1

—If objects are the synthesis of their "aspects," and aspects constitute "torrents" of the world, then this sounds like an updated idealism to me.

—It's close to panenexperientialism. It can be seen as a "purified" idealism that removes "witness consciousness." Reality doesn't need someone to look at. Lookers-at-things are in the same world as the things they look at. Reality just "is". Reality is not "for" some metaphysical subject.

—But you do claim that reality is always "from a point of view."

—I claim that presence is perspectival. I try to explain this "from-a-point-of-view-ness" without "consciousness stuff."

—You deny aperspectival reality, which some would call "objective reality."

—Yes. I jettison indirect realism. So I jettison "things in themselves" that are supposed to live in such an aperspectival reality.

—And function as truth-makers.

—Correct. So we end up with a deflation of truth. We are left with more or less warranted beliefs. That only represent in an intra-worldly sense.

—Why the imaginary interview format ?

—I've also written papers. The interview format encourages me to reach for less jargon. And maybe it's more "authentic." The ideas have their own existence, but they "go with" a personality. Not just my personality but with others who might appreciate them.

—How would you sum up your approach ? Including presentation or style ?

—So I love Heidegger and Hegel, but some of their stuff is difficult to read, and this difficulty is not always a matter of content. Sometimes the style is needlessly difficult. We can look at James, Mach, Mill, and Ayer for "deep" ideas presented in an easy style.

—So the difficultly should only be in the ideas themselves.

—Yes. Though many an obscure philosopher would probably agree. What makes an idea difficult ? In my view, it's our own prejudices that get in the way. For instance, the indirect realist framework is entrenched. So those who face a challenge of it are naturally going to be confused, just as I was. As Gadamer stresses, the most constraining prejudices are the ones you don't know you have.

—How seriously do you take your ideas ?

—Well, I'd say that my kind of "ontology" doesn't have much to do with practical life. I happen to

find the "mind-matter-truth" issue fascinating. Others who want to resolve the associated confusion may enjoy what I do indeed think is a solution. To me it's like knowing how to untie a knot. I'd say that the other, more literary side, of my philosophy, which I mostly don't share, is more "important." I'll probably share this under a different brand name or only with those who clearly might appreciate it.

—Is it original?

—No more original than "ontocubism." Except perhaps that the literary approach calls for more creativity in expression. But as I age I find more and more that the ideas I consider profound turn out to be old indeed.