousness". Biological response is not weak consciousness. Conscious experience is a different claim that requires additional evidence.

A multidimensional approach also avoids a second mistake: assuming that the species with the most human-like behavior must have the richest experience in every respect. Different nervous systems may specialize in different forms of perception, memory, evaluation or integration. A cephalopod, bird and mammal can therefore provide evidence for consciousness through partly different combinations of capacities. The scientific task is to compare indicators without forcing them onto one ranking.

5. Experience cannot be observed directly from outside

Consciousness creates a methodological asymmetry. Neural activity, behavior and physiology are observable from the outside. Experience is available directly only to the subject having it.

In humans, language allows reports such as "I see red", "I feel pain" or "I remember yesterday". Even then, reports are imperfect: as noted in Section 2, blindsight and the partial separation of visual pathways show why sophisticated visual processing cannot simply be equated with conscious seeing [8,9]. In non-human animals, evidence must be indirect. Researchers therefore combine behavior, neuroanatomy, physiology, learning, motivational tradeoffs and evolutionary comparison.

The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness summarizes the current evidential position in deliberately cautious terms: there is strong scientific support for conscious experience in mammals and birds, and at least a realistic possibility in all vertebrates and many invertebrates. The Declaration itself is a consensus statement rather than an authored research paper; its background scientific rationale was developed separately [7].

The wording matters. Evidence for consciousness is not the same as proof of a particular human-like inner world. Nor does the absence of a human capacity, such as linguistic report, establish the absence of experience. Comparative consciousness research therefore works under persistent uncertainty: evidence can strengthen or weaken particular attributions without giving direct access to another organism's first-person state.

That uncertainty is not unique to animal research. Even in humans, consciousness can become behaviorally difficult to detect, as later chapters on disorders of consciousness will show. The methodological continuity is important. Science never observes experience itself from the third person; it observes indicators that are related to experience with different degrees of confidence.

6. Consciousness changes what an organism can lose

A non-conscious physical system can be destroyed. A living system can die. But if an organism is conscious, death has another implication: the end of a point of view.

That claim should not be exaggerated. This chapter does not identify the exact evolutionary moment when experience first appeared, and it does not assume that all conscious animals represent death or anticipate their own future nonexistence.

It establishes only the step needed for the rest of the book. Once experience exists, there is something that can cease from the inside, even though science can study that cessation only from the outside.

The later human problem of mortality depends on this more basic fact. Before a being can know that it will stop observing, there must first be an observer for whom the world is experienced at all.

References

- [1] Feinberg TE, Mallatt J. *The Ancient Origins of Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2016.
- [2] Godfrey-Smith P. *Other Minds: The Octopus, the Sea, and the Deep Origins of Consciousness*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2016.
- [3] Godfrey-Smith P. *Metazoa: Animal Life and the Birth of the Mind*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2020.
- [4] Ginsburg S, Jablonka E. *The Evolution of the Sensitive Soul: Learning and the Origins of Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2019.
- [5] Birch J, Ginsburg S, Jablonka E. Unlimited associative learning and the origins of consciousness: a primer and some predictions. *Biology & Philosophy*. 2020;35:56.
- [6] Birch J, Schnell AK, Clayton NS. Dimensions of animal consciousness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2020;24:789-801. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2020.07.007.
- [7] Andrews K, Birch J, Sebo J, Sims T. *Background to the New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness*. 2024.
- [8] Weiskrantz L. Blindsight revisited. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*. 1996;6:215-220. doi:10.1016/S0959-4388(96)80075-4.
- [9] Goodale MA, Milner AD. Separate visual pathways for perception and action. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 1992;15:20-25. doi:10.1016/0166-2236(92)90344-8.

Chapter 7: The First Person

1. Experience is always from somewhere

Conscious experience has a feature that physical description does not capture simply by listing external events: it is experienced from a point of view.

A visual scene is not merely processed. It appears from here. Pain is not merely nociceptive activity. It hurts someone. A remembered event is not merely stored information. It is experienced as belonging, however imperfectly, to a history.

Thomas Nagel made this issue famous by asking what it is like to be a bat. His point was not that bats are unknowable in every scientific respect, but that an organism's subjective character of experience cannot be replaced simply by an objective description of its mechanisms [1].

For this book, the importance is immediate. Death matters differently once there is a first-person perspective, because there is then something whose continuation is not captured merely by the continued existence of matter.

2. The self has several layers

Neuroscience and philosophy do not offer a single agreed entity called "the self".

Antonio Damasio distinguishes forms of self-related processing that range from the proto-self and core consciousness to autobiographical identity [2]. Shaun Gallagher distinguishes a minimal self, associated with the immediate sense of ownership and agency, from a more extended narrative self constructed across time [3]. Dan Zahavi likewise emphasizes minimal selfhood as a structural feature of first-person experience rather than a story added afterward [4].

These distinctions are useful because they prevent us from treating "the self" as one indivisible object. The immediate sense that this experience is mine is not identical to autobiographical memory. A person can lose parts of the autobiographical story while retaining conscious experience. Conversely, ongoing experience can disappear temporarily during anesthesia while the biological organism remains alive and may later resume consciousness.

They also show why continuity of selfhood cannot be read from one variable. Ownership of a present experience, agency over an action, memory of a childhood event and recognition of one's social identity can come apart. Ordinary life binds them so tightly that they feel like one thing. Neurological and psychological disturbances reveal that they are partly separable achievements of an organized system.

The later chapters on coma, amnesia and dementia depend on these separations.

3. The strongest challenge: perhaps there is no self as a thing

Thomas Metzinger takes a more radical position. In *Being No One*, he argues that there are no selves as independently existing entities. What exists is a phenomenal self-model, a representational process through which a system experiences itself as a subject [5]. On this view, the feeling of being a substantial inner owner of experience is generated by the brain's modeling activity.

That proposal directly challenges any simple statement that individuality is an obvious inner substance. It does not, however, imply that organisms are unreal or that experience is irrelevant. It changes what kind of thing the experienced self is claimed to be.

Daniel Dennett also rejected the idea of a central Cartesian theater in which all mental contents are presented to an inner observer. His multiple drafts framework treats consciousness as distributed processing without a single privileged internal screen [6]. Keith Frankish develops an even more revisionary position under the label illusionism, arguing that what we describe as phenomenal properties may reflect how the system represents its own states rather than properties instantiated in the way common sense assumes [7].

These views remain controversial. They are included because the book cannot declare the individual self straightforwardly real at one level while ignoring serious accounts that analyze selfhood as model, process or construction.

A claim that the self is constructed does not make it fictitious in the ordinary sense. Visual perception is constructed from sensory signals while remaining constrained by the world; body representations are constructed yet their distortion can profoundly alter experience and action. Likewise, a dynamically generated self-model can organize memory, agency and behavior without being an independent inner substance. This is why the book rejects two extremes: treating the self as an indivisible object separate from the body, or assuming that because selfhood is modeled and distributed the individual is therefore unreal.

4. The problem of consciousness remains open

None of these theories solves the deepest explanatory problem by consensus.

David Chalmers distinguished functional and behavioral questions about consciousness from what he called the hard problem: why and how physical processing is accompanied by subjective experience at all [8]. Researchers disagree about whether that formulation identifies a genuine additional problem, whether it can eventually be dissolved, or whether it reflects limitations in our present concepts.

Its naturalistic framework is narrower. Consciousness, as far as current evidence shows, depends on organized activity in living nervous systems. Changes to the brain alter experience. Anesthesia can abolish reportable consciousness. Brain injury can fragment memory, perception and self-representation.

The dependence is asymmetric in an important way. We possess abundant evidence that changing the brain can change or abolish conscious capacities, but that does not tell us why those physical processes are accompanied by experience rather than occurring without it. The book therefore treats brain dependence as an evidential constraint while leaving the explanatory problem open.

That is enough for the questions pursued here, even though the existence of subjectivity is not fully explained.

5. The first person is both undeniable and difficult to locate

The first-person perspective has an unusual status. It is the most immediate fact available to the subject and one of the hardest things to describe from outside.

A neuroscientist can observe brain activity while a participant reports seeing a face. The participant can report the face. Neither perspective is reducible in practice to the other description alone. Science seeks lawful relations between them.

This is why the book must avoid two mistakes. The first is to treat the self as an invisible object hidden somewhere in the brain. The second is to conclude that because the self is constructed, modeled or distributed, the lived fact of first-person experience is trivial. A scientist can measure neural activity from outside while the subject has the experience from within; these are two epistemic positions on the same living event, not interchangeable descriptions.

Whatever theory of selfhood eventually succeeds, mortality confronts the observer at the level of experience. Others may later observe the body, record electrical activity and apply diagnostic criteria, but the individual cannot occupy a later standpoint from which to verify its own absence. The question is therefore not merely whether a body continues to contain particular atoms or cells. It is whether there remains a system capable of having this perspective.

The limit is severe: the observer can investigate its brain, describe its memories and imagine a future without itself, but it can never stand outside its own experience and directly observe what it is like for that experience no longer to exist.

References

- [1] Nagel T. What is it like to be a bat? *Philosophical Review*. 1974;83:435-450.
- [2] Damasio AR. *The Feeling of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the Making of Consciousness*. New York: Harcourt Brace; 1999.
- [3] Gallagher S. Philosophical conceptions of the self: implications for cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2000;4:14-21.
- [4] Zahavi D. *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2005.
- [5] Metzinger T. *Being No One: The Self-Model Theory of Subjectivity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2003.
- [6] Dennett DC. *Consciousness Explained*. Boston: Little, Brown; 1991.
- [7] Frankish K. Illusionism as a theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. 2016;23(11-12):11-39.
- [8] Chalmers DJ. Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. 1995;2:200-219.

Chapter 8: Other Conscious Animals

1. Consciousness is not a human monopoly

Any book centered on the observer risks quietly turning "observer" into another word for human being. The evidence does not justify that move.

Mammals and birds show extensive behavioral and neurobiological evidence consistent with conscious experience. Cephalopods provide particularly important comparative cases because complex behavior and large nervous systems evolved in a lineage very distant from vertebrates. Other invertebrate groups are increasingly studied with the same question in mind.

The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness summarizes this evidence cautiously. It states that there is strong scientific support for conscious experience in mammals and birds, and a realistic possibility of conscious experience in all vertebrates and many invertebrates. The declaration is not itself a research article and has no conventional author list; its background document and the underlying comparative literature provide the evidential context [4]. Broader evolutionary treatments by Feinberg and Mallatt [5] and Godfrey-Smith [6] likewise emphasize that conscious capacities need not be organized in a uniquely human way.

The useful framework is multidimensional, not hierarchical. Birch, Schnell and Clayton argue that animal consciousness may vary across dimensions such as perceptual richness, evaluative richness, integration and temporal characteristics rather than along one ladder from "less conscious" to "more conscious" [1].

2. Different bodies can support different experienced worlds

A bat, an octopus, an elephant and a human do not encounter the same environment through the same sensory architecture.

Echolocation, polarization sensitivity, electroreception, olfaction, vision and touch can dominate different species' relationships to the world. Nervous systems also organize action differently. The result is not merely that animals possess different sensors. They may inhabit different experienced structures of relevance. Cephalopods are especially informative because complex perception and behavior evolved in a body plan and nervous system architecture very distant from vertebrates [6].

This point matters because human consciousness should not be treated as the template against which all other consciousness is measured. A species may lack language, autobiographical narrative or human-style self-reflection while still having pain, perception, motivation or integrated experience.

The comparative problem is therefore not "how close is this animal to us?" It is "what evidence supports particular forms of experience in this animal?"

3. Evidence comes from converging indicators

Because non-human animals cannot provide human linguistic reports, consciousness must be inferred indirectly. Researchers use multiple kinds of evidence, including behavioral flexibility, learning, motivational tradeoffs, responses to analgesics or anesthetics, neural organization, attention, memory, sensory integration, and evolutionary homology or convergence. No single indicator is decisive in every taxon.

This is why a multidimensional evidential framework is preferable to a simple score. The animal consciousness literature increasingly emphasizes combinations of indicators rather than one threshold that all conscious species must cross in the same way [1].

Chapter 6 described several evolutionary proposals for consciousness. The present chapter does not repeat that discussion. Its purpose is to establish that the observer in this book cannot be equated automatically with the human observer.

4. Responses to death require special caution

The question becomes especially sensitive when animals respond to dead conspecifics.

Chimpanzees and other primates have been observed remaining near corpses, inspecting bodies and changing behavior after deaths within their groups. Elephants show repeated investigation of carcasses and bones, touching, approach behavior and altered social behavior around dead conspecifics; field reviews emphasize that these responses can occur even when the dead individual was not a close social partner [2]. Cetaceans, especially dolphins, have been documented carrying, supporting or remaining near dead calves or other conspecifics for prolonged periods [3].

These observations are scientifically important because they show that death is behaviorally salient to several socially complex animals. They may reflect attachment, disrupted expectations, investigation, caregiving systems, social information or affective responses, and different explanations may apply in different cases. They do not establish that those animals possess the human concept "I will one day cease to exist".

Comparative thanatology must therefore hold two ideas together. We should not deny consciousness to other animals merely because they cannot describe it in human language, but neither should we project human concepts of mortality onto them merely because their behavior toward the dead moves us.

5. Human distinctiveness lies elsewhere

If consciousness is not uniquely human, what is unusual about our species?

The strongest defensible answer is not that humans alone experience the world. It is that humans combine several capacities to an exceptional extent: symbolic language, cumulative culture, explicit abstraction, scientific modeling, long-range planning and reflective thought about the self.

These capacities allow humans to transform consciousness into an object of inquiry. We can ask whether another animal is conscious, whether our own consciousness depends on the brain, and whether the perspective from which we currently experience the world will one day end. An animal can be conscious without possessing an explicit concept of death, and it can respond to a dead companion without representing its own future nonexistence. Consciousness widens the domain of what can be lost; reflective understanding of mortality adds anticipation.

Other animals may possess richer forms of awareness than current methods reveal. Scientific caution requires openness to that possibility. The same caution applies in the opposite direction: behavioral sophistication can sometimes be generated by specialized mechanisms without establishing a rich human-like form of experience. Comparative inference is strongest when behavioral, neural, pharmacological and evolutionary indicators converge.

But the evidence available today still supports a narrower claim that matters for this book: humans show a uniquely developed capacity to formulate mortality conceptually and make their own future nonexistence an explicit object of thought.

6. The observer was plural before it became philosophical

Conscious observation did not begin when humans began writing philosophy or science. If mammals, birds and other animals possess conscious experience, then the universe contained many local first-person perspectives before any organism described them conceptually.

Humanity adds another layer rather than creating experience from nothing.

Humans can become conscious of being conscious, investigate other conscious beings and understand that the capacity to observe is itself temporary. The next chapters therefore narrow from consciousness in general to a more specific problem: what changes when an observer can explicitly understand that one day its own perspective will no longer be present?

References

- [1] Birch J, Schnell AK, Clayton NS. Dimensions of animal consciousness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2020;24:789-801. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2020.07.007.
- [2] Goldenberg SZ, Wittemyer G. Elephant behavior toward the dead: a review and insights from field observations. *Primates*. 2020;61:119-128. doi:10.1007/s10329-019-00766-5.
- [3] Bearzi G, Kerem D, Furey NB, Pitman RL, Rendell L, Reeves RR. Whale and dolphin behavioural responses to dead conspecifics. *Zoology*. 2018;128:1-15. doi:10.1016/j.zool.2018.05.003.
- [4] Andrews K, Birch J, Sebo J, Sims T. *Background to the New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness*. 2024.
- [5] Feinberg TE, Mallatt J. *The Ancient Origins of Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2016.
- [6] Godfrey-Smith P. *Other Minds: The Octopus, the Sea, and the Deep Origins of Consciousness*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux; 2016.

Chapter 9: Other Possible Observers

1. One known biosphere is not a universal template

Every conscious observer known to science emerged on one planet and from one evolutionary history. That fact imposes a severe limitation on any claim about observers in general.

Life on Earth uses carbon chemistry, liquid water, nucleic acids, proteins, membranes and a shared genetic code. All known terrestrial organisms descend from a common ancestry. We therefore possess a sample size of one for life as a planetary phenomenon.

Astrobiology begins from that constraint rather than pretending it away. A frequently used NASA working definition, associated with Gerald Joyce and an exobiology working group in the 1990s, describes life as a self-sustaining chemical system capable of Darwinian evolution. NASA itself treats this as a practical, non-binding framework rather than a final definition of life [1,2,3]. The importance of the formulation is not that extraterrestrial life must reproduce terrestrial biochemistry. It is that living systems require some means of persistence, heredity, variation and adaptation. The chemistry could differ.

DNA need not be universal. The exact amino acids of terrestrial proteins need not be universal. Even the solvent and molecular architectures familiar on Earth should not be elevated automatically into necessities of life elsewhere. Work in astrobiology and synthetic biology explores alternative informational polymers and other possible chemical architectures precisely because the only life we know may represent one successful solution rather than the only possible one. Synthetic genetic polymers, including XNAs capable of heredity and evolution under laboratory conditions, demonstrate experimentally that DNA and RNA are not the only conceivable molecular substrates for Darwinian information [4,5].

For this book, the implication is simple. A conscious observer elsewhere would not need to resemble a human being in body, biochemistry or sensory world.

2. Life elsewhere remains a possibility, not an observation

No confirmed extraterrestrial life has been detected. That sentence sets the epistemic boundary for everything that follows.

The astronomical abundance of planets and the chemical availability of many ingredients relevant to terrestrial life make extraterrestrial biology scientifically plausible enough to justify a major research

program. Plausibility, however, is not evidence of existence. We do not know how often life originates, how often complex multicellular systems evolve, how often nervous systems or functionally analogous structures appear, or how often any of those systems become conscious. The same uncertainty applies to intelligence.

It is tempting to imagine evolution repeatedly converging on beings that construct telescopes and mathematics. Convergence does occur in biology, but there is no basis for treating human-style technological intelligence as an inevitable destination. Evolution has no requirement to reproduce our lineage elsewhere. A second observer in the universe could therefore be radically unfamiliar, or there may be none within our observable reach. Both possibilities are compatible with current evidence.

3. What would make an extraterrestrial system an observer?

The word observer should not be reduced to possession of eyes, brains or spoken language.

Chapter 1 distinguished physical detection from biological sensing, conscious experience and reflective observation. Those distinctions apply even more strongly to hypothetical extraterrestrial life.

A system could detect its environment chemically without experience. Another could integrate information and alter behavior without anything equivalent to a vertebrate nervous system. A conscious extraterrestrial organism, if such a thing exists, might organize experience through structures for which we have no terrestrial analogue. The scientifically meaningful question is therefore functional before it is anatomical. Does the system distinguish aspects of its environment? Does it integrate information across time? Can it learn or update internal states? Is there evidence that some of those states are consciously experienced? Can it construct models that extend beyond immediate behavioral demands?

The final two questions would be extraordinarily difficult to answer across interstellar distance. Even detecting life is hard. Detecting consciousness would be harder still.

A technosignature could demonstrate complex engineering without directly demonstrating subjective experience. Communication could provide stronger evidence, but even communication would require interpretation. The existence of another observer would therefore be not merely an astronomical discovery but an epistemological challenge.

4. Artificial systems raise a different version of the same problem

The possibility of artificial consciousness separates two questions that are often conflated. Can a system process information intelligently? Can a system have conscious experience?

Current artificial intelligence demonstrates that sophisticated language use, planning and problem solving can be implemented without establishing that the system has subjective experience. Butlin and colleagues proposed an indicator based framework derived from several scientific theories of consciousness, including recurrent processing, global workspace, higher order, predictive processing and attention schema approaches [6]. Their analysis did not identify current systems as conscious, while also arguing that no obvious technical barrier is known that would prevent future systems from satisfying more of the proposed indicators.

That conclusion is deliberately conditional. Scientific theories of consciousness remain contested, and computational similarity to one theory's mechanisms would not by itself settle the existence of experience.

For this book, artificial intelligence therefore serves as a conceptual stress test. It shows why behavior alone cannot define the observer whose mortality concerns us. A system may produce sentences about death without there being evidence that anything is experienced when those sentences are produced.

The first-person problem remains.

5. Observers may be more diverse than life on Earth suggests

If consciousness can arise in different biological lineages, as Chapter 8 argues, then the human nervous system is already not the only conceivable architecture for experience.

Cephalopods demonstrate how evolution can produce complex nervous systems independently from vertebrates. Their existence does not prove extraterrestrial convergence, but it warns against treating one anatomical route as necessary.

Astrobiology extends the warning further. Alternative hereditary chemistry, different environmental pressures and billions of years of independent evolution could generate organisms whose distinction between body and environment, individual and colony, memory and inheritance differs greatly from ours.

That possibility affects the concept of individuality developed earlier in the book. An observer need not be organized exactly as a human individual to be temporary. Whatever physical architecture supports experience must still be maintained. It must exist under particular conditions. If those conditions disappear, the observer may cease. Finitude could therefore be much broader than human mortality even if its biological implementation differs completely.

6. The universe may contain observers we will never know

The possibility of unknown observers changes the scale of the argument without changing its core.

Human beings are not entitled to treat themselves as the purpose of cosmic history. Along one contingent terrestrial lineage, matter became organized into living systems, some living systems evolved nervous systems, and one lineage eventually produced beings capable of constructing explicit models of the universe. Other cases may exist.

If they do, they would not make the universe conscious as a whole. They would add other local perspectives within it. If they do not, the existence of conscious life on Earth becomes even more remarkable, not because humanity was intended, but because at least once a physical universe produced beings capable of asking what it is.

Either way, the observer remains internal to reality. The possibility of other observers therefore widens the frame without changing the problem. Conscious perspectives, wherever they arise, are physically situated and contingent. The next part turns from that general possibility to the one case we can study from within: an observer capable of representing its own future absence.

References

- [1] NASA Astrobiology. Forming a Definition for Life. 25 July 2013. Accessed 28 September 2026.
- [2] Joyce GF. Foreword. In: Deamer DW, Fleischaker GR, eds. *Origins of Life: The Central Concepts*. Boston: Jones and Bartlett; 1994.
- [3] NASA Science. Life on Other Planets: What is Life and What Does It Need? Accessed 28 September 2026.
- [4] Pinheiro VB, Taylor AI, Cozens C, et al. Synthetic genetic polymers capable of heredity and evolution. *Science*. 2012;336:341-344. doi:10.1126/science.1217622.
- [5] Chandru K, Potiszl C, et al. Alternative Pathways in Astrobiology: Reviewing and Synthesizing Contingency and Non-Biomolecular Origins of Terrestrial and Extraterrestrial Life. *Life*. 2024;14:1069. doi:10.3390/life14091069.
- [6] Butlin P, Long R, Elmoznino E, et al. Consciousness in Artificial Intelligence: Insights from the Science of Consciousness. arXiv:2308.08708. 2023.

PART IV

What Changes When an Observer Knows It Will Die?

Chapter 10: The Animal That Knows It Will Die

1. Mortality is biological; knowledge of mortality is cognitive

Every organism dies. That does not mean every organism understands death.

The distinction is central to this book. Death existed for billions of years before any known organism could describe it. Predation, disease, aging and injury shaped evolution long before there is evidence of beings capable of explicitly representing their own future nonexistence. The difficult question is not when death began. It is when death became an object of thought.

There can be no direct fossil of that realization. A skeleton cannot reveal whether the individual once thought, "I will die." Archaeology can document behavior around the dead, symbolic artifacts and increasingly complex forms of representation, but those observations are indirect. The emergence of explicit mortality awareness must therefore be reconstructed cautiously.

2. Other animals may understand more about death than we once assumed

Comparative thanatology has complicated any simple claim that only humans distinguish life from death.

Chimpanzees alter their behavior around dead conspecifics, inspect bodies and respond differently to injured and dead individuals. James Anderson has argued that chimpanzees may understand at least some components of death, including cessation of function and irreversibility, while evidence for universality and understanding of their own inevitable death remains much weaker [1].

Elephants, cetaceans, corvids and other socially complex animals also show systematic responses to dead conspecifics. Gonçalves and Biro emphasize that these behaviors may involve sensory discrimination, expectancy violation, social attachment and learned distinctions between animate and inanimate states [2].

More recent philosophical work warns against demanding a fully human concept before granting that another animal may possess any concept of death. Monsó and Osuna-Mascaró argue that a minimal death concept may require less cognitive sophistication than often assumed and could therefore be more widely distributed in nature [3]. This debate matters because the book must avoid replacing one anthropocentrism with another. The responsible claim is not that nonhuman animals know nothing of death. Nor is it that they understand mortality as humans do. What remains uncertain is whether any nonhuman animal represents death as universal and applies that representation explicitly to its own future self.

For clarity, four different achievements should be kept separate throughout this book: recognizing death in another organism, possessing a minimal concept involving features such as nonfunctionality or irreversibility, understanding that death is universal, and explicitly anticipating one's own inevitable death. Developmental research in children has long distinguished irreversibility, nonfunctionality and universality as separable components of the death concept [4].

3. Burials do not reveal thoughts directly

The human archaeological record provides increasingly strong evidence of complex treatment of the dead, but interpretation requires the same discipline.

Deliberate burials occur in both *Homo sapiens* and Neanderthal contexts. At La Ferrassie in France, multidisciplinary evidence supports intentional burial of a Neanderthal child more than 40,000 years ago [5]. Early *Homo sapiens* burials are documented in the Levant at sites including Skhul and Qafzeh, broadly within the approximately 130,000 to 90,000 year range established by multiple dating programs [6,7]. In Africa, the intentional burial of a young child at Panga ya Saidi in Kenya, dated to about 78,000 years ago, provides particularly strong evidence for deliberate mortuary behavior [8]. Claims for deliberate disposal or burial in other hominins, including *Homo naledi*, remain disputed and will not be used here as evidence for mortality awareness. These behaviors show that dead individuals were sometimes treated in ways different from ordinary refuse or abandoned animal remains. They do not provide direct access to beliefs about personal mortality.

A burial can indicate attachment, social identity, practical corpse management, memory, symbolic behavior or combinations of these. It does not by itself demonstrate that the living participants possessed a fully articulated theory of death, still less that they contemplated their own eventual nonexistence. That distinction must remain visible throughout the argument.

4. Symbolic culture expanded the space in which mortality could be represented

The archaeological record also contains evidence of increasingly elaborate symbolic behavior.

Engraved ochres and ostrich eggshells from southern Africa provide evidence of socially transmitted visual traditions extending back roughly 100,000 years in some contexts [9]. Personal ornaments and other symbolic artifacts appear across several Middle Stone Age and later sites.

No single artifact marks the birth of a modern mind. The record is uneven, and capacities can appear, disappear and depend on population size, social transmission and ecology [10]. What symbolic culture does provide is a mechanism for making absent things cognitively present. Language and symbolic representation allow humans to discuss individuals who are not physically present, events that occurred before anyone alive was born and futures that have not happened yet. Once a species can represent distant futures and stable identities across time, its own death becomes representable in a new way. The observer can place itself inside a future from which it is absent.

5. Varki's proposal and its limits

Ajit Varki has argued that explicit awareness of mortality creates a distinctive evolutionary problem. In a 2009 *Nature* correspondence, he proposed that denial mechanisms may have been important in allowing humans to tolerate the potentially debilitating consequences of understanding their own inevitable death [11]. The proposal is provocative rather than established. It identifies a genuine puzzle: if an organism can vividly imagine unavoidable personal extinction, why does that knowledge not continuously paralyze behavior? But evolutionary explanations of psychological traits are difficult to test retrospectively, and the uniqueness of human mortality awareness itself remains hard to establish conclusively. The value of Varki's argument for this book is therefore not that it settles human uniqueness. It makes explicit the transition we need to examine: from recognizing death in others to representing one's own death as inevitable.

6. Becker and the psychological significance of mortality awareness

Ernest Becker placed awareness of death near the center of human psychology in *The Denial of Death* [12]. His thesis was broad and interpretive rather than a modern experimental theory, but it influenced later work on how awareness of mortality might affect identity, values and social behavior.

Terror management theory developed one empirical program from that tradition. It proposes that reminders of mortality can alter behavior partly through attachment to cultural worldviews and self esteem. An influential 2010 meta-analysis of 277 experiments reported moderate mortality salience effects across a broad set of worldview and self esteem outcomes [13]. Later evidence has complicated that picture. Many Labs 4 failed to replicate a classic mortality salience effect across 17 laboratories [14], and a 2023 meta-analysis focused on social-norm moderation found substantially smaller estimates after corrections for publication bias [15]. The appropriate conclusion is neither that the tradition has been refuted nor that it constitutes a settled general law of human behavior. The deeper point survives independently: humans can make their own mortality an explicit object of cognition, and doing so can affect how they experience the present.

7. The difference between seeing death and seeing oneself as mortal

An animal may recognize a corpse. It may distinguish living from dead. It may grieve, investigate or avoid the body. It may even understand that death is irreversible. The human problem explored here begins one step further. A human observer can understand that the category applies to itself. The same individual who remembers childhood and imagines tomorrow can project the sequence forward and infer that there will be a future in which the world continues but the observer does not. That inference is conceptually simple once stated. Experientially, it is enormous. The observer becomes aware not only of the universe but of the temporal limit of its own access to the universe. The next chapter asks what that knowledge does to a being that must continue living while knowing that its perspective is temporary.

References

- [1] Anderson JR. Chimpanzees and death. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*. 2018;373:20170257. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0257.
- [2] Gonçalves A, Biro D. Comparative thanatology, an integrative approach: exploring sensory/cognitive aspects of death recognition in vertebrates and invertebrates. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*. 2018;373:20170263. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0263.
- [3] Monsó S, Osuna-Mascaró AJ. Death is common, so is understanding it: the concept of death in other species. *Synthese*. 2021;199:2251-2275. doi:10.1007/s11229-020-02882-y.
- [4] Speece MW, Brent SB. Children's understanding of death: a review of three components of a death concept. *Child Development*. 1984;55:1671-1686.
- [5] Balzeau A, Turq A, Talamo S, et al. Pluridisciplinary evidence for burial for the La Ferrassie 8 Neandertal child. *Scientific Reports*. 2020;10:21230. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-77611-z.
- [6] Grün R, Stringer C, McDermott F, et al. U-series and ESR analyses of bones and teeth relating to the human burials from Skhul. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 2005;49:316-334.

- [7] Valladas H, Reyss JL, Joron JL, Valladas G, Bar-Yosef O, Vandermeersch B. Thermoluminescence dating of Mousterian proto-Cro-Magnon remains from Israel and the origin of modern man. *Nature*. 1988;331:614-616.
- [8] Martínón-Torres M, d'Errico F, Santos E, et al. Earliest known human burial in Africa. *Nature*. 2021;593:95-100.
- [9] Tylén K, Fusaroli R, Rojo S, et al. The evolution of early symbolic behavior in Homo sapiens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2020;117:4578-4584. doi:10.1073/pnas.1910880117.
- [10] Sterelny K. From hominins to humans: how sapiens became behaviourally modern. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*. 2011;366:809-822.
- [11] Varki A. Human uniqueness and the denial of death. *Nature*. 2009;460:684. doi:10.1038/460684c.
- [12] Becker E. *The Denial of Death*. New York: Free Press; 1973.
- [13] Burke BL, Martens A, Faucher EH. Two decades of terror management theory: a meta-analysis of mortality salience research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2010;14:155-195. doi:10.1177/1088868309352321.
- [14] Klein RA, Cook CL, Ebersole CR, et al. Many Labs 4: Failure to Replicate Mortality Salience Effect With and Without Original Author Involvement. *Collabra: Psychology*. 2022;8:35271. doi:10.1525/collabra.35271.
- [15] Schindler S, Hilgard J, Fritsche I, Burke B, Pfattheicher S. Do salient social norms moderate mortality salience effects? A challenging meta-analysis of terror management studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2023;27:195-225. doi:10.1177/10888683221107267.

Chapter 11: Why Finitude Changes the Observer

1. Knowing that life ends is not one fear

The phrase "fear of death" sounds singular, but it combines several different concerns. A person may fear the physical process of dying: pain, breathlessness, loss of control or dependence. A person may fear being dead, even though the idea of experiencing one's own absence is conceptually unstable. A person may fear losing future experiences that would otherwise have been possible. A person may fear separation from other people. And a person may fear something more specific to the theme of this book: the loss of the role of witness, the knowledge that reality will continue but no longer be experienced from this particular first-person perspective. These concerns overlap, but they are not interchangeable. The five-part distinction used here is an analytic framework for this book, not an established clinical taxonomy. Shelly Kagan's philosophical treatment of death is useful precisely because it separates questions that ordinary language often collapses: what death is, whether it is bad for the person who dies, whether nonexistence can be harmful, and whether immortality would solve the problem [1].

This chapter does not try to eliminate fear by argument. Its task is to identify what the observer is actually responding to.

2. Fear of dying concerns a process that can be experienced

Dying can involve events that occur while consciousness is still present.

Pain, respiratory distress, weakness, confusion and loss of autonomy are possible features of illness and injury. Modern palliative medicine exists partly because these are experiences that can often be treated even when the underlying disease cannot be reversed. This fear is therefore different from fear of being dead. The process of dying can be anticipated through analogies with other experiences and can itself become an object of medical intervention. A person who says "I am afraid of death" may in fact mean "I am afraid of suffering before death." Conceptual clarity matters because reassurance about nonexistence does not answer fear of pain.

3. Fear of being dead confronts a first-person paradox

Epicurus argued that death is not something the subject experiences, and Lucretius later developed a symmetry argument comparing the unexperienced future after death with the unexperienced past before birth [2,3]. Their arguments expose a difficulty in imagining nonexperience: when a living person imagines "being dead", the imagination quietly inserts a spectator. Darkness and silence are still experiences, whereas the end of consciousness would contain no first-person darkness and no observer for whom nothing is happening.

This clarification addresses one component of death anxiety without answering the others. Chapter 19 returns to Epicurus, Lucretius and the asymmetry between the unexperienced past and future in detail.

4. Death can be bad because of what it removes

Thomas Nagel shifted the question from the state of being dead to the life that death prevents [4]. On a deprivation account, death can be bad because it removes relationships, projects and future experiences the individual would otherwise have had. This explains why even a painless death can be regarded as a loss without treating nonexistence itself as an unpleasant state.

The issue becomes especially concrete with aging. A person may care about events that lie beyond the expected span of their life. Chapter 20 develops the deprivation argument and distinguishes it from a separate concern that matters particularly to this book: losing access to the future as a witness.

5. Separation from others runs in both directions

Mortality is relational. The individual anticipates losing other people, but can also anticipate being lost by them.

Parents imagine leaving children. Partners imagine one survivor continuing without the other. A person may fear not only absence from future events but the effect of that absence on people who remain. This concern cannot be reduced to personal deprivation.

Part of a human identity is distributed across relationships. Other people remember us, depend on us, react to us and incorporate our actions into their own lives. Chapter 12 will examine that relational continuity in more detail. The important point here is that mortality threatens both directions of a relationship at once. The dying observer loses access to others. Others lose access to the observer.

6. The loss of the role of witness

There is another concern that is easy to confuse with deprivation but deserves separate analysis. A person can long to know what happens next. What will become of children and grandchildren? What discoveries will be made? Will humanity answer questions that currently remain open? What will the world look like in fifty years?

This is not necessarily a desire for additional pleasure or achievement. It can be a desire to remain a witness.

The distinction is especially visible in old age. Someone may accept that a long life has contained love, work and accomplishment and still feel a specific sadness at leaving the story before the next chapter. We will call this concern **longing for the unwitnessed future**.

The phrase is descriptive, not a proposed psychological diagnosis or established emotion category. It should also not be confused with anticipatory nostalgia, which Batcho and Shikh define as missing aspects of the present before they are lost in the future [5]. Longing for the unwitnessed future concerns something different: events that have not yet happened and may never have been personally available except by continuing to live. It is the loss of access to the future as an observer.

7. Mortality salience does not produce one universal response

If humans can explicitly represent their own death, what does that representation do to behavior? There is no single answer.

Terror management theory proposes that mortality awareness can increase attachment to cultural worldviews, self esteem and other sources of symbolic stability. A large 2010 meta-analysis reported moderate mortality salience effects across many outcomes [6], while later work has raised substantial replication and publication-bias concerns, including the failure of Many Labs 4 to reproduce a classic effect [7] and more conservative estimates in a recent meta-analysis of social-norm moderation [8]. The safest conclusion is not that reminders of death trigger one universal defense. It is that mortality can become psychologically salient and interact with personality, culture, context, age, relationships and existing values. Some people avoid the subject. Some plan. Some become more attached to projects or relationships. Some experience anxiety. Some report greater acceptance. The book should not force this diversity into one theory.

8. Finitude can alter value without providing consolation

Knowing that a perspective will end can change how time is valued.

Scarcity can increase attention to what remains. Projects gain urgency because they cannot be postponed indefinitely. Relationships can matter differently when their duration is understood as limited. None of this proves that mortality is good. Nor does it show that finitude automatically gives life meaning. Those are philosophical interpretations, not scientific consequences. The defensible point is narrower: awareness of temporal limitation can change decisions, priorities and emotional responses while the organism is still alive. A finite observer does not merely occupy time. It can understand that its available time is limited.

9. The central asymmetry

The observer can imagine the universe without itself. It cannot experience that universe without itself. That difference is the source of much of the tension examined in this book.

From the third-person perspective, there is nothing conceptually difficult about the world continuing after one individual dies. We observe it happening constantly. From the first-person perspective, every experienced world has so far contained the observer. The mind can construct a model of its future absence, but the future absence cannot be rehearsed as an experience. This is why the loss of the role of witness matters. The individual knows that the story can continue and that others may see what happens next. But knowing that another observer will exist is not the same as continuing to observe. Finitude changes the observer because a being capable of representing time can understand that time extends beyond the interval in which it will have a point of view.

References

- [1] Kagan S. *Death*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2012.
- [2] Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. In: Inwood B, Gerson LP, eds. *The Epicurus Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 1994.
- [3] Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by Martin Ferguson Smith. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 2001. Book III.
- [4] Nagel T. Death. *Noûs*. 1970;4:73-80.
- [5] Batcho KI, Shikh S. Anticipatory nostalgia: Missing the present before it's gone. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2016;98:75-84. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.088.
- [6] Burke BL, Martens A, Faucher EH. Two decades of terror management theory: a meta-analysis of mortality salience research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2010;14:155-195. doi:10.1177/1088868309352321.
- [7] Klein RA, Cook CL, Ebersole CR, et al. Many Labs 4: Failure to Replicate Mortality Salience Effect With and Without Original Author Involvement. *Collabra: Psychology*. 2022;8:35271. doi:10.1525/collabra.35271.

- [8] Schindler S, Hilgard J, Fritsche I, Burke B, Pfattheicher S. Do salient social norms moderate mortality salience effects? A challenging meta-analysis of terror management studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2023;27:195-225. doi:10.1177/10888683221107267.

PART V

What Makes a Person?

Chapter 12: Memory, History and Relationships

1. A person is not remembered all at once

A human being carries a past, but not as a complete recording. Autobiographical memory is selective, reconstructive and organized around present concerns. Conway and Pleydell-Pearce describe autobiographical memories as constructions produced within a self-memory system in which personal knowledge and current goals constrain what is retrieved [1]. Remembering is therefore not simply opening an archive. It is an active relation between a present self and traces of a past life.

This matters for personal continuity. We normally experience ourselves as having lived through childhood, adolescence and earlier adulthood even though most individual moments are inaccessible. Continuity does not require remembering every episode. It depends on a structured network of remembered events, facts about one's life, habits, relationships and expectations that makes the present person intelligible as someone with a history.

Tulving's account of episodic memory introduced the idea of autonoetic consciousness, the capacity to mentally place oneself in subjective time and re-experience events as belonging to one's own past [2]. Autobiographical memory goes further by integrating episodic recollection with semantic knowledge about one's life: where one grew up, whom one married, what work one did, what one values and which events shaped later choices.

The result is not a perfect record. It is a temporally organized model of a life.

2. Memory supports identity without being identical to identity

Memory has long been central to theories of personal identity because it connects present consciousness to past action. But psychological evidence makes a simple memory criterion difficult to sustain.

People forget enormous parts of their lives while remaining recognizably themselves. Memories are distorted, updated and sometimes falsely reconstructed. Current beliefs influence how earlier selves are interpreted. Wilson and Ross describe a bidirectional relationship in which memory supports identity while current identity also reshapes the appraisal of remembered past selves [3].

The dependence therefore runs both ways. A person uses memory to answer "Who have I been?", but the present answer to "Who am I?" also influences which memories are accessible and how they are understood.

This does not make autobiography arbitrary. Memories remain constrained by events, records, other people and the physical consequences of past actions. It means that personal history is neither a perfect transcript nor a free invention.

For the temporary observer, the important point is that continuity through time is partly represented from within. The observer does not merely persist biologically. It interprets its own persistence.

3. The self is partly social

Autobiographical memory develops in interaction with other people. Research on the sociocultural development of memory shows that parental reminiscing styles influence how children learn to construct coherent personal narratives and link events to an emerging sense of self [4]. A life story is learned partly through conversation.

That social dependence continues in adulthood. Families and friends remember events we have forgotten. Photographs, messages, diaries and shared stories stabilize parts of a past that no individual nervous system preserves perfectly. Other people can correct us, contradict us or restore details that have disappeared from our own recall.

This means that the history of a person is distributed across more than one brain, although the first-person perspective itself is not distributed in the same way. Other people can preserve information about my past. They cannot thereby possess my current experience.

The distinction becomes important later in the book. Relational continuity can survive even when autobiographical continuity weakens. A spouse may remember a shared life more fully than the person with dementia. A child may preserve family stories after a parent dies. These continuities matter, but they are not interchangeable with the persistence of the first-person observer.

4. Relationships are not external additions to identity

A purely individual picture of identity treats relationships as things a complete person happens to have. Human development suggests something more entangled.

Language is learned socially. Values are shaped in families and communities. Roles such as parent, partner, colleague, friend and citizen are relational by definition. Much of what a person considers important about the self exists only within networks of recognition and obligation.

Autobiographical memory reflects this structure. Many of the events that organize a life are shared: a conversation, a birth, a separation, a collaboration, an illness, a reconciliation. The significance of such events cannot be reconstructed solely from what happened inside one organism.

The self is therefore not reducible to relationships, but neither is it independent of them.

This conclusion also prevents an error that will matter when discussing death. The continuation of memories in other people is a genuine form of relational persistence. It should not be dismissed as nothing. But it should not be redescribed as survival of the same consciousness.

5. Narrative continuity is useful but incomplete

Philosophers and psychologists often describe identity in narrative terms. Marya Schechtman's narrative view emphasizes the way persons constitute themselves through an intelligible account of their lives [5]. Narrative captures something that a purely biological description misses: human beings organize events into explanations, commitments and projects.

Yet narrative cannot be the whole story. Infants are human individuals long before they can construct autobiographical narratives. People can remain conscious during periods in which narrative capacity is impaired. Severe amnesia can damage the life story without obviously creating a numerically new organism at each moment.

Narrative continuity is therefore one layer among several.

The architecture developed in this book now contains at least five forms of continuity: biological continuity, neural capacity for consciousness, ongoing conscious experience, autobiographical continuity and relational continuity. They usually travel together, which is why ordinary life rarely forces us to distinguish them.

Neurological cases do.

6. A life can remain connected even when memory is incomplete

The fact that memory is incomplete does not make personal history unreal. A scientific history of the universe is also incomplete, reconstructed from surviving evidence rather than remembered directly. What matters is that present states bear structured relations to earlier states.

For a person, those relations include bodily development, neural change, retained skills, documents, commitments, memories and the responses of other people. No single strand is sufficient in every philosophical theory, but together they explain why a human life can remain coherent across enormous internal change.

The observer who looks back is not physically identical in every component to the child who first learned its name. It does not remember most of that child's days. Yet there is a continuous biological and psychological history linking them.

The next chapters test that continuity by separating its components. Conscious experience can stop and restart. Memory can fail while consciousness remains. The story can fragment while the organism continues.

Those cases reveal why the question "Am I the same person?" cannot be answered by pointing to memory alone.

References

- [1] Conway MA, Pleydell-Pearce CW. The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*. 2000;107:261-288. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.107.2.261.
- [2] Tulving E. Episodic memory: from mind to brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2002;53:1-25. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135114.
- [3] Wilson AE, Ross M. The identity function of autobiographical memory: time is on our side. *Memory*. 2003;11:137-149. doi:10.1080/741938210.
- [4] Fivush R, Habermas T, Waters TEA, Zaman W. The making of autobiographical memory: intersections of culture, narratives and identity. *International Journal of Psychology*. 2011;46:321-345. doi:10.1080/00207594.2011.596541.
- [5] Schechtman M. *The Constitution of Selves*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; 1996.

Chapter 13: When Experience Stops

1. Consciousness can disappear without the organism dying

A central mistake in thinking about death is to treat every absence of experience as equivalent. Sleep, general anesthesia, coma and prolonged disorders of consciousness all involve altered relations between brain activity, responsiveness and experience, but they are not the same state.

Normal sleep is a regulated biological process with characteristic cycles and a strong tendency toward spontaneous recovery. General anesthesia is a drug-induced state produced for a medical purpose. Coma is a pathological condition of unarousable unresponsiveness. Prolonged disorders of consciousness include distinct clinical categories such as unresponsive wakefulness syndrome and the minimally conscious state [1,2].

The differences matter because the temporary interruption of conscious experience does not by itself end the person.

A patient under anesthesia may later awaken with no memory of the interval. During dreamless portions of sleep, there may be little or no reportable experience. Yet the organism retains the neural capacity to resume consciousness, and the surrounding biological organization remains sufficiently intact to support that return.

This distinction between ongoing consciousness and capacity for consciousness is essential.

2. Sleep is not a nightly death

Sleep changes consciousness rather than simply turning the brain off. Dreaming demonstrates that internally generated experience can occur while responsiveness to the environment is greatly reduced. Even within non-REM sleep, conscious experience varies [6].

The philosophical temptation is to ask whether the self ceases every night if conscious awareness is interrupted. Ordinary continuity argues against that conclusion. Biological organization persists, memory systems continue to function, and the same nervous system moves through a regulated cycle that normally returns to waking consciousness.

The interruption is therefore embedded inside a continuing process.

This is important for later arguments about death. If death ended only current experience while preserving an intact capacity for later recovery, it would resemble anesthesia more than irreversible death. The medical concept of death depends precisely on the loss becoming permanent or irreversible under the relevant criterion.

Sleep teaches that absence of report is not enough.

3. General anesthesia is controlled but not physiologically identical to sleep

General anesthesia is often described colloquially as being put to sleep. Brown, Lydic and Schiff emphasized both the useful analogies and the major neurophysiological differences among anesthesia, sleep and coma [1]. Anesthetic drugs act through specific molecular and circuit mechanisms and can produce profound unconsciousness, immobility and amnesia.

The return from anesthesia is also instructive. The person does not normally experience the missing interval as a long empty duration. Subjective time seems to jump from one conscious episode to another.

That phenomenology illustrates a general property of unconscious intervals: the absence itself is not experienced as absence.

From outside, clinicians can measure the passage of time and changing brain states. From inside, there is no continuous observer recording the gap.

This is one reason that imagining death as an endless unconscious experience is conceptually misleading. An unconscious interval has no experienced duration while consciousness is absent.

4. Coma and prolonged disorders of consciousness complicate behavioral diagnosis

In severe brain injury, the relation between behavior and consciousness becomes uncertain.

Coma involves lack of wakefulness and lack of behavioral evidence of awareness. In unresponsive wakefulness syndrome, patients may open their eyes and show sleep-wake cycles without reliable behavioral evidence of awareness. In the minimally conscious state, reproducible but limited signs of awareness are present. Guidelines emphasize repeated standardized assessments because arousal fluctuates and bedside behavior can be misinterpreted [2].

The conceptual lesson is that wakefulness, responsiveness and consciousness are separable.

A person can be awake without demonstrating awareness. A person can fail to produce a motor response even when some cognitive processing survives. These distinctions make the observer difficult to locate from the outside.

5. Covert consciousness changed the evidential problem

In 2006, Owen and colleagues reported a patient behaviorally diagnosed as being in a vegetative state who produced task-specific fMRI activation when asked to imagine playing tennis or moving through her home [3]. The result showed that absence of overt command-following did not always imply absence of preserved intentional cognition.

The field has since expanded. A large multicenter study published in 2024 examined 353 adults with disorders of consciousness using behavioral assessments together with task-based fMRI or EEG. Among participants without an observable behavioral response to commands, approximately one quarter showed task-related brain responses consistent with cognitive motor dissociation [4].

This does not mean that every unresponsive patient is conscious. Nor does every brain response establish a rich inner life.

It means that behavioral unresponsiveness can underestimate preserved cognition in a clinically important minority.

The observer may sometimes remain present when the body cannot show it in ordinary ways.

6. No single brain signal is consciousness itself

Research on anesthesia, sleep and disorders of consciousness has identified recurring changes in large-scale connectivity, complexity and neural dynamics [5]. Such measures can improve inference about conscious state, but they should not be turned into a single meter that reads consciousness directly.

Consciousness is inferred from converging evidence.

In healthy humans, verbal report provides unusually strong access. Under anesthesia, physiology and behavioral responses become central. In severely brain-injured patients, standardized bedside examination may need to be supplemented by EEG, fMRI or other techniques.

The methodological problem mirrors the philosophical one introduced earlier. Experience is first-person; clinical evidence is third-person.

Medicine must make decisions at the boundary between them.

7. Interruption is not extinction

Sleep, anesthesia and some pathological states show that conscious experience can be discontinuous while personal continuity is preserved.

That fact weakens any theory according to which uninterrupted experience is necessary for being the same person. We do not ordinarily think that a patient becomes a new person after every anesthetic or that dreamless sleep destroys identity each night.

What persists through these intervals is a broader organization: the living body, much of the nervous system, stored dispositions, memory architecture and the capacity for consciousness to resume.

The distinction will become decisive in Part VI. Death is not important merely because experience stops at a moment. Experience stops temporarily many times during a life.

The deeper boundary is reached when the organization capable of supporting that observer can no longer restore the perspective.

References

- [1] Brown EN, Lydic R, Schiff ND. General anesthesia, sleep, and coma. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010;363:2638–2650. doi:10.1056/NEJMr0808281.
- [2] Giacino JT, Katz DI, Schiff ND, et al. Practice guideline update recommendations summary: disorders of consciousness. *Neurology*. 2018;91:450–460. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000005926.
- [3] Owen AM, Coleman MR, Boly M, Davis MH, Laureys S, Pickard JD. Detecting awareness in the vegetative state. *Science*. 2006;313:1402. doi:10.1126/science.1130197.
- [4] Bodien YG, Allanson J, Cardone P, et al. Cognitive motor dissociation in disorders of consciousness. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2024;391:598–608. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2400645.
- [5] Mashour GA, Hudetz AG. Neural correlates of unconsciousness in large-scale brain networks. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2018;41:150–160. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2018.01.003.
- [6] Siclari F, Baird B, Perogamvros L, et al. The neural correlates of dreaming. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2017;20:872–878. doi:10.1038/nn.4545.

Chapter 14: When the Story Breaks

1. Consciousness can remain while autobiography fails

Chapter 13 showed that experience can disappear temporarily while much of the person remains organized for recovery. Amnesia reveals the opposite dissociation: consciousness can remain present while access to personal history is severely damaged.

This distinction matters because memory often feels like the thread that makes a self continuous. If that thread breaks, what exactly is lost?

The classic case of Henry Molaison, known for decades as H.M., demonstrated that severe anterograde amnesia can follow bilateral medial temporal lobe surgery while perception, language, intelligence and many previously acquired skills remain substantially intact [1,3]. Molaison could converse and engage with the present, but he had profound difficulty forming new declarative memories.

A conscious present survived even though the ordinary accumulation of autobiographical continuity was radically impaired.

2. Memory is not one faculty

Amnesia also dismantled the idea of a single memory system.

Molaison could improve on some motor skills despite having no ordinary recollection of practicing them. Brenda Milner's mirror-drawing experiments provided an early demonstration that his performance could improve across trials despite profound declarative-memory impairment [2]. This helped establish distinctions among declarative memory, procedural learning and other forms of memory. Later work refined these categories further.

The consequence for personal identity is important. Losing one memory system does not erase every continuity at once.

A person may forget an event while retaining habits shaped by it. Emotional responses may persist without explicit recollection. Semantic knowledge about one's life can remain when episodic reliving is weak. Conversely, someone may remember facts without recovering the first-person quality of mentally returning to a past scene.

The story of a life can therefore fragment along multiple dimensions.

3. Autobiographical memory has episodic and semantic layers

Research on the self-memory system distinguishes specific episodic recollection from more general autobiographical knowledge [4]. I may vividly remember one afternoon in a childhood classroom, know as a fact which school I attended, and also possess a broad self-description such as "I was a shy child." These are related but different representations.

Dementia can affect them unequally.

In Alzheimer's disease, autobiographical memory often becomes less specific, with episodic detail declining and remote memories sometimes better preserved than recent ones. Reviews also emphasize that autobiographical decline can weaken self-knowledge and the coherence of identity [5].

But the effect is not equivalent to instantaneous disappearance of the self.

Different aspects deteriorate at different rates.

4. Dementia does not justify saying that the person is already gone

Families sometimes describe advanced dementia by saying that the person they knew has disappeared. The statement can express a real loss: memory, personality, language, recognition and reciprocity may change profoundly.

Scientifically and ethically, however, it is too coarse to treat identity as a binary switch.

A systematic review of self and identity in dementia found evidence for persistence of at least some aspects of self even in moderate to severe disease, while also documenting deterioration in others [6]. More recent work continues to distinguish impaired autobiographical reconstruction from preserved forms of self-reference, affective response and relational engagement [5,7].

The person may no longer be able to narrate the shared past accurately. That does not mean there is no current experience, preference, comfort, distress or recognition.

This distinction has an ethical counterpart. Ronald Dworkin emphasized the authority of earlier, competent values and advance directives when dementia later changes the person's capacities and interests, while Rebecca Dresser argued that the present interests and experiences of the person with dementia can retain moral importance [8,9]. The dispute is not settled here. Its relevance is that dementia can separate an earlier autobiographical self from a later experiencing subject without making either dimension trivial.

The observer can be altered without being absent.

5. Relationships can preserve continuity that memory no longer carries alone

Dementia makes relational continuity especially visible.

A patient may fail to identify a family member by name while responding to the person's voice, touch or emotional presence. Shared routines can retain significance after explicit autobiographical recall weakens. Caregivers often become custodians of a history the patient can no longer retrieve independently.

This creates an asymmetry.

Other people may preserve the narrative identity of the person better than the person's own memory does. They know who this individual was, what promises were made, what preferences were repeatedly expressed and which relationships shaped the life.

That social preservation matters for care and moral responsibility.

But it should not be confused with the patient's own first-person continuity. A biography stored in other minds is not the same thing as autobiographical access from within.

6. Severe memory loss tests simple philosophical criteria

If personal identity required actual memory of every earlier stage, ordinary forgetting would already produce countless new persons. Severe amnesia makes the problem impossible to ignore.

The biological organism can continue while autobiographical access is profoundly damaged. The capacity for conscious experience may also continue, together with some skills, dispositions and semantic knowledge. Relationships remain from the perspective of others even when the individual can no longer retrieve the shared history independently.

These strands therefore do not fail together. Severe memory loss is philosophically important not because it proves one theory of identity, but because it prevents any single form of continuity from being treated casually as the whole person.

7. The story can break before the observer ends

A life story is one way a conscious organism organizes itself across time. It can be damaged while experience remains.

That fact has two consequences.

First, autobiographical memory is deeply important without being a complete criterion of existence. Its loss can transform identity, agency and relationships while leaving a subject who still experiences the world.

Second, death must not be defined merely as the end of the story. The autobiographical story can become incoherent before biological death, and a coherent story can remain in documents and other people after the first-person observer is gone.

The next chapter brings these separations together. If body, consciousness, memory and relationships can diverge, what exactly do we mean when we ask whether someone remains the same person?

References

- [1] Scoville WB, Milner B. Loss of recent memory after bilateral hippocampal lesions. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*. 1957;20:11-21. doi:10.1136/jnnp.20.1.11.
- [2] Milner B. Les troubles de la mémoire accompagnant des lésions hippocampiques bilatérales. In: Passouant P, ed. *Physiologie de l'Hippocampe*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique; 1962:257-272.
- [3] Corkin S. What's new with the amnesic patient H.M.? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*. 2002;3:153-160. doi:10.1038/nrn726.

- [4] Conway MA, Pleydell-Pearce CW. The construction of autobiographical memories in the self-memory system. *Psychological Review*. 2000;107:261-288. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.107.2.261.
- [5] El Haj M, Antoine P, Nandrino JL, Kapogiannis D. Autobiographical memory decline in Alzheimer's disease: a theoretical and clinical overview. *Ageing Research Reviews*. 2015;23:183-192. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2015.07.001.
- [6] Caddell LS, Clare L. The impact of dementia on self and identity: a systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2010;30:113-126. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2009.10.003.
- [7] El Haj M, Roche J, Gallouj K, Gandolphe MC. Autobiographical memory compromise in Alzheimer's disease: a cognitive and clinical overview. *Geriatric et Psychologie Neuropsychiatrie du Vieillessement*. 2017;15:443-451. doi:10.1684/pnv.2017.0704.
- [8] Dworkin R. *Life's Dominion: An Argument About Abortion, Euthanasia, and Individual Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf; 1993.
- [9] Dresser R. Dworkin on dementia: elegant theory, questionable policy. *Hastings Center Report*. 1995;25(6):32-38. doi:10.2307/3527839.

Chapter 15: What Makes Me the Same Person?

1. The ordinary answer works until the strands separate

In everyday life, the question of personal identity rarely feels difficult. The same human being wakes, remembers yesterday, inhabits the same body, is recognized by others and continues existing projects. Biological continuity, consciousness, memory, character and relationships point in the same direction.

Philosophical difficulty appears when those strands are pulled apart. Memory can be lost while the organism survives. Consciousness can be interrupted and later resume. Psychological information could, at least in thought experiments, be copied. A body can continue while capacities strongly associated with the person disappear.

The earlier chapters have prepared these possibilities empirically. This chapter asks what follows conceptually when the continuities that ordinarily travel together no longer do so.

2. Locke made consciousness central

John Locke's discussion of identity and diversity distinguished the identity of a human organism from the identity of a person. For Locke, personal identity extended with consciousness across time rather than simply following sameness of material substance [1].

The view captured an intuition that remains powerful: what matters about being the same person is connected to psychological continuity, not possession of exactly the same atoms.

But memory-based formulations face familiar problems. People forget. Memories can be false. A present person cannot literally remember every intermediate stage. The relation therefore needs to be broader than direct recollection.

Later psychological-continuity theories replace one remembered link with overlapping chains of memory, intention, belief, character and other mental connections. Shoemaker's work was an important twentieth-century contribution to this shift from simple memory criteria toward broader psychological relations [5].

The person at seventy need not directly remember the person at seven if enough intermediate psychological continuity links the life.

3. Biological continuity offers a competing answer

Eric Olson's animalist account rejects the idea that psychology determines numerical identity. On this view, we are human animals, and we persist as long as the same living organism persists [2].

The attraction is obvious after Chapters 5 and 14. Memory can change dramatically while the organism remains continuous. Infants and temporarily unconscious adults do not cease to exist merely because sophisticated psychological continuity is absent.

Animalism therefore captures something psychologically centered theories can understate: persons are living organisms, not detachable streams of information.

Its difficulty is also clear. In extreme neurological cases, the continued organism may preserve little of what the individual and others cared about as the person's mind. Biological identity can remain while psychological continuity becomes profoundly altered.

The theory may answer the question "Is this the same animal?" more easily than the question "What matters to me about continuing?" Bernard Williams pressed a related objection against purely psychological criteria by constructing cases in which bodily continuity and psychological continuity pull intuitions in opposite directions [6].

4. Parfit separated identity from what matters in survival

Derek Parfit transformed the modern debate by arguing that personal identity may not be the deepest fact we need [3]. His reductionist view treats persons as constituted by more particular physical and psychological facts rather than by an additional indivisible entity.

Parfit's thought experiments about fission are deliberately extreme. Imagine that the psychological organization of one person could stand in the right continuity relations to two future people. Numerical identity cannot be one-to-two in the ordinary sense. Yet both successors might preserve memories, intentions and character traits continuous with the original.

Parfit's conclusion was that what matters in survival may be psychological continuity and connectedness, even when the question of strict identity has no simple answer. In his mature discussion of Relation R, the relevant psychological continuity must have an appropriate causal history in ordinary cases, but Parfit also argues that, for what matters, the cause need not be restricted to one biologically privileged mechanism [3].

The importance of this argument for the present book does not depend on believing that literal human fission will occur. It reveals that two questions can come apart: whether a future individual is numerically the same person, and which continuities make that future matter from the present person's point of view.

5. Narrative theories capture intelligibility rather than mere persistence

Marya Schechtman argues that personhood and identity are connected to the organization of a life into an intelligible narrative [4]. Narrative views emphasize agency, interpretation and the way past events acquire meaning within an ongoing story.

This fits the role of autobiographical memory discussed in Chapter 12.

But it should not be treated as a complete biological criterion. Narrative capacity varies across development and disease. A person does not cease to be an organism or necessarily cease to experience because the narrative becomes fragmented.

Narrative identity is therefore especially useful for explaining what kind of self human beings care about, even if it does not settle every case of numerical persistence. It describes continuity at the level of an interpreted life.

6. No single continuity does all the work

The evidence and theories considered so far support a plural analysis.

Biological continuity tracks the living organism.

Neural capacity for consciousness tracks whether the nervous system remains organized so that conscious experience can occur or resume.

Ongoing conscious experience tracks the presence of a current first-person perspective.

Autobiographical continuity tracks memories, self-knowledge, projects and the interpreted history of the individual.

Relational continuity tracks the person's place in networks of recognition, dependence, commitment and shared history.

In ordinary life these dimensions are tightly coupled. Pathology and thought experiments separate them.

No claim is being made that these five dimensions constitute a new metaphysical theory of personal identity. They are an analytic framework for asking what persists and what is lost in different cases.

That distinction is important. A framework can clarify the problem without pretending to solve centuries of philosophy by definition.

7. Continuity comes in degrees even when numerical identity does not

Numerical identity is ordinarily all or nothing: one entity either is or is not the same entity as another. Psychological connectedness, by contrast, can weaken gradually.

A person may retain most memories but undergo major changes in values. Another may lose episodic memory while preserving personality and relationships. Dementia can erode several strands over years rather than at one instant.

This gradual structure explains why families can sincerely say both "she is still here" and "she is not the same" without necessarily contradicting themselves. The first statement may refer to biological presence and current experience. The second may refer to autobiographical, behavioral or relational transformation.

Philosophical vocabulary becomes useful when it lets those meanings be separated.

8. What matters to the temporary observer

No single metaphysical account has to be settled before the analysis can continue. For mortality, the crucial facts are more concrete: the living organism can end, the neural capacity for consciousness can become irrecoverable, and ongoing experience can stop. Autobiographical continuity may be destroyed earlier, while parts of it can remain represented in other minds and records. Relationships can also continue asymmetrically after one participant is gone.

These losses are related but not identical. Death therefore cannot be analyzed adequately by saying only that "the body dies" or only that "the story ends." Different continuities have different conditions of persistence and failure.

Part VI will ask the more exact question prepared by these distinctions: when an observer dies, which continuities have ended, which can persist, and which kinds of persistence should not be mistaken for survival of the first-person perspective?

References

- [1] Locke J. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Book II, Chapter XXVII, "Of Identity and Diversity." 2nd ed. London; 1694.
- [2] Olson ET. *The Human Animal: Personal Identity Without Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1997.
- [3] Parfit D. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1984. Part III.
- [4] Schechtman M. *The Constitution of Selves*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press; 1996.
- [5] Shoemaker S. Persons and their pasts. *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 1970;7(4):269-285.
- [6] Williams B. The self and the future. *Philosophical Review*. 1970;79:161-180. doi:10.2307/2183946.

PART VI

What Ends When an Observer Dies?

Chapter 16: When Does an Observer Die?

1. Death is biologically distributed but socially declared

A human organism does not fail everywhere at once. Circulation can stop before every cell has died. Neurons differ in their vulnerability to ischemia. Skin, connective tissues and some cellular processes can persist for a time after the organism can no longer function as an integrated whole.

This creates an apparent tension. Biology often looks gradual, while medicine and law require a moment at which a living patient has become a dead person.

The tension is not new. Robert Morison asked in 1971 whether death should be understood as a process or an event, and Leon Kass replied that the biological process does not eliminate the practical need to identify an event at which death can be determined [1,2]. The debate remains useful because it separates two questions: how organisms fail, and when medicine is justified in concluding that the person has died.

This chapter does not propose a new definition of death. It asks which criteria matter for the temporary observer developed in the preceding chapters.

2. Two routes are used to determine death

Modern medicine generally recognizes death through either circulatory-respiratory criteria or neurologic criteria.

Under circulatory criteria, death is determined after circulation and respiration have ceased permanently. Under neurologic criteria, brain death, also called death by neurologic criteria, refers to the complete and permanent loss of brain function as defined clinically by unresponsive coma, absence of brainstem reflexes and absence of the capacity to breathe independently [3,4].

These are not meant to identify two different kinds of death. They are different routes for determining the death of the same organism.

The details matter because machines can preserve functions that once failed together. Mechanical ventilation can move air when spontaneous breathing is absent. Drugs can support blood pressure. Extracorporeal systems can maintain circulation. Technology can therefore separate signs that earlier generations treated as a single package.

The observer problem becomes medically concrete at this point. A warm body with a beating heart can, under artificial support, lack the brain functions required for consciousness and spontaneous respiration. Conversely, a person in coma can retain brain function and therefore remain alive despite profound unresponsiveness.

3. Permanent and irreversible are not identical words

James Bernat clarified an important distinction between **permanent** and **irreversible** cessation [5].

Irreversible means that a function cannot be restored, whereas permanent means that the function will not return spontaneously and will not be restored by intervention. The difference matters in circulatory determination of death. Physicians do not test every imaginable future technology. They determine that circulation will not resume spontaneously and that resuscitation will not be attempted or continued. Under accepted medical standards, permanent cessation functions as the relevant operational criterion, while irreversible cellular destruction follows with time.

The 2020 World Brain Death Project and the 2023 US consensus guideline also use permanence explicitly in defining neurologic death [3,4].

This distinction prevents a common philosophical error. Death determination is not a claim that every cell has already become physically incapable of any activity. It is a judgment about the permanent loss of the organismal functions specified by the relevant medical standard.

4. Brain death is not ordinary coma

The difference between coma and brain death is categorical in clinical practice.

A patient in coma may retain brainstem reflexes, spontaneous breathing or other brain functions and may in some cases recover consciousness. A patient in a vegetative or unresponsive wakefulness syndrome can show cycles of eye opening and sleep despite severe impairment of awareness. A minimally conscious patient shows reproducible but limited evidence of awareness.

Brain death requires much more.

The 2023 AAN/AAP/CNS/SCCM guideline requires a known catastrophic and permanent brain injury, exclusion of confounders and a standardized examination. There must be coma, absence of brainstem reflexes and absence of spontaneous breathing under an apnea test, with ancillary testing used in specified circumstances [4].

Residual spinal movements do not by themselves contradict the diagnosis because spinal circuits can remain active after brain function has been permanently lost.

For the argument of this book, the decisive feature is not the dramatic appearance of the body. It is the permanent loss of the neural organization required for any return of consciousness.

5. BrainEx and OrganEx changed what we know about cellular irreversibility

Experiments in pigs have made the distinction between cellular function and organismal recovery impossible to ignore.

In 2019, Vrselja and colleagues used the BrainEx system to perfuse isolated pig brains four hours after death. They restored microcirculation and several molecular and cellular functions, including active

metabolism and some spontaneous synaptic activity, while finding no global electrocorticographic activity associated with organized brain function [6].

In 2022, Andrijevic and colleagues extended the approach with OrganEx in whole pigs after one hour of warm ischemia. The system restored circulation and selected molecular and cellular processes in multiple organs and reduced some markers of cell death [7].

Neither experiment restored a conscious animal or demonstrated recovery from brain death as clinically defined. Their importance is different. They show that the transition from circulation arrest to cellular destruction is more biologically plastic than a simple "all cells die within minutes" picture suggests.

This reinforces, rather than dissolves, the need to specify the level at which irreversibility is being claimed.

6. Death criteria belong to a level of organization

The chapters on identity distinguished atoms, molecules, cells, organs, organismal organization and first-person experience. Death determination requires the same discipline.

A dead organism can contain living cells for a time, a functioning heart does not by itself prove the presence of a conscious observer, and a preserved spinal reflex does not establish brain function. Conversely, the temporary absence of overt behavior does not prove the absence of consciousness, as Chapter 13 showed.

Death therefore cannot be located by asking whether any biological activity remains anywhere in the body. The medically relevant question concerns whether the integrated functions required by the chosen criterion have ceased permanently.

This is why cellular recovery experiments do not imply personal survival after death. Restoring metabolism in tissue is not the same as restoring the organized nervous system that supported the observer.

7. Criteria vary across jurisdictions and remain philosophically contested

Medical practice is not globally uniform in its formulation of neurologic death. In the United States, the 2023 consensus guideline operationalizes death by neurologic criteria through permanent loss of function of the entire brain, including the brainstem [4]. In the United Kingdom, the 2025 Code of Practice retains a formulation centered on irreversible loss of the capacity for consciousness together with irreversible loss of the capacity to breathe, established through brainstem testing [8]. Spain's Real Decreto 1723/2012 recognizes death through irreversible cessation of circulatory and respiratory functions or of brain functions and specifies protocols for neurologic determination [9]. These formulations overlap substantially in practice but are not philosophically identical.

The neurologic criterion has also faced a major biological objection. D. Alan Shewmon documented cases in which bodies diagnosed as brain dead maintained integrated somatic functions for prolonged periods, challenging the claim that the brain is uniquely responsible for all organismic integration [10]. The President's Council on Bioethics revisited that criticism in 2008 and defended a neurological standard on a different conceptual basis, while other bioethicists have continued to dispute whether the neurological criterion is fully coherent [11,12].

This debate matters because the present book should not pretend that one medical definition has dissolved every philosophical problem. What is much less controversial for the observer-centered argument is narrower: permanent loss of the neural capacity for consciousness is incompatible with any future first-person experience by that organism.

8. The observer does not vanish because a clock says so

Medicine records a time of death because institutions need a determinate point. Biology may reach that point through a cascade of failures rather than one instantaneous transformation.

That does not make the recorded event arbitrary.

A diagnosis can mark the point at which sufficient conditions have been met even when the underlying biological process began earlier and continues afterward.

The same structure appears elsewhere in medicine. A seizure can have a recorded onset even though molecular changes precede it. Consciousness can disappear under anesthesia even though drug distribution continues afterward.

The important question is which transition matters for the observer.

Within the naturalistic framework of this book, the first-person perspective requires an organized nervous system capable of supporting consciousness. Death by neurologic criteria identifies a state in which that capacity has been lost permanently. Death by circulatory criteria reaches the same endpoint through permanent cessation of circulation, after which brain function cannot resume without restoration of circulation.

The body may still contain viable material. What has ended is the living organization capable of sustaining that individual's conscious perspective.

References

- [1] Morison RS. Death: process or event? *Science*. 1971;173:694-698. doi:10.1126/science.173.3998.694.
- [2] Kass LR. Death as an event: a commentary on Robert Morison. *Science*. 1971;173:698-702. doi:10.1126/science.173.3998.698.
- [3] Greer DM, Shemie SD, Lewis A, et al. Determination of Brain Death/Death by Neurologic Criteria: The World Brain Death Project. *JAMA*. 2020;324:1078-1097. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11586.
- [4] Greer DM, Kirschen MP, Lewis A, et al. Pediatric and Adult Brain Death/Death by Neurologic Criteria Consensus Guideline. *Neurology*. 2023;101:1112-1132. doi:10.1212/WNL.000000000000207740.
- [5] Bernat JL. How the distinction between "irreversible" and "permanent" illuminates circulatory-respiratory death determination. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*. 2010;35:242-255. doi:10.1093/jmp/jhq018.
- [6] Vrselja Z, Daniele SG, Silbereis J, et al. Restoration of brain circulation and cellular functions hours post-mortem. *Nature*. 2019;568:336-343. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1099-1.
- [7] Andrijevic D, Vrselja Z, Lysyy T, et al. Cellular recovery after prolonged warm ischaemia of the whole body. *Nature*. 2022;608:405-412. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05016-1.
- [8] Academy of Medical Royal Colleges. *A Code of Practice for the Diagnosis and Confirmation of Death*. 2025 update.
- [9] Spain. Real Decreto 1723/2012, de 28 de diciembre. Anexo I: Protocolos de diagnóstico y certificación de la muerte para la obtención de órganos de donantes fallecidos.
- [10] Shewmon DA. Chronic "brain death": meta-analysis and conceptual consequences. *Neurology*. 1998;51:1538-1545. doi:10.1212/WNL.51.6.1538.
- [11] President's Council on Bioethics. *Controversies in the Determination of Death: A White Paper*. Washington, DC; 2008.
- [12] Miller FG, Truog RD. The incoherence of determining death by neurological criteria: a commentary on "Controversies in the Determination of Death". *Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal*. 2009;19:185-193. doi:10.1353/ken.0.0282.

Chapter 17: The End of the First Person

1. The central loss is not darkness

When people imagine the end of consciousness, they often picture darkness, silence or an empty field.

Those images contain an unnoticed observer. Darkness is something seen, silence is something heard as silence, and emptiness is represented from a point of view. If the capacity for consciousness has ended permanently, there is no experienced darkness and no subject located inside an endless blank interval.

This distinction does not make death trivial. It changes the form of the problem: what ends is not an experience called "being dead", but the capacity for this organism to have any further experience at all.

2. The first person depends on conditions that can fail

The earlier chapters separated ongoing conscious experience from the neural capacity for consciousness.

Sleep and anesthesia can interrupt experience while preserving the organization required for consciousness to resume. Some severe brain injuries can abolish behavioral responsiveness while leaving covert evidence of conscious processing. These cases matter precisely because absence of response is not equivalent to absence of an observer.

Death is different because the relevant capacity does not merely become inactive. It is lost permanently.

Within the naturalistic framework used here, the first-person perspective is not an entity that departs from the body. It is a property or process associated with the functioning organization of the living nervous system. Damage to that system can alter perception, memory, agency and selfhood. Permanent destruction of the capacity for consciousness removes the physical basis on which further first-person experience depends.

There is no established evidence that human consciousness continues independently of a living nervous system.

That statement is empirical. It does not pretend that neuroscience has solved why consciousness exists.

3. Near-death experiences occur near a boundary, not beyond evidence

Near-death experiences are real experiences reported by some people who survive life-threatening events.

Typical reports can include unusual vividness, altered time, feelings of peace, perceived separation from the body, movement through a tunnel or encounters with people or scenes. Their occurrence deserves scientific study rather than dismissal, but the phrase "near-death" can mislead.

People who report the experience survived. The report is therefore evidence about experience during a severe physiological crisis, during loss or recovery of consciousness, or during periods whose exact timing may be difficult to reconstruct. It is not direct testimony from a state of permanently ended brain function.

Prospective study of cardiac-arrest survivors has a longer history. Van Lommel and colleagues reported near-death experiences in a subset of resuscitated patients in a 2001 multicenter study, while the Greyson scale provides a standardized instrument for characterizing such reports [1,2]. A 2024 scoping review found substantial heterogeneity in methods and estimates and concluded that the phenomenon remains poorly understood [3].

AWAKE II, a multicenter study published in 2023, investigated awareness and recalled experiences during cardiac arrest and resuscitation. Some survivors reported memories or perceptions, and the study also explored electroencephalographic activity during cardiopulmonary resuscitation [4]. These observations are scientifically interesting, but they do not demonstrate consciousness continuing after irreversible death.

The distinction between severe reversible crisis and permanent loss is essential.

4. Timing is one of the hardest problems

A remembered experience can feel extended even if the neural events supporting it occur over a short interval.

Dreams illustrate the general point. Subjective time need not map simply onto clock time.

During cardiac arrest and resuscitation, several phases are possible: declining cerebral perfusion, absent or extremely low perfusion, intermittent circulation during chest compressions, restoration of spontaneous circulation, sedation, awakening and later memory reconstruction.

A report obtained after recovery does not, by itself, identify the exact physiological interval in which every component of the experience was generated.

This uncertainty does not invalidate the report, but it limits the inference that can be made from it. The scientifically responsible question is not whether a person's account is sincere. It is what neural and physiological state accompanied the experience and how confidently that state can be reconstructed. Experimental cardiac arrest in rats produced a brief surge of coherent gamma activity after arrest, and a small study of four dying human patients found marked gamma surges in two after withdrawal of ventilatory support [5,6]. These findings show that the dying brain can remain dynamically active under some conditions. They do not establish that the recorded activity is conscious experience or that it explains any particular near-death report.

5. Paradoxical and terminal lucidity require the same discipline

Reports of unexpected lucidity shortly before death create a related interpretive challenge.

In severe dementia, patients sometimes appear to regain meaningful communication or recognition after long periods of profound impairment. Mashour and colleagues reviewed this phenomenon under the term paradoxical lucidity and emphasized both its potential scientific importance and the weakness of the existing evidence base [7]. The National Institute on Aging subsequently highlighted the need for systematic prospective study [8].

Older literature often calls episodes near death terminal lucidity [9].

These observations do not show that consciousness is separating from the brain. If reliably characterized, they may instead reveal that severely damaged neural systems retain transient functional capacities not apparent during ordinary examination.

The correct scientific response is therefore neither ridicule nor metaphysical inflation, but careful measurement.

6. The last experience may not coincide with the declared time of death

The final conscious moment can precede medical death.

A person may lose consciousness during cardiac arrest and never recover it. Another may become unconscious under palliative sedation before the final circulatory arrest, while severe brain injury can abolish consciousness even as circulation continues under intensive care. The end of the first person and the formal determination of death therefore need not occur at the same second.

Chapter 16 asked when the organism is medically declared dead. This chapter asks a different question: when does experience cease for the last time? In many deaths, medicine cannot identify that final subjective moment with precision, although it can identify conditions incompatible with any further consciousness and, in neurologic death, determine the permanent loss of the capacity itself.

The epistemic boundary is real.

7. No transfer is required for the perspective to end

Ordinary language encourages a misleading picture in which the person must "go" somewhere when consciousness ends, but nothing in the evidence requires that model.

The cessation of a process does not logically require that some entity be transferred elsewhere. If the organized neural activity required for consciousness ends permanently, no additional relocation hypothesis is needed to describe that cessation.

For a conscious organism, the loss is more significant because a point of view existed. Memories were accessed from here, pain and pleasure occurred here, and the world appeared from this position in space, time and biological history. When the neural organization capable of sustaining that perspective ends permanently, the first person ends with it according to the best evidence currently available.

8. The limit cannot become an observation

An observer can attend a funeral, watch another organism die, study electroencephalography, circulation and neural injury, and imagine its own future absence. What it cannot do is observe its own state of having no perspective, because observation requires the very capacity whose absence is being imagined.

The end of the first person is therefore a peculiar boundary of knowledge. It can be inferred from third-person evidence and approached through physiology, but it cannot be confirmed by the individual as a later experience.

The universe does not become unobserved when one observer ends. Other perspectives may continue, but what is lost is this one.

References

- [1] van Lommel P, van Wees R, Meyers V, Elfferich I. Near-death experience in survivors of cardiac arrest: a prospective study in the Netherlands. *Lancet*. 2001;358:2039-2045. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)07100-8.
- [2] Greyson B. The near-death experience scale: construction, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 1983;171:369-375. doi:10.1097/00005053-198306000-00007.
- [3] Kooor JG, Santhosh S, Stretton B, et al. Near-death experiences after cardiac arrest: a scoping review. *Discover Mental Health*. 2024;4:19. doi:10.1007/s44192-024-00072-7.
- [4] Parnia S, Keshavarz Shirazi T, Patel J, et al. AWAreneSS during REsuscitation - II: a multi-center study of consciousness and awareness in cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*. 2023;191:109903. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2023.109903.
- [5] Borjigin J, Lee U, Liu T, et al. Surge of neurophysiological coherence and connectivity in the dying brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2013;110:14432-14437. doi:10.1073/pnas.1308285110.
- [6] Xu G, Mihaylova T, Li D, et al. Surge of neurophysiological coupling and connectivity of gamma oscillations in the dying human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*. 2023;120:e2216268120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2216268120.
- [7] Mashour GA, Frank L, Batthyany A, et al. Paradoxical lucidity: a potential paradigm shift for the neurobiology and treatment of severe dementias. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2019;15:1107-1114. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.04.002.
- [8] Eldadah BA, Fazio EM, McLinden KA. Lucidity in dementia: a perspective from the NIA. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2019;15:1104-1106. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2019.06.3915.
- [9] Nahm M, Greyson B, Kelly EW, Haraldsson E. Terminal lucidity: a review and a case collection. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*. 2012;55:138-142. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2011.06.031.

Chapter 18: What Is Lost and What Remains of the Body

1. Death does not make matter disappear

The death of an organism is not the disappearance of its material constituents.

Atoms remain, many molecules persist for a time, some cells remain viable after circulation has stopped, and organs differ in how quickly structure and function deteriorate. This continuity of matter is sometimes invoked as comfort, but it answers a different question from personal survival. The atoms that composed a living observer can continue participating in physical processes without preserving the organization that made that observer a conscious individual.

Chapter 5 already showed that identity was never reducible to possession of one fixed set of atoms. Death makes the complementary point. Material persistence is not sufficient for continued identity.

2. The organism was an organized process

A living human body continuously maintains gradients, repairs damage, regulates temperature, circulates blood, exchanges gases, coordinates organs and supports a nervous system capable of consciousness.

The organism persists not because every component stays the same, but because these processes remain sufficiently integrated. Death disrupts that integration.

After permanent circulatory arrest, oxygen delivery stops and energy-dependent processes fail. Ion gradients collapse, cells enter different trajectories depending on tissue, temperature and metabolic demand, microorganisms already present in and around the body continue their own activity, and autolysis and decomposition alter structures that had been actively maintained during life [3].

The transition is not instantaneous at every level, but what ends is the organism's capacity to maintain itself as that living individual.

3. Some parts outlast the whole

The persistence of cells and tissues after organismal death can seem paradoxical only if we assume that every level of life must begin and end together.

It does not. Cells can remain metabolically active after the organism has died. Corneas, skin, bone, connective tissues and other structures can remain usable for transplantation or research under appropriate conditions. Organs can sometimes be preserved or perfused after circulation has ceased.

BrainEx and OrganEx reinforce the same point experimentally. Selected cellular and molecular functions can be restored in mammalian tissues after prolonged ischemia without restoring the organism as a conscious individual [1,2].

The lesson is not that death has become unreal, but that death is level-specific. A person can be dead while some cells remain alive.

4. The body after death is both continuous and transformed

A corpse is materially and causally continuous with the living body that preceded it. Whether it is numerically the same entity is a separate philosophical question, often discussed as the corpse problem [5].

Initially it occupies the same region of space, contains much of the same matter, and bears scars, bones, teeth and anatomical structures formed during the person's life. Yet the mode of organization has changed fundamentally.

The body is no longer maintaining the boundary conditions that sustained metabolism and consciousness. Its structures now persist passively or decay according to local chemistry, temperature, microorganisms and environment. Saying that "the body remains" is therefore both true and incomplete, because what remains is not the living body in the same biological sense.

5. The brain is material, but material persistence is not neural continuity

The distinction is particularly important for the brain.

After death, brain tissue does not vanish. Neurons, glia, blood vessels, proteins and lipids remain physically present for a time. Human postmortem transcriptomic studies also show tissue-specific changes in gene expression after organismal death rather than immediate universal molecular silence [4]. Under experimental conditions, some cellular functions may even be restored.

But the presence of neural tissue is not equivalent to the persistence of the organized dynamics required for consciousness. A preserved anatomical structure can lack functional integration, and a functioning cell

can exist in a system that no longer supports a conscious subject. This is the same distinction that prevented us from equating a long-lived cortical neuron with personal identity in Chapter 5.

At death, the issue becomes absolute at the level that matters for the observer: the system no longer has the capacity to generate another first-person state.

6. The body can continue to matter without continuing to be the observer

After death, the body can have medical, scientific, legal, ecological and emotional significance.

Organs can be donated, tissues can contribute to research, and a body can be buried, cremated, preserved or returned gradually to ecological cycles. Other people can continue to care about what happens to it. Those forms of significance should not be confused with continued consciousness.

The body mattered before death partly because it was the living physical basis of the observer. After death, it can still matter for many reasons, but not because the deceased continues to experience what happens to it.

That difference is easy to state and emotionally difficult to absorb.

7. What death removes is organization, not substance

The most precise contrast is not between existence and nothingness at the level of matter, but between one form of organization and its loss. Before death, physical constituents participate in a living system that regulates itself, acts, remembers, perceives and, in humans, can understand its own mortality. After death, those constituents continue in other physical relations.

The individual does not "return to the universe" because the individual never left it. The living observer was always a physical part of the universe, and death ends the organization that sustained that particular conscious perspective.

8. What remains is not yet the same question as what follows from a life

This chapter has deliberately stayed close to the body. It has not asked what causal effects a person leaves in other people, institutions, documents or culture, or whether an event remains part of the past once it has occurred. Those questions belong later, when the book turns from bodily persistence to consequences without survival.

The distinction prevents a common slide. Material continuity, causal influence and memory in other people can all be real without constituting personal survival or continuation of the deceased first-person perspective.

Part VI therefore ends with a narrow conclusion. When the observer dies, matter remains and physical processes continue, but the organization that made that matter this living conscious individual has ended. The universe continues to contain the material history of the body, but it no longer contains that body as an experiencing observer.

References

- [1] Vrselja Z, Daniele SG, Silbereis J, et al. Restoration of brain circulation and cellular functions hours post-mortem. *Nature*. 2019;568:336–343. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1099-1.
- [2] Andrijevic D, Vrselja Z, Lysy T, et al. Cellular recovery after prolonged warm ischaemia of the whole body. *Nature*. 2022;608:405–412. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05016-1.
- [3] Metcalf JL, Xu ZZ, Weiss S, et al. Microbial community assembly and metabolic function during mammalian corpse decomposition. *Science*. 2016;351:158–162. doi:10.1126/science.aad2646.
- [4] Ferreira PG, Munoz-Aguirre M, Reverter F, et al. The effects of death and post-mortem cold ischemia on human tissue transcriptomes. *Nature Communications*. 2018;9:490. doi:10.1038/s41467-017-02772-x.
- [5] Olson ET. Animalism and the corpse problem. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*. 2004;82:265–274. doi:10.1080/713659837.

PART VII

How Do We Live Knowing We Will End?

Chapter 19: Before Birth and After Death

1. Two periods we do not experience

Human life is bounded by two stretches of time that the individual does not experience: the past before birth and the future after death. Lucretius used this symmetry to argue that the second should not terrify us if the first does not [1]. Epicurus had already framed death as something that is never present to the experiencing subject [2].

The symmetry is intellectually powerful because both intervals lack the observer. Yet psychologically they are not equivalent. We usually feel deprived by a future we will not see in a way we do not feel deprived by centuries that elapsed before our birth. The difference is not that one interval contains experience and the other does not. Neither does. The difference lies in our temporal orientation as living beings.

The ancient argument therefore separates two questions that are easily confused. Is nonexistence itself an experience? No. Can the prospect of losing future life matter to someone who is alive now? It can.

2. We are organized toward the future

Memory makes the past available, but action is directed forward. Organisms anticipate, plan, avoid threats and pursue outcomes. Human beings extend this orientation through language, calendars, promises, projects and institutions.

The future is therefore not merely another region of time. It is where current intentions point. A planned conversation, an unfinished experiment or a child's adulthood can already matter before it occurs. Death interrupts that directedness.

This helps explain why the unexperienced future can feel like a loss while the unexperienced past does not. The future contains unrealized continuations of projects already underway. The distant past before birth contains no comparable first-person commitments.

Parfit treats this broader tendency as temporal bias: people commonly care differently about past and future experiences even when their intrinsic character is similar [3]. The asymmetry of concern may therefore arise partly from the structure of agency rather than from any metaphysical difference between prenatal and posthumous nonexistence.

3. The symmetry argument and deprivation address different problems

Nagel's deprivation account changes the question. Death can be bad, on this view, because it removes goods the person would otherwise have had, not because being dead contains an unpleasant experience [4].

Brueckner and Fischer developed a modern response to the Lucretian challenge by asking why death can be bad when prenatal nonexistence is not normally regarded in the same way [5]. Their answer focuses on the orientation of desire and welfare toward possible future goods. The relevant comparison is not simply between two blank intervals. It is between a life with additional goods and a life cut short before those goods can occur.

The debate remains open, but one distinction is now clear. Epicurus and Lucretius address the imagined state of being dead. Deprivation theorists address what death removes from a life. A person can accept the first argument and still take the second seriously.

This matters for the observer. The problem is not that it will later endure an empty state. The problem is that a perspective capable of projects, attachments and curiosity will cease before some possible continuations are realized.

4. Why records point backward rather than forward

Physics contains a temporal asymmetry relevant to this discussion. We possess records of the past, not records of the future. Footprints, photographs, memories, fossils and cosmological observations are correlated with earlier states.

David Albert and Sean Carroll connect this asymmetry to the thermodynamic arrow of time and the low-entropy condition of the early universe, often discussed through the Past Hypothesis [6,7]. The point here is deliberately limited. Thermodynamics helps explain why records and memories are naturally oriented toward what has already happened, while the future must be inferred, modeled or imagined.

It does not explain grief, fear or attachment. Those belong to biological, psychological and cultural levels of description.

The distinction is important because physics can otherwise become existential decoration. The arrow of time helps explain why an observer remembers one direction and acts toward another. It does not tell the observer what its mortality should mean.

5. Birth and death occupy different positions in a life

Before birth, there was no established first-person history from which the individual was excluded. Before death, there is. A living person has accumulated memories, relationships, commitments and plans and can project them beyond the expected limit of life.

This weakens a simple psychological symmetry without refuting the logical symmetry of nonexperience.

The future after death will not be experienced by the deceased observer. The centuries before birth were likewise not experienced. But only one of those intervals lies downstream from a life already in progress.

That difference explains why people can be indifferent to the year 1200 yet care intensely about the year 2120.

6. Imagining the posthumous future is itself an achievement

When people imagine the world after their death, they do not perceive that future. They construct it from current models. The image may include descendants not yet born, technologies not yet invented or astronomical events no human now alive will see.

This ability depends on symbolic cognition. It allows an observer to place itself outside its own expected temporal range conceptually, even though it cannot do so experientially.

The result is a peculiar form of knowledge. The observer can know that the world is likely to continue without being able to occupy that later standpoint.

This is one of the deepest asymmetries introduced by reflective consciousness. A finite organism can represent time beyond its own existence.

7. Nonexperience and loss can both be true

The ancient arguments remain valuable because they block one persistent confusion: postmortem nonexistence should not be imagined as an endless experience of absence. There is no subject there to experience darkness, waiting or deprivation.

But this clarification does not erase the value of future life to someone who is still alive. The loss can occur relative to the life that could have continued, not as a later experience suffered by the dead.

The observer therefore confronts two truths at once. It will not experience its own nonexistence. It can nevertheless care now about possibilities it knows it will not reach.

That is the point at which the symmetry between before birth and after death stops being merely logical and becomes existentially uneven.

The next chapter isolates one form of that unevenness: the desire not simply to live longer, but to remain present as a witness to what happens next.

References

- [1] Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by Martin Ferguson Smith. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 2001. Book III.
- [2] Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. In: Inwood B, Gerson LP, eds. *The Epicurus Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company; 1994.
- [3] Parfit D. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1984.
- [4] Nagel T. Death. *Noûs*. 1970;4:73-80.
- [5] Brueckner AL, Fischer JM. Why is death bad? *Philosophical Studies*. 1986;50:213-221.
- [6] Albert DZ. *Time and Chance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 2000.
- [7] Carroll SM. *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time*. New York: Dutton; 2010.

Chapter 20: The Future We Will Not See

1. Deprivation is not the whole problem

Nagel's account explains why death can be bad even though being dead is not an experience: death can deprive a person of goods that would otherwise have been available [1]. That insight is indispensable, but it does not exhaust the phenomenology of mortality.

Some future events matter not because they would benefit us directly but because we want to know what happens. We want to see what children become, whether a scientific problem is solved, how a society changes or what future observers discover about the universe.

This is the concern introduced earlier as **longing for the unwitnessed future**. The phrase is descriptive rather than diagnostic. It names a recognizable structure of concern, not a proposed clinical category.

2. Anticipatory nostalgia points in another direction

Batcho and Shikh use anticipatory nostalgia for missing aspects of the present before they are gone [2]. A student nearing graduation may already miss the campus. A parent may feel nostalgia for a child's current age while the child is still young.

Longing for the unwitnessed future points in the opposite temporal direction. The desired object is not a present condition expected to disappear, but a future state that may occur only after the observer is gone.

The distinction matters because it reveals how far human temporal cognition can extend. We can care about events from which we expect to be absent, including events that do not affect our welfare in any ordinary sense.

3. Curiosity can extend beyond self-interest

Scientific curiosity provides a clear example. A researcher can want to know the result of an experiment that may finish after retirement or death. A physicist can wonder whether dark matter will ever be identified. An astronomer can care about phenomena that will unfold long after any human lifetime.

The concern is not reducible to reward. It is a desire for epistemic access.

The observer understands that information will become available later and also understands that this particular nervous system may no longer be capable of receiving it.

That combination matters. Knowledge does not merely expand what we can see. It expands the range of futures we know we will not see.

4. The future may still be observed

The individual will not see the future. But the future may still be seen.

Other people can continue observing, measuring and interpreting. Other animals will continue to experience their environments. If other technological or extraterrestrial observers exist, they too may occupy later perspectives. None of this transfers the deceased person's first-person viewpoint to them.

The continuity of observation in the universe is therefore compatible with the termination of one observer.

That distinction blocks an easy consolation. It would be false to say that because others continue, nothing important is lost. A particular route of access to reality has ended.

5. The witness role is relational

To witness an event is not merely to exist at the same time. It is to receive information from it and integrate that information into an ongoing perspective.

The desire to remain a witness can therefore attach to people, projects and the world itself. A parent wants to see a child become an adult. A scientist wants to know which theory survives. A citizen may want to see whether an institution improves.

These desires connect personal persistence to external processes without making those processes part of the self.

They also explain why the witness role is not simply a disguised demand for possession. Wanting to see the future does not mean believing that the future belongs to us. Mortality can be painful because access ends, not because reality violates an entitlement by continuing.

6. Personal, collective and impersonal futures

The desire to witness can have several objects.

Some are personal: children, partners, friends and unfinished shared lives.

Some are collective: political changes, scientific discoveries, ecological recovery or technological developments.

Others are comparatively impersonal. A biologist can wonder which forms of life will exist in a million years. An astronomer can know that stars will evolve long after humanity is gone. A cosmologist can care about questions that may remain unresolved for generations.

These examples show that curiosity can reach beyond direct self-interest. The observer can value access to information because reality remains unfinished from its present point of view.

7. Science makes the asymmetry unusually explicit

Modern science makes posthumous futures concrete. We can calculate stellar lifetimes, model climate trajectories, reconstruct evolutionary timescales and design research programs that exceed individual careers.

This creates a remarkable mismatch. Human cognition can model processes that vastly exceed human duration, yet the individual observer remains biologically finite.

The same scientific capacity that enlarges temporal understanding also sharpens awareness of exclusion from the future.

This does not imply despair. It clarifies the condition: a finite perspective can understand events beyond the interval in which it will be able to witness them.

8. The future of other observers does not become ours

There is a temptation to dissolve the problem collectively. Humanity will continue. Science will continue. Future people will know the answers.

Those statements may be true, but they answer a different question.

Brueckner and Fischer's treatment of the badness of death emphasizes that a lost future matters relative to the person who would otherwise have had it [3]. Kagan likewise separates the badness of death from broader questions about what makes continued life valuable [4]. That distinction applies here: later observers can possess knowledge that the deceased wanted, but their epistemic access is genuinely theirs.

Knowledge can be socially cumulative while experience remains first-person. A later scientist may learn the result of an experiment that an earlier scientist wanted to see. The later knowledge does not retroactively become the earlier scientist's experience.

This is why the continuation of inquiry is meaningful without amounting to survival.

9. The unwitnessed future marks the boundary of perspective

Longing for the unwitnessed future should not be treated as a universal response to mortality. Some people may feel it strongly, others weakly or not at all. It can also vary with age, relationships, unfinished projects and curiosity.

Its conceptual importance is that it isolates a loss distinct from pain, fear of dying or deprivation of pleasure.

A temporary observer can understand that there will be later states of the world worth knowing while also understanding that they will not become part of its own experience. The future remains open while one perspective closes.

References

- [1] Nagel T. Death. *Noûs*. 1970;4:73-80.
- [2] Batcho KI, Shikh S. Anticipatory nostalgia: Missing the present before it's gone. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2016;98:75-84. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.088.
- [3] Brueckner AL, Fischer JM. Why is death bad? *Philosophical Studies*. 1986;50:213-221.
- [4] Kagan S. *Death*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2012.

Chapter 21: A World After Us

1. Meaning often depends on people we will never meet

Samuel Scheffler asks us to imagine that humanity will disappear shortly after our own death [1]. Our personal lifespan remains unchanged. What changes is the future of everyone else.

Scheffler argues that many present activities would lose part of their significance under that assumption. Scientific research, art, education, political projects and environmental protection often presuppose a future audience, user or beneficiary.

The thought experiment exposes a dependence that individualistic accounts of meaning can miss. A person's values are partly oriented toward a social world extending beyond that person's own life.

2. The relevant continuation is ordinary human posterity

Scheffler uses the language of an afterlife to describe the continued existence of other people after one's own death [1]. In the present book, only that secular and social sense matters.

The point is not that the deceased continues to experience anything. It is that the anticipated continuation of humanity can matter to someone while alive.

This creates a striking asymmetry. We can value events that will occur when we are no longer present and from which we will receive no later benefit.

The future community matters before it exists.

3. Projects can extend beyond their authors

A scientific paper may become useful after its authors die. A bridge may serve people not yet born. A conservation project may protect ecosystems for centuries. A mathematical proof, institution or language can outlast every individual currently using it.

These cases do not establish personal survival. They show that agency can be temporally extended through consequences, practices and institutions.

Humans often describe this extension using survival language. A person's work survives. A tradition survives. A name survives. These expressions are intelligible, but they refer to continuity of effects or practices, not continuation of first-person consciousness.

The distinction is essential because both forms of continuation can be real without being the same thing.

4. Science depends structurally on successors

Science is cumulative by design. Measurements are checked by others. Data are archived. Methods are taught. Theories are revised. Instruments are built for communities rather than for one observer.

A scientist can therefore care rationally about a future community of inquiry without expecting to participate in it. The value of an experiment may depend partly on later researchers being able to reproduce, challenge or use it.

This makes Scheffler's point concrete. If there were no future observers at all, many current scientific activities would lose part of the context that gives them purpose. A dataset no one could ever inspect would occupy a different place in scientific practice from a dataset intended for later inquiry.

The individual scientist can die while the epistemic project continues.

5. Environmental responsibility has the same temporal structure

Environmental decisions often concern timescales longer than the lives of current decision makers. Forest restoration, biodiversity conservation, climate mitigation and management of long-lived waste can affect people and organisms not yet alive.

Concern for them demonstrates that values can cross generational boundaries. The present observer can act for beneficiaries it will never meet.

This is not evidence of personal survival. It is evidence that responsibility need not end at the boundary of one's own expected experience.

The distinction also helps explain why posterity can matter even when recognition does not. A person can care that a forest survives without expecting future people to know who helped protect it.

6. Meaning can depend on continuity without becoming fragile illusion

One might object that if projects need future people to matter, their value is derivative or unstable. Scheffler's thought experiment suggests something more interesting.

Human values are often relational from the start.

A book is written for readers. A discovery becomes science through a community. Education is directed toward lives that continue beyond the teacher's role. Institutions exist because practices are carried forward by people who replace one another.

Dependence on continuation therefore does not make present value unreal. It reveals the temporal structure of many human goods.

The isolated observer is an inadequate model for understanding them.

7. Posterity does not substitute for the individual

The continued existence of humanity does not solve the first-person problem. Future people can inherit projects without inheriting the exact perspective of the person who began them.

This prevents a subtle equivocation. Social continuation can preserve purposes, knowledge and institutions while personal experience still ends.

A world after us can matter to us without becoming a world we will experience.

This is precisely why posterity has philosophical significance here. It shows that the value of a future does not depend entirely on our being present in it.

8. We already inhabit the consequences of absent people

Every generation lives in a world partly shaped by people who did not survive to see it. Languages, roads, legal systems, scientific knowledge, works of art and environmental damage all cross individual lifetimes. Chapter 23 examines in detail how institutions and cultural memory carry some of those effects forward [2,3].

The future after us is therefore not an exotic possibility. It is the same ordinary continuity that produced the present.

What is unusual is that a reflective observer can understand its position in this chain before leaving it. It can recognize itself simultaneously as beneficiary of earlier lives and predecessor of later ones.

That recognition enlarges the meaning of finitude without dissolving it.

The observer will not enter the later world as a first-person subject. But the existence of that world can still matter now.

References

- [1] Scheffler S. *Death and the Afterlife*. Edited by Niko Kolodny. New York: Oxford University Press; 2013.
- [2] North DC. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
- [3] Assmann J, Czaplicka J. Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*. 1995;65:125-133. doi:10.2307/488538.

Chapter 22: Would Endless Life Solve the Problem?

1. Mortality makes endless life look like the obvious solution

If death removes future experience, indefinite life appears to remove the loss. The observer could continue seeing what happens. Projects would not have to end because time had run out. The unwitnessed future could recede indefinitely.

But philosophical discussions of immortality show that the solution is not simple.

Bernard Williams argued that an endless life might eventually become intolerably repetitive if the person retained a sufficiently stable character, while radical transformation would raise the question of whether the distant future individual was still meaningfully the same person [1].

His argument does not show that death is good. It asks whether simply extending duration forever would preserve the conditions that make a life recognizably one's own.

2. Williams's dilemma is influential but not decisive

Williams develops the problem through Elina Makropulos, who has lived for centuries and has become profoundly bored [1]. The example supports a dilemma: either desires remain sufficiently stable that they are eventually exhausted, or the person changes so deeply that continuity with the original self becomes weak.

John Martin Fischer directly challenged the claim that immortality would necessarily become intolerable [2]. New projects, relationships and forms of knowledge may continue to arise. A person's motivations can evolve without automatically erasing identity.

More recently, Fischer has returned to the debate to defend the possibility that an immortal life could be good [3].

The disagreement matters because it blocks an easy slogan. Endless life is neither obviously desirable nor obviously meaningless.

3. Indefinite lifespan is not the same as invulnerability

Biology requires another distinction. An organism could cease to age while remaining vulnerable to injury, infection or environmental catastrophe. Negligible senescence, discussed in Chapter 4, is not immortality.

Likewise, hypothetical life extension would not guarantee uninterrupted consciousness, memory or psychological continuity.

The continuities developed in Part V would still matter. A body could persist while autobiography changed radically. Memory could fail. Consciousness could be interrupted. Relationships could transform.

Simply adding years does not answer what must remain for the observer to regard later experience as its own continuation.

4. Memory would become a central constraint

An indefinitely long human life would confront a practical problem often ignored in simple fantasies of immortality: finite cognitive organization.

Autobiographical memory is already selective over decades. Across centuries or millennia, either memory capacity and retrieval would have to change dramatically or enormous portions of lived history would become inaccessible.

If an observer no longer remembered most earlier stages, psychological continuity could become thinner even while biological continuity remained uninterrupted. The identity problems discussed in Chapter 15 would become more severe, not less.

An endless lifespan would not guarantee an endless autobiography.

This does not prove that continuity would fail. It shows that biological persistence alone would not settle the question.

5. Relationships would transform endless life

Immortality for one individual differs radically from immortality for everyone.

If only one observer persisted while others died, loss and replacement would dominate its social world. If everyone persisted, reproduction, population, resources and institutions would have to change.

These scenarios are speculative, but they expose an important point. Lifespan cannot be varied independently of ecology and society.

An organism does not live in an empty temporal container. Human identity is partly relational, and a radically extended life would transform the very relationships through which that identity develops.

The desire not to die is understandable, but fulfilling it would alter many of the structures that currently make a human life recognizable.

6. Scarcity can shape value without creating all value

A common response to mortality is that finitude gives life meaning.

That claim is too strong.

A friendship does not become valuable only because one participant will die. Curiosity does not require an expiration date. Scientific understanding would not become worthless merely because researchers had more time.

Scarcity can alter priorities. A deadline can make a choice urgent. A limited lifespan can force selection among projects. But it does not follow that death is the source of everything valuable.

The argument for finitude should therefore not become a retrospective justification of mortality.

7. Risk would remain unless endless life meant absolute invulnerability

Even a non-aging organism would exist in a physical environment. Accidents, catastrophic injury and large-scale environmental change could still threaten it.

The distinction between indefinite lifespan and guaranteed endless existence is therefore essential. A being that does not senesce can still die, and a being that survives ordinary hazards can still face rare hazards.

To remove mortality completely would require much more than stopping aging. It would require a specification of what kinds of physical destruction are impossible.

The apparently simple wish to "live forever" therefore contains multiple biological and philosophical assumptions.

8. Endless life changes the problem rather than erasing it

An observer expecting indefinite continuation might no longer fear losing access to the near future in the same way. But questions about boredom, transformation, memory, relationships and identity would become more prominent.

Kagan emphasizes that whether death is bad and whether immortality would be good are distinct questions [4]. The absence of one problem does not automatically produce an ideal condition.

The thought experiment is useful because it reveals what different people value about continuation.

Someone who would accept radical transformation to remain alive may place great weight on biological persistence. Someone who would reject continuation without memory may value autobiographical continuity more strongly. Someone who mainly fears losing access to future events may care most about the witness role.

There is no single variable called survival.

9. The opposite of mortality is not yet a complete life plan

Endless life sounds like a solution only when it is described negatively, as not dying. Once the condition is described positively, questions proliferate. What is remembered? What can change? Which relationships continue? What risks remain? What happens to motivation when time ceases to be scarce?

None of these questions makes mortality desirable. They show that avoiding death and defining a good endless life are separate tasks.

The temporary observer therefore faces a genuine loss, but the opposite condition is not a fully specified solution.

References

- [1] Williams B. The Makropulos case: reflections on the tedium of immortality. In: *Problems of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1973.
- [2] Fischer JM. Why immortality is not so bad. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*. 1994;2:257-270.
doi:10.1080/09672559408570794.
- [3] Fischer JM. Why immortality could be good. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*. 2024;32:78-100.
doi:10.1080/09672559.2023.2286537.
- [4] Kagan S. *Death*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 2012.

PART VIII

What Remains After the Observer?

Chapter 23: Consequences Without Survival

1. An event can end and still have effects

When an observer dies, first-person experience ends. It does not follow that everything caused by that life disappears.

Actions alter other people. Documents preserve information. Biological descendants inherit genetic material. Institutions retain procedures. Built objects continue to function. Scientific results enter later work.

These are forms of causal persistence. They are real, but they are not personal survival.

The Introduction and Chapter 19 already established that physical records can preserve correlations with earlier events and that this asymmetry belongs to a universe with a thermodynamic arrow of time. The present chapter asks a different question: how consequences continue through biological, cultural and institutional transmission after the observer has ended.

2. Biological inheritance is continuity without autobiography

Parents transmit genetic material to descendants, but genetic inheritance is not the transfer of a personal point of view. Genes influence development through interactions with cellular and environmental systems, and descendants can resemble ancestors in morphology, physiology and disease risk while possessing their own nervous systems and first-person histories.

This distinction matters because biological language often encourages loose talk of individuals "living on" in their descendants. A lineage can continue, alleles can continue and traits can recur without the deceased person's autobiographical consciousness continuing.

Biological inheritance is genuine persistence across generations, but it is persistence of information and developmental influence, not persistence of the same observer.

3. Cultural transmission can extend farther than genetic descent

Human beings transmit information through language, imitation, teaching, writing, images and institutions. Cultural evolution therefore creates lines of continuity that need not follow biological kinship.

Boyd and Richerson formalized culture as socially transmitted information capable of changing under selection-like and population-level processes [1]. Later cultural-evolution research has developed this framework extensively.

A mathematical technique can pass among people with no family relationship. A scientific method can survive the death of everyone who first developed it. A story can cross languages and centuries.

These are powerful continuities because they allow patterns generated by one observer to influence minds that did not coexist with it.

But transmission always involves reconstruction. The later mind is not a container into which the earlier person is transferred.

4. Institutions preserve rules rather than persons

Institutions allow consequences to persist in another way.

A laboratory can preserve procedures. A court can preserve precedents. A company can preserve routines. A university can maintain curricula and archives across generations of employees and students.

North describes institutions as humanly devised constraints that structure interaction [2]. Their persistence depends on repeated enactment by changing populations of people.

This produces continuity without personal identity.

An institution may carry traces of decisions made by people long dead, yet those people are not conscious within the institution. Their influence has been incorporated into rules, incentives, records and expectations.

The distinction is particularly important because institutional persistence can greatly exceed the lifespan of any participant.

5. Social memory is selective

People do not remain in collective memory as complete copies.

Jan Assmann distinguishes forms of cultural memory maintained through texts, rituals, monuments and shared representations [3]. Such systems allow societies to preserve selected aspects of the past, but selection is unavoidable.

Families remember some stories and lose others. Institutions simplify origins. Historical reputations change. Archives survive unevenly. Languages alter the meaning of inherited words.

A person's social representation can therefore persist while becoming increasingly unlike the person's own self-understanding.

This does not make memory unreal. It makes it relational and reconstructive.

What remains depends partly on later observers.

6. Documents preserve fragments, not subjects

Writing, photographs, recordings and digital archives can preserve extraordinary detail. They can reproduce a voice, a face, a style of argument or thousands of pages of correspondence, and future systems may be able to search and recombine those traces with increasing sophistication.

The abundance of information can create an illusion of continued presence, yet a record is not automatically a subject. An archive of emails does not have the experiences described in the emails. A genome is not an autobiography. A recording of speech does not continue the speaker's auditory awareness.

Information can persist without the organized causal architecture that made the original observer conscious.

7. Consequences extend beyond intention

Some effects of a life are deliberate. A paper is published. A child is taught. A bridge is designed.

Others are unintended. A casual conversation changes a decision. A procedural mistake alters a later rule. An environmental action influences organisms the actor never considered.

Causal persistence therefore exceeds legacy in the narrow sense.

A person does not control all the effects that outlast them.

This is one reason consequences should not be romanticized. Effects can be beneficial, harmful, ambiguous or unnoticed. Their persistence is a causal fact, not a guarantee of meaning.

8. Recognition is not required for consequence

A person can affect the future without being remembered. An anonymous engineer may contribute to a system used decades later, a scientific observation may enter a database after its collector's name is forgotten, and a parent may alter descendants through habits that are no longer attributed to their origin.

This distinction separates causal persistence from reputation. Being remembered is one possible consequence of a life, but it is not the condition for having consequences.

The same point applies in reverse. A famous name can persist while the actual causal influence of the person is misunderstood.

9. What has happened cannot be made not to have happened

Frankl, in the 1984 postscript "The Case for a Tragic Optimism" included in *Man's Search for Meaning*, emphasizes that what has been realized in a life belongs irreversibly to the past [4].

The claim does not require personal survival.

If a conversation occurred, later death cannot make it the case that the conversation never occurred. If an experiment was performed, its occurrence is part of history even if every participant later dies.

This is an asymmetry between occurrence and continuation.

The event does not continue as an experience. It remains a fact about what happened.

10. Persistence should not be inflated into survival

Because so many things can remain, language easily overreaches. Matter can continue without the person continuing, information can persist without the person persisting, and effects can remain without the observer remaining.

None of those inferences follows. A conscious individual can cease while biological inheritance, cultural transmission, institutions, memories, documents and physical consequences continue.

The distinction is not a pessimistic subtraction from what remains. It is what makes the remaining continuities conceptually precise.

The final chapter can therefore ask the book's last question without confusing it with survival: what does it mean that a temporary observer existed, understood part of the universe, affected other systems and then ceased to have a first-person perspective?

References

- [1] Boyd R, Richerson PJ. *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1985.
- [2] North DC. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.
- [3] Assmann J, Czaplicka J. Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*. 1995;65:125-133. doi:10.2307/488538.
- [4] Frankl VE. The Case for a Tragic Optimism. In: *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press; 2006. Postscript first published 1984.

Chapter 24: A Temporary Observer

1. The observer was never outside the universe

The central mistake this book has tried to avoid is picturing the observer as something standing apart from reality.

A human being is a biological system produced within cosmic history. Its atoms, metabolism, nervous system and culture all belong to the same physical world it studies. Observation is therefore not an external inspection of the universe by an independent spectator. It is an activity performed by one part of the universe upon other parts.

This does not make the universe as a whole conscious. Evidence supports local conscious systems, not a universal subject.

The title of this book refers to that local fact: portions of the universe have become capable of constructing models of other portions, including models of their own origin and limits.

2. Individuality is real without being absolute

The individual is neither an illusion nor a sealed substance. Biological individuality is maintained through boundaries, regulation and coordinated organization, yet those boundaries are permeable and context dependent. Pradeu emphasizes that biological individuality itself has several dimensions and cannot be reduced to one universal criterion [1].

Air, food, microorganisms, language and other people continuously participate in a human life. The individual depends on conditions it did not create, but dependence does not erase individuality.

A person remains a particular organized history even though that organization is relational. The useful formulation is therefore neither complete separation nor identity with the whole.

3. Consciousness makes finitude first-person

Life can end without anticipating its end. Conscious life introduces experience. Reflective consciousness adds the capacity to represent the future disappearance of experience itself.

Humans appear unusually developed in the combination of symbolic language, autobiographical memory, cumulative culture, scientific modeling and explicit reflection on mortality, although other animals possess forms of consciousness and may understand aspects of death.

This distinction prevents human distinctiveness from becoming a hierarchy of worth.

The important fact is narrower. Some observers can understand that the condition enabling them to observe is temporary.

4. Identity persists through several continuities

The book has separated biological continuity, neural capacity for consciousness, ongoing conscious experience, autobiographical continuity and relational continuity.

Ordinary life binds them together so tightly that they can feel like one thing. Sleep, anesthesia, amnesia, dementia, brain injury and death pull them apart.

No single continuity was assumed to be sufficient for personal identity in every case.

That restraint matters at death. The persistence of atoms is not the persistence of consciousness. Memory in other people is not first-person survival. A functioning cell is not an observing person.

The observer is therefore not one substance hidden beneath all change. It is a temporally organized living individual in which several kinds of continuity normally overlap.

5. Death ends one perspective, not reality

Chapter 18 established that the individual was always physically within the universe. Death does not reverse a prior separation. It ends the living organization that sustained one particular conscious perspective.

Other organisms may continue living. Other conscious animals may continue experiencing. Other humans may continue asking questions. The future can still be observed.

But it will not be observed by the same deceased consciousness.

This is the asymmetry at the center of the book. The world can continue without one observer, while that observer cannot continue experiencing without the living organization that made experience possible.

6. What remains is not nothing

A temporary life can have consequences that outlast it. It can alter other people, contribute to knowledge, produce institutions, leave documents and change physical conditions. These continuities do not defeat mortality, but they show that ending and having mattered are compatible.

A finite event need not be unreal because it is finite. A scientific measurement remains a measurement after the instrument is gone, and a conversation remains part of history after both speakers have died.

None of this restores the first-person perspective. It simply prevents mortality from being confused with erasure.

7. Individuality and connection are not opposites

Mark Johnston has explored philosophical ways of loosening the picture of a radically isolated self [2]. The present book takes a more empirically restrictive route and does not claim survival of the first person beyond the functioning organism.

Still, the challenge to radical separateness is useful. The observer is constituted through a body, environment, developmental history, language and relationships. Its knowledge is profoundly collective, and even the concepts used to think about consciousness and death were inherited from other observers.

This does not dissolve the individual into a larger subject. It shows that singularity and dependence can coexist.

A perspective can be uniquely situated without being self-created.

8. Knowledge can exceed the observer's duration

A human lifespan is brief compared with cosmic time. Yet human observers have reconstructed stellar evolution, inferred the age of the universe, decoded genomes and measured neural processes associated with consciousness.

The duration of the observer does not set the duration of what can be understood. A finite organism can discover events that occurred billions of years before its birth and model processes that will continue long after its death.

This is possible because knowledge is cumulative, symbolic and social. No individual observer independently contains all of science. Scheffler's discussion of posterity helps explain why the continuation of later communities can matter to projects that no single life can complete [3].

Temporary observers can nevertheless participate in models whose temporal reach vastly exceeds their own lives. That fact is not a victory over mortality, but a property of what finite observers can do while they exist.

9. No final theory is required for the central conclusion

This book has crossed cosmology, biology, neuroscience and philosophy without producing a final theory of consciousness or personal identity. Those problems remain open, but the central argument requires less.

As far as current evidence shows, conscious experience depends on organized living nervous systems. Human observers can understand that their own capacity for experience is temporary. Identity involves several overlapping continuities that can separate. Death permanently removes the capacity for further first-person experience even while matter, records, relationships and consequences remain.

Nagel's deprivation account is one major philosophical precedent for understanding why the loss of future experience can matter without requiring any experience of being dead [4]. The present book adds a narrower emphasis on the loss of the witness role.

Each claim can be defended without pretending that every deeper metaphysical problem has been solved.

10. The observer is singular without being isolated

Every first-person perspective is singular in the straightforward sense that no other organism occupies exactly the same biological history and point of view, yet singularity does not imply isolation.

The observer is assembled from inherited biology, environmental exchange, language, culture and relationships. Its knowledge is collective, its concepts are inherited and revised, and its body is maintained by continuous exchange with the environment.

The individual is therefore best understood as a maintained local organization with a history, not as a substance detached from nature. This position preserves both sides of the problem: the observer is genuinely this observer, and this observer was never outside the processes it observes.

11. A finite perspective can still disclose reality

Finitude does not invalidate observation. A temporary instrument can measure accurately, and a finite organism can discover facts that remain true after it dies. The temporary character of a perspective does not make every statement perspectival in the sense of being merely subjective.

Science depends precisely on methods by which observations can be compared, corrected and integrated across many observers. No one individual sees the entire universe, yet local observers can build increasingly reliable models of domains none of them can experience directly in full.

This is one of the most remarkable consequences of cumulative inquiry. A short-lived organism can reconstruct processes that began before Earth existed and can infer futures it will never witness.

12. The temporary observer

The universe existed before any known observer on Earth. Life appeared within it, some living systems became conscious, and one lineage developed symbolic language, cumulative science and the ability to understand both cosmic history and personal finitude.

Nothing in that sequence implies that observers were the goal of the universe. It establishes something more modest and, for this book, more important.

An observer can arise from processes it did not design, discover that it is part of those processes, and understand that its own perspective is temporary, while coming to know a reality whose past precedes it and whose future will continue without it. It can know that other observers may continue, care about futures it will not see, leave consequences without continuing as the same first-person subject, and understand that the end of its perspective is not the end of reality.

The universe does not need this observer in order to exist.

But while the observer exists, the universe is present from here.

References

- [1] Pradeu T. Organisms or biological individuals? Combining physiological and evolutionary individuality. *Biology & Philosophy*. 2016;31:797-817. doi:10.1007/s10539-016-9551-1.
- [2] Johnston M. *Surviving Death*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2010.
- [3] Scheffler S. *Death and the Afterlife*. Edited by Niko Kolodny. New York: Oxford University Press; 2013.
- [4] Nagel T. Death. *Noûs*. 1970;4:73-80.