

LEE EIGENHOFF

16 JUNE 2025

RESPONSE TO THIS COMMENT

To me the problem with qualia vs. quality is our limited appreciation of the “outside-ness” of the world. Our genetic evolution has forced us to perceive everything as an insular point of direct experience at the cost of universal experience. Thus anthropocentrism becomes anthroponaturalism. I think this has had a terrific and consequential impact on how humankind’s relationship with the world. It is not so much a dualistic appropriation, but a hierarchical one, where we are seen as appointed overseers and husbandmen to the world. Maybe this is more a western emergence, but I think an argument can be made that this began with the advancement of agricultural methods that necessitated rigid and planned structures of controlling the environments we came to inhabit, thus projected our alienated language onto the world.

This gels with my own thinking. *Moloch demands a tower !* David Peirce’s “Darwinian nightmare.” Dawkins’ “moist robots,” servants of that gray math, itself the blood of a blind Demiurge. Nepotistic in the depths of our meet, though inheriting a dream of the (trans-)human family, Klingons and Synths both welcome at the cookout.

As you may well know, this is also in Heidegger’s later

work. The (nihilistic) “subjectification” of the world. Neopragmatism, radical instrumentalism – pretending to be beyond the arcane metaphysics of subjectivity – implicitly recognizes only the tool that gives us what we want as Real. But already in Descartes, this Luciferian humanism. Explicit in David Strauss, who was part of a transformation of the incarnation myth into techno-tyrannical-optimism.

The thing with qualia and quality is that the former presumes that we are active participants in this meta-narrative process and not passive involuntary subjects to it.

To me the concept of qualia registers a presupposed dualism. The thing has quality. But qualia are understood as modifications of the subject.

Language as the patrix of universal being is constantly opening new channels and valves of the world. You brought a traffic light analogy to me a while ago and I meant to tell you that years ago I had this thought while sitting at a traffic light; that the traffic light was only possible in a world moved by Language as it does not so much communicate to me it is clear to go but is a component in creating the world I am now a part of\*. This is semiotics fully realized as the science of Language as opposed to vulgar linguistic. Human behavior, and thus human consciousness, is shaped by this very power.

Consider the world of a snake, or a bird, a bee or

a dog, or even a virus. It isn't so much that they see things differently, but that world itself has a multidimensional facet to it that we are likewise contribute to. Man very much is made for the Sabbath and this refutes the dualistic, anthroponaturalism that has dictated our thinking for millennia.

\*This also I think refutes the static physicalism of Dennett.

“Patricx” is a great metaphor. These “channels and valves” of the world. I agree. The poetic-revelator-CREATIVE function of language. Language is not inside. Language is the essence of the world. The spoken sentence. The traffic light that turns blue tomorrow. This allusiveness ( I refer to the Hendrix song ) is of course part of that. The organic and even carnal presencing of “meaning” as the radiance of the sign in the world. All things are signs in the extended sense, but we tend to reserve the word for conventional signs, the ones we inherit like the law, as Saussure says. Language the sown-in lining of world. I associate this insight with Hegel and Heidegger. And Saussure’s concept of THOUGHT-SOUND is perhaps the gist of Derrida’s early work. The world is a “text” inasmuch as it is articulated, speakable in terms of pulsating situations. “The world is all that is the case.” In this blurry-go-round of our condition which isn’t too blurry for us to call it so.

I think that just “honestly looking” ( which includes facing the uncanniness of our situation ) “refutes” (

or leaves laughable ) any kind of static physicalism. The fetishized scientific image, undeniably potent, is a crude version ( still naive, really) of ontology in the neo-pragmatic nihilism mentioned above. I think we find the sophisticated version in Rorty. The total “form of life” is understood as a tool. Religions and great works of art are also instruments for coping. The “naive” version is strangely more laudable, because those sentimental about the scientific image still “believe” in a “pure perception” that does not molest the object. But this ontological gaze is utterly secondary to the application of the image in worldly terms. Their cheerleading is glaze on the donut. Rorty dissolves like the Cheshire cat. A kinder, gentler machine gun hand. Obscuring assimilation, sophistic gentrification. What Gellner critiqued in *Words and Things*.

Naturally I agree that it's not that other animals ( or, for me, even other humans) see things differently. As if the seen is a function of the independently real. No. We have a multifaceted reality that manifests in terms of presence-and-quality that is always FOR. The-world-for-that-bee, the-world-for-Larry, but never The True World. As if we could speak with sense about belief and qualitative presencing that is not situated. We, who are, as dangerously unspeakable individuals, stapled in to our situation, thoroughly incarnate.