

The meaning of life

Tom Rochette <tom.rochette@coreteks.org>

July 24, 2025 — [b5600af2](#)

Life doesn't have a meaning.

You define the meaning of your life.

What is a reasonable meaning to give to your life?

From an utilitarian perspective it should be about reducing pain or increasing pleasure for the largest population.

It's not clear which one is preferable.

If both are considered to be on the same axis, then it is a matter of identifying the changes that will lead to the largest relative increase.

Similarly to any optimization problem there are things that are easier than others to optimize and to improve, while others are neglectable in terms of improvement.

With this line of reasoning one would think the best they can do is to help those that have the least: food, shelter, education, happiness, freedom.

But is it worthwhile to improve the life of those people if they still die young or are unable to benefit from what you provided them?

Why should we care about most of the population?

Given our capitalistic environment, we want as many individuals as possible to accomplish work. The purpose of that work is meaningless, but in the grand scheme of things it is about survival.

We evolved from nothing, to atoms, then molecules, then in/organic compounds, then collections of molecules, proteins, RNA, DNA, cells, organs, humans.

At the electron, proton and neutron level we don't observe any specific goal other than reaching some level of stability within atoms through the different electronic shell levels.

Should we see structure as an indication of some type of implicit "design goal", i.e., structure implies intent?

Once we reach a certain complexity level we nowadays consider "life", we start using energy as a way to interact with the environment around us.

Eating is the foundation. Eating is how we acquire energy. We need to eat to have energy to accomplish anything.

Sleep is necessary as a mean to conserve energy.

We need energy for the sole purpose of looking for more energy. From this perspective we're engaged in a vicious useless cycle of finding energy, storing it, and using it to find more energy.

Energy used to achieve movement produces some heat due to friction with the environment.

As long as the environment we live in can self-sustain itself, that is, it can produce consumable sources of energy faster than they are consumed by those inhabiting it, we can live in that environment. When it ceases to be the case, the organisms that rely on this property being true are at risk of dying.

In our society, it's easy to have access to food and thus fulfill this need.

Prokaryote cells separate themselves from their environment through a lipid bilayer. We can see this as being similar to a human being living in their own home.

Why did atoms turn into more complex molecules, which in turn, after many steps, turned into cells?

Why did this complexity arise instead of staying at very simple atomic levels?

In many cases different atoms aggregate together to form a molecule because this assembly is structurally more stable.

Why does the environment want more stable molecules over less stable ones?

Why are there atoms to begin with an not just soups of electrons, protons and neutrons?