

2 JULY 2025

1

The hard problem of consciousness looks to me like the problem of being. In disguise, you might say.

The eagerness to **explain** is perhaps part of the problem.

To explain presence itself is perhaps absurd.

Now there *are* feasible **operational conceptions** of consciousness that fit just fine into the explanatory project.

Operational consciousness would be a set of properties that we would define to indicate consciousness. But this would be a dead fish. Misses the point. Shrinks consciousness from presence itself to things merely present *for* this or that consciousness.

2

The essence of dualism may be the correspondence theory of truth. Indeed, the essence of dualism may, more exactly be, a belief in Truth, a belief in Objective Reality.

This monotheistic belief is so strong that its critics are often understood to claim the equivalent of *the truth is there is no truth*.

But this performative contradiction is not what is intended. The radicalized redundancy theory of truth is a situated suspicion that all belief is “merely” situated belief.

Experience is the world manifested in a first-person way. Genuine conversation (including science and philosophy) presupposes that we are discussing the same world as a world we share. But genuine conversation need not suppose that this world has some definite “shape” that transcends our individually evolving beliefs. We can have science as something other than the quest

to mirror a single pre-articulated Objective Reality.

As I see it, the hard problem of consciousness is driven by a need to reduce consciousness to something less than the presence of the world. If we presuppose that science mirrors a substrate reality somehow beyond all such presencing, we are tempted to think of consciousness as a stuff *within* the world rather than the situated manifestation *of* the world.