

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

Re: Re: Teleology and the Meaning of Life

Osamu Kiritani¹

¹ Tokyo Women's Medical University

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

Some remarks are made on a previous paper “Re: Teleology and the Meaning of Life” (<https://doi.org/10.32388/1LT25R.3>).

Osamu Kiritani

Clinical and Academic Research Promotion Center, Tokyo Women's Medical University, 8-1 Kawada-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8666, Japan. Email: osamu.kiritani@gmail.com.

Not only reproduction but also survival

The meaning of life is not only reproduction but also survival. Even if we do not or cannot reproduce, the meaning of life can be survival.

Type nihilism, token realism

From the point of view of type, there is no meaning of life. We eat or have sex for survival or reproduction. But, for what, do we survive or reproduce? Life has no meaning from the viewpoint of type. However, from the point of view of token, there is a meaning of life. We survive now for our survival in the future. We reproduce for our children's reproduction. Life has a meaning from the viewpoint of token.

Why not use ChatGPT?

ChatGPT was said to be used in order not to be subjective or personal. Being not subjective is not equal to being objective. Being not personal is not equal to being common. Co-authorship does not promise to be objective and common, but helps not to be subjective or personal. Feedback from reviewers does not promise to be objective and common, but helps not to be subjective or personal. Similarly, ChatGPT does not promise to be objective and common, but helps not to be subjective or personal.

Deliberate laziness

Being not subjective or personal is necessary for arguments in general. In order not to be subjective or personal, no amendments were made to the outputs from ChatGPT in the paper. Following Terms of Use of ChatGPT, which says, “Output may not always be accurate.... You must evaluate Output for accuracy...,” I only evaluated the accuracy of the outputs and cited them as they are.

Aleatoric argumentation

The paper was said to amplify my previous argument. From the beginning, I realized that it did not follow the conventions of academic papers. So, it was uploaded to the preprint archive. But, fortunately, it received open peer reviews. I decided to defend against not only *possible* counterarguments by ChatGPT but also *actual* counterarguments from reviewers. More fortunately, it received a positive review. I was able to adopt the outputs not only from AI but also from a human. My argument has been multiplied. Then, I hoped that it would receive more reviews and further amplify my argument. However, unfortunately, it has received no more reviews, and my argument has ceased to be multiplied.