

What difference does the existence of 'I' make to the nature of things? - Discuss with reference to the question of solipsism and its refutation.

The existence of 'I' as an absolute, as an axis from where the living present and my relation to things in that metaphysical world or reality is the most real. Nothing could be more apparent to me than that immutable incommunicable fact. As a solipsist nothing really exists on the outside it is an interior world that is my world alone. A self-sufficient place where characters and things are just appearances, a phenomenal world that 'I' alone judge and act in whilst these characters in my experience merely behave. But what if I saw this world as being *like a prison* (The negative concept of a prison is just a useful metaphor, as a spectre of my finitude, it is not to exist in a dark and frightening world (although for some sad souls that may be so) but to exist in a system that no one else can access in the way I can means 'this' exists only in relation to the 'I' that has it), I am the one locked in *for life*, that is to my system of representation one in which I can't escape, if my map of the world is not the only reality I have to concede I need help from the outside.

When I direct my attention towards something from my subjective standpoint, I am observing, judging, hating and loving something, there must therefore be a reason or cause of this, something autonomous something exterior to the interior of my most real living present or 'this'. What if that *thing* doesn't fully submit to my valuational perspective, what happens if something is hidden from me, doesn't that mean I am missing out? No, more, it means I haven't got a firm grasp of reality because I might be wrong. So for there to be a self, there has to be other or not self unless I am a self alone, but maybe that's just too fragile a story the foundations of which are far too shaky, it's a terrifying thought! To transcend the absolute 'I' is a metaphysical leap of faith, to admit to the 'other' another metaphysical reality than my own is to admit to an outside world of real public objects and other people who act and not merely behave, one where my world is our world.

To appreciate and validate the content of my subjective experience of 'this', the 3 second 'now' (Ernst Pöppel) **involves judgements, mine alone are not sufficient to identify an objective reality. My determinate character colours my judgements with any amount of bad faith and error accompanied by my biased views, own interests, preferences and projects. Therefore the radical exteriority and difference of the other (and his and her unique perspective's arising from their own determinate characters) is a position that I grant authority to (as they do to me) which I can't do for myself, that is to correct my judgements, provide a different perspective and therefore to move onwards towards the reality of our objective world or standpoint. The reality of this objective standpoint necessarily depends on the absolute impossibility that my unique subjective standpoint can ever become self-sufficient, whilst it (my subjective standpoint) is affected by the world and affects the world by its actions it does not and can never be the final word or only reality.**

**To see the other in this light is to treat someone as an end in themselves, not a mere means for my self-realisation or just to validate my possible experience. Everything real must have a nature which places constraints on how it acts or interacts, the other person is similar to me, he can have the same kind of feelings as 'I', but he can't just do *entirely* what he wants and neither can I. We *have to* value and respect each other, although we may not always agree in our actions as agents in the world we have a responsibility to each other and indeed to the world as a whole and all of its resources.**

**So when I think 'that' x and utter I have moved into the objective world of language and others and real things independent to me, where others see aspects with points of views other than mine and it is here where the existence of 'I' makes a difference to the nature of things, it is here where I can be corrected because I may be wrong (I may be right and agreed with) or**

**there may be another side that I haven't seen or heard or thought of.**

**So when `I' as a spatially located physical body look out into the world of real objects existing independently to me, these objects become mine, they are present to me or indeed absent to me if they have withdrawn into the background because I have failed to notice them (Ready to hand, Heidegger). They are mine because they exist for me in my world, my subjective standpoint (coloured by my own unique perspective); they also exist for others and their unique subjective standpoints. As an language using agent who physically acts and is embodied and embedded out in the objective world, I am not just an impartial observer a knowing subject but a doer and a discoverer just like David Livingstone. When I act I add to the actual past, I am not coerced to do as I do, I do as I do at that particular time with all of my resources being summoned up and are exhausted in that moment. Unlike the external objects that are `never fully exhausted in the exact way in which a thinker considers them'. (Graham Harman, the Quadruple Object)**

**My subjective standpoint, here, now, `this' is a metaphysical reality in its own right, the world revolves around this point this unique existence, this I-ness, in a way the world is looking out upon itself from this point in addition to the world and its objects that exists independently to me and indeed any other sentient being.**