

I'd like to read your essay when you finish it.

I very much agree with you that the postulation of the radically External as the truly Real is a disaster. A big theoretical mistake, a taking of the wrong path.

As I see it, the philosophical tradition (the state of the art) has moved beyond this dualism. But very few people are motivated enough to ever begin to catch up with the state of the art. Because it doesn't usually pay or make one popular to do philosophy well. In fact, Socrates was given poison for his impious questioning.

So those who still identify the External with the Real are really a small group in absolute terms. But a big group in terms of online philosophers (usually hobbyists) who are still catching up with the tradition. The "philosophical" problem for non-philosophers seems to me to be primarily the "spiritual" problem of envy, resentment, etc. It seems to me that people always prioritize solving this identity crisis issue, and then a few of them become genuinely interested in something scientific in the dry sense. For instance, as a young man I found Nietzsche completely fascinating, and Husserl seemed boring. But now I take the good stuff in Nietzsche for granted, so Husserl can be fascinating.

I think the word "real" will continue to have its many many uses in practical life. As philosophers talking to philosophers, I personally think we should always be prepared to change our terminology. I think that there are concepts (in some blurry sense) "behind" "signifiers" and that these concepts are what matter. For instance, I can imagine some guy in France who doesn't know English but reads French translations of some of my influences coming up with what I call "ontological perspectivism." He'd call it something in French. But maybe he's expressing (basically) the same nondual system. Perhaps some Italian who knows both English and French could translate a live conversation. And we would both end up feeling understood and deciding that we were saying "the same thing."

If I was meeting someone who liked philosophy, I'd want to know if they "could see the lifeworld." I mean "see" it theoretically. We all *live* in it. So the question is whether they are still trapped in that inherited default dualism. In my experience, you cannot talk someone out of this

dualism. It happens slowly. Maybe they keep reading. Maybe they don't take philosophy seriously enough, so they never progress beyond philosophy in the time of Locke, for instance. I spent more than decade on various forums, and I've seen some people grow and change and others stay the same. And the one's that stay the same are sometimes exposed to surgically precise and valid criticism of their views, but they can't or won't update or modify. Heidegger didn't have the metaphor yet, but there is something bot-like in what he calls "interpretedness" and what Husserl calls "sediment." The thoughts of the past have a kind of undead second life in us. The past lives in us like software, governing our interpretation of the present and constraining our dreams of the future.

This is already too long, so I say goodnight for now.