

I can't **make sense of** the presence of an entity that lacks a from-a-point-of-view-ness. So I can't make sense of others making sense of the presence of an entity that lacks a from-a-point-of-view-ness.

The apple is still on the table when I leave the room. This I believe. But what do I **mean** ?

Anyone can go and check. See it. Take a bite of it. It is waiting there for others.

This apple that I believe to exist without my help is nevertheless *primarily* the apple as it presented itself to me. I don't just call it "red." This quality that I call "redness" is **there in the apple itself**. I don't know if it gives you "my version" of red when you look at it. We both call it "red" and that's that. I can't see it through your eyes, nor you through mine.

When I believe that you are "conscious," I believe that this apple, for instance, is also **there for you**. Your so-called "consciousness" is the presence of my world from your point of view. My so-called "consciousness" is the presence of your world from my point of view.

I suggest that being is the first-person presence of world. That being and consciousness are synonyms.

I also suggest that presence and qualities are synonyms. Presence is qualitative. Presence is the presence of quality. The shaped redness of the apple, its tart crunch. The feel of it in my hand, the THUNK if it slips from my hand to the floor.

Perhaps I learn some physics at school. I adopt beliefs presented in the textbook. I expect the thrown apple's path to approximate "gravity's rainbow," to be approximately parabolic, from the point of view of someone standing in the right place as witness.

I expect that, if I measure the time it takes for the apple to fall from my hand and hit the floor, that this time will be close to that predicted by my physics textbook. 32 feet per second per second floor-ward acceleration. Initial velocity of 0. I trust that

this pattern has been tested many times.

I am also aware that measurement is of finite precision, that the setup is simplified, as if the force of the earth's gravity was directed exactly toward the point on the floor closest to the apple's initial position. Still, I "believe in" physics, and I'd be surprised if the apple's time of travel was very different from the prediction I calculate before hand. I grant that it is "logically possible" for the apple to defy the "laws" of physics. I have read about Hume's shocking problem of induction. Indeed, I sympathize with the subjective probability of QBism, taken largely from De Finetti.

To me these "laws" of physics are the consensus expectation of experts. One "ought" to expect the implications of the "laws" of physics. If one is "rational" and "scientific." And I do, without however adopting an ideology or ontology that tends to come along for the ride. As far as I can make out, these "laws" are just codified expectation. As far as I can make out, expectation is always **someone's** expectation.

Often scientific beliefs are applied so that the forum is dissolved. The forum is "really" atoms and void. But an ontology of atoms and void is only one indulgent myth among others without the normative structure of the forum. Any thesis that rejects the conditions for the possibility of warrant is itself unwarranted. It's easy to ignore this in the pursuit of a grand vision of the world.