

1

I'd be glad to explain, *of course*, as a fellow citizen in No One Gives A Fuck Ville.

2

Ontology presupposes the conditions for its possibility. Ontology is a necessary entity for itself. Is this theological ? I think Feuerbach had a right. It's the other way around. God was a self-alienated rendition of rationality.

3

That means that **a forum is presupposed**. This "forum" is a "place of assembly." This forum is "the world" in an especially *and intentionally* indeterminate sense. Its "structure" is "all that is case." The world is, by definition, what people (philosophers, ontologists) talk about, make claims about.

4

It is a place of assembly because it's where we philosophers must be if we are having scientific conversation. And having such a conversation requires language ("public" concepts) and scientific norms for inquiry (inferential and semantic norms, etc.) So we are necessarily here in the same world with the same concepts, subject to the same norms.

5

How do I justify such a claim ? I point out that negating those claims involves a performative contradiction. I cannot be *scientifically* (rationally) challenged on this "theory" of "the forum." Someone would have to tell me that I was wrong about "our" world in "our" language according to "our" scientific-logical norms.

6

I have presented my own version of this idea (I did not invent or discover this kind of idea), and I was dismayed and yet not too surprised to meet

with an array of performative contradictions. “Multiple logics.” That was the gist of one attempt to “correct” me. But how can my theory be wrong in any interesting sense if everyone gets their own logic ?

7

But perhaps the point is rather that there is no right or wrong, not really. But here we must ask after the status of “this” claim. Since it itself is presumably neither right nor wrong, it fails to inform us of anything “really.”

8

Ah, you might say, full of generosity in your magnanimous heart, you must think of it as a liberating speech act. It is poetry. Here you have me, and I welcome such poetry, at the right time anyway. But are we to identify philosophy with bumper sticker “feel good” nonsense ? With paradoxical edification ? Let the half-literate drug-addled guru-fanboy mystics have their fun, I say. Give the nice lady chicken soup for her soul. But extend that tolerance also to those who do not want to settle for such flimsy evasions.

9

What the “multiple logics” critic refused to acknowledge was their implicit denial of the possibility of “actual” (genuine) science. One can of course say that “it is all just opinion.” But my foundationalism only applies to those who embrace the role or project of philosophy or science *in the first place*.

10

The inferences involved are trivial. The issue seems to be the entrenchment of what *seems like* open-mindedness. (The limit of this open-mindedness is visible when the open mind is presented with a constraint on play, a foundation.) But perspectivism offers the same virtuous awareness of fallibility and other ways of looking at things, without the baggage of the absurdity of multiple logics or relativism.

11

Who cares though ? The assumption that only practical differences matter is questionable, for it implies the destruction of science (its transformation into politics.) But I don't mean to persuade you to care. Ontology is foolish. Ontology is a joke. All earnest science (when disconnected from worldly gain) is "foolish." It's "just aesthetics."

12

And what is practicality ? What is the self ? Do we really believe that the selfish atomistic human should maximize pleasure or offspring ? Even if we are evolved beings, what are the logical implications ? Is the self just the body ? Or is the self always already intensely social ? What if we are cultural beings with lifespans counted therefore in the centuries ? Our hosts live maybe 100 years, but "we" are not (exactly) the hosts ?

13

Am I selling a religion ? No. I am pointing out assumptions that show the intellectual complacency in cynical reductions of philosophy to the practical. A philosopher wants to know what they are talking about, a little better at least than they currently do. Just because ?