

—Maybe Husserl intended what I call a “worldstream” or “worldstreaming” with his “transcendental ego.” This worldstream does indeed have the structure of the experience of a creature in the world. One “climbs” up to this “nondual” theory using the “ladder” of “idealism.”

—Too many quotes !

—Figurativity or metaphoricity or whatever we want to call it is the essence of conceptuality and language —not a mere ornament or exception.

—So it’s all in quotes ?

—Yes. But the intensity of figurativity varies, so we mark this or that piece to emphasize where careful reading is necessary.

—OK, so the worldstream and the transcendental ego — the famous pure witness.

—Right. Pure empty anonymous **so-called** subjectivity.

—To which you object.

—The “philosophical I” in the TLP is exactly a “side” of the world or world-from-perspective. Consciousness does not exist. There is no transcendental ego.

—People tend to flip out when you deny consciousness.

—I am more on their side than they are. They are just impatient sentimentalists. Or clinging to their immortal soul. But they need not worry. The practical use of “consciousness” is intact. My dramatic assertion is me trying to shake the tree.

—You are on their side ?

—Yes. So the “idealist” (who is typically a confused dualist) is trying usually to affirm their own intimate and familiar reality. Look, they say, there is color and sound and meaning in this world. Don’t tell me that it’s all really dead atoms and voids.

—And you agree.

—Very much. But I don’t do it for Jesus. I do it for science.

–What’s the difference ?

–Dualism is fragile and confused. It makes no sense. It creates the famous “hard problem.” Yes, if you assume that $1 = 0$, you create problems for yourself.

–You have in mind indirect realists ?

–Yes, them too. But more so those who are trapped on the boundary. I think of one guy in particular, who (it seems to me) reliably *half*-understood various spiritualistic profundities.

–Such as ?

–Subjectivity plays an important role. He and his type can see that. But many are afraid to question scientific realism. Because, I speculate, they are closet theists, and this would be walking naked.

–And they want the soul that goes along with most religion ?

–Right. But there’s a sort-of-Buddhist guy who will gossip about the doctrine of non-self but fails to recognize its careful explication.

–Such as your own ?

–Yes. But “mine” is that of Wittgenstein, Mach, Heidegger, Husserl, others.

–Not on the approved list. Not sufficiently exotic and imported. Wine and cheese.

–Wine and cheese.

2

–This “wine and cheese” issue turns out to be central. Because it’s an example of projection or transference or the distortion that comes with the father figure.

–Jungian archetype ?

–Yes. But we can’t or shouldn’t use Jung here as a father. All of these mighty dead in their fame have whatever value they do have in terms of a logic or rationality that has no final finite avatar.

–We are all just people.

–To put it bluntly, yes. The greatest of the name should flow from the

greatness of the reasoning and insight. But fame and transference means mystification and understanding that relationship backwards. On Reddit, mostly a wasteland, one sees the typical young person wallowing in the “parent-child” (father-son) “game.”

–Instead of reasoning for oneself, they want someone to tell them what Nietzsche said about this or that issue.

–Exactly. And they need to know who wrote the passage before they judge it. And the numinous name is used to organize a conversation in the first place. Cartoons. Einstein, Buddha, Hegel. To the childish mind, these are vivid, magical figures. They aren’t relatively coherent and adventurous articulations of this or that aspect of the world.

–They aren’t their work, in other words.

–Exactly. They are magical authorities, numinous fathers.

–So the child lives in a world of numinous fathers. The adult ?

–Lives “as” such a father, you might say. But “peer” or “adult” is better. Because I, for instance, like to teach, but I really want to be understood and recognized by an equal. Or at least the better part of me does.