

## A Cartesian Demon Cuts A Diamond Card

The appearance of the self-apprehending system to itself through the physical field of focus, should long ere now have given pause to the enthusiasms of that "naive realism" still prosecuted in one form or another by every modern discipline; expecting either that the given sensorium or its accompanying, cognitive faculties should render a portrait of "the real" in any way accurate or having a reliable degree of (ultimate) verisimilitude with "what is" remains, to today, what it always has been, an unwarranted article of faith buttressed by anemic "correspondences" of a superficially practical kind which only "prove" the agreement of prefigured complements within a profoundly unfathomable context.

Such presumption never surpassed Descartes' "demon"; the cofounder of modern secular philosophy (along with F. Baco, you know) stated the problematic axioms forming *the pons asinorum* of rational inquiry at the outset. They were as plain to him then as they should be to modern investigators now. (How do we *know* what we know? What grants us epistemological certainty on the basis of contingent, *a posteriori* faculties and functions? How do we transcend the *petitio principii* of anaclitic faculties necessarily *taking for granted* the very datum evoked to prove its own point?) Modern investigators uniformly take their point-of-departure from a tacit faith, a quasi-religious bottom line assumption bequeathed them courtesy of Descartes' original "special pleading" (i.e. for a Divine all-knowing Being Who, owing to just such status, constitutionally wouldn't lie to us) only long emptied of its original conviction, the deiflc substance having dribbled away to the secular millennium without notice so that all which is left is the unexamined faith itself, a hollow superstructure with Nobody Home.

Now we may see more clearly the magnitude of the problem involved; and we may also perceive, perhaps with happy non-expectancy, that part of truth which still clings from Descartes' original solution. (Oh; did you expect Monty to be programmatically anti-Cartesian in good old "new age" fashion, doctrinally dubious that *any* part of truth could come from the old "cogitors" of the Renaissance like Francis and Rene? Well, it's not for nothing those two culprits have forenames sounding suspiciously feminine to modem ears—embedded in their "egregiously macho" and aggressive philosophies are many subtle reflections and soft reservations unbecoming the negative icons we've made them in light of ecological catastrophe).

The magnitude of the problem, lies here: we have no way to assess the truth-value of faculties and processes which allow themselves to be perceived *only through prefiguration of their own pattern*. It's for this reason that we've modernly settled on pragmatism *alone* to rule on "truth". And, as we've seen, pragmatism alone doesn't account for the actual truth-value even of things demonstrating experimental domesticability; we see more clearly now how empirical links *do not* equate in one-to-one correspondence with the phenomenological whole (as when we may activate memories and emotions by electrode stimulation of brain-lobes, yet are no nearer understanding the experience of consciousness thereby). We see the ways in which factors of phenomenological process strobed to operations of our pre-patterned faculties may yield a coherent "discussion" of reality in terms of those faculties (as when cause-effect reality performs technologically according to our equations; or "renormalizable" mathematic operations yield magical correspondences-of agreement with "real" behaviors of forces and fields); by the same token, we perceive just as plainly how reality continuously surpasses the zones through which we may conduct an intercourse of mirror-agreements between process and patterning faculty.

On the other hand, in light of our preceding *metaphysical* examination of the subject (taking its point-of-departure in the *Noesis* of reality, yielding *apodictic*—therefore irreducible—values assessed from the common-denominator *Being* informing and filtering through the interstices of relativized faculties), we may find again our rightful measure of agreement with *Descartes' original assessment*: we may renew our confidence in the authentic correspondence between conditional faculties and prepatterned

functions with respect to Being (i.e. truth-value) while enlarging the framework *immeasurably* in which we may exercise that confidence.

*Indeed* we may agree with Descartes that our sensorium and reasoning faculties etc. participate in the Reality of Divinity (Self-evident or apodictic Truth) so that ultimately, given sufficient *self-correction* or *balance*, they may yield reliably-accurate correspondences with that Reality (i.e. "God" would not—ultimately—lie to us); for we see the way in which all processes and functions regardless how complex or ranging in interpretive faculty comprise coordinative elaborations and projective expressions of *basic ontological principles*. The *ontology* behind and informing those functions is immediately accessible, *not* primarily as reflex activity or self-assessment *of those* functions but owing to their derivative participation in whole-being value.

Once the "mask" of their filtrate/focal operations is penetrated (through threshold realignment of their coordinative operators *congruent with the Resolving Void-value*, or *axial pleroma*, from which they issue) the Spirit of that primary value endues the blessed Beholder with the immediate power of *discrimination (buddhi*, in the Eastern traditions) whereby the conditional may be clearly distinguished from the unconditional.

There is then no further question as to whether the ground of assessment proceeds from relativistic and conditional faculties *toward some* approximated "truth" wholly dependent on their configuration to begin with. All relativistic and conditional faculties are *illuminated* in their fundamental derivation from the Ground-of-being (this *lifts* the burden of truth-value from their conditional objects altogether); their ontological continuity and principial correspondence with that Ground is rendered Self-evident This form of *Self-evident* knowledge is primary and irreducible; it's that which the term "apodictic" *ought* essentially to mean, therefore it isn't just an intellectual certitude—as when we say the effect of oxygen on iron is "self-evident"—rather it refers to the wholly-convincing and transparent certitude of Being when the Self of Being and the Being-of-Self are exactly identical, without anything at all "left over".