

## NOTES ON EIGENDORFF'S ASPECT THEORY

“root-deep truthlessness” : Eigendorff “fixes” logical positivism by pointing out their failure of this otherwise laudable tradition to demystify what is perhaps *the* (pejoratively) metaphysical concept, namely truth. While Ayer, for instance, endorsed the redundancy (anti-)theory of truth, he also endorsed verificationism in the same book. Verificationism is an insufficiently cautious attempt to capture the *spirit* (ego-ideal, ethical gist ) of empiricism.

For Eigendorff “there is only belief.” He says “Belief is the horse, and truth is a unicorn.” Belief is also *someone’s* belief. Belief is the “speakable structure of an aspect of the world.”

These “aspects” are what others have called “streams of phenomenal consciousness.” William James called each of these aspects a “personal continuum.” For Eigendorff, the world is the “semantically fused system of such aspects.”

“Perspective is fundamental.” To-the-root or “radical” perspectivism is “ontological” and not just epistemic. Eigendorff calls merely epistemic perspectivism “trivial,” and this trivial articulation of what are only perspectival “images” is already vaguely implied by an assumed and incoherent dualism.

He writes:

The inquiry-hobbling but deeply assumed picture that holds us captive goes like this: each individual’s existence is an epiphenomenal *im-*

*age* or representation (transformation) of a *single* Real world, which is not otherwise available, and yet functions as a substrate for this plurality of existences-as-images.

Truth understood as correspondence depends on and reinforces this fixed idea, which Eigendorff calls a “sci-fi quasi-theological prejudice.”

He also emphasizes the “*unseen* hard problem of the physical” as the generator of the pseudo-hard-problem of consciousness. The famous “hard problem of consciousness” is “the shadow cast by the blind assumption that perception is representation.”

Representation and truth-as-correspondence are interdependent concepts.

Note that Eigendorff emphasizes that his own aspect theory is just a belief that others may or may not adopt. Anti-representational ontology, when coherent, is not presented as an accurate re-presentation of a pre-articulate “true” reality. It is offered as an economical explication of the general situation ( of our sharing the world. )