

A universe without a master

[Religion](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In the twentieth century, the existing individual has found a space for itself in philosophy which was a missing point until then, when questioning the right, the good and beings. With the introduction of the existing individual into philosophy, the subjective world gains importance. Philosophers of the twentieth century such as Albert Camus and Jean Paul Sartre discussed the individual's responsibility for their actions. Moreover, Camus described the universe without the master where man is free. In a universe where there exists a master, the decision of whether an action is true or not, would be determined by the universal laws.

Those laws given by the God would lead man into his final decision for his action. However, in a universe where there is no master, there would be no universal laws. Moreover, each man has to decide his own actions without the guidance of a master. The path that man would choose will be illuminated not by the universal laws but by the free will of the man. So how will man decide the truth when there are no universal laws? Free man would make decisions about the truth based on his own experiences. Could man not be free when there is a master?

According to Albert Camus, a man lives freely when he lives without appeal. A universe with a master would create opportunity for men to have appeal. However, a man has to decide his own actions without any influence which requires to live without appeal. His decisions should not be affected by the universal laws given by the master. When a man makes decisions according to those laws, he would be choosing the truths that they define. However, these truths would not be his, but the master's. Choosing the truth of the master, would lead the individual to live a life that the master decides.

Therefore, the man would be living a life which is already decided, but not his own life. According to Camus, man becomes hopeless when he confronts the difference between what he wants and what the world gives. In other words, man has to face that the desires he wants to fulfill, were not always given by the world. Disappointed with the situation man tries to find the reason for his unachieved desires. However the real world keeps its silence and the man rejects this situation (revolt). After that the man becomes conscious about the situation and accepts it.

At this point man, conscious of the dissatisfaction chooses freely not to put an end to the situation and keep going. Where acceptance takes place, choice is made freely and the absurd man emerges and becomes the master of his own. The meaning of a universe without a master lies here. Where there is an absence of control by the master, there man becomes free. It is already concluded that, in a universe where man is free, there exists no master. Without a master how man's experiences of world would change is another issue that has to be concluded.

First of all to find the answer, one has to know the experience of the world that man had in a universe with a master. The control of the master over man's decisions, would stop him from behaving the way he wanted because this way might be against the universal laws. For example the universal law states that do not commit crime. However a guy might want to kill a man which is a crime. This guy might think that killing someone is not against morals. At this situation the universal law is an obstacle for him to fulfill his desire. Thus, avoids him from gaining experience of the world.

On the other hand where there is no master and thus, no universal laws, this guy would be able to achieve what he wants. Additionally when there is master, man concerns about the future. Because man thinks about whether his action is against what master forces him to do. Therefore, man starts to take actions for future without thinking about the present. However free man that lives without appeal means that he should turn away from eternal in this case it is future. The experience of present would be poor if future is that concerned.

Thus, when a man could turn away from future than, his experience would be transformed. When he lives the present in its fullness, he could gain a lot of experience of the world. Consequently, free man could only live without appeal. If there is a master, man would live with appeal and could not make free decisions which would cause no gain in experience of the world. Since the issue of how man's experiences of world would change when there is no master is one of this paper's concern, the answer is that men would get more experience when there is no master because men is more free in this situation.

However when men are free to do whatever seems them right, it might cause disorder. For example take crime again. If there is no universal law about crime than, everyone would be able to commit it whenever it seems true. This would definitely cause disorder. So, who is going to determine the borders of men's freedom when there is no master? A universe without a master might give a men more freedom, but what would freedom mean if you could be killed tomorrow by someone who believes murder is true?

In conclusion, in a universe with a master, man lives according to universal laws which might be an obstacle for him to achieve his desires. On the other hand, when there is no master in the universe, there is no one to control individual actions. Man is more free in a universe like that. If a man is more free, than he could decide his actions according to his own free will. The way that man choose to go, would be determined by him. Thus, the action will be his. He would be now responsible for his actions.