If it is true that clear and straightforward writing is “the honesty of the philosopher”, then Michel Bitbol is certainly one of the most honest philosophers of science I have ever read. His writing stays away from metaphors and seductive images, without ambiguity either in the words or in the turns of phrase, preferring the right word - see repetition - to elegance, taking care not to exclude any reader by insufficiently explicited references. His articles show that he obeys the requirement to "do his job well" as a philosopher: to carry out information work, so as to facilitate access to the most difficult questions (and the philosophy of quantum mechanics is one of more arduous). In doing so he also shows us, by example, the right way to tackle problems, to delve deeper into them and to obtain a better understanding.

We will take here as a reference the article by Michel Bitbol: A phenomenology of identity - QBism and quantum (non-)particles (Ref MB-PI)

In this article Michel Bitbol...

...advocates a strategy, which consists in going below the level of logic and set theory to inquire how their categories are generated in the experience and activity of knowing subjects, and whether this mode of category generation is still relevant in the field of experimental quantum physics. This project of a “genealogy of logic” is borrowed from Husserl’s last treatise, entitled Experience and Judgment. It is applied to the case of quantum physics through a QBist approach to Mott’s theorization of quasi-“trajectories” in Wilson cloud chambers. It is also shown that one of the most appropriate ontologies for quantum objects or quasi-objects is to reverse the (grammatical) roles of subject and predicate, as advocated by the Japanese philosopher Nishida Kitarô in reasonable agreement with both Schrödinger’s and Krause’s approaches to the concept of “particle”. (extract from abstract)

The writing of this article is so clear, everything is so necessary that it would seem counterproductive to draw a summary from it. I simply recommend reading this article before reading mine. The benefit will be well worth the effort.

My article does not aim to explain or contest what Michel Bitbol writes. The clarity of his text allows us to understand the theories to which he refers and to grasp the evolution of the concept of "object" from Husserl to QBism.... but this clarity also reveals, by contrast, some shadows. The following article will attempt to highlight four questions which, in my opinion, are left unanswered (or poorly resolved) by QBism and to show the answers that the Ontology of Knowledge (OK) can provide.

The subject QBism vs OK is covered in much more detail in my article (ref RQOC) which I also recommend reading.

Let us first note that the objectives of QBism and OK are different:
- Qbism aims to resolve the difficulties of interpreting quantum theory while OK attempts to understand the relationship of consciousness to the world it represents.
- Qbism has science as its domain and uses ontology to give it rational meaning whereas OK is an ontology which tests its compatibility with science as a validation means.
The four questions to QBism:

● The rejection by phenomenology as by QBism of the object in itself, individuated and persistent, necessarily raises the question of the nature of the subject itself.

The sentence below (ref MB-PI), shows this ambiguity:

“Pre-predicative experience thus associates a variety of presentations and sensuous contents whose only initial unity is established by their being recollected by the knowing ego,...”

So what is this knowing ego? and if its persistent unity is the condition of possibility of all knowledge * how does it enjoy such an *a priori* unity? (* cf the Kantian concept of transcendental apperception (ref CRP)

It would indeed be incoherent to conceive of the subject (or the agent) as having in itself the properties of individuation and persistence that we deny to the object. The subject is real, his thought is real. The knowing subject is not a container having a reality different from what it contains. At the most elementary level of understanding, what the subject knows is the subject and becomes of the same becoming as the subject.

To be complete, an ontology based on the principles of QBism must therefore explain how the subject comes to exist, individuated and persistent, for itself.

● Let us also note a certain confusion between “what the concept says” (its meaning) and “what it is”: (its reality before having meaning). If the concept for what it says can be the concept “of something,” the concept for what it is cannot be “something” individuated and persistent.

It is at the ontological level that we study the subject's thinking, so it is not consistent to make him combine (even in the subject's unconscious) what the concepts say. It is in what they are that concepts combine and construct meaning.

It is obvious that the concepts for what they are do not have the attributes of existing, they are not disjoint, non-contradictory, present, localized, ordered, etc... Likewise the relation A→B between the concepts of objects A and B does not have, for what it is, the attributes that we associate to this relationship for what it says. The reality of relationship between A and B is not this pretty arrow that we have become accustomed to.

Although the meaning of the concept emerges from a reality, the concept for what it is is not “meaning” and it is not at the level of meaning that concepts combine. Meaning is not founded on a sayable reality.

The mind is neither a 'container' (existing, individuated) nor a 'processor' of meaning, meaning does not 'circulate' in the mind, it emerges from it.

The ego is reality before it takes on the meaning of "I become myself" and it would be incoherent for a QBist to claim that the reality of the ego has the attributes of the experienced ego, in particular that it is located in the brain or the body or the world, or in the present moment that the subject represents.

We need to understand from what common reality world, mind and meaning emerge.

● The concept of probabilistic expectation, fundamental for the QBist, must be redefined in its essence.

Under penalty of inconsistency, the QBist cannot base *a priori* probabilistic expectation on the attributes of things that would exist prior to experience, nor connect it to the thought ( expectation, hope, betting or any related concept) even unconscious of an Agent *a priori* individuated and becoming.

Probabilistic deduction and induction do not have to be founded *a priori* on a causal reality, itself unfounded. The attachment of probabilistic expectation to facts of the world is not in its essence. The Agent is not a simple witness to the relationship of what she knows to what is possible, this relationship constitutes the Agent. The knowing subject is not “a mind that bets on possibilities”,

the knowing subject is knowledge and the reality of this knowledge is probabilistic expectation. From probabilistic expectation we must put aside worldly interpretation and only consider the mathematical fact and try to understand how the knowing subject emerges from it and how the meaning of the world emerges from it.

- If the object of physics is a construction by the subject from concepts that are neither present nor ordered, changes in this object are also a construction. How then can we justify the assertion that the time which, in representation, animates the world, also animates the prior reality from which this representation emerges?

Should we not consider a reality not subject to time and representation as an “animated affect* of immobile reality” (*in the Spinozian sense), as a wave of meaning animated by its own nature?

The four questions to QBism are therefore:
- How does the subject come to exist for itself, individuated and persistent?
- From what common reality do world, mind, and meaning emerge?
- How does meaning emerge from the mathematical fact of probabilistic expectation?
- Is meaning animated by its own nature?

The answers proposed by the Ontology of Knowledge (OK):

The OK does not claim to expose the truth of reality but only to propose a coherent model of representation according to which:
- Reality is subject neither to form nor to time.
- The Knowing Subject is a wave of meaning riding through immobile reality.

As an introduction, the reader will find below a very brief summary of the basics of the OK:

Summary of the OK:
Let's start with a simple heuristic model: that of a purely logical structure of links between elements with more than two links per element.
On a large scale, the abundance of links in this structure is such that it would be impossible to ordain the elements in a space regardless of its number of dimensions. Such a structure would in itself be unspeakable.
Let us call “ordering modes” all the possible ways to follow the links, without excluding the superposition of ordering modes.
OK postulates that among these complex ordering modes there necessarily exist some which present a statistical equilibrium between expansion and contraction of complexity. Equilibrium occurs simply because its probability increases with complexity. This probabilistic equilibrium must therefore necessarily “be the case” for infinitely many ordering modes.
The OK calls this case an Individuation.
The Shannon entropy of such an ordering mode is zero by definition.
An Individuation therefore merges the complexity that constitutes it into a simple information digit E carried by a one-dimensional link.
The information carried is written: conditionnal probability of E “knowing” E =1 (Pr(E|E)=1) and expresses a One and persistent necessity.

Note:
The term individuation characterizes the ordering modality and not what is ordered which remains unspeakable.
Although we use to represent the logical relationship of existence as a space-time line the term “one-dimensional link” must be considered in a purely logical sense of One to One relationship and not in a geometric sense. Likewise the logical concept of "continuity"
means that between the experience of E and the experience of E the experience of E is possible but not that E would be endowed in itself with a continuous existence (we will come back on this).

Reality is unfounded:
An Individuation associates a persistent statistical singularity with a complex unfounded set of relationships. This set is always “separable” into component individuations and can always “merge” with others into a compound individuation. It is not possible to enumerate the components of an individuation nor the compounds to which it contributes.

The non-foundation of the real.
That the world ceaselessly comes to exist for us, emerging from the horizon of meaning with the meaning (the forms) given to it by our extensional multiplicity, leads us to believe that what is still beyond the horizon of meaning, what does not exist yet (or no longer) for us because it is "future", "past", "too far away", "too small", "too complex", etc... the intensional inaccessible to our immediate understanding, is nevertheless governed by these same laws of our multiplicity.

The laws of what makes sense to us appear to us as Universal laws.
Our present representation projects, beyond what exists for us, present and certain, beyond the horizon of meaning, a universe of possibilities, a universe of possible meanings a priori conforming to the laws of the existing universe imposed on us by our multiplicity.
We think that what is only possible is nevertheless possible in space-time and according to the different structures of meaning. We draw a possible future, immediate or distant, a possible interior, a possible causal explanation, all images conforming to the strict formal rules of our multiplicity and which we would not even be able to think outside of these rules.

NB: We know, however, that the possible does not respect the rule of non-contradiction which is at the basis of our representation of the existing.

The intensional, beyond the horizon of meaning, that which does not yet have meaning and from which meaning must emerge, has no a priori reason to conform to our multiplicities.
The fact that we have been able, at every lived moment and throughout the millennia, to always push back the horizon of meaning in order to enlarge the extensional representation and explanation of the world, has anchored in us the opinion that the horizon of meaning is only a veil that separates the known (the extensional) from an unknown (the intensional) that are formally similar.
It is not so: what is beyond the horizon of meaning simply does not make sense.

The disjunction between Individualations would be unprovable.
Non-foundation implies that the relation A=A is unprovable

Reality is not substantial:
By a probabilistic necessity, complexity generates One and persistent singularities which are its own “objects”. We can then abandon the “substantial object” element of the initial heuristic model and replace it with Individuation: persistent statistical singularity which does not have the attributes of a substance element (locality, disjunction, etc.).

Note: Here is undoubtedly the conceptual « revolution » proposed by the OK: probabilistic expectation must no longer be considered as an analytical tool for the use of the mind, concerning relations of interdependence in the substantial world, but as the very essence of reality.
We must abandon the substantial nature of reality and consider a purely relational nature. Reality is made up of probability relations between unfounded relational singularities.
OK shows that this paradigm shift makes it possible to merge the world and the mind into a single essence; thus completing the Kantian revolution.
The quantum mechanics “phenomenon” and the Agent’s “gambles” are one and the same reality.
The (transcendental) subject is an Individuation among possible Individuations. The information it carries is the Existence of the subject: $\text{Pr}(E|E)=1$.

Note: The expression $(\text{Pr}(E|E)=1)$ is that of a virtual third party perspective, the philosopher's perspective. Speaking in the name of the subject itself, from the inside one could say, the expression will be $(\text{Pr}(Je|Je)=1)$. It then denotes a necessity.

This information is not a “thought” of the subject but a fact of probability. It is not the state of something but a singular relationship between probability facts. The transcendental subject does not designate what we call the spiritual or corporeal envelope of the subject but an ordering mode of reality, without topological limit and not subject to time.

Individuation $(I)$, being unfounded, it also separates into possible component Individuations $X$ $(\text{pr}(X|X)=1)$. Since separation does not imply disjunction, there are infinity of infinities of “possible modes of separation” which we will call “representations”.

A necessity (individuation) can be fulfilled according to an infinity of infinities of contingent paths and this non-calculability is essential.

The representations are $a$ $priori$ constrained by the necessary fact that they participate in the unity and continuity of the $Je$ $(\text{pr}(Je|Je)=1)$ and this infinitely, from separation to separation, from compound to components:

- The Individuations of the $X$s composing a representation eventually merge into the One Existence of the subject.
- The continuity of the $Je$ imposes a law of probability distribution on the possible modes of separation of any $X$ “knowing” $Je$.
- The meaning of $X$ for $Je$ is this law of distribution. It is the law of probability distribution over all possible modes for $X$ to contribute to $Je$, knowing that if $X$ exists for $Je$ then $(\text{Pr}(X|Je)=1)$, that is to say, all these (contingents) possibilities merge into the necessity for the subject to “become him/her.self.”

In the transcendental subject, the relation $(\text{pr}(Je|Je)=1)$ splits into a structure of probabilities over all possible $X$s “knowing” $Je$: $(\text{pr}(X|Je)>0)$.

The possible $X$s are themselves singularities, attractors of meaning. The meaning of a representation is the law of probability on the representations that it makes possible. Not as a thought but as a probabilistic fact.

This structure of probabilistic expectations animates meaning and representation in a continuous and irreversible way.

The representation therefore takes the form of a wave of meaning which expands according to a law of probabilistic expectations and contracts under the necessity of the individuation of the transcendental subject.

This wave of meaning is the knowing subject.

On a philosophical level:
- Meaning is not data for thought but the very principle of thought.
- Contrary to the laws of the world which would determine the change of meaning in a prior time, the individuation of the subject induces meaning and its changes by a necessity out of time.
- A representation of the Existing is a law of probabilistic expectations on possibles which globally preserves the unity, coherence and continuity of the knowing subject and his representations. This law of representation is inductive, it is idoneous because it is constrained by the prior necessity for the subject to “become oneself”.

The possible objects of expectation are the concepts, they act as attractors of meaning « from a present representation ».

The field of concepts and their interdependence is the subject's multiplicity.

The multiplicity rules idoneously the emergence of meaning because it is constrained by the prior necessity for the subject to “become oneself”.

Although the meaning is constrained by the necessity \( \text{pr}(\text{Je}|\text{Je})=1 \), its probabilistic and unfounded nature allows this necessity to be fulfilled according to an infinity of infinities of possible modes. Some of the possibilities come to Existence \( (\text{pr}(X|\text{Je}) \to 1) \) and so on. For the knowing subject what Exists is certain, present (in the representation), necessary and non-contradictory, the possible is probable, out of time, contingent and possibly contradictory. The notion of concept is stated:

In the subject, what Exists (in the present) is possible (out of time).

The principle of causality is stated:

In the subject, what Exists (in the present) separates into possibles (out of time).

The statistical equilibrium (out of time) between expansion and contraction of complexity, which characterizes the transcendental subject, takes on the meaning for the knowing subject of a parametric law which is imposed on what Exists in the world and time represented. Starting with space-time parameters.

- The Individuation of the transcendental subject is not disjoint from the Individuation of other subjects and all participate in other "Individuations" which could be designated as Humanity, Languages, Cultures etc... The OK is therefore in no way idealistic or solipsistic.

The ideas presented in this summary are not justified. To learn more about the OK and its relationship to the representation of the world, it is recommended to read the refs OK, MOND, LOGEX Based on this summary we will nevertheless be able to answer the four questions.

**Answers to questions :**

Q: How does the subject come to exist for himself, individuated and persistent?

A: Reality is like a field of probabilistic interdependence (NB: the term field is misleading insofar as it presupposes a space), what M. Bitbol designates as the pre-individual background. Individuation in its principle is a necessary singularity. The attributes of individuality and persistence of the transcendental subject are therefore not determined by laws in time but induced by this necessity out of time. The reality of the transcendental subject, a probabilistic singularity, is out of time. The relation of Individuation \( (\text{pr}(\text{Je}|\text{Je})=1) \) strictly takes the meaning of "I exist, I become myself" in the knowing subject. In doing so, it passes from the status of truth out of time of a probabilistic singularity to the status of truth of the subject's knowledge in his present time. Note that this relation is not meaning "for the use of the knowing subject" it is the subject himself, at its first logical degree: the condition of possibility of all knowledge.

Q: From what common reality do world, mind and meaning emerge?

A: The world, the physical subject and his mind are meaning that emerges from the field of probabilistic interdependence, in the transcendental subject, under the constraint of its Individuation. The subject only knows of reality what participates in its individuation. There is not a physical world that the subject's mind would know, there is only the probabilistic singularity that is the individuation of the transcendental subject and the wave of meaning that runs through it that we call the knowing subject. The primary, containing meaning of all possible meanings is "I become myself." This primary meaning "separates" into the world, the physical subject, its knowledge. The distinction between the "Self" and the "non-Self" is a matter of second-degree probabilities: the Self is for the subject that which Exists and cannot not Exist.
Q: How does meaning emerge from the mathematical fact of probabilistic expectation?

A: The subject does not know “something” that is Other to him, he only knows himself. The subject “becomes” as the meaning becomes. What the meaning “says” is nothing other than what it “is.” Meaning is not data processed by the mind. The mind does not “think” meaning. Mind is meaning. Meaning is mind.

Facts of Knowledge have no proper meaning, no “internal” meaning. Meaning has neither content nor container. There is only extensional meaning. Meaning (and therefore the mind) is nothing other than the laws of probabilistic expectations which associate a fact of knowledge with the facts of knowledge that it makes possible, a concept with the concepts whose emergence it makes probable, the present representation to the representations that it makes possible. Neither sense nor mind have a state because they are probabilistic expectation. The present moment of representation is only present in the subject's consciousness to the extent that what it presents to him is certain: pr(X|Je)=1. Neither sense nor spirit has substance and is not attached to any substance. There is no substance.

Individuation (pr(Je|Je)=1) is a singular mode of order in reality. The mind of the knowing subject therefore finds not in itself but in reality the simple meaning of his existence which conditions all knowledge.

This simple digit meaning then separates into interdependent singular modes of orders from the field of possible concepts and their interdependencies (the subject's multiplicity). The concept is not in the memory of the knowing subject as an existing datum, always (more or less) available for the use of the understanding. The concept is due to the fact that "what is certain is possible"*: the certainty of X (as existing in the present), entails the possibility of X (as a concept out of space-time) and this possibility of X makes of X the possible object of probabilistic expectations associated with the Y to come.

* To provide an emphatic illustration of that: The once Existence of X (pr(X|Je)=1) makes of the meaning X an out-of-time connection towards the meaning of the subject's Existence (pr(Je|Je)=1). Then this connection is a possible way to the Existence of any Y probabilistically related to X.

This probability relation is the meaning and the complex field of these relations is the mind of the subject. It does not need to be attached to any substance.

It is the principle of individuation which makes speakable the unspeakable, by aggregating the “infinitely improbable facts” which constitute reality, in the form of possible singularities which are concepts.

Q: Is meaning animated by its own nature while reality is not subject to time?

A: The image of a wave traveling across the surface of a still ocean should be enough to answer this question. To do this, we must understand that probabilistic induction is a mathematical fact and get rid of the idea that it is based on material facts. Reality being unfounded, it is vain to seek a proper meaning for the concept; there is only an extensional meaning. Meaning is none other than the relationship of the certain (meaning) to the probable (meanings).

This essential relationship of the certain (known, present) to the probable, stripped of its material prejudice, is formally the logical equation of a wave which animates meaning under the constraint of the necessity of “I become myself”:

The present meanings induce possible meanings, concepts (Pr(Y|Je)> 0) according to a law
of probabilistic induction.
The field of all possible meanings resulting from all present meanings necessarily aggregate into singularities that are certain, defining another present.
The present meanings of these new Existings induce other possible meanings, etc.
Probabilistic induction is irreversible.
The knowing subject is indeed a “wave of meaning” which irreversibly travels through the transcendental subject, a singular mode of order of a reality not subject to change.

Conclusion:

As far as my knowledge allows me to speak about QBism, the OK and the answers above do not call into question its specific explanation of Quantum mechanics.
These four responses rather consolidate the foundations of QBism by providing a rational response to the immanence of the knowing subject and his "hopes", to the subjectivity of all representation and to the non-substantiality of the object.

Note: On the other hand, the OK shows that time and space are not 'per se' but emerge with meaning. As meaning, their representation must necessarily conform to the constraint of Individuation of the knowing subject and to the concept of non-foundation; which calls into question (among other things) the notions of infinity and continuity.
In the eyes of QBism, the “conceptual revolution” proposed by the OK is not really revolutionary: for the QBist already, the world represented is relative to the subject who represents and the object is not “substance”.
In fact, this “conceptual revolution” imposes itself more widely on Western culture whose representation of “reality” has until now remained underpinned by a mind-matter dichotomy whose limits E. Schrödinger had sensed.
Can we accept the immanence of spirit without falling into the error of believing in the transcendance of matter?

Note on Ontic Structural Realism:
The ontic version of structural realism (OSR) proposes to abandon not only the intrinsic predicable of being « one cannot know being » but also being itself “there is no being”. The OK takes up this proposal.
The OK, like OSR and QBism, denies the object any ontic reality and, in its model, puts the relationship of interdependence at the forefront.
But the OK differs from the OSR precisely in that the relationship of interdependence, the structure of interdependencies, has no more ontic reality than the object, it is an unfounded probabilistic singularity which has only extensional meaning, in its contribution to other probabilistic singularities.
Structures are only probabilities that cannot be disjoint.
And as we have seen, the knowing subject does not witness the world he knows, he is the world he knows.

Note on the idoneity of the agent's presuppositions:
We will use the extract below from ref MB-PI page 23 to show how the OK accounts for the fact that the agent's presuppositions come true and for the phenomenon of collapse of the \( \Psi \)-function

But then, what is the connection between this way of understanding the quantum formalism and the observed tracks, namely the observed particle-like appearances of water droplets trails in a cloud chamber? Since this connection is not one of description, it must be one of presupposition. Even though a \( \Psi \)-function does not describe the features of a “real”
particle, its variables are the coordinates of a model-system previously composed (in the agent’s mind) of a model particle plus a model-set of ionizable atoms. Inserting these coordinates in the argument of the \( \Psi \)-function associated with the cloud chamber, is a way to mentally presuppose that a persistent particle may ionize atoms there. And submitting this \( \Psi \)-function to evolution through a Schrödinger’s equation whose Hamiltonian depends on particles and fields variables, is a way to mentally presuppose that this particle moves in a certain energy (or potential) landscape. Then, the probabilities calculated by applying the Born rule to this time-evolved \( \Psi \)-function show the distribution of events that can be expected when this highly elaborated presupposition is made.

At the end of the process, the observed phenomena are compared to such expectations, thus enabling one to test the presupposition. But what is remarkable in the quantum paradigm is that, since the agent’s expectations of particle-like behavior of finite sequences of phenomena are purely probabilistic, testing them in various experimental contexts may yield a continuous scale of agreement ranging from strict agreement to complete disagreement. Even in a particle-presupposition-friendly experimental context like the cloud chamber, the outcome is not entirely in favor of the persistent particle model, since the sequence of ionized atoms and droplets is discontinuous, and these droplets are not perfectly aligned. This is why quantum phenomena can never be anticipated under the presupposition of a single model (such as the model of persistent particles), but only under the presupposition of a mix of mutually exclusive models (such as Goyal’s models of persistence and non-persistence).

According to the OK, the Agent's mind is constrained by the necessity of becoming-onceself, which is the condition of possibility of all meaning. The presupposition that she “becomes herself” is in Alice and realizes with certainty and this certainty constrains, on the scale of very large numbers of iterations, all the other presuppositions she can make.

In the same way: in the casino at the roulette table, the presupposition “I am ruined” constrains Alice, on the scale of the very large numbers of throws, and the bets that Alice can make on her immediate probabilities of winning.

The self-becoming of the transcendental subject is a mathematical fact and is not subject to the time which accompanies the emergence of meaning for the knowing subject. Becoming oneself is for the subject forever, a “prior” truth to any possible truth.

The agent's presuppositions about a phenomenon emerge from these conditions of possibility, from the multiplicity of possible meaning attractors, from the agent's model-system as designated in the extract above, and not from the phenomenon considered in isolation, in itself.

The necessity of Alice's ruin is not determined by the throws considered in themselves but induced by a "rule of the game": the fact that only 36 squares can win out of 37 possible, a "condition of possibility", not subject to the time which makes the throws follow one another.

The presuppositions of the agent and their idoneity are induced by the “prior” necessity of self-becoming and not deduced from laws of the world.

Becoming-oneiself is not continuous in reality. The relation of Je to Je is not something that could be continuous because Je is an unfounded meaning. The relation of Je to Je: \( \text{pr}(\text{Je}|\text{Je})=1 \), is a judgment of necessity. Only the meaning appears continuous to the subject because it is the certainty of the experience of himself.

Here we find again the remark on non-foundation: We want to believe that what is between the meaning of Je and the meaning of Je, although it is beyond the horizon of meaning, would nevertheless be con-form with what has meaning for us. Nothing justifies this interpolation.

Likewise the existence of the object X existing for the agent is not a continuum in itself. It is certain for the agent that an experience of himself will contain the experience of X: \( \text{pr}(\text{X}|\text{Je})=1 \), the experience of himself knowing X.

The paths to fulfilling the necessity from X to X are infinitely contingent (they are even unfounded)
and remain so until an experience (a macroscopic bubble in the bubble chamber) makes a new X to Exist as {certain, present, necessary and non-contradictory}.

Between the experience of X and the experience of X there is no meaning Existing but only an unfounded field of meanings that are {possible, out of time, contingent and possibly contradictory}

Thus the “new” experience that the Agent makes of X does not trigger the « collapse » of multiple Existences but gives the meaning of Existing to one among the possibles, makes it to Exist as necessary to her own Existence and therefore as non-contradictory.

The multiplicity of conditions of possibility in the subject is a field of interdependent meaning attractors of extraordinary complexity. As a result, the relevance of presuppositions on the macroscopic scale is extraordinarily resilient.

Let us remember that the concepts and their interdependencies which populate the multiplicity of the subject are unfounded.
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