

Review of: "On the subject part I: what is the subject?"

Daniel Rueda Garrido

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, I have to say that I enjoyed reading your article and I would like to see more research related to intersubjectivity. I find the proposal very interesting. I value positively the effort to combine the results of biological science with those of anthropology and philosophy. And of course, it seems inevitable to me to start from Kant, and I think that any approach and treatment of the problem of subjectivity must recognize the starting point in his work, even if it is to discuss and deny it.

However, I am not sure I agree that subjectivity is that state of insufficiency with respect to an objective and noumenal reality. I think it is necessary to ask the following questions: Is subjectivity a state of progressive knowledge with respect to a reality that can be called truly real? Is subjectivity a mode of progressive knowledge with respect to an objective world? As a position it is respectable, and it abounds in the Kantian dichotomy. I would, in any case, introduce, at least as a discussion, the Fichtean progressivity (leading to Nietzsche) that the world simply is not until the subject assimilates it through his activity and makes it his own (umwelt), gives it the only possible status which is that of being world for a subject.

The "objective world" would be the world that is for no one, a world sub species aeternitatis; an ideal not only unattainable but unreal as the basis of subjectivity. I do not believe that theoretical knowledge is the criterion of the subjective, but neither is practical knowledge, understood as certain learned behavior in correspondence with an objective world from which we obtain feedback or a stimulus. In any case, the subject is a subject because of the way in which he thinks of himself as a human being and realizes in the world the image he has of himself through the behaviors assumed as necessary in relation to that image, which is the one he shares with his community.

Progress could be according to this always in relation to a totality assumed as the only possible way of being and acting in the world as opposed to a progress, which in your article is taken for granted (albeit infinite), towards a closer vision of the noumenal, objective and true reality. Even the cybernetic progress you speak of does not imply a knowledge of the real but a certain resistance to the behaviors that in certain communities and ways of life are felt necessary to live. That is, reality and its properties is also an assumption set by the subject's own behavior, so that each form of life establishes a particular reality. In short, the in-itself is only a for-itself. For example, natural reality is the reality given to us by physics and empirical sciences after the Renaissance, when the capitalist way of life of control, use and exchange value of the material intensifies.

In contrast, the Taoist or Buddhist conception of reality is that of a source of energy that cannot be controlled or modified; reality is that of being moved by it, by that natural energy shared with the totality (something like Fichte's pure will and

Schopenhauer's will-to-will). Two different visions of what constitutes the background of reality, and yet both establish reality from their expectations and image of what it is to be in the world as an individual.

With the above I just want to give you a different perspective with which perhaps you can discuss and enrich your article by expanding the alternative points of view given in it and discussing other traditions, which would influence those authors you do mention but with whom you do not discuss, such as Foucault and Kuhn (at least not in the present essay).

Otherwise, very elaborate work and I encourage you to continue with your projected articles. Thank you for it in advance.