

# **On the Describability of the World Without Explanatory Closure**

## *A Text That Does Not Advance Any Position*

### **Abstract**

This article does not advance a new theory, intervene in an ongoing debate, or offer normative or political recommendations. Its purpose is more limited and more precise: to fix, in a form minimally resistant to misreading, the conditions under which explanation, judgment, and intervention themselves become possible. The text proceeds without hypotheses, prescriptions, or conclusions. It treats cognition as a self-referential circulation whose continuity is not necessarily disrupted by external stimuli, and it locates the rupture of this circulation, when it occurs, prior to meaning, judgment, and language, in bodily dissonance or refusal. Such refusal is not an action or a value judgment, but a non-continuation. From this follows a structural prohibition: bodily refusal is not an object of interpretation, justification, optimization, or overcoming. This prohibition is not ethical but structural, functioning as a stop condition required to preserve the coherence of the described configuration. The article does not justify action, collectivity, or responsiveness; it fixes the prior condition under which entry into these domains may remain suspended. In doing so, it seeks neither integration nor critique, but a stable textual placement that allows evaluation, acceptance, or rejection to register without forcing explanatory closure.

### **Introduction**

This article begins without a problem statement. Problems presuppose criteria, and criteria presuppose stabilized operations of judgment. The present text addresses what precedes those operations. It does not ask why cognition responds, intervenes, or explains, but under what conditions such responses become possible at all.

In much contemporary scholarship, including work attentive to science, technology, and social practices, evaluation proceeds through explanation, critique, or positioning. These operations differ in orientation, but they share a common structure: they presuppose that continuation is already warranted. The present text suspends that presupposition. It neither contests nor endorses explanatory practices. Instead, it fixes a minimal configuration in which continuation itself is no longer taken as given.

The aim is not to establish priority or originality, nor to synthesize existing frameworks. It is to prevent misreading. What follows should therefore be read not as an argument advancing a claim, but as a placement of conditions under which claims, arguments, and interventions may or may not proceed.

## **Theoretical Positioning**

Cognition is treated here as maintaining a primarily self-referential circulation. Responses to external stimuli are therefore not necessary outcomes but remain conditional. A rupture of this circulation does not arise from reasons, judgments, or evaluative decisions. It occurs, if at all, at a prior level: through bodily dissonance or refusal that precedes meaning-making, judgment, and language. Such bodily refusal is not an action, a claim, or a value judgment. It consists solely in not continuing. As such, it is a non-act rather than an intervention.

From this follows a structural prohibition. Bodily refusal is not to be interpreted, justified, optimized, or overcome. This prohibition is not an ethical injunction but a stop condition required for preserving the structure under description. The present position is therefore not relativistic. It does not multiply criteria of judgment, but withholds judgment where the conditions for intervention are not met. Bodily refusal functions as a non-relative, highest-order stop condition within this framework.

Accordingly, this position does not seek to justify action, participation, or forms of collectivity. It addresses, instead, the prior condition under which entering into action, collectivity, or responsiveness remains suspended. In this sense, it is adjacent to accounts that emphasize the irreversibility of action, while remaining located before action occurs, and to accounts of non-shared or inoperative community, while remaining located at the level where participation itself can be withheld.

## **Scope and Limits**

Nothing in this text authorizes withdrawal as a norm, nor does it prescribe non-participation as a stance. It does not elevate bodily refusal into a value, a method, or a politics. It fixes a condition under which continuation does not occur and specifies the structural consequences of that non-occurrence. Where continuation resumes, the present text has nothing further to add.

## **Closing Note**

This article offers no conclusion. Closure would contradict its object. If the text appears incomplete, this should not be corrected. The incompleteness marks the point at which description gives way to operations that the text neither prohibits nor supplies.

Yosuke Yoshimura

Tokyo, Japan