

Disclaimer: In the following spiel, I am “methodically blunt.” While I consider my work to be an ever-tentative and fallible explication, forceful claims are easier to understand.

There is no “truth.” I call my own beliefs “true,” and I call your beliefs “true” if they are also my beliefs. The concept of “truth” is an unjustified reification of truth-talk into a quasi-mystical property of some statements.¹

The “true” object or “object-in-itself” is likewise a related “metaphysical” mystification within the same framework.

The tacit presupposition at the basis of this framework is the existence of an *aperspectival* reality, sometimes called “objective reality.” This “objective reality” is (tacitly) the world as “God” knows or sees it.

Because a genuinely aperspectival reality would not be articulated by belief, it is a vacuous piece of nonsense. So “objective reality” is indeed tacitly conceived as an articulated perspectival reality after all. But it is “articulated by God.” Of course a certain kind of physicalist who asserts this (pre-articulated) pseudo-aperspectival reality doesn’t notice these theological underpinnings.

I agree that reality “contains” the “subject.” And the “subject” does not “contain” reality. *Subjective* (personal) idealism is confused and absurd.

¹This is *not equivalent* to the claim that all beliefs are equally warranted. The demystification of “truth” is not necessarily and definitely not in this case an absurd, self-subverting irrationalism.

But it is easy to fall into nonsense and mystification in the *other* direction. “Subjectivity in general” cannot be ignored and removed. “Reality in itself” from “no point of view” is a round square, the vague dream of a not-so-tough minded metaphysician-after-all, a check that cannot be cashed.

I claim that what we *have* (because we presuppose it in any rational conversation) is *reality-from-a-perspective*, reality “articulated” by the *belief* of a participant in that conversation. We express and compare *beliefs*. We *live in* our beliefs. This “belief” is not “internal” and “psychological.” It structures reality-for-me and reality-for-you.

Yet it must be emphasized that the *same reality* is intended in both cases, because language is “immediately” world-directed, transcendent, “aimed” at objects in the world we *share*. This is why we can discuss and compare beliefs in the first place. The “public” or “transcendent” intelligibility or “meaningfulness” of the signs we trade is presupposed by every rational conversation.

Reality is “shared” and also always “from-a-point-a-view.” The articulation of reality by belief is its “speaking form.” “I sit at my desk with a cup of coffee, looking at these words on the screen.”

Granted that I do not as “subject” engulf and contain the world, how exactly do objects transcend me ? How do other “subjects” transcend me ? Am I “consciousness” ? Is perception representation ? Do “true” objects function as the obscure cause of per-

spectival *images* “made of” this “consciousness” stuff?

No. For these “true” objects are just the pseudo-explanatory theological confusions discussed above. There is no “consciousness.” Nor is there “the physical” as its complement. “Consciousness” and “physicality” are two sides of one coin.

This dualist framework is a misreading of how the “from-a-point-of-view-ness” of reality is entangled with the “between-us-ness” of entities. This dualism generates the hard problem of consciousness as well as the unnoticed hard problem of the physical.

These hard problems are indicators of a bad assumption. That bad assumption is the “truth” through “aperspectival reality” as “truthmaker.”

We can update J. S. Mill with help from Heidegger to explicate our shared situation without dualism and its artificial mysteries.