

“Truths” are the beliefs of the *ideal* (optimal) believer.

The “truth” is reality as *God* understands or thinks it.

Truth, as opposed to merely warranted and fallible belief, is a *theological* notion.

The thing-in-itself is the thing-for-God.

Naive physicalism is (tacitly) “theological.”

This “God” is a “flight” from the threat of an otherwise unlimited perspectivism which is not merely epistemic but ontological. Without “objects as understood and pre-articulated by God”, we have only a *plurality* of articulations, one for each “subject” or embedded believer. We have, for instance, the world as I make sense of it and the world as you make sense of it.

What is “given” or *tacitly presupposed* by scientific conversation is only world-from-perspective, along with the project of *constructing* an *approximation* of the **ideal believer** via construction of an ideal set of properly (ideally) “scientific” beliefs.

The scientific personality strives to *become* this ideal believer through a second-order tradition of that extends and purifies belief through an open, creative, self-explicating, and self-critical conversation.

Here I use “belief” as the articulation or intelligible structure of world-from-perspective. For some, the correspondence theory of truth (tacitly) postulates

the possibility of a correspondence of actual belief with ideal belief. But this is typically disavowed, and the “theological” basis is obscured. This is managed through the vague presupposition that an External reality is *already* in the form of thought or belief. The external objects are already perfectly definite, as if a “reality beyond consciousness” (and therefore beyond thought) was already sliced up in just the way that belief “happens” to “slice up” or “articulate” the world. In other words, we find a tacit equation of thought and being, right where we *also* find an insistence of a “pure” thought-independent “true” being.

The point is not that reality is only given in a system of bubbles of consciousness that are structured by “internal” thought. Indeed, it is just this secret premise of physicalism that is rejected here. *Consciousness does not exist.* “Thought” is not “psychological” or “internal.” Belief is the structure of world-from-perspective. The subject is emptied, turned inside out.

We have the same world from many “points of view.” We can understand the “objective world”, soberly and without mystification, as the vague goal of inquiry. In other words, the goal is to be less stupid. We strive to be less stupid personally through an open conversation others, in which we expose ourselves to instruction and criticism. Belief remains local and personal despite this.

The scientific image is a theological notion. Do we believe that all scientists have the same beliefs ? Of course we expect overlap, but *the* scientific image is

not the belief system of an actual embedded “subject.”