Reality seems to always possess a smaller or at least more fundamental attribute of higher qualitative and quantitative influence. This is a consequence of the tools that we employ to interpret reality, or it may even be that what exists is an infinite chain of increasing or decreasing size. In order to contextualise this order of importance that is implicitly assigned to certain aspects of reality, we can analyse objects near us. The objects were placed next to us due to a series of causal events (Aristotle, 1). We can observe that when hypothesising the source of an object, we give importance to the predecessor rather than the successor (Aristotle, 2).

Sometimes it might appear that a successor is assigned more importance than a predecessor, however this is due to the presence of a *different* hierarchical variable that is of even greater perceived significance than the former. Humans have certain tools that make them unknowingly assign a unary—not a binary—to an object that comes prior in the causal hierarchy. This unary is associated with, as words can best describe, something positive.

We can perhaps link the development of this unconscious attribution to primitive organisms that employed correlating means to associate survival with understanding the predecessors of objects, events, people, and concepts. It can also be that only a concept more basic than cause and effect can define the origins of what causes cause and effect, or there needs to be another variable. Since a framework can be applied to itself, finding the reason for the development of cause and effect would not be entirely irrational. I would therefore say that correlation is a more fundamental tool for humanity than causation. This certainly does not mean correlation is at the bottom of the chain, but it is a causal predecessor to causation or perhaps it is more innate to human nature.

Since humans are constantly looking for origins and causation is a framework that applies to itself and other frameworks, they would surely not stop at trying to look at causation as a means to an end. Since this framework has become so fundamental to what it means to be human, it is necessary that we explore its limits. The core of an object is by definition a thing of utmost importance. This is due to a sub-tool of the causal framework, which I would call centrism. A thing that is centred, beneath, beyond is of more importance. Therefore, if we mix gold with dirt, the area more abundant in gold is considered to be the core or the cause. This attribution is a consequence of correlation and is obviously faulty. However, if I say that I mixed gold with another element which resulted in a layer of a different compound forming around this mixture, my correlation is not faulty, but can be said to have a causal relation.

Now, a natural conclusion that we can come to is that for a core to be a cause and not merely a correlation, it requires an element that is distinct from itself. Therefore, to find the most fundamental of all the cores, we have to find one that is causal yet *only* self-serving. Many people claim that procreation, meaning, or power are the guiding forces of humanity. Keeping in mind the self-serving nature of the prime motivator, I would disagree with the central importance of all three. A school of thought of much acclaim is that of procreation (Freud, 3). Procreation is a correlation that humans make between their offspring and their continuing consciousness. Therefore, procreation is just a means to survival. However, survival cannot be the core that is self-serving, as it is interacting in any shape or form, with the other centres of human action.

A more self-serving ideation would be continuity. People can willingly die as they prioritise their higher meaning over their own survival. However, never will they do so without having the sense of extended continuity perhaps through their offspring, through the concept of

heaven, a perceived significant action that they created or propagated, or a sense of superiority over others—which is often the correlated core of all the former reasons.

The 'denial of death' hypothesised that humans deal with dying by trying to leave behind symbols of immortality in life like an offspring, a working or an ideation, etc (Becker, 4). The denial of death through continuity is a response to human association of certain memory triggers through the reference of the name of a person or an object they possessed after their passing. This memory trigger mimics the presence of a person after their death. Overtime, humans came to associate memory triggers as the persistence of the person themselves. A questioning of this misdirected attribution of value brings about the 'denial' part of death. However, I argue that continuity is an even more primal force than the fear of death. It is only possible to fear something if it disrupts a desired outcome that existed prior to the emergence of the fear. Maybe that is why the fear of death is so innate in humanity, it is a disruption of something so fundamental to being.

When I speak of continuity, I refer to the continuity of consciousness. It is the force, often fearful, that drives humans to move through yet persist. The human drive to continue is inherently linked to their obsession with persistence.

Other forms of trying to continue are once again partially false correlations that were transformed into prime symbols of continuity due to persistent positive experiential stimuli over a long period of time.

Similarly, power can be a major driving force for human action (Adler, 5). There are, however, instances when people give up their position of power if something threatens their life or the lives of their offsprings and companions, or if a higher meaning motivates and entices them. Of course, some might claim that higher meaning and survival are just means to

gain or maintain power. However, it would be difficult to deny that there are many intersections between these principles.

Meaning might be the tougher one of the three to dissect (Frankl, 6). Humans find meaning in things because meaning is fundamentally linked to causation or looking for reasons. However, as causation is not the most basic tool that humans employ, it cannot be the self-serving core. This is because causation is of less perceived importance in the hierarchical chain than some other human tools. If a tool is of less perceived importance than another, it would by definition not be the prime motivator of human action.

Therefore, I would access continuity to be more self-serving than the others. I cannot declare that it is entirely self-serving, as if its interaction with another framework creates something new, its importance would decline.

Since continuity is the known central goal of humanity, I can reason that it is the shared core of pleasure and pain. Humans feel pain when they reason that something is endangering their lives or their extended selves, which might be their offspring, or their work.

They feel pleasure when something is quite the contrary, or at least the danger is stalled.

There are those who mourn the prospect of being punished in an afterlife and question the unfairness of this punishment. This is due to their inability to influence reality without being directed by what is often called fate. I would say that such people are only partially sceptical.

Humans feel pain because their life is endangered. Pain can be a form of delayed gratification, which is often associated with that which causes happiness. However, this does not mean that pain is not an unconscious indication of potential death. People just learn to be able to disassociate certain kinds of pain and prospective death. Which in turn results in a

wiser cycle of gratification. Unfairness is the quality that is the consequence of powerlessness

and pain.

Pain is a reaction to prospective death. However, promised eternity, whether it is a cycle of

pain or pleasure, only causes suffering due to a delusion of cores. If you are promised

eternity, then pain becomes an unnecessary response. It is a misdirected attribution of

perceived value. Hence, the feeling of unfairness is an absurdity of the mind when it comes to

the afterlife.

Humans constantly explore reality and in consequence add new but not truly ingenious

frameworks to their arsenal. I would not want to end my paper by making a prognosis.

However, as it seems, the next self-serving core of humanity can be the mutation of the

surface.

References:

- Aristotle. (2000). *Metaphysics*. (H. Lawson-Tancred, Trans.). London: Penguin Classics.
- 2. Aristotle. (2004). *The Art of Rhetoric* (H. C. Lawson-Tancred, Trans.). London: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 4th century BCE)
- 3. Freud, S. (1920). *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. (J. Strachey, Trans.). London: Hogarth Press
- 4. Becker, E. (1973). The Denial of Death. New York: Free Press
- Adler, A. (1927). Understanding Human Nature. (W. B. Wolfe, Trans.). New York: Greenberg.
- 6. Frankl, V. E. (1959). *The Doctor and the Soul: From Psychotherapy to Logotherapy*. New York: Knopf