

1

–What the fuck do you mean by “final pussy”?

–It’s Plato. Beyond the beauty of flesh there is what? What is the nothingness that calls out to us? What is the presence of an absence discussed by the lovable Paul de Man? More sinning than sinned against?

–Is your work sexist?

–I don’t think so, or not unless reality is.

2

–I’m *reluctantly* esoteric. I think my favorite philosophers were in the same situation.

–But you must want to at least be difficult to understand.

–I want to have made some progress, which I can share. I want to bring some gift to the tribe, the kind of gift that I feel especially able to bring. Or that I want to be especially able to bring.

–But you only bring death.

–That’s true. That’s part of it. Socrates drinking poison is prophecy or essence rather than history. Pure science is a devouring flame like God. So there’s something uncanny in me. Even I can see that.

–But your influences got themselves loved.

–That’s true, but much of that love is false or confused. People love fame, they love the icon of the scientist. But science itself is a flame that consumes the local, petty ego. Socrates was poor, and “shamefully” lacking credentials.

–This makes you an unworldly philosopher.

–That’s true. Pragmatism, on the other hand, is open and shameless sophistry. And I’ve learned from the pragmatists. I can play the smoke and mirrors game of sophistry better than many, probably, but I can only look back on that phase of my philosophical growth as embarrassing.

–But you love Paul de Man?

–Yeah. But I’ve read some of his work. He’s not a cartoon for me. We naturally live in a world of crude cartoons. Television for children. We always start in the mud of vague gossip which is disgustingly sure of itself.

3

–You’ve insulted pragmatism. That helps me understand why you bother defending direct realism.

–Yes. The fear of truth likes to wear the mask of the fear of error. A forum is pre-fucking-supposed. Our communication situation is that which is most real, most certain, to the degree that the real is to be determined (articulated) “rationally.”

–Why does this issue fire you up ?

–Arrogant confusion is disturbing. The false humility of the sophisticated anti-philosopher is disturbing. Imposters are disturbing. Biting into chocolate cake that turns out to be dog shit. Ethics aesthetics authenticity blah blah but seriously yes. Of course.

–But not formulated.

–For me as philosopher there’s the mission of telling the whole truth. Radical, self-critical honesty. Science is sacred. Some kind of ideal sociality is implicit in the concept of science, philosophy, ontology. Pragmatism and others attempted reductions are confused.

–Can you justify that statement ?

–I could repeat the criticisms of Husserl and others. But what’s the point ? Those who don’t read the greats are not going to be swayed by a needle in the haystack like me. Fame, mystique, prestige. That’s what makes most of the world go round.

–But I recall that you believe in “affirming” the world.

–Yes. In a certain sense. I don’t believe in whining or blaming. Declaring the world good or evil is questionable. But taking responsibility is necessary. In my view. For me. Because it’s beautiful noble autonomous etc.

–Even if people aren’t “really” free.

–Right. Psychology presupposes that we are imprisoned in the causal

network. That we are not free in some sense. But that doesn't matter. Or it doesn't change the "necessity" of embracing the role of the responsible agent. The "man," as opposed to the "boy," takes responsibility. But this includes a terrible freedom. Because that man owns his own life and can choose to destroy, to say no to the world.

–Suicide.

–Yeah. I'm not interested in praising or blaming suicide. That would be a descent...

–Into politics.

–Yes. You get me, don't you ?

–Yeah. You are a gloomy motherfucker.

–I am and yet I am not. I mean I am often quite happy. I adore my little wife. But I do have a tragic view of life. Ecstatic tragic. Facing death is not some secondary part of it. Heroically charging death. Running ahead. But maybe not in the sense of risking my life constantly. But deciding again and again to be brave, to "be true to myself." Which is an infinitely tangled thing, I confess. But let's not pretend that we have no idea what it means to conform as a coward as opposed to speak up for what is strange and unique and hopefully good in oneself.

–But you are not an evangelist.

–That's very true. So it's about beautiful friendship, if you can find it. I've had it in the past, but I'm more alone these days, except for my wife.

–Why?

–Time and chance. But also progress is alienating. If you get anywhere in the useless but beautiful world of philosophy, you become difficult to understand. I had a friend who couldn't follow me, and I started to think that he secretly was at least tempted to think that I was full of shit, lying to myself, etc.

–How are you sure that you are not ?

–Clear and distinct ideas. An ability to find one paraphrase after another. I can "see" the thought. But the good views require a dialectical climb.

–Still, you are reluctant to offer proofs.

–No. I’ve put it all out there over the years. I’ve left a trail of arguments and explanations. I’m getting old, and I’ve accept the fact that not everyone gets very far. There’s something uncanny and almost wicked in the real philosopher. And yes I take myself as a real philosopher, which doesn’t mean I’ve managed much yet beyond assimilation. But I’ve been set ablaze. I’m sick and in love with philosophy.

4

–You just mocked “the hard problem of consciousness” and denied the “transcendental ego.”

–Yeah. Clickbait maybe. I’m looking for a few who have seen something. I’m ambivalent about my methods. Reddit is disgusting in many ways.

–So you go too far ?

–What is the being of language ? Who is the who of everyday existence ? What does it mean to speak English ? To run around town in that semantic field ? The lifeworld includes a semantic field.

–So that’s the “transcendental ego” ?

–Someone might say something like that. We can’t (should not) get attached to terms. “Point out the fucking situation.” My phrases are trying to point out at that world we are in. Out from me. I am trying to universalize my window on the world. The essence of the world-for-me ought to be the world-for-us. The general structure of world-for. Of “experience”.

–Why the quotes ?

–Because I want to get beyond subjectivism. Phenomenology is ontology. It’s about the world. The real world is not hidden behind the lifeworld. The lifeworld is the real world. And in that lifeworld we have lots of weird ontological theories, some of them confused and absurd. The forum of the lifeworld is radically presupposed. That includes the “semantic field” of language and also the normativity of logic and selfhood.

–Can you prove these assertions ?

–It’s more about pointing at the situation. It’s about explicating or unfolding basic concepts. We already know this stuff in some sense,

but it's too close, too familiar.

–Heidegger.

–Sure. And Hegel and Wittgenstein. And those names deserve mention to the degree that they are resources for further research. But the claims are only “justified” by checking them, by wrestling with the task of explication. By suffering from confusion and working against it.

–And you've claimed that philosophers are hypersensitive.

–Yes. More annoyed than most by plot holes, more delighted than most by coherence and efficiency in narratives.