

An unworthy topic perhaps, the soil in which ontocubism and so many other projects grew. That soil being of course my strange and yet ordinary life.

1

Now for the “anonymous ontocubism guy” that you had me check out. For convenience, I’ll call him “Klump.”

So Klump puts up voice-over videos and pdfs that explain his “ontocubism,” which is something like an update of J. S. Mill’s phenomenalism, which he turns into something like an update of Leibniz’s theory of monads. But he’s also into Feuerbach and the “Young Hegelian” movement. Almost no one “in the establishment” talks about phenomenalism or monads in a serious and non-historical way. Almost no one talks about Feuerbach.

So Klump is dusting off some forgotten positions, putting some spin and polish on them. The name “ontocubism” is actually appropriate. It’s probably too cute and unpretentious to impress a certain kind of person. The art reference is also justified. Klump is an outsider philosopher who doesn’t seem to care what academics think. He doesn’t come off as anti-academic. But he’s “to the point” in his papers. In one he provides some footnotes. He will quote sources. But he comes off as a guy who doesn’t care about what’s fashionable.

Does he think he’s a young Wittgenstein ? No. He doesn’t have the earnestness of youth. There’s no grandiose mysticism. I’d say there *is* an “artistic”

passion. If you really dig into his online pdfs, it's hard to miss the pessimism. This guy in his "spiritual" views is *darker* than Schopenhauer. Or at least less "metaphysical." He celebrates the forgotten logical positivists. Is his "phenomenalism" metaphysical? I guess that depends on how you feel about Mach. Because people have basically forgotten about Mach and Mill, phenomenalism tends to be understood in terms of subjective idealism. But of course the "point" of phenomenalism was a strict empiricism. It is basically a demystification of *philosophers'* matter. Not the matter of physics. So Klump is a basically anti-metaphysical "neo logical positivist." Which the world is not asking for.

It's clear that Klump pushes his ontocubism to the foreground, probably because he sees the futility of discussing his ironic pessimism. People would of course be triggered by tis pessimism. Klump is not a guy to "believe" in "The Party." Be it left or right.

You've heard me complain about the shallowness of academia. But I was relatively lucky. Many worked hard and tried to get a decent position. I worked hard and got one. But people are people, and I can't say I love the average professional philosopher. Or think they are especially wise or even especially rational. Like me, they hacked a certain game. Obviously the system has its stars. Who really say something. But most of us are lost in the background. We are vultures feeding on the carcasses of "the mighty dead."

So I'm inclined to like an outsider philosopher who

has clearly read some good books and squeezed out something relatively bold and original. This “relatively” matters, because there’s just about nothing new under the sun. Anyway, I could probably drink some bourbon with Klump and enjoy the conversation. I imagine it’d be like hanging out with an artist. Long ago, I knew a sculptor. He never went to art school. Not from that kind of family. But he’d weld metal parts from the junkyard. I used to have one of his pieces in my back yard, but my wife got tired of looking at. Abstract. Now it’s in my basement. It’s still one of my favorite sculptures. Not that I pretend to be an expert on that kind of thing. But this guy saw the world through the eyes of a sculpture, like he was evaluating the work of the demiurge, mostly finding it wanting. I don’t know what became of this sculptor. He was always reading old art manifestos. And he wrote a few himself. I think he might have ended up working part-time at a junkyard. He could do some welding, but he wasn’t the type to spend all of his time working. A skinny guy, probably still poor and barely noticing it. Assuming his health held up. I imagine that he wouldn’t quite fit in with working class types. But he didn’t fit in with college kid types either.

Klump reminds me of this guy. I don’t think he resents my being an insider. He probably could have made it inside himself, but then he wouldn’t be Klump.

—I like your ontocubism, but isn't finally just an atheistic monadology ?

—That sounds about right. Close enough.

—So why bother ?

—I do ask myself that. But be fair. It incorporates Wittgenstein, J. S. Mill. It elaborates on Leibniz. I also like to think that I make Leibniz more definite and comprehensible.

—I agree. I like the “correspondence theory of belief.” I like your completely deflationary approach toward truth. You squeeze all of the juice out the lemon of the redundancy theory of truth.

—Thank you. Now ask me why I bother.

—Why?

—I don't know. Really I want to talk about this stuff with others. It's nice to get a few likes here and there, but I really want is community.

—Not much of that to be had.

—No. I've been through grad school, so I don't think there's much community there either. A person needs friendship. Or benefits from it.

—Are you sure ?

—I know from experience. But the 40s are rough. I'm married, so I'm not alone. But I'm alone with my

hobbies, shall we say.

3

Futility and futility and futility and the futility in speaking this futility.