Are we alive or dead?

If we are alive, what is the state of aliveness? Must it exist independently of our existence. – Quandary of multiple alivenesses. Hypothesise a state x within the axioms of energy etc.

Maybe its unknowable?

Atheistic, where could God be in Metaphysics

Basically all theories converge to say it doesn’t matter anyhow

Book 1: Metaphysics

Derived almost directly – and noticeably – from Heidegger – Plato – Aristotle (Classic texts.)

This cover allows for the introduction of *psychological metaphysics.*

The real agenda – a new metaphysical ideology – is not laid out.

I will explain this new metaphysical ideology to close friends and academics.

The explanation:

Why am I so hung up on ‘metaphysics’. I mean I’m bringing something new, right? What is it? It’s cognitive science – essentially. Why’s that **so** important though; so necessary to explicate??

It’s because it solves **so** many other problems, particularly with the whole Zizek / Lacan thing. I’m saying that this is the truth; like a rational truth that’s actually scientific **and** experiential. The main thing is though, the next step, is to point out that religion and ideology are always grounded in an existential truth; or whatever a rational agent can convince themself or be convinced is the truth, like God, for instance. God was literally a uniting metaphysical concept for thousands of years until we deconstructed him (Nietzsche). You can say he existed as an ideology due to negative power structures like Zizek might do, but that’s

(1) a very Western-centric perspective driven by ideas of Monarch-Church and colonialism – to expand it you would have to suggest that literally every hierarchical structure can be eliminated in society so that *like* even primitive untechnological societies aren’t a model, because God exists in those, right?

(2) doesn’t account for the psychological *power* of God, and the universal desire for meaning. Those are really the same thing to me. I mean this metaphysics / cognitive science actually explains why that’s a thing, because it has a lot to do with language and ‘rational’ thought, and how we constructed language structures like ‘why’ / the query.

So this informs that whole post-ideology thing that people are basically accepting within philosophy / politics. When Zizek says ‘post-ideology’ he’s really talking about politics, not philosophy. He’s talking about the seeming inability to find meaning (Lacan) **hence** all ideologies are basically the same and so on and so on. We should basically accept them all as conflict within society and so on, he just deconstructs and critiques stuff, often very fairly, but (and he accepts this) he has no answers (and so on and so on). How *do* we structure society? Well not around an ideology, he says. It doesn’t work. It may be driven by a touch of liberalism as well – people shouldn’t be expected to conform to an ideology, shouldn’t be expected to seek perfection or truth.

The existential exploration comes next, and then the philosophy. That should ground the philosophy in a pretty clear picture of the individual in society, and **as** society - and not this post-modernism dystopia. Obviously it kind of engages with Camus and Absurdism, but with wildly different conclusions, I probably need to read more. Apparently Judith Shklar’s book *After Utopia* suggests that all this political fatalism might only be passing – that we can find a new political philosophy – got to read that too.

I guess a kind of new Enlightenment is the best outcome – a fairer, more equitable one though, and one that isn’t just going to collapse at the sight of *the Beagle*. A shared utopian vision, really, where we understand why knowledge is worth accumulating, and to what extent. That’s my dream, I’d like to see it happen. It’s a hell of a lot of work :)