

# The Preterphysics

Noah Greenstein

December 11, 2008

# 1 Prologue: Insanity

If am insane, then I have a problem. If I believe that I am insane, then there is nothing to be done because I am irreparably damaged and won't be able to learn or understand anything.

I do not believe myself insane.

## 1.1 Substances

If I affirm the previous sentence then I may infer a few things:

1. Words exist, else I wouldn't have been able to make the above statement; I wrote it.
2. Commitments exist, else I wouldn't have been able to affirm the above statement; I'm committed to it.
3. Something other than words and commitments exist, else I wouldn't have had anything to describe or commit to.

These three existential statements are inferred from affirming that I am not insane. So if you say you are not insane then you can also be said to believe in commitments, words, and other objects. I'll refer to these three as substances.

## 1.2 Discipline

Being irreparably damaged is the same as being insane; if damaged you're incapable of understanding what others can understand. Therefore if you deny that you are insane then you deny that you are damaged.

Anyone who asserts that they are not damaged, not insane, is committed to an ontology that everyone who is sane will understand.

If it were false, i.e. you claim you are not insane and you are committed to an ontology that some who are sane cannot understand, then those who you say cannot understand are damaged in some way because they cannot understand but are also not insane. However, claiming that someone is incapable of understanding but not insane is nonsense.

Therefore there is no preferential ontological perspective: ontology is relative to the sane. All sane people are equal in the sense that they can understand each other, are reasonable, when researching the kinds of things that exist. This is not to say that there won't be disagreements or that understanding will not take time and effort: the difference between not understanding and being insane will be the subject of the preterphysics.

Having discipline means accounting for ontological perspectives that are not your own.

## **2 Metaphysical Ontology**

### **2.1 Undisciplined Substances**

To be disciplined is to take other people's ontological position into consideration. Since it is impossible, without being crazy, to do otherwise, what is meant by 'undisciplined' is the minimal position: to take other people's ontological position into consideration as little as possible.

#### **2.1.1 Objects, Processes and Nature**

Objects cannot exist alone. To observe an object, to recognize its existence, requires observing some process that the object is part of. Rational beings can lose their rationality; the process of losing rationality identifies a rational being, because the process could not occur without the existence of one.

Objects and processes are what make up Nature.

#### **2.1.2 Words, Descriptions and Language**

Words cannot exist alone; they are inseparable from descriptions. For a word to exist is for that word to be part of some description. Without being part of a description, a word is indistinguishable from anything else.

Words and descriptions are what make up Language.

#### **2.1.3 Commitments, Values and Responsibility**

Commitments cannot exist alone; they are inseparable from values. Values are how commitments are ranked. Without values all commitments are equal, and hence non-existent.

Commitments and values are what make up Responsibility.

### **2.2 Disciplined Substances**

When you take other people into consideration when considering substance, then you have disciplined substance.

#### **2.2.1 Science, Art and Craft**

When we describe objects and processes in a disciplined way then we are describing art. This means that the objects and processes are described in a way that is not limited to a particular person or place. If we are describing features that all nature has, then this is called science.

Craft is an art or science that is localized: when you describe nature such that it refers to a particular group of people or places, then you are describing craft.

### **2.2.2 Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric**

When we describe words and descriptions in a disciplined way then we are describing grammar. This means that the words and descriptions are described in a way that is not limited to a particular description. If we are describing features that all language has, then this is called logic.

Rhetoric is a grammar or logic that is localized: when you describe language such that it refers to a particular group of words or descriptions, then you are describing rhetoric.

### **2.2.3 Ethics, Worldview and Society**

When we describe commitments and values in a disciplined way then we are talking about ethical responsibilities. This means that the commitments and values are described in a way that is not limited to a particular person or place. If we are describing features that all ethics have then this is a worldview.

Society is a level of discipline that is localized: when you describe ethics such that it refers to a group of commitments or values, then you are describing a society.

## **3 Preterphysics**

(Sometimes not everyone understands.)

Everyone has experienced misunderstanding: either you have been misunderstood, misunderstood someone else, or, more likely, both.

When some do not understand and others do, then there is something different between the two groups: one group recognizes something about the world or themselves that the other does not. It is this mutual recognition that allows for metaphysical agreement, and lack thereof for metaphysical disagreement.

To change metaphysical understanding means to recognize, discover or invent something that was not previously recognized, which likewise identifies a deficiency in the prior understanding. However, this means going outside of your prior metaphysics and thence the failure of ontological relativity.

With the denial of accepted metaphysics, some (if not all) things that everyone previously believed to exist will now be denied. The people who believe the prior metaphysics are excluded, at least initially, from understanding the new metaphysics and hence ontological relativity fails. The person who is denying the prior metaphysics may be considered insane by those that are excluded (which could be everyone).

Moreover, when ontological relativity is foregone, the denial of insanity is put into question. Making a unique claim is, at first, indistinguishable from nonsense because there is nothing comparable anyone else has ever said. If no one has ever made a similar claim then there is no way to tell whether you have become damaged, i.e. lost your mind, and if this claim is metaphysical, it can lead to changes in all other aspects of thinking. Therefore changing your metaphysics is done at the risk of going insane.

No one pulls something from the metaphysical vacuum without risking being pulled in themself.

### **3.1 Love**

Metaphysical research done with love discovers a new worldview in relation to responsibility to others. Therefore, since others are included, it is possible to change your metaphysical position without the complete loss of ontological relativity.

If you love with respect to other people, then you need not fear new worldviews. Any change that you make will inherently have something in common with others, even if they do not yet recognize what you have recognized. Moreover, any inferior worldview will be apparent because it will be comparatively limited in ways to identify with others.

Without love having a fractured worldview with shattered responsibilities is possible. You can start to be worried when you are unsure of what your commitments to yourself are: if you are not committed to valuing your sanity, then you have lost your ability to deny insanity.

### **3.2 Force**

Metaphysical research done with force discovers a new logic in relation to the language of others. Therefore, since others are included, it is possible to change your metaphysical position without the complete loss of ontological relativity.

If you use force with respect to other people, then you need not fear new logic. Any change that you make will inherently have something in common with others, even if they do not yet recognize what you have recognized. Moreover, any inferior logic will be apparent because it will be comparatively limited in ways to change others.

Without force having a fractured logic with shattered language is possible. You can start to be worried when you are unsure of what your own words describe: if you cannot describe insanity, then you have lost your ability to deny it.

### **3.3 Creativity**

Metaphysical research done with creativity discovers a new science in relation to other peoples' view of nature. Therefore, since others are included, it is possible to change your metaphysical position without the complete loss of ontological relativity.

If you create with respect to other people, then you need not fear new science. Any change that you make will inherently have something in common with others, even if they do not yet recognize what you have recognized. Moreover, any inferior science will be apparent because it will be comparatively limited in ways to explore the world.

Without creativity having a fractured science with a shattered view of nature is possible. You can start to be worried when you are unsure of your own existence: if you cannot be sure of the existence of your sanity, then you cannot deny that you are insane.

## **4 Conclusion**

If you have love, force and creativity then you are assured rationality even in unfamiliar territory. This means you have wisdom: the ability or skill to maintain and adapt your

knowledge to future situations is called wisdom. Hence the greater love, force and creativity that you wield, the greater will be your wisdom.

Moreover, the basic metaphysics derived from the denial of insanity can now be built upon with confidence. Discipline is the foundation knowledge and wisdom is how we are able to extend it. If every distinction is made in such a way, then there will be no need to fear any argument.