

On Schrimppff's foolosophy, as requestified : He understands objects as idea-fused systems of faces or aspects. He doesn't hide that this is from Husserl, Sartre, etc. But Sartre doesn't do much with it. Husserl doesn't focus on it. Schrimppff puts this notion of the object at the center of what he's lately calling "ontocubism."

Schrimppff also emphasizes the value/relevance/breakthrough of **phenomenalism**, as in Mill, Mach, James, Ayer, etc. Along with this, he celebrates logical positivism. Of course he's invested in phenomenology too. But his style is "sober" and demystifying. As in does not indulge in terminological gymnastics. Maybe to his detriment, in terms of shifting units or generating mystique. He's strongly influenced by Heidegger but is refreshingly free of the usual fanboy jargonmongering.

I know that inflated language irritates you, so I stress this point. And this is why I mentioned Schrimppff in the first place. Schrimppff is not original in terms of content. But I'm amused by the curation, by what he emphasizes and by what he leaves out.

For instance, he leaves out politics. If you dig a little, you can surmise that he's privately some kind of ironic pessimist. I see him as someone who sees himself as sober among the drunks. Consider Sartre and Heidegger and Derrida (all influences on Schrimppff's work). They are each to some degree cartoons who represent this or that political folly. Left wing, right wing, broken wing. Culture war stuff.

Schrimppff also leaves out mysticism, refuses to put phenomenology on spiritual stilts. Has a YouTube channel but has not yet sold out to culture war or consciousness mysticism. But (one can deduce) he is interested in gnosticism, writers like Campbell and Jung. I think I detect a conscious decision to focus on a "dry" topic like the object as ideal manifold. Like phenomenalism as a solution to the thorny mind-matter issue. "Math" he calls it.

He likes early Derrida on the issue of meaning and voice and phonocentrism. Celebrates Saussure as underrated. Claims (somewhat playfully) that esoteric Plato was already basically Derrida.

As in the unwritten doctrine was a theory of the utter confusion or entanglement of ideal discrete concept and basically a sensory continuum. This, for him, is prior to subjects. Subjects “fall out” of a “constituting ideality.”

He becomes abrasively rationalistic (for imagined consumers seeking sci-fi) in his theory of The Forum. Basically a soft foundationalism. The space of reasons. You can find something like this in Karl-Otto Apel. Also in James. Dramaturgical ontology. The forum is a stage is the scientific horizon. Not really new but **emphasized**. As a pretty decisive attack on the false humility of Kantian what-not.

The “problem” is the common sense of it all. The phenomenism is somewhat daring in *our* age, I guess. But he offers a sober “lifeworld realism.” Which is something like a theoretical appropriation of the way we live. He says he does “explicative philosophy.” He explores what science *takes for granted*. Its enabling conditions. Our ability to talk about the same objects which appear to each of us different at different times.

I’m a little unfair here. He does explicitly reject consciousness. He is also extreme on the redundancy theory of truth. He rejects it altogether. Associates this with an unmitigated perspectivism. Monads basically. But, following Heidegger, the monads aren’t windowless but instead “all window.” In other words, a stream of “phenomenal consciousness” is a piece of reality itself. The world is “made of” or the “system” of such pieces. Which he finds *implied* by Mach, Mill, James, and Ayer. I agree on this point. Phenomenalism implies that the world is basically a plurality of streams. He doesn’t dance around an outright denial of an aperspectival reality as nonsense or mystification. Put all of this together, and he is somewhat radical against a background of scientistic types who take the hard problem of consciousness for granted as deep and genuine.

A weird fusion. Perspectivism as phenomenism and also a rationalistic anti-skeptical insistence on the forum as the set of conditions for the possibility of warranted belief. So, yeah, that

squares with what I know of the logical positivists. Sober and skeptical and rational and “boring.” Yet so anti-metaphysical that they questioned the physical in the metaphysical sense. The hidden real world. The obscure substratum, out of which “consciousness” somehow emerged.

Schrimppff addresses ancestral objects with inferentialism. Statements about the past are empirical and meaningful through their implications for the present and future. So the physical is still understood in terms of possible perceptual or sensory presence.

Who will object ? Well the consciousness crowd will resent the denial of consciousness. Not seeing probably that Schrimppff saves the lifeworld (perhaps his primary motive, a distaste with alienating insincere metaphysics.) The typical scientistic physicalist will be annoyed to see their truly real physicality splintered into “faces” of an “ideal manifold.” The limp anything-goes type will resent the persistence of the scientific spirit in Schrimppff’s work. Which is arguably built on the concept of philosophy as the search for more warranted and adequate beliefs. In short, his anti-skepticism shines a light on what he calls their persona incoherence. The performative contradiction, for instance, of their arguing against logic, etc.

You can probably guess which 15% of Schrimppff’s philosophy that I would challenge. I won’t get into that here. I do share what I sniff out as his pessimism. Stanley Fish talks about the uselessness of this kind of philosophy. I basically agree. But I like it anyone. This strange form of art. Rational, explicative philosophy is a strange product for a strange consumer. I could probably sip bourbon with Schrimppff. Because I wouldn’t be given spiritual or political lectures. We’d focus on the neutral gray ideas with our scalpels. We’d laugh at ourselves for spending so much time on sharing our creations in a world that is so drunk on tribal identity, mystification, etc. Wallow in our logical purity, pigs in the same sty.