

Is Ontology of Knowledge a solipsism?

Introduction

The Ontology of Knowledge (OK) states:

-The world as a Knowledge, set by the principle of the Logos is infinitely more persistent than the world as an event regulated by the laws of physics.

To eventually state:

-The world is the act of understanding my knowledge. (ref OdC)

These propositions seem to place the world within Knowledge, or at least they seem to make of Knowledge, the substance from which the subject gives rise for himself to a representation of the world and himself.

The OK is realistic in that it states that there is a reality, but it also states clearly that the **Reality is informal** and that **there is no being in reality**, no other beings than those created by the subject in representation.

That justifies the title of this article: Would the knowing subject be, in fact, the only being in the world, all other beings being only his representation?

While the Cogito guarantees the Existence of the "I" that enunciates it, is there no other Me than this "I"?

As much as our mind can consent to the idea that objects and material facts are only representations, including the atoms of our own body, it seems absurd to us, paradoxical, contrary to the evidence of every moment, the idea that "I" would be the one and only knowing subject.

The first part of this article proposes, by a clarification of concepts and terms, to answer specifically to the question of the existence of other "I's"

The second part will try to widen the spectrum of our reflection to study, within the conceptual framework of the OK, the possibility of a supra-human thought/knowledge.

Are there others "I's" ?

Before attempting an answer this question, we need to clarify some terms used by the OK.

A **Knowledge** is a set of Interdependencies stemming from a **Point of View**. Nothing psychological or electro-chemical.

The Logos (principle of creation of meaning) aggregates Knowledge into singularities or **Facts of Knowledge**.

The **Point of View** is the virtual focal point of this aggregation.

The point of view is also the asymptote of the individuation of the knowing **subject**.

Each Fact of Knowledge appears circumscribed by a **cut**. The cut is the place of the **Act** by which appears the **Meaning** of the Fact of Knowledge.

To **Exist** is nothing else but "to be represented by-" or "to have Meaning for the conscience / subject".

To Exist is not an universal truth but relative to the subject.

The Meaning of a Fact of Knowledge is a law of probability on the Facts of knowledge it makes possible.

This too brief introduction can be completed by reading the introduction to Ontology of Knowledge (Ref OdC).

The vocabulary being fixed, we can distinguish 3 levels in the concept of the "self":

1- My Knowledge, which is the set of Interdependencies stemming from my Point of View. It is also my thought/object. My Knowledge, my thought/object is infinite, unfounded and therefore unknowable as such.

2- My present representation of the world, with me in the middle. All this appears to me in the form of Facts of Knowledge whose cuts present the Meaning. Among these facts there is the one whose cut presents the conscious thought or thought/subject. The thought/subject presents to me the world of common sense and science. It is to the thought/subject that events, beings and laws appear.

3- The "I" is the virtual asymptote of the individuation of the knowing subject. The "I" is (for himself) that point towards which seem to converge all the determinations coming from the world which is presented to us, it is also this common becoming around which spiral all the microscopic processes of our physical body, it is also the common subject of all our conscious thoughts.

The example of a drawing in perspective makes it possible to illustrate the virtuality of the "I".

In a painting, the rules of perspective define the virtual position of a point of view, in a virtual geometry, so virtual that the point of view seems to be outside the materiality of the painting.

In reality, the position of the point of view results from a set of rules applied to each Fact of the drawing in its relation to all other facts.

The point of view is unique, even if the image seems to allow other points of view. Even if in the painting there may be other Facts (characters represented) that also seem to have a point of view on the object of the painting, there is only one perspective, one order and this order is relative to a point of view that is defined by the whole painting.

In a perspective drawing, it is impossible to place a "Fact" at the virtual point of view.

Everything is Fact in the drawing, but the point of view, although determined by the Facts in the drawing, is not a Fact. It is a rule, a meta-Fact of judgment, not on the Facts of the drawing, but on relations between the Facts of the drawing.

The "I" is the unique point of view in relation to which the representation is ordained.

Note: In this example, it is also remarkable that the disposition of the Facts that appears to the thought/subject emerges from a global rule on the entire chart and not just sensations of individual positions of objective Facts. Space is not solved by a juxtaposition of individual positions, but requires a prior meta-judgment on the entire picture from which the aperception of positions will emerge.

Having shown the uniqueness and virtuality of the "I", let's see how "I" Exist for myself.

The world, the physical self, my thoughts Exist for my consciousness/subject in the form of a representation that is relative to me.

Meaning is revealed by the replacement of the unfathomable, formless, unspeakable reality of the Fact (what the OK calls its In-Act) by laws of probability on what future Facts it makes possible.

Meaning does not present to me what the Fact is, its deep reality, but what I can expect of it.

Thus, my self that Exists for me is not "something" but the meaning of a Fact of knowledge, of an unfounded structure.

What appears to me from this self is a set of probability laws extracted from an unfathomable and formless reality.

The reality of this self does not Exist for me. Certainly an infinity of infinites of meanings are actual but they do not Exist for me.

There is between the reality of the self and what appears to me as me/subject an incommensurable relation. We are far beyond the psychological notion of the unconscious.

Note: The need for the thought / subject to represent itself in the form of Probability is the very essence of its Anima, of its contingent dynamics, of the necessary run ahead of the present of the representation.

So if this "Myself" that exists for me is not "something", the "others" that exist for me are not more "something"

For the OK, in my representation of the world, others "subjects" exist in the same terms as exist the "me/subject". I only know their Meaning as it appears to me on the cut-surface of the Fact of Knowledge that encloses them. Their reality is unknowable to me.

Qualitatively, I see little more of my thought/subject than the thought/subject of others. My thought is only the experience I have of my thought.

The means of experience of my thought seem to me quantitatively more extensive than the means of experience of the thought of others, we have shown (app V of the article Ref MAT) that “ *the Existence of the world is included in the Existence of the subject of which the totality cannot exceed a mere certainty*”, in other words the totality of the Existence of all facts of my experience of the world, and a fortiori of all the other”subjects”, cannot exceed my own Existence.

If it is true that quantitatively the “I” subsumes the Existence of all other subjects, qualitatively the “I” remains in an unknowable relation with the unfathomable reality of my thought/object, of my Knowledge.

The perspective that separates the “I” from other "subjects" is no more distant than that which separates the “I” from the "me/subject".

Moreover, the means of experience of my thought/subject are the signs, inseparable union of the signified (the concept) and the signifier (the word). What is revealed to me from my thought/subject is thus structured by words, just as what is revealed to me from the thought of others.

On the other hand, "I" is the point of view of the perspective that I have of myself and others, in that they appear in my time, my space, my universe. "I" am the center, not by accident but by essence; because the Logos defines me as the sum and the center of all that Exists; and in this sense "I" can only be unique. If there are other centers they are in another world, they are the sum and center of another representation. In an unknowable relation to the world of which I am the sum and center.

In conclusion, having redefined the meaning of the term 'Exist' and having specified the 3 levels at which it is possible to consider the self, we find that for the OK:

- 1- the other "subjects" Exist quantitatively in the same terms as the "me /subject".
- 2- the "I" is only a virtuality, a meta-fact of my representation.
- 3- My reality is as unknowable to me as the reality of others.

In that sense, the OK is in no way a solipsism.

Is there a supra-human thought ?

We will show, by the example of language, that there is at least one thought (i.e. a knowledge) supra-human, a thought of Humanity.

In advance, it would be desirable to have read the article "The philosophy of language and the OdC" (ref: PdL)

F. de Saussure distinguished 'Language from Word'; N. Chomski distinguishes 'Competence from Performance' (Ref LDP); The OK distinguishes 'the In-Act from the Act'

These three distinctions are quite similar for what is their objects: the first term is more or less the timeless substance of meaning *, the set of conditions of possibility (of words and rules) of the discourse, and the second term describes the temporal transaction by which the discourse happens and by which its meaning is revealed.

* limited to the synchronic aspect of the language.

De Saussure also attributed to the word (the psychic image) the role of conventional signifier, inseparable from the concept (the signified) in the sign. Of what he deduced that *"there can be no thought without language"* and that *"Apart from its expression by words, our thought is only an amorphous and indistinct mass (...) taken in itself thought is like a nebula where nothing is necessarily delimited."*

By this postulate de Saussure refused to thought any prevalence on language. He showed that there can be no thought without language, that the word forms the thought as much as thought forms the word.

At all time scales of the living, language will have helped to develop thought just as much as thought has helped to develop language.

We must not limit language to the role of the expression mean of a thought already present.

It would also be wrong to limit speech to the act that "uses" an already structured language (words and syntax).

We saw in the preceding paragraph that the Act reveals the In-Act.

The In-Act of Signs and Rules is an infinite structure of interdependencies between concepts, of Facts and Meta-Facts.

The In-act of signs and rules does not exist for the speaker and the listener.

Speech is the Act by which this In-act comes to Exist for the speaker and the listener, in the form of words and instantiated application of the rules.

Each word is at the same time an instance of use of words and rules of language and a quantum of reinforcement of the attractivity of these words and these rules, of these facts of Knowledge.

It is also by speech that the language develops in the individual, by learning.

Each word helps to create language, individually and collectively.

The words, syntagms and sentences structure the timeless substance of language competence before letting the Meaning emerge from its performance in the moment.

We could just as well write:

The words, syntagms and sentences structure the timeless substance of the thought/object before letting the Meaning of Facts emerge in the present moment of the thought/subject.

If the words, syntagms and sentences are the instantiations that emerge from the language, they are also the preliminary imprints, the attractors that structure the perspective on the thought/object.

Whereas the reality of thought/object as of language is unfounded, unspeakable, nonsignificant, words are significant cuts because they are non-complex entities.

The structure of thought/object, as of language, is at the informal level whereas speech is at the formal, representable level.

Language and speech, signified and signifier, thought/object and thought/subject are not in the same space.

NB: This is why it is impossible to explain a concept with words; as impossible as filling a square with dots.

This similarity is more than formal, the language is part of the thought/object. Language has the same reality, made of interdependence, as thought/object, as Knowledge.

With the exception that if the thought/object, in the usual sense of the term, is structured, agglomerated into thought/subject and finally individuates into an "I", the language is structured, also aggregated into an extra thought. - or supra-individual thought and finally individuates in virtual Points of view that one could designate by the terms "cultures" or "humanity".

Through language, Humanity can speak in the first person.

Language (competence, the In-act) is not a simple substance (the words) or metasubstance (the rules of syntax), tool of interactions between individuated beings equipped with thought, it is not a product of individual thought, it is the structure of a supra-collective thought (note 1).

Thus, there is at least one Point of View, a subject, a collective thought.

If our representations seem so similar to us, it is because our thoughts take shape from the Facts of Knowledge made possible by speech. It is the acquired language/competence that allows us to attach a sound label to the concept to create the sign, to formulate our thought.

Language competence is the substance of a collective thought.

Language competence contains both the **Power** of Expansion of Collective Knowledge and the **Will** that directs it.

The word is the Act by which the Meaning of the collective thought is revealed and which creates the conditions of its structuration.

The "I" of this collective thought is the virtual asymptote towards which this structuration seems to converge.

It is the same with all the collective knowledge that is both created by thought and creative of thought (body language, arts, techniques, technologies, mathematics ..)

note 1: All grammatically possible sentences of language are actual; so much so that no one can say that such a sentence has never been pronounced (is it undecidable?)

Only the sentences that form in my mind, which I pronounce or hear, come to Exist for me.

They are then made possible (of non-zero probability to Exist) in my thought/object.

They have a non-zero probability of Existing in my Knowledge.

My language knowledge (my competence) 'com-prehend' a non-zero probability of this sentence.

The author:

Jean-Louis **Boucon**

E-mail : boucon.jean-louis@neuf.fr

Blog : <http://jlboucon-philosophy.over-blog.com/>

Références :

- Ref LDP: Le discours politique
L Guespin, JB Marcellesi, D Maldidier, S Slatka
revue langages ed sept 1971 N°23
- Ref OdC: Introduction to *ontology of Knowledges*
Jean-Louis Boucon.
Article on PhilPapers
- Ref PdL: The *philosophy of language and the ontology of Knowledges*
Jean-Louis Boucon.
Article on PhilPapers
- Ref MAT: The OK, logic, arithmetic, sets theory, geometry
Jean-Louis Boucon.
Article on PhilPapers

Other publications of the author :

A natural concept of time

Article published on PhilPapers

Beyond QBism with the Ontology of Knowledges

Article published on PhilPapers

L'Univers n'a pas la forme

Ed. Mon petit éditeur 2013