

1. I use William James' phrase **personal continuum** for what others might call a particular stream of phenomenal consciousness.
2. The world (reality) is the logically fused "system" of all such personal continua, actual and possible, human and non-human.
3. Each personal continuum can also be described as an **aspect** or **face** of reality.
4. Reality is nothing more than these faces. Reality is not hidden "behind" these faces.
5. Reality is, in other words, only "first-personal" or *from a particular point of view*.
6. "Objective reality" is sentimental, meaningless phrase.
7. Objectivity is senseless if understood as the absence of perspective. It remains useful, however, for indicating the absence of *relevant* or *disqualifying* bias. It's OK if the juror and the defendant both speak English and grew up in the same town, but the juror should not be the defendant's mother.
8. Consciousness is best understood as the (perspectival) *being* or *presence* of the world. The world is not "made of" consciousness or mind — or of some equally mystified and elusive hyper-physical stuff.
9. Aspect theory is a pluralism. No category, such as the mental or the physical (mind or matter), is fundamental.
10. Metaphysical declarations of the form *All is X* are cognitively empty, though they can serve as flags

in the boring war between spiritualism and anti-spiritualism.

11. The “there-ness” or being or presence of entities is *not a kind of stuff*. The noun “being” is used to point at the “fact” that there *is* a world in the first place.
12. The character or form of the presence of the world is “subjective” in the sense of “from a point of view.” *I* see the chair. *You* see the chair.
13. Sharing in the world through language, we each understand the chair as seeable-by-others. We discuss and intend the *same* chair, which nevertheless appears only in various personal continua or phenomenal streams, always from a point of view, and *for* this or that sentient organism.
14. This organism, in the human case an “empirical ego,” is one more entity that exists as a system of aspects or moments. There is no organism-from-no-perspective. My empirical ego and yours, like other entities, are logically between us. They have their being, all of it, in various personal continua.
15. Objects are not representations, and objects are not “inside” subjects.
16. Subjects, as aspects of reality, are the form of the presence of objects.
17. *Empirical* subjects are empirical entities “at the center” of their associated personal continuum. As a body with a name, trained to say “I,” I live in a “torrent” of reality-from-my-point-of-view. This “my” refers to my empirical-linguistic ego.

18. These personal continua are *not containers*.
19. What gets misunderstood as a “physical” chair-in-itself is the logical-conventional “between-us-ness” of the chair.
20. Empirical entities are interpersonal possibilities of perspectival perceptual presence.
21. Just as reality is a “system of faces” or “ideal manifold” of personal continua, so are objects system of their own “faces.”
22. A “face” or “moment” of an object is also known as a perception or appearance of that object.
23. An object is the “ideal manifold” of its manifestations in various personal continua.
24. An existence (a personal continuum) is a stream of situations-from-a-perspective. The continuum is therefore a stream of aspects of situations, and these aspects of situations include aspects of entities.
25. Finally, a particular “stream of situations” (a particular personal continuum) is itself an aspect of reality.
26. The world is fundamentally a forum.
27. Ontology, as a *rational* explication of what fundamentally is, tacitly presupposes this “forum” as the set of the conditions for its possibility.
28. Language (logic) is a component of the “communal subjectivity” that is presupposed in all conversation that takes a shared world and the general success for granted.

29. We might say that the chair is the logical-conventional synthesis of perceptions *of* the chair, possible and actual. This **of-ness** is “logical.”
30. We can’t “prove” the “external world” or successful reference. Proof only makes sense in a “forum” that is radically “presupposed.” This is why Kant was confused when he regretted the lack of such a proof. He did not “see” his assumption of and reliance upon the “forum.”
31. “Truth”, like “objective reality”, is cognitively empty. Belief is the horse. Truth is the unicorn. The confused notion of truth as correspondence evaporates with the confused notion of a reality-from-no-perspective where truthmakers were supposed to live.
32. In words less blunt, I embrace a radicalized redundancy theory of truth.
33. What remains is more or less warranted, more or less *desirable*, *belief*. This explication is therefore not presented as “truth.” I offer a set of beliefs for consideration.
34. Note that inferential and semantic norms are also always “from a point of view.” Successful conversation depends on something like a sufficiently congruent grasp of such norms.