

ASEM Class Notes : March 8, 2018



Class Discussion : Bring Questions



Initial Conversation Concerning Final Project Paper : Narges Haghighat **&** Tim Clark



Class Discussion : Selected Reference Notes



___ BODY / BODIES	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ DIFFERENT / DIFFERENCES	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ ELEMENT / ELEMENTS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ INDIVIDUAL / INDIVIDUALS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ KIND / KINDS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ NUMBER / NUMBERS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + . . . <i>n</i>	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ OBJECT / OBJECTS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ PROPERTY / PROPERTIES	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ SAME / SAME AS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>
___ SET / SETS	= PEOPLE ? CARS ? PAINTING ? CHAIRS ? ART + . . . <i>n</i>

Consider __ The Correlative Relation between the Finite {subject} to the Infinitude of ∞ Space / Time.



Consider a situation where, relative to your specific, finite location in time and space . . . ,



Part One : The Correlative Relation between the Finite {subject} to the Infinitude of ∞ Space / Time.

Consider a situation where, relative to your specific location in time and space _ { *for example, you are in a museum located in Montreal, on Thursday, January 23rd, at 3.02 pm.* } _ there is an exhibition of paintings whose subject matter is non-objective, colorist formalism. Moreover, while you have seen pictures of paintings before in publications this is the first time you have ever been in a museum or seen an exhibition. Finally, your decision to go to the exhibition was initiated by a friend who also had never gone to a exhibit, but, because she could not go herself, asked you to attend the exhibition so that you could, through the visit, provide an explanation what this exhibition was about, and, more importantly, to answer the question “What is a Museum? ” That is, what is the “ **actual or real or true** nature” of a museum? We can extend this example by saying that your friend asks you to visit more than one museum in the city because any claims about what the museum is, or is not, should be based on more than one experience given that there may be commonalities and differences with regards to each museum.

The question that your friend has asked implies a request which is similar to those types of questions which Markus Gabriel critiques, with respect to question concerning the “true” nature of a museum. As Gabriel first states “*we can find no basis any explanation **only** through observed data.*” The point concerning ‘*observed data*’ is important because it speaks to fundamental epistemological questions that bare directly on how **any** human generates knowledge of the world they function in. One of the primary conditions of our example of the museum visit is the requirement of an functional, experiential framework in which **any** visit can occur in the first place. In walking around the building one is engaged in an socio-epistemological exchange between your movements, **which occur in time**, through the various galleries of the museum, and, with those movements your interaction with everything around you. That experientiality takes the form of what you **see, hear, read, feel**, and/or through what one **reads** or in **discussions** with museum staff. We could say that all these forms of experientiality allow you to accumulate what one refer to as ‘knowledge.’

Part Two : The Correlative Relation between the Finite {subject} to the Infinitude of ∞ Space / Time.

So, once you return to your friend's place with your response to her initial question will take the form that a museum possess "is such and such and such . . . characteristics {properties}." Note that the claim concerning museums refers **not to a** specific museum ; rather it speaks the nature of **all** museums. However, if we accept the Gabriel's model then this claim **cannot** be an **all encompassing** or **absolutely complete enumeration** of the **total** properties {characteristics} of what museums exist, or will exist. Gabriel argues that to attempt to provide such an "**enumeration**" will fail because, *"It represents **One**, "**enumeration**" is impossible given that there are inactuality an infinite sets of possibilities. **Two**, such a request assumes a metaphysical bias with respect to the assumption that it is actually possible to provide such a true definition of what a museum is given that we are located within the constraints Space and Time. We can never experience all existing and possible museums. We can only experience one or more of the parts, and these parts cannot be representative of all possible museum's"* Or, conversely, we can never arrive at an understanding of the meaning the the term "museum" independent of a specific socio-**conceptual** context. socio-**conceptual**. The deeper problematic concerning Gabriel's position why should we accept their model in the first place?

The short answer is that all knowledge claims are **not** intrinsically wrong or false. Rather, claims of "truth" and "falsity" are what philosophers refer to as, 2ND order claims *about* specific 1ST order sentences like 'that a museum "is such and such and such . . ."'. "Truth" and "falsity" concern claims which are finite by definition _ they are provisional insofar as a sentence like 'that a museum "is such and such and such . . ." ' functions heuristically. By finite, I mean that **one** : our movements in space and time are constrained by, **or**, finite to our specific time and location **in** infinite space and time, **two**; each of us are finite with regards to the functional characteristics of our **eyes**, **ears**, **bodily movements**, etc, which are specific to the genericity of the being of our personhood, and, **three**; the framework of **language**, **concepts**, and **words** enunciated will, by definition, parameterise, and, at the same time, form a finite epistemological and cultural framework that allows us to function experientially since they provide constraints on both the potential infinitude of experience, and, though we can conceive of infinitude we cannot experience it. As Markus Gabriel argues, . . .



Markus Gabriel. Why the World Does Not Exist

But can one not simply differentiate the museums in its environment from the rest of the world ? This also leads no further, because once again one needs an environment for the environment. For environments too are found only in environments. An absolute contrast always carries too large a contrast with itself. This is not only a fact about the limits of human knowledge. This applies much more to the information that we gather. Reality itself makes information available___ for example, the information that there is only a single moon. This information does not come into the world through human beings differentiating heavenly bodies from one another. The difference between the sun, the earth and the moon is no human doing but a condition for the existence of knowing beings and intelligent life on our planet.

Thus, no absolute difference exists. Some things are differentiated from some other things. But it is not the case that everything is differentiated from everything else. Some things are actually identical with some other things, something that poses a well-known philosophical riddle : How can two different objects or facts be identical with each other ? This must be possible, for the Rhine is identical to itself, although it is constantly changing. The material out of which the Rhine consists today is constantly being replaced, and the river does not remain the same over time. At this point, let's go on the record : objects are always differentiated from other objects. There are contrast classes, which are always relative and never absolute. We are sometimes mistaken about the determination of the relevant contrast classes, from which, however, it does not follow that there are no contrast classes at all. Quite to the contrary: we are sometimes mistaken about the determination of the relevant contrast classes because contrast classes, about which we are mistaken, really exist.