

(An Outline of Metaphysics)

1 Problems are objects, or *things* which *block our way*.

1.1 A problem is a barrier to the composition of forces in time, and thus a revelation.

1.1.1 Problems do not only impede our abilities, but also allow for their full exercise.

1.1.2 Similarly, objects do not just cover part of the visual field but accomplish the depth and coherence of space.

1.2 A problem accomplishes the disruption and potential (sometimes painful) renewal of a flow of desire.

1.2.3 A problem allows a solemn moment of authentic reconnection whence desire regains the courage to resurrect itself.

1.2.4 So the “real” problem is always what to do to cut the chains of machinic obedience, of the “...and again and again and...”

1.2.4.1 Our desire is in every particular case to make desire-gratification automatic.

1.3 The simplest figure of the solution is the use of a minor object-problem to solve a major object-problem.

1.3.1 Such a prioritization is an arbitrary ordering: solutions always approach (but never encounter) and retreat (but not completely) from a sort of fundamental solutional discontinuity between different degrees of problematic dimensionality.

1.3.2 Solutions decode problems by encoding an infinite rupture, by a breaking or fracturing of the problem space.

1.4 Solutions accomplish a retroactive collapse of the problem space into a singular multiplicity, a ‘patching’ or mapping between problem-spaces (or shapes of objects) of differential problematicity.

1.4.1 Consider the difference between a database of “possible solutions” before and after the solution of (for example) a search query.

1.4.1.1 Prior to the performance of the solution-operation encoded but ‘hidden’ within the problem space, the list has many possible entries: the problem space has a depth and shape characterized by the formulation of the problem.

1.4.1.2 After the solution, however, the problem space collapses to a single point (or set of points, etc.)

1.5 The problem encodes a solution by decoding a secret message, a problem ensnares the infinite/singular solution without revealing it, that is, within a formal figure (of desire, i.e., the solution.)

1.5.1 The solution thus provides a relation resolving the dichotomous break in dimensionality between problem-spaces.

1.5.2 Problems are a cosmically ironic opportunity, because they expose an unforeseen vulnerability.

1.5.2.1 We are always looking in the wrong direction at the right time: this (infinitely coincidental) chaotic violence is in fact the potency and momentum of objective reality.

2 The physical world presents itself as an objective, problematic reality demanding solutions.

2.1 The problem of ‘finding a solution to a problem’ is an implicit and trivial first-order form of self-reference.

2.2 The problem-space, at any dimension, is always infinite even if there is but a single solution.

2.2.1 The extreme case for “single-solutionarity” is identical structurally to the transcendence experienced in religion (or mathematics,) both transcendences which are ultimately impossible to present directly—not for lack of trying, but for the simple reason that desire has absurdly infinite problematicity.

3 A metaproblem is a second-order, non-trivial, form of referential problematicity, and therefore must be considered as part of the solution to all (zero-order) problems.

3.1 In order to avoid Zeno’s paradox, it is necessary to presuppose that, in order for us to be able to find a sensible solution for every, some or any problem, that every dimension of problematicity is continuous through infinity.

3.1.1 Any sensible solution must also provide a semblance or template of a fractally-infinite solution.

3.1.2 Thus a solution seamlessly encircles boundless collections of solutions to the same sort of system, the same problem-shapes at infinitely different scales and rotations.

3.1.2.1 While such solutions are indeed ‘finite’ and ‘singular,’ as they are bounded under an n-dimensional perimeter, they also exceed their dimensionality and break it in such a way as to provide a mapping to another problem space entirely (the source possibly not resembling the destination in the slightest!)

3.1.3 A solution’s infinite mapping of dimensionally differential problem-spaces flood and fill the spaces and the interstices so deeply and completely they begin to exhibit a differential quality

relative to their strictly topological dimension.

3.2 Thus the solution can be said to 'break itself' open in an infinite flood of awareness and understanding. It is a decoding of the metaproblem; a cut across which 'separates the wheat from the chaff.'

4 Sense is an agreeable decoding, which always implies that the "meta-decision" (disambiguating dimensionality) has been solved completely, that is, infinitely.

4.1 Sense is genealogically geometric: any solution to any problem must also encircle a (perhaps fuzzy!) solution to the infinite-degree "macro-problem"—the infinite series of all metaproblems which collapses into the unity of the fundamental metaproblematic of disambiguating dimensionality.

4.2 This kind of fractal meta-symmetry is associated with any even the tiniest, most insignificant problems in the field of objective reality.

4.3 Dimensionality also implies a differential quality, and not only an integral quantity.

4.3.1 Dimensions are not hierarchized. This can also be understood as: all problem-spaces are fractal.

4.3.1.1 Thus all mappings between problems spaces exhibit a hypersymmetry which composes sensibly.

4.3.2 All problem-spaces have partial dimension(s), whose shape(s) are encoded within the form of the problem.

5 Sense is not different in kind than nonsense. The difference is rather, quantitative and subjective.

5.1 Sense is a kind of mapping between dimensions which are not hierarchized.

5.1.1 Sensicality is a special case of solutionality.

5.2 Therefore the question of sense presents us with the fundamental metaproblem.

5.2.1 But sense is not a solution like any other where the correctness depends solely on whichever dimensional transcoding the observer is expected to discover between problem spaces.

5.2.2 Indeed, it is clear sense adds another set of second-order fractal mappings 'onto' and weaving through our original ones.

5.3 This is because sense is first a marking of bodies.

5.3.1 Thus the establishment of sense is the first (and only) ethical operation of society: i.e., to decide what ‘makes sense’ for ‘everyone’ to do.

5.4 The ambiguity relevant to the sense (not accuracy) of a statement is always a political ambiguity (i.e., “but what side are you on?”)

5.4.1 This is particularly clear, for example, in humor, perhaps especially in the case of seemingly apolitical humor: what possible sense could toilet humor have to an alien rational species without anuses (or even waste, for that matter)?

5.4.2 In other words, we have to make a radical transcoding across objective worlds to ‘get it’: the aliens, for example, could eventually make sense of many or even most human jokes, provided they learned enough about humankind– that is, developed the appropriate fractal mapping across unique and topologically complex problem spaces.

5.5 The solution of any problem always demands the prior resolution of abstractional ambiguity. Thus only a truly objective reality in its very problematicity allows for the depth and flowing poetry of space.

5.5.1 Expressing poetically involves an intimate connection, which is only accomplished in the fractal transcendence of an infinite collapse of ‘total’ spaces.

5.5.2 Poetry stuffs partial worlds-within-worlds into a form.

5.5.3 Expression produces sense not as a surface but as a depth.

5.6 The question of clarity in expression is always then an ethical question: “Do you really mean what you said?”

5.6.1 Avoidance, hysteria, neurosis, psychosis: these cannot merely be described in dimensional isolation, or simply analysing desire as displaced, naked or otherwise incomplete, an impotent, defractalized, ‘whole’ desire.

5.6.2 We have to address the fact that desire completes an infinite and fractal mapping across discrete universes of reference and thus even the purest ‘non-sense’ has a sort of sense to it in other dimensions; perhaps sometimes we even desire a dimension in which a particular form would ‘make sense.’

5.6.3 If dimensions are non-hierarchizable, then ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ in terms of the quantity of dimension are irrelevant to the question of sense, and indeed more generally to the fundamental question of solution.

5.6.3.1 For the quantitative resolution of any problem is always an approximation of an infinite series of decisions; but the actual pre-solution situation is constructing a fractal mapping between dimensionally differential problem-spaces such that these spaces collapse upon themselves in a unity of self-relationity.

5.7 In this way we could say that non-sense is autopoetic in that it is not created by anyone, but exists merely as a sort of observational coincidence (once again: the right place at the wrong time.)

5.7.1 Our dimensional expectation doesn't map cleanly to the space in question whether words or states of affairs in pure nonsense—in other words, nonsense breaks the problem space in a non-fractalized way, without a possible immanent reconciliation.

5.7.1.1 Non-sense is therefore like death: the seemingly endless potential for reconnection is aborted forever, at least at a certain dimension of observation—whence comes the objective brutality and and problematic rupture of the death-event, when subjectivity is silenced without the spark of hope for reconnection.

5.7.2 We need look no further than death for non-sense itself, endlessly observed and so ever reconnected to sense on other dimensions, but at the one level—the level of 'original connection'—death is the intervention of the unavoidable face, the face of the corpse, the face of the abyss, of the void, whose austere countenance radiates an unbearable and haunting sense of an absolute future.

(c) Fractal Ontology, 2007