

## A LETTER FROM OTTO FREIDOFF

Yes I'm attached to my unmitigated antirepresentationalism, which I don't know if I want to call "philosophy." I am learning a contempt for labels. Labels are wisemen's counters and the money of fools ( first chapter of Leviathan, yclept "Of Man", remains some of my favorite foolosophy.)

A crush. Like a poet on one of his better poems, or a sculptor on the stone that finally shines. But what makes it good — if I am not a deluded crank — is also what makes *me* "lonely." To peak around what almost of the "intellectuals" take for granted makes me unintelligible, I reckon, to just about all of them. Though I am grateful for enough recognition to keep me trying to find better words for it. To the neglect of a rival ( also edgy and lonely ) literary project involving "idspeak."

It's weird, my absent brother. Precisely this lonely inspiration opens me up to more potent interpretations of what were already my favorite texts. I empathize more with Nietzsche than I already did, but he's just one of many possible examples. He's associated with "perspectivism," but this *label* does not properly *signify*. I'm biased, but I'm inclined to say that almost no one under-fucking-stands ("properly") the framework-shredding *depth* of "perspectivision." I say "almost no one" because I *search* for "real" (institutional) philosophers who "see" it.

Grant me, as your vision-fettered brother, the valid-

ity or worth of my “aspect theory.” Let’s try some “psychology of belief”. Ours is an age of epistemology, at the expense of ontology. “Because” (?) of our unquestioned-because-unseen **representation-alism**. What *is* this -ism ? It’s the quasi-theological knee-jerk assumption of an “actual reality.” For instance, Tim Maudlin speculates on *whether* reality is “actually” discrete, without *noticing* the **vacuity** of talk about what is “actually” going on. The assumption is that we live in a haze that hovers over a substrate. *For now we see through a glass, darkly*. Fucking *theological*, my brother.

Rorty wrote about the *mirror* of nature. We might also use the telescope as a metaphor. The assumption is that we are stuck on one end of a telescope, getting a non-actual *image* of the actual. Instead of thinking of this supposed actuality as a vague projection, we’ve come to think of our own existence in all its richness as secondary, as fumes from a substrate with an absolute solidity.

But I claim that perception is not representation but manifestation. An “inaccurate” perception (or “false” belief ) is just a perception that has been *revised*.

A “false” belief is only “false” in the sense that we’ve replaced it with a *new* belief. This new belief may also be declared “false” for the same reason. All we have is the *transformation of belief*. Because we tend to call our current beliefs “true,” we incautiously invent TRUTH, without being able to give it a meaning.

Because we find ourselves, as practical creatures, seek-

ing a consensus ( trying to harmonize the beliefs of many people), we incautious invent OBJECTIVE REALITY, without being able to give it a meaning.

In demystified terms, the “truth” is what “we” believe, and “objective reality” is “represented” by the truth.

This use of “representation” is problematic, for it suggests that the world is already articulated-in-itself and that our “truth” re-articulates reality “correctly”—as it is already pre-articulated.

Since sane people aren’t quite that arrogant, they think in terms of belief that (hopefully) *approximates* “truth.” “The truth is out there,” though, whether or not we can prove that our beliefs *are* “true.”

Science never needed truth. The association of science with truth is theological — anti-scientific in an important sense.

Note how greedily scientific theories are integrated into “spiritualistic” metaphysical theories. To the degree that scientists themselves, waxing ontologically, consciousness or not, speak of the “true” world, they themselves are already “spiritualistic” metaphysicians. Consciousness is understood as a ghost that haunts the machine of nature.

Note that I don’t hate this representational myth *itself*. I only object to its dominance *as* a myth that *takes itself* as the great anti-myth. As the mighty hammer that mercilessly shatters the sentimental myths of others. While being itself a supremely sentimen-

tal (motivated) myth, which even echos the very theology it prides itself on setting itself against. “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face.” Perception they understand as a lying telescope. “Consciousness” is a fume that rises mysteriously from a postulated substrate. Our current beliefs are “false” perhaps, but the “truth” is out there.

But we live now, as presumably always, *in* our current beliefs, *as* the speakable structure of the world. Because our beliefs vary in intensity, the world itself is “experienced” (I’d say genuinely *manifests*) as indeterminate. But surely the “actual” world is crystalline. The “true” world will free us from ambiguity. Even the idea is comforting, especially since we reluctantly confess the implications of our faith. If “consciousness” is an “illusion” that rises from the holy substrate — and if we are stuck in or as such believing consciousness — then this true world is forever untouchable, merely to be guessed at.

On the other hand, we are practical apes who trust the technology that gives us what we want. The ideology of “truth” can be left to the sentimentalists. Science, the real stuff, is just tech that works *whether or not its users or victims believe it will*.

But this demystification of truth is not the best part. I have to attack representationalism and “truth-ism” ( point out their unnoticed nullity) in order to set the stage for the gist, which is the “ontocubic” conception of a thing or entity as the system of its faces. Time shows one aspect of a thing only by hiding (not

showing) all the others. Things are logical syntheses of aspects, and the world itself is a logically entangled system of its own kind of aspects. My existence, for instance, is such an “aspect” or “face” of the world. So is yours. And so on, aliens not-yet-born included. Perception is not inside subjects (for subjects have been emptied.) Indeed perceptions are better thought of as “faces” of a perceived object that is nothing *more than* a potentially infinity of such faces. But I’ve presented this part in many videos and in other pdfs. In your last letter, I tried to read between your polite questions and guess at what seemed to stifle what I hope will become your appreciation. Even if I don’t win you over, I hope you better understand what charms me about this approach.