(1) There are no facts, only interpretations. That is, nothing non-recontextualizable, no belief that can’t be thrown in to doubt by being hard to reconcile with more latterly acquired beliefs.

(2) The notion of “correspondence to reality” or “factuality” is pointless, since coherence is the only test of beliefs or desires.

(3) Objectivity is simply intersubjectivity

(4) The idea that “the facts” or “reality” puts pressure on us is OK, as long as pressure is thought of simply as causal pressure, rather than pressure to agree with something that is already there (the “nature” of reality).

(5) There is no way to provide “legitimacy” to an institution or belief-system or anything else other than by trying to make it coherent with the rest of what we believe and desire.

(6) There is no pre-linguistic awareness. The notions of “expression of the inner” and “representation of the outer” stand or fall together. Both should fall, as should the inner-outer and subject-object distinctions.

(7) Language does not progress or grow by our spotting more and more “natural kinds” to represent. It progresses by an internal, conversational, dialectic. You cannot escape from this historical-evolutionary process, stand outside it, and judge it. Nor can you say that it is leading you closer to, or farther away, from reality. All stage of this process are equally in touch with reality.

(8) The function of language is not to represent, but to coordinate and inspire. It coordinates by providing practical syllogisms, and inspires by providing new “metaphorical” terminologies in which to state the premises of practical syllogisms (e.g., I may want to be Falstaff, or I may want to burn with a hard and gem-like flame)