

Thank for you the email ! Like probably any foolosopher, I'm grateful for any opportunity to lay my insectuous eggs.

How is it “demystified Platonism” ? Collusion of “forms” and “continuum.” Reality as collision. Reality *analyzed* as such. So “Esoplato” says that it's not forms along or continuum alone but always their interpenetration. Their *entanglement* is primary. Esoplato offers a merely theoretical separation of this given complex into “constituting poles.” But the “poles” themselves are not given.

Note that Esoplato is *my* Plato, just Kojève had *his* Hegel. Maybe (hard to say) the empirical Plato was like my Esoplato. What matters to me, ultimately, is the theory itself. The gallery of personalities is fun, of course, but “serious” philosophy is research into the ideas, and the picture-show of masks is a means rather than an end. Though one can and should explication the relationship between this picture show and the process of (philosophical) research. For instance, what functions as a primary distraction if not a kind of idolizing transference ? A mystification of actual human beings into something otherwordly ? Plato is not a “guru.” Or I claim that taking Plato or Heidegger or whoever as a guru is a kind of irrationalism. You won't find me preaching against irrationalism, though. Read Plato on sophists. Philosophers and not sophist are the fools in this world.

I think you *do* understand correctly what I mean when I call things “ideal manifolds.” Yes, I am saying that

“consciousness” *is* these things. Or rather that “consciousness” *is* situations-from-a-point-of-view. And of course these situations-from-a-point-of-view are “constituted” by objects-from-a-point-of-view. In other words, “consciousness” is a torrent of situations constituted by the sensory faces or “aspects” of things.

You ask me to clarify the claim that *the eye of the beholder is in the beauty*. This goes back to early Heidegger, and others before him surely. If we look with a phenomenological eye at the world, we see ugly things and beautiful things and neutral things. Duchamp chose his famous urinal for its neutrality. A beautiful urinal may have distracted from his point. *The object itself is beautiful*. This is how it is “experienced.”

Of course objects “give themselves” (are unveiled) in terms of perspectival aspects. What is unveiled as beautiful in my stream may be ugly or neutral in yours. We are more likely to agree about the weight or the size of the object. Though special relativity surprised us by suggesting that even length is observer-relative. Still, our tendency to agree about certain mathematizable properties of objects encouraged us to separate this mathematizable “part” of the object from the rest. The “value predicates” were stuffed inside a subject conceived of as a container.

This concept of a “container subject” has a certain practical-social utility. I don’t expect it to vanish. But it’s terrible as an ontological axiom. It gives rise to a basically confused “two substance superstition.” I mean, of course, all the shades and hues of represen-

tational or indirect realism.

Why do I find Popper's concept of "basic statements" so important ? Popper and Wittgenstein both see that reality is "articulated" into "states of affairs." The simplest observation statements involve "universals" or "categories" or "forms." *The thermometer read 72 degrees.* So we have thermometers and numbers and degrees. We are already in an inferential and theoretical space. Theory-laden. We don't have the "naked sensual fact." Indeed, this word "fact" should be our clue. Facts are articulate. Facts are also revisable and not completely certain. The "actual" is a work in progress.

This ties in with your other question. Why the redundancy theory of truth ? Which is (as you note) an "untheory" of truth. Because belief not truth is the fundamental concept. This "falls out" of taking the world to be given in perspectival "torrents." Scientific inquiry seeks a consensus of rational or warranted belief. But belief is some sense always "local." The "articulation" or "speaking structure" of a "streaming of the world" is the belief of the empirical ego at the center of that torrent. Hence the confusion between what I used to call the ontological ego and what I still call the empirical or transcendent ego.

This implies that I should understand myself to be sharing belief rather than truth. Indeed, I am sharing my belief. I am offering an explication of reality that I consider to be warranted. In this very letter, I continue to sketch a "global" explication that I hope others will recognize as relatively coherent and adequate.

I understand what I currently call “ontocubism” to be a reduction in cognitive dissonance.

As a foolosopher, I also write on Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, etc. So ontocubism is just my philosophical approach to the problem of reality and consciousness and truth. Classic stuff, but quite dry compared to my existential stuff. I think that “Ontomonotoncubism” stands secure without any help from its existential soil or background. In my view, one is not usually fascinated by “fundamental ontology” until one is settled on various “identity issues.” My dry, merely explicative ontocubism is sure to disappoint those still searching for a coherent identity. Suffice it to say that I’m the type of person to read philosophy of science on the toilet. Ontocubism fits in with (“is”) philosophy of science. It is even “neo” logical positivism.

I don’t mind the more personal question. As you can see, I’ve already started to answer it. What do I expect from sharing ontocubism ? Not much. Yet I foolishly and genuinely believe that it’s substantial, even if this substance is primarily borrowed from influences. Does the world need or care much about philosophy of science ? About “fundamental ontology” without its existential cape ? No. Not really. What I do here is “pure math,” without the sanctification that math gets via its proximity to applied science. Part of me is even surprised by the moderate attention my videos have accumulated. My “existential-literary” project (itself a beast with many names) is built on the idea of graffiti for passing strangers. Naturally I thought of “ontocubism” in terms of such graffiti. Hence my

joke about “insectuous eggs.” My art has always been weird and marginal. I was, for instance, in a noise band once. I went at that project with just as much passion. Here and there a whiff of recognition. But mostly impatience and incomprehension. But I think it’d be immature to complain about this. My influences were often if not always ignored, misunderstood, etc. Even the great names are swamped by idle talk that trivializes their content. That’s just life. That’s the world we live in, which I try to affirm. You don’t get to be an “authentic” artist without the cross on your back. Can’t have it both ways. Though occasionally this or that person gets lucky. Their fever dream becomes the fad. To eventually become trivialized. And even in its glory day as fad it lives primarily as its own parody.

To answer another personal question: I *don’t* think “ontocubism” (a name that may be thrown away at some point) is the one right approach or “solution.” I confess to a kind of “tunnel vision” as I *develop* ontocubism as a “concept sculpture.” What I’m getting at will probably be hard to understand for anyone who isn’t also a *creative* philosopher, especially in the large sense of offering a system. I’m not blind to how arrogant it must seem for me to float my little boat neath the flag of a cute name, an “ism” waiting to be born via discussion thereof in the absence of its creator. Am I foolish or shrewd with such brand consciousness?

Now for a crucial issue: You ask about the “spiritual ramifications” of my foolosophy. I hope to ex-

plain to you why I think those “must” be downplayed. I’ve discussed philosophy online for years, and I have maybe seen all the *types* of personalities who participate in this our glorious Forum. One prominent type is the would-be “thought-leader” or “politician” or “guru.” This type is always an idealist is both common sense of the term. They almost always sacrifice “rigor” for such “spiritual ramifications.” For them the crystalline structure of the system is means rather than end.

They tend to wrap up a mundane complaint about scientism in a jargon that obscures the simplicity of their pose. Their primary goal seems to be prestige won through the “spiritual ramifications” of their hazy ontological offering. This offering is haze because it isn’t aimed at the critical-skeptical mind in the first place. They pine to be the next Kastrup or Gilchrist or Hoffman. They likewise dabble in appeals to the very science they accuse of blindness. “Science proves that science proves nothing.” Perhaps I exaggerate. But prioritizing the spiritual cash-value of a theory tends to result in sophistry, with sophistry understood here as an irrational appeal to emotion.

The “crystalline structure” of the “system” “must” be “value neutral.” It is itself a transcendent intentional object. The accidental sophists I mentioned are all forgettable and hackneyed. That is their creative sin. What they sell is *themselves* as snowflake-wonderful avatars of the same old product. They want to be pop stars. But who can blame them ? The shortest path is a straight line is a repetition of what already

triumphs in the market.

So we have “spiritual ramifications” enough, in my view. These assembly line sophists all say the same thing, that the world runs on metaphysics. If only others will gaze into the blind spot of science as I have, they too will be liberated and clean. The rape of Mother Nature will cease, and the Classless Society will arrive. Global harmony, the End of History. With help from your neighborhood ~~sophist~~ thought-leader.

Can you feel the influence of Schopenhauer in that ? Or should I say Plato, who discusses the sophist as a skilled controller of that wild beast known as the mob ? We might say that there is a self-aware and a self-unaware escapism. What I call “transcendent pessimism” or “the black flower” *understands itself to be* what Kojève calls a “slave ideology.” These naive idealists-sophists are, from my POV, living in a self-flattering optimistic bubble — and selling this bubble to others. “You too are a star seed.” It’d be wrong to think that I hate them or resent this escapism. The “black flower” understands itself to be *necessarily* marginal. If everyone thought as I did, we’d probably go extinct, though I’m not an anti-natalist. Those who live in mental constructions and find them fairly satisfying aren’t going to dominate the earth, gather resources, and transform them efficiently into offspring. Unlike Kant but like Socrates, I find myself married. With pets if not children. Entangled indeed in attachment. No stranger to the breathflower skinwheel, the bloodflower sinwheel, the deathflower fuckwheel.

But my ontocubic concept jazz has a certain independence from that grimly joyful pessimism. And (quite obviously by now) from optimistic soul-saving ramifications. I see that I have contaminated by crystalline production in some sense by juxtaposing it with my necessarily marginal existential position. We are people-oriented creatures. If I don't like you, I don't like your constructions. We insist that the artist too be a lovable piece of art.

This itself might be lumped in with the sentimentality I criticized earlier. Those spiritual types mentioned earlier will, for instance, understand Plato as a Sage who Heard the Secret, and not a mortal man with the time and money to dedicate to his art. "The envelope is the letter." I guess I'll give you what you want after all. If not a ramification, there's a spiritual *motivation* for "immaterialism." (Of course ontocubism is largely based on J. S. Mill's immaterialism.) That would be the passion that drives a rejection of the mystified and alienated concept of reality as something "beyond." As in I need a guru to give me the Secret or a physicist to give me the Final Equation. Different flavors of the same con, which is not so much con as product ever in demand. The con itself is sold to be repeated by the user. The pose of secret holder is itself sold in a proximity pyramid scheme.

I think I should end on a positive note. The "object as ontocube" is the object as fundamentally infinite manifold. It is primarily the object as *possibility*. The empirical object is essentially an intentional



object. The “substance” of the object is “logical.” “Actual” or “empirical” situations are “flesh-in” “pictured” situations. Actuality is a matter of degree. The (relatively) actual is made possible by the theoretical, through categories that are primarily already in place. This is some of what I get from the *Tractatus*.

It seems to me that our slavishly practical minds are often tangled up in a merely *practical* notion of what “exists.” The default understanding of “existence” in terms of public empirical situations leads to every kind of confusion. This goes with the tacit conception of the subject as a container of sensations and ideas. These “ideas” are understood in a merely *psychological* way, as the “contents” of a “consciousness” stuff. This consciousness stuff, quite hilariously, doesn’t “exist.” So people might say in a “Forum” that also doesn’t “exist.”

These ideas or concepts are understood to be “internal” or “private.” Yet people, having assumed this, will go on reasoning about the world in public, blissfully unaware of the performative contradiction. They do this of course only in the game of philosophy. In practical life, it’s back to a blend of naïve realism and “beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” You can container subjects who take their sharing of the world for granted. This is logically incoherent, but people *act* sanely enough. They just don’t usually bother to work out a *coherent theoretical appropriation* of their worldly know-how. Because, of course, such an appropriation is weird fucking hobby, son.