

ONTOCUBISM : 16 FEB 2025

The eye of the beholder is in the beauty of the thing. Turn the subject inside out like an old sock. Dasein, as existent rather than extant, is disclosure — is time as “horizontal” (partial) presence.

How do we achieve the concept of *is-ness* in the first place ? How do we “achieve” the recognition of the ontological difference ? Being/idea and time. Being is ideal. Which is to say “given” through “ideas.” But I do *not* mean ideas in a psychological sense. You might say that “container subjects” were an attempt to account for this “pre-psychological ideality.”

Harman corrects Heidegger when he says that each entity has its *own* “earth” or “horizon.” (I am paraphrasing.) That’s when I began to feel that I agreed with him. The *individual object* has a *unique* “horizon” — because that object is a manifold. Its “manifoldness” is its “horizontality.”

Interjection : What I mean by all this jargon is something so familiar, so mundane. “A thing of this world.” *Between* us. Not inside us as unreal representation. Perception is not representation but manifestation. What follows from this declaration of the reality of the “appearance” ? What must objects be to be genuinely present ?

What of objects that existed before life as we understand it ? How did mountains exist in age without “sentience” ? For me there is no “sentience” as some other kind of stuff. “Sentience” is attempt to speak about the presence of entities. Now we can ask about the presence of mountains before presence. Which is absurd. But we do have radiocarbon dating. We project behind us a past that precedes this projection. We try to.

I argue that we can only give meaning to these Ancient objects in terms of conditional assertions. If one *could* go back in time, then one *would* perceive the mountain. What other meaning can be given ? Well one can draw inferences about the future from this projection into the past. Indeed, that’s how we’d test such retro-projections.

So *After Finitude’s* point *cuts both ways*. If only mathematizable qualities are real, that’s just the tacit equation of thought and being. Ontocubism just stops trying to run from this equation. To speak or intend the object involves some kind of “ideality,” for lick of a butter word.