



**Research Paper**

## **Man, and the Cosmos**

Socrates Ebo.

Head, Department of Philosophy, Federal University Otuoke, Nigeria.

---

### **Abstract**

*The place and the ultimate fate of man in the cosmos have been puzzles man has been trying to resolve since time immemorial. Man, who has not been able to fully understand himself is charged to understand the cosmos. But he has to fully understand the cosmos in order to fully himself since his being and the cosmos are inexorably interwoven. But then, man is part and parcel of the cosmos. How does this man who has not been able to fully understand himself understand the cosmos which he is required to understand in order to understand himself when in fact, he is part of that very cosmos? This is the hydra-headed epistemological problem that arises when the relationship between man and the cosmos is contemplated. Apparently, the understanding of one seems to be tied to the understanding of the other. Man needs to understand the cosmos in order to understand his place in it. Man needs to understand himself, his epistemological and ontological capabilities and limitations in order to gain a bigger window into the nature of the cosmos. This work is cosmological as well as ontological. It is analytic and speculative in certain dimensions. It is the aim of this work to shed more light on the nature of man and the nature of the cosmos. It is the principal target of this work to explain in lucid terms, the ontological nexus between the cosmos and man.*

*Received 07 Mar., 2025; Revised 16 Mar., 2025; Accepted 18 Mar., 2025 © The author(s) 2025.*

*Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)*

### **I. Introduction**

Man is born into the cosmos without any user-manual. He is born without any fore knowledge of the nature and extent of the cosmos. He is born even without full knowledge of himself. His biological existence is entirely programmed for functional survival. If his functionality fails, his existence collapses. Nevertheless, the cosmos always continues in its inexorable existential motion even if man fizzles out. Nature is fundamentally about the survival of the fittest. That maxim is undeniably true of the biological nature which is the category man belongs. Man, necessarily has to understand the cosmos around him as a matter of survival necessity. To biologically survive, he has to choose the right food to eat; not every part of the biological nature is conducive to man's survival. As a matter of fact, much of the biological nature would outrightly poison him while some species of the biological nature would outrightly devour him. Poisonous herbs and fruits abound. Hostile animals abound. If the man happens to find himself in certain parts of the cosmos, mosquitoes abound in their numbers to finish him off. Even at the cellular level, man is not secure for millions of bacteria, viruses and fungi abound in the environment to devour man from within. It is an existential battle.

Man has to negotiate the existential challenges above successfully and still endeavour to rise above mere biological survival. Overcoming these challenges in order to survive is no mean feat. Man is forced to gain key knowledge of the cosmos right away. Beyond knowing what to eat, he has to acquire the capacity to get what he eats. That means the mastery of hunting, the mastery of the seasons and the mastery of agriculture. It also means the creation and building of societies in order to escape the harshness of the wild. These are not choices for man to optionally make but existential necessities he must confront with urgency [1]. As a matter of biological reality, man is born hungry. He is born crying. He is born, gasping for life and clutching unto survival. These are not options to take or not to take but instinctive responses. Existence before essence.

What is the place of man in the cosmos? This is a question man asks after fulfilling the basic necessities of survival. Indeed, it is an established fact that leisure gave rise to philosophy [2,3]. Only a stable society philosophizes. A society on the brink of survival rarely philosophizes. The civilization of nature gave rise to philosophy. It is the stability that comes with civilization that enables man to probe meaning.

There is no gainsaying that man is part and parcel of the cosmos. But man has the capacity to reflect on the cosmos despite being part of the cosmos. Although man is not the only conscious entity in the cosmos, only man appears to be conscious of the immensity of the cosmos. No doubt, a dog for instance is definitely aware of

the world around it. Birds of migration seasonally move from one part of the world to another. To that extent, these animals know the world. But only man comprehends the immensity of the cosmos. Only man reflects on the cosmos. Should it not be proper to ask man to know himself first before unriddling the cosmos? How does a man who has not properly unriddled himself get to unriddle the cosmos? This takes us back to the Socratic dictum that led to the shift of paradigm in ancient Greek philosophy from the cosmocentric bias to the anthropocentric bias [4].

### 1. **The Appearance of Man**

The history of the cosmos started for man the moment man gained consciousness of himself as a thinking entity. The history of the prior existence of the cosmos is an inference made by human consciousness. Such history would not exist without human consciousness. In the light of this reality, it could be stated that man as a species appeared the moment man gained the consciousness of himself as a man - a being with heightened consciousness. In principle such a moment couldn't possibly have been dated as it unfolded. Any historical period apportioned to such a happenstance is definitely an afterthought of human consciousness. Only measured inferences could be made about man's origin. In the same light, only even fainter inferences could be made about the cosmos' possible origin.

The theory of evolution is one of the measured inferences aimed at explaining the emergence of man in the cosmos. Charles Darwin who promoted this inference deduced the origin of man from the animal kingdom. The basis of his inference is the undeniable resemblance between man and some animals. All animals share some characteristics with man. Among some classes of animals, the shared characteristics are even greater. Man, it was observed, shares heightened characteristics with primates. Darwin inferred that man and the primates must have a common origin [5]. The significantly shared characteristics couldn't have been products of chance. Darwin concluded that man is a primate that has attained greater evolution. He hinged his argument that man previously existed as a lower animal on the delicacy of the human young. There is no way the human young could have survived the harshness of nature uncared for. Therefore, man potentially existed in previous species that continuously evolved until the breakthrough into personhood [6].

While the evolutionary argument has strong merits, it definitely has big questions surrounding it. The ultimate question is, if man originated from the primates, why are primates no more becoming men? If the primates are not converting to men to this day, it would be logically impossible to escape the conclusion that man was always different from the primates. Yes, they have similarities, but they are decisively different. Otherwise, primates should always have the capacity to convert to man.

The defence of the evolutionary theory is the principle of natural selection. The proponents posit that species which can't cope with the environment often fizzle out. It is either they die off or those with desired characteristics are naturally selected for reproduction; thereby, keep multiplying while those with undesirable characteristics, get lesser chances of reproduction and ultimately fizzle out [7]. The dinosaur is a typical example of a species that couldn't cope with the environment and had to fizzle out. Evolutionists opine that there was enormous biological pressure on species at the earliest stages of evolution when species were grappling with adaptation.

Yes, animals share some characteristics in common, but does that mean that all animals are descended from a single animal? That could hardly be the case. What if such a primordial animal did not survive? The cosmic risk is too much to be contemplated. Biological life in the cosmos couldn't have been staked on the survival of a single organism. These are matters of inferences rather than empirical observation. Paleoanthropologists point to fifteen to twenty fossils of different species of early anthropoids that could have given rise to early man [8]. The question is, where are they? Why did they not continue to exist just as other primates have continued to exist? Could it be that they were taken out of existence by forces of natural selection?

Contrary to the appearance, evolution is not an empirical science. It is lowkey metaphysics. That it is not an empirical science does not in any way dismiss its truth value; it qualifies and modifies the value rather. The takeaway from evolution is that man is part and parcel of the biological nature. There is no metaphysical or esoteric significance to his being or emergence. That was huge considering what the mainstream thoughts were when evolution was formulated as a theory. The demerits of evolution notwithstanding, it boasts of key biological facts that cannot be dismissed. What it has decisively proven is that man has common roots with other organisms. Man is a type of animal; a primate. The primates distinguished themselves from the rest of the mammals around 8 million to 6 million years ago [9]. Evolutionists place the birth of man as a separate species at around 6 million to 2 million years ago ostensibly when man developed human consciousness and broke away from the rest of the primates [10]. The evidence they present for this claim are humanoid carbon-dated fossils.

To the question, why has evolution not continued if man really evolved from lower forms of animals? Evolutionists posit that man continues to evolve even in the contemporary time. They point out that the human brain is expanding, human metabolism is changing and human reproductive span is changing [11]. They however, state that cultural selection rather natural selection is what is fundamentally driving evolution nowadays. They

note that cultural sophistication has led to increased brain size in humans. The more sophisticated culture became, the more complicated the brain activity required to adapt to it. The more complicated the human brain became, the more sophisticated the culture it would produce. This unending evolutionary cycle has led to continuous increments in the size of the human brain.

## **2. The Created Man**

An alternative account of the appearance of man is the creation story. Although this is not exclusive to religious accounts of the origin of man, the creation hypothesis is the favoured rendition of the origin and implied purpose of man by most organized religions. In nonreligious traditions, the creation account of the origin of man is about a force using pre-existing substances to create man. In religious renditions, it is about God creating man from other things he had previously created in the cosmos. The creation hypothesis presupposes an intelligent maker creating man in a preconceived form. This is a diametrical opposite of evolution. This school of thought holds that man is not a product of chance but a deliberate work by an intelligent being superior to man. Man has purpose which has been set by its maker. Man is said to be spiritual and material. The material element is perishable while the spiritual element is eternal. Death is not the end of man. Man has a soul which lives on even after death.

A man of the nature described above definitely would see himself as the focus of the cosmos. His interaction with the cosmos would definitely be skewed to the sentiments expressed above. Such a man could either see himself as the shaper of the universe or just a pilgrim passing through the world. It is pertinent to state that the creationist hypothesis also holds that whoever made man made the cosmos. Man, and the cosmos are seen as factors in a bigger scheme of events set up by the creator. All creationists recognize a spiritual or non-material component in both man and the cosmos although not all of them are religious. Plato has in his account of the cosmos recognised three primordial entities: the Demiurge, formless matter and the forms [12]. Although Plato, subsumed the emergence of man under the emergence the cosmos, like everything else in Plato's cosmos, man is a composite of matter and form. The soul is the form of man, and ipso facto, immortal.

There are many creation accounts of the origin of man. Almost every religion has its own creation account of the origin of man. What is common in the accounts is that man is a purposefully made being. Man has never existed in any form different from his present form. He was made as a finished creation, and did not need to undergo any evolution. The Judeo-Christian account of creation seems to be the most popular worldwide. It has long dominated Western thought and its sphere of influence. It views man as the focus of the universe. The Judeo-Christian man is spiritual and material. He is but a pilgrim in this passing world. His destination is the city of God which is in heaven above. The Christian man's essence does not lie in this world but in heaven, which is his goal. He exists in this world fundamentally to prove his virtuousness in order to qualify for an eternity of bliss in heaven. His body will eventually give way to yield his beatified soul. The cosmos like the body will ultimately give way at the end of time.

## **3. The Cosmos as a Phenomenon**

Man, no doubt, is the measure of all things [13]. He is the only animal that has attained the level of consciousness that would warrant reflection and the contemplation of the cosmos. Simply put: only man reflects on existence; only man contemplates the cosmos. The cosmos is primarily an object of man's perception. If man did not have the ontological capabilities to experience and perceive the cosmos, the cosmos would not epistemologically exist. It would be unknowable; therefore, irrelevant. It might as well not actually exist as its existence or otherwise would be of no conscious consequence to man. Therefore, for the cosmos to exist, it must manifest its existence to man. It must impress itself on the consciousness of man. Of course, the cosmos is a phenomenon. It manifests; its existence in the consciousness of man. It is an object of human experience and human perception. There is no gainsaying that other animals experience and perceive phenomena, such experience by other animals do not tell us about the cosmos neither do they influence the idea of the universe in the mind of man. Although certain animals demonstrate superior perceptive prowess to man in certain faculties, most animals do not know the world beyond their immediate environment. As has been repeatedly stated, they are incapable of reflecting on the cosmos. Birds of migration, fly from one part of the world to another as the seasons change. But these are instinctual behaviours which do not necessarily flow from their conscious knowledge of the seasons or the universe.

But man apprehends phenomena and reflects on them as hindsight activities. Man knows the cosmos only but in hindsight. Man does not directly observe the cosmos as an entity. On the contrary, man observes the multitude of things in the world individually. The nexus of relatedness among things are only seen by the mind as afterthoughts. It is the nature of the mind to relate events in order to enhance meaning. The cosmos is nothing but phenomena related by the mind as a single entity. Man has never stepped outside the cosmos to view or observe the cosmos as an entity. He is forever observing individual things while mentally picturing them together as "the cosmos". The entity is arguably, not a product of observation but an outcome of an inference. In this regard, it

decisively stands that the idea of the cosmos is not a product of direct observation but a creation of the human mind.

To actually observe the cosmos, man, has to step outside the cosmos; a feat that is not possible [14]. There is no gainsaying that advances in technology and space exploration have opened many vistas of discovery regarding the cosmos. Space is always observed between cosmic bodies. Space is eternal; space is infinite. In principle, should the cosmic bodies miraculously disappear, space would still be there. Simply put, the cosmos is all the things existing individually in space captured in a single mental picture.

#### **4. The Cosmos According to Physics**

Physics views the cosmos in a radically different way from the way we ordinarily perceive it. For physics, the cosmos is observably real. It is considered to be a spatial entity. Physics talks about the formation and expansion of the cosmos via the big bang. The theory of the big bang implies that the cosmos is a single entity which expanded, exploded and is still expanding down to the present era. This rendition of the cosmos presupposes that the mind actually observes the cosmos without any a priori input. Physics views the observable cosmos as consisting of a couple of trillion galaxies which in turn observably house at least 3200 stars with planets orbiting each of them [15]. The sheer enormity of it is mind-blowing. Now, this is not all of the universe but the extent of it observable from earth using the speed of light as the basis of the calculation. Meanwhile, the universe is said to be spherical. Any point in it could be assumed to be its centre. The implication is that the furthest point of the universe from the earth could be assumed to be the centre of the universe, and if the speed of light is used to measure the observable cosmos from it, it would yield distances much further from the earth. Since light is the basis of the measurement of the universe, it cannot be accurate as the cosmos is continuously expanding, necessitating that some previously observable lights would fade away with time while some other lights that had been travelling to earth for years might ultimately reach the earth in future and become observable.

What is implied in the rendition of the cosmos above is an infinite cosmos. An expanding cosmos is necessarily an infinite cosmos. If the cosmos is expanding, it means that it is extending into an area that was previously non-cosmic. Physics views the cosmos as the only reality. If reality can extend into non-reality, the capacity for that extension would be necessarily infinite. Therefore, an expanding cosmos is necessarily an infinite cosmos. The corner of the cosmos that hosts man is the earth. All scientific and philosophical judgments made on the nature of the cosmos are made from the perspectives of the earth. Even though, scientifically the centre of the cosmos could only be relative as any point, the earth could be considered to be its centre since the cosmos is adjudged to be spherical. The earth practically serves as the centre of the cosmos since man who is the probing entity operates from the earth. Physics considers the earth to be either the only part of the cosmos that supports life or the only part of the observable cosmos that is capable of supporting life.

The constant theme in the rendition of the cosmos according to physics is that the cosmos is a physical entity. Although physicists acknowledge that they cannot adequately account for some phenomena in the cosmos like: the blackhole, dark energy, dark matter, antiverse, etc. They nevertheless uphold that these phenomena are indeed physical even though their behaviours might show some deviations to some physics-established laws. They constitute the dimensions of the universe, albeit not clearly mapped out.

The earth which is our world is said to have pre-existed in vacuous forms which cooled and coalesced into its present-day state [16]. It is said to have developed from stage to stage to the point it was able to develop conscious life. The human person is the apex of the earth's development. Physics' account of the development of the earth necessarily comes to a full halt at the emergence of life on earth. Biology takes over. What is upheld as a sacred creed in physics is that the earth, like all parts of the cosmos is an outcome of the big bang. Whatever that is on earth today was potentially in the big bang. It is doubtful if life can be found in any part of the cosmos apart from the earth. Only time will tell. Nevertheless, there are frantic efforts to make life multiplanetary by extending civilization to Mars.

#### **5. The Cosmos and the Problematics of Perception**

The perception of the cosmos has been a perennial problem in the history of philosophy. The problematics of the perception of the cosmos came to the fore when Plato put forward his theory of a two-tiered cosmos. For Plato, the cosmos is dual in nature. There are the invisible world of forms and the visible world of appearances. The world of forms according to Plato is the authentic realm of existence where eternal ideas or forms of things abide. The world of appearances is the unreliable world where the ideas manifest in matter albeit, imperfectly. Plato was of the strongest views that the apparent cosmos is but a poor reflection of the imperceptible world of forms. His ideas seemed queer at the dawn of the Renaissance and were largely discredited by modern thinkers but contemporary cosmology pander to his disposition. It is a widely accepted hypothesis among contemporary cosmologists that there is an antiverse to the universe. While the universe is expanding outwardly, the antiverse is expanding inversely [17]. Contemporary cosmologists are unanimously agreed that there are existent but imperceptible phenomena in the cosmos. Nowadays, there are talks about dark matter and dark energy,

which are believed to exist in the cosmos even though they are imperceptible to us. It is clear that while Plato may not have been right about his rendition of the cosmos, he definitely had not been entirely wrong.

Aristotle did not take long in countering Plato. He had a somewhat photographic conception of the cosmos. Aristotle was of the view that the senses faithfully represented the cosmos. For him, the senses give us accurate perception of the cosmos. Knowledge is rooted in the observations and experiences of the senses. Whatever that cannot be observed is not knowable. For, Aristotle, the cosmos is a single entity. It is thoroughly material in nature. Aristotle did not concede the possibility of imperceptible realities in the cosmos neither did he concede the possibility of nonmaterial entities in the cosmos. Aristotle set the tone for the scientific view of the cosmos as a unitary material entity.

Unless, Aristotle was talking about the earth alone, the view of the cosmos as a single observable entity does not hold water. If space is not a thing, at the cosmic level all we could perceive are a multitude of separate entities existing in their own right. The possibility or extent of space would be limitless as it is not a thing. As long as space is not a thing, the cosmos cannot be an entity; as such, there could be no empirical statement on the cosmos. Instead, we would be talking about entities existing on their own. Some cosmologists posit that matter materialized from space [18]. That is unlikely considering that space is not a thing. Space is the emptiness between two matters. Emptiness cannot possibly be considered as a thing as by definition, it is not. This reality punctures Aristotle's postulation that the cosmos is a single entity.

Even the definition of cosmos as "everything that exists" is metaphysical rather than empirical. That sounds like the "being" of metaphysics. "Everything that exists" cannot possibly be known. It would be a misnomer to talk about the cosmos as an empirical entity if the definition of the universe is fundamentally metaphysical. The critical question is, what is the cosmos? Is the cosmos a phenomenon or a collective name for the assortment of phenomena in outer space? Does the cosmos actually have a beginning? If the cosmos has no beginning, the big bang would be more or less a metaphysical metaphor. The big bang is said to have occurred 13.8 billion years ago [19]. What was it that exploded? Nothing can come out of nothing [20]. Matter is indestructible but can change from one state to another [21]. Energy can neither be created nor destroyed but can only be converted from one form to another. How can we scientifically talk of the big bang in the light of these eternal scientific laws? A cosmic beginning is definitely an impossibility. There is definitely nowhere to begin. If space is not a thing, it cannot hold matter; it cannot form matter. Space is a necessary consequence of finite matter; the nothingness that announces the boundary of matter. Perhaps, there was primordial matter that expanded and broke off in trillion pieces, forming the multitude of things that are found in space. That still would not constitute the origin of matter or the cosmos but a stage in its history or development as the primordial matter that supposedly broke up into trillions of pieces always was.

Recognizing the problematics of empiricism, phenomenologists put forward, a theory of perception that sought to factor in the input of consciousness and the a priori structure of the human mind in the perception of observable reality/cosmos. Intentionality cannot be ruled out in perception. Perhaps, our panoramic view of the cosmos is a but function of intentionality in perception. The mind intentionally organizes perception to yield meaning. The problem of ascertaining the nature of the cosmos is as much a problem of perception as it is of cosmology. We bring our default bias to knowing even as we deal with the cosmos. We have a particular way of apprehending phenomena as human beings. We shall never be free of that bias. It necessarily emanates from our default mental constitution for that's how we have been ontologically fitted.

## **6. The Nexus**

There is no gainsaying that there is an intricate and inexorable nexus between the cosmos and man. Man cannot stand apart from the cosmos. He has his being in the cosmos. He is part of the cosmos. Both man and the cosmos are substantially material. The big bang which is said to be the turning point in the manifestation of the universe as we know it today is also a material phenomenon. Man, and the cosmos share fundamental and sometimes complementary relationships. The connections between man and the cosmos need to be discussed in detail in order to lay bare the dynamics.

As stated earlier on, man is part of the cosmos. Man is neither an antiverse nor is he a being that exists in isolation from the cosmos. Man's existence is contiguous to the cosmos. Man has no parallel existence. He is part of the multitude of things that panoramically constitute the cosmos. Without the cosmos, there is no man. As of today, man can only be found on earth but there is no doubt that with the ongoing eponymous breakthroughs in space exploration, the existence of man will sooner than later be interplanetary. Elon Musk and his space exploration company, SpaceX are working phenomenally hard with breath-taking successes to land man on Mars.

Although, man is a biological organism, like the cosmos, he is also a chemically composed entity. His composition is not fundamentally different from the basic composition of things in the observable cosmos. Like the rest of matter, man is basically an assemblage of elements. All elements in the cosmos including those that constitute man have their origin in the big bang. Man is chemically sustained, and sources those sustaining chemicals from the cosmos. Like the cosmos the chemicals that constitute man were sourced from the stars. The

sun which is the earth's major star practically feeds man. The sun chemically powers the earth. Lots of chemical elements are unleashed on earth on a daily basis via sunrays. The radiation releases elements and useful energies to the earth. Man absorbs these energies directly as vitamin D, and indirectly from the plants which produce the foods that sustain man. Without the sun, it would be impossible for the earth to sustain life. The seas and the rivers would be permanently frozen, creating drinkable water and food scarcity. Perception by sight would be near impossible. The earth would have fundamentally been of different outlook. The survival of man on earth is inexorably tied to the sun.

The chemical composition of man includes majorly 65% oxygen, 19.5% carbon, 10% hydrogen, 3% nitrogen, 1.4% calcium and about 1.1% phosphorous [21]. These chemical elements constitute over 90% of the total body mass of man [22]. Of course, there are other elements that exist in minor quantities but crucial to the proper functioning of the human person. They include: potassium, sulphur, magnesium, chlorine and sodium [23]. These are all sourced from the cosmos. The elements are not different because they are in man. They were sourced from the supernovas just as the rest of the cosmos did. They are all by-products of the big bang. The human being breathes in the oxygen in the air that abounds in the atmosphere. No air, no life. Without oxygen, man would die within minutes. Man breathes out carbon dioxide, an essential chemical that plants take in for photosynthesis. The plants themselves give off oxygen as they take in carbon dioxide, supplying the atmosphere with the much-needed oxygen for the survival of man. This is an act of perfect cosmic economy; a cool blending of man with the cosmos. Man, sources nitrogen and carbon from the food he consumes. The plants that produce the food of course source these elements from the soil, and from the atmosphere as they hit the earth via radiations from the sun and the stars. Carbon serves as the building block of the body structure. Nitrogen is an essential element in body proteins production. Calcium is essential for the development of bones and the teeth.

Like the cosmos, man defies single dimensional definition. Human nature just like the cosmos is shrouded in puzzles. Simply put, man and the cosmos share a crisis of definition. In the past, the cosmos was entirely seen as dead matter floating in space. Even though Aristotle saw self-motion as a basic characteristic of the cosmos, the motion he had in mind was a mechanistic motion. Aristotle was far from attributing organic dynamism or biological motion to the cosmos as an entity. To Aristotle, the cosmos is an inanimate matter. But contemporary advances in cosmology point to the existence of supra material entities in the cosmos. Today, there are talks about dark energy and dark matter which have far more mass than matter which is said to constitute just about 5% of the total mass of observable universe while dark energy is said to constitute about 68% and dark matter, 27% of the observable universe [24].

It is a fact that dark matter penetrates the whole of the universe. Its interaction with the gamut of things in the universe are so weak that the reactions of matter to it are barely noticeable. It could also be that their effects on matter are so imperceptible because dark matter is of a nature other than material. If dark matter is present in the whole of the cosmos, it follows suit that dark matter is necessarily present in man. The big question is, what are the effects of dark matter on the human person? Does dark matter have any role in the composition or nature of the human person? Dark matter plays active role; in fact, critical role in the universe. It is said to be the force keeping the galaxies together, making sure that they do not fall apart; essentially giving our world organization. Without dark matter, the cosmos would fall apart. There would have been no galaxies; there would have been no meaningful cosmos. Everything would have been perpetually thrown apart by dark energy.

If dark matter has such essential role in the cosmos, has dark matter any role in man? Some researchers are of the view that dark matter has a critical role in the making of man [25]. Science talks about the chemical composition of life but has not been able to pinpoint the particular force that is the dynamism we call life. A part of the body made of carbon when man is alive will still be made of carbon when man is dead. Carbon will always be carbon whether in a dead man or in a live man. What then is life? What is the make of life? What is that critical force that is present in a certain organisation of carbon that makes it to be alive? What is that critical ingredient that is lacking in the same organization of carbon that warrants death? What disappears when that organization disintegrates? Could it be dark matter? Could dark matter be the force that dynamically keeps the chemicals that make up the body together and propels the body to life? Could dark matter be the answer to the missing gaps, the puzzles beclouding the search for the quiddity of life?

Some researchers believe that dark matter though imperceptible, is the answer to the puzzles highlighted above. For these researchers, consciousness couldn't have arisen from matter as we know it. There is a supra material dimension to consciousness. This supra material dynamic is the activity of dark matter. Dark matter they posit, is responsible for some puzzling activities of the human body which are not often readily explicable in material terms. If the human person is chemically constituted, why does it have the capacity to fall sick; why does it have the capacity to heal? Apart from entities that have the capacity for consciousness, why is it that other material entities or other chemically constituted entities do not fall sick? It appears that dark matter modifies the organization of matter. They hold dark matter to be responsible for the capacity of the human body to fall sick and the capacity of the human body to heal. Even the aging process, and our biological clock are all attributed to the activities of dark matter [25]. All these processes highlighted above are instances of the modification of the

organization of matter. Aging, sickness, healing, death are all modifications of the organization of matter. This gives credence to our earlier assertion that dark matter appears to have the capacity for the modification of the organization of matter

But all this pale into insignificance when the possibility of the presence of dark matter in human DNA is considered. Researchers have discovered sections of non-protein coding genes in the human genome that apparently seemed irrelevant to the arrangement of genes in the human DNA. These unmapped genes were considered to be dark matter in the human DNA. The expression is somehow figurative in that the genes are not dark matter in the cosmological sense. They were directly observable. They were identifiable. However, their roles in housing body information were not observable. They would later be thought to act as sort of regulators of the protein-coding genes which are the bearers of the body's DNA information. But it is believed that dark matter is actually acting on those irregular non-protein coding genes that appear to be redutant yet so consequential. It is believed that the activities of these genes are not thoroughly observable because of perhaps, the presence of dark matter in them. Of course, as stated earlier on, dark matter is thought to have decisive effects on the body's composition and function. It could as well be that the entire software of the human person is characterized with dark matter if not organized by dark matter.

## II. Conclusion

The dynamics between man and the cosmos are characterized by interplays of relationships. Man is part and parcel of the cosmos. Without the cosmos, there is no man. However, without man, the cosmos wouldn't be known. Man is the only entity in the cosmos that is capable of knowing the cosmos. Man is the highest manifestation of knowing in the cosmos. Perhaps, man is the cosmos knowing itself. Man creates the idea of the cosmos because it is the human mind that weaves the separate entities into a single panoramic view, thereby creating the imagery of the cosmos. The cosmos is an unresolved mystery. It is what it is irrespective of how it is perceived. Man is known for attempting to capture the cosmos meaningfully to his mind.

Like the cosmos, man is also an unresolved mystery. Even though man has made breath-taking progress in his quest to understand the world above, he is still far from understanding the world within him. Just like it is not possible to go outside the cosmos to view the cosmos from an outside dimension, it is not possible for man to step back from humanity in order to view man outside humanity. We can only know ourselves as much as our faculties permit. We did not make ourselves. We did not write the human nature's software. Man, and the universe ultimately have one source. The fate of man is tied to the fate of the cosmos. Perhaps, the cosmos will outlive man as man was not always in the cosmos. Time shall ultimately tell.

## References

- [1]. Ebo, S. (2018). Existential issues in the environment. <https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JPCR/article/view/40530>
- [2]. Spracklen, K. (2011). Philosophy of leisure. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230348721\\_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230348721_2)
- [3]. Winiero, M. (2017). Leisure: The basis of everything? <https://www.hprweb.com/2017/01/leisure-the-basis-of-everything/>
- [4]. Eyo, E & Ogar, J. (2004). The Socratic "Man know thyself" and the problem of personal identity. <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/sophia/article/view/115083>
- [5]. Tattersall, I. (2009). Charles Darwin and human evolution. *Evo Edu Outreach* 2, 28–34 . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12052-008-0098-8>
- [6]. Darwin, C. (1871). The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex. [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_2309881\\_7/component/file\\_2309880/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2309881_7/component/file_2309880/content)
- [7]. Gregory, T.R. (2009). Understanding natural selection: essential concepts and common misconceptions. *Evo Edu Outreach* 2. 156–175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12052-009-0128-1>
- [8]. White, T. (2013). Paleoanthropology: Five's a crowd in our family tree. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982212014418>
- [9]. Rector, A. (2020). Introduction to Anthropology: A Four Field Approach. <https://viva.pressbooks.pub/introtoanthropology4field/chapter/chapter-5-primates/>
- [10]. Umer, S. (2018). A brief history of human evolution: challenging Darwin's claim. *Int. j. anthropol. ethnol.* 2(6). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41257-018-0014-2>
- [11]. Kuzawa, C.W, Chugani, H.T & Grossman, L.I. (2014). Metabolic costs and evolutionary implications of human brain development. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1323099111>
- [12]. Alican, N.F. (2017). Ontological symmetry in Plato's formless things and empty forms. <https://philarchive.org/archive/ALIOSI>
- [13]. Kattsoff, L. O. (1953). Man is the measure of all things. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 13(4), 452–466. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2103811>
- [14]. Ebo, S. (). The infinite cosmos. *ASUU Journal of Humanities. A Journal of Research and Development* 6(1). [https://ejournals.asuu.org.ng/editor/uploaded\\_articles/EBO,%20S.%201-The%20Infinite%20Cosmos.pdf2040.pdf2022](https://ejournals.asuu.org.ng/editor/uploaded_articles/EBO,%20S.%201-The%20Infinite%20Cosmos.pdf2040.pdf2022)
- [15]. NASA Hubble Team. (2016). Hubble reveals observable universe contains 10 times more galaxies than previously thought. <https://science.nasa.gov/missions/hubble/hubble-reveals-observable-universe-contains-10-times-more-galaxies-than-previously-thought/>
- [16]. Vaquez, E. (2010). The earth in time. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4419-1684-6\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1684-6_2)
- [17]. Baras, P. (2020). What if the Universe has no end? <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200117-what-if-the-universe-has-no-end>
- [18]. Siegel, E. (2018). How did the matter in the universe. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/startswithabang/2018/01/05/how-did-the-matter-in-our-universe-arise-from-nothing/>
- [19]. Siegel, E. (2024). How we know the Universe is 13.8 billion years old. <https://bigthink.com/startswithabang/universe-13-8-billion-years-old/>

- [20]. Bijman, M. (2021). Nothing comes from nothing. <https://sevencircumstances.com/2021/04/30/nothing-comes-from-nothing/>
- [21]. Ebo, S. (2019). The “matser” made world: a new conceptualization of matter and spirit. *Skhid*, 1(159), 29–36. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1\(159\).157444](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.1(159).157444)
- [22]. Davies, R. (2023). What chemical elements are found in the human body? <https://www.news-medical.net/life-sciences/What-Chemical-Elements-are-Found-in-the-Human-Body.aspx#:~:text=The%20human%20body%20is%20approximately,11%20elements%20are%20essential%20elements.>
- [23]. Jomova, K. (2022). Essential metals in health and disease. *Chemico-Biological Interactions* 367. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0009279722003787>
- [24]. Centre for Astrophysics. (2024). Dark matter and dark energy. <https://www.cfa.harvard.edu/research/topic/dark-energy-and-dark-matter>
- [25]. Cox, D. (2023). The mystery of the human genome's dark matter. <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20230412-the-mystery-of-the-human-genomes-dark-matter>