

A RESPONSE TO A YOUTUBE COMMENT

The comment is:

Our ability to witness and share a signitive aspect of the rose is fundamental in the sense that it defines us as seemingly alive. We seemingly create order out of disorder, which clues others that there is somebody home. The signitive aspect is also fundamental for our ability to reason about things, such as a rose. But IMHO there are parts of reality (we largely ignore) which have no signitive aspect we can share, and they are part of our being (and the being of the world) nonetheless. I can speak about the effects these things had on me, but the things themselves are immune to any attempt to conceptualise them. We can talk about the feeling you had when the rose burned, and you can instruct me to burn my favourite souvenirs ceremonially, for maximum psychological effect. But how burning that rose felt in your gut, or how you felt when you woke up with the dream image of that rose fresh in your mind, is barely penetrable to reason and has only trace amounts of the signitive aspect. Yet, I suspect, these are fundamental parts of your being, and of your relationship with that now-signitive-only rose. Does this qualify me as a fundamentalist?

I agree with you. And (I think) with Plato's esoteric doctrine. The "categorical" component of the reality ("thought" or "signitive presence") is always already

”entangled” with the qualitative continuum. What does empirical mean ? What is perception ? The sensory ? The emotional ?

It is “there” in the “redness” of the rose, the “pain” of the burned finger. This is what I mean by “perceptual presence” which is “signitively gripped”. I can “refer” to my “pain,” but my pain is not “in” the words, though poets can convince us that their pain is like ours.

One of my objections to indirect realism is that it makes pain and scent and color “unreal” and “secondary.” It makes what is important unreal, but only in theory of course. No one lives like an indirect realist. But that’s my other objection. A “coherent” personality explicates reality in a way that makes sense in the total context of their life. Indirect realism is a “sophisticated” (pretentious ?) “conspiracy theory” which is moreover a mere pose, a mere theoretical ploy. We get a “realism” that projects the real at an infinity distance, which implies that the lifeworld and the drama of every personal existence within in it is peripheral, indeed *optional*. Our trust that we can successfully discuss objects with others is transformed into a fetishized impossible object that only “God” can see. A mutation of Berkeley’s philosophy that misunderstands itself as the opposite of that philosophy. I say all this as someone who was, for many years, an indirect realist who could never get comfortable in it.

A last point. It precisely because I *believe in* the “sensory-emotional” “reality” of others that I think

of the object as “fragmented” into manifestations that are beyond me. How does this piece of music make *you* feel ? How does cheese taste to mice ? To a particular albino mouse ? I speculate that some painters see color much more vividly than I do. That some mathematicians can turn more complicated structures around in the imagination than I can. And so on. The “idea” of an entity is just our (assumed but unprovable) co-referencing or co-intending of that entity. Substance is logical-poetic. I hope that my “aspect theory” is just an explication. Not speculative but an attempt to sketch the basic structure of my existence, which (as “basic”) is hopefully the structure of others’ existence. But I have to share it with others and see if they find themselves in it. It’s also a non-representational belief, but that’s a thorny issue for some other time perhaps.