No. 20

<Structures of life-worldly situativity: Momentaneous situation – special situation – entirety of the situation – situation of the all. Single subjective and common situation. The civic normal world>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> Concerning the fundamental differentiation of the relativities. At first modalization and situation. And identical world through all relativities of the modalization towards situations. The steps of the life-worlds up towards the total world as relativities – relative worlds, enclosing their manifold situations. The corresponding relativity of the horizon’s structure.*

*“Truths of the situation”, civic world, fellow citizen, differences of the awakening of the respective horizons of the situation. Nation among nations.*

<§1. The intermingling of the more or less awoken situations and wholenesses of the situation>

Here a clear distinction is needed:

1) Within the universal empirical evidence of the natural, not scientific life we have our surrounding world in an empirical way, our being realities, for them empirical verifications and truths. They are called “relative”, they have implicit unverified or incompletely verified predispositions, although one can trust them in an empirical-practical way, insofar as they, what is possible, have in their way a practically sufficient verification. Within the course of experience there is constantly an empirical certainty of being, and verification of being prior to the special activity of cognizing, the judicial activity directed towards security, towards true being as such, the result of which is the judicial truth justified in a special sense. That which has emerged **harmoniously** as our world within the course of experience, or rather, as familiar content of that which is existent for us, including that which we have secured through judging justifications, and [what we] have corrected in respective purposeful actions from the naively valid as being right for us, this forms our **respective ground of being** **for all further practice**, also for new activities of the judicial assessment and its reasoning, especially for possible systematic cognizing activities of the sciences. This means: all following critique only belongs to the single verifications, but the **universal ground of verification** is not attacked; rather it is always the ground of all questions within the not attacked contents, the doubtless, with which all newly emerging needs to harmonize, the firm, that with the help of which the incorrect shows itself, simply is marked by as nullity, etc. Such a unitary basis for judgment now goes through life, that is, within the community life with its common experiences, thinking, acting, etc, a universally persisting ground of being, persisting in its always familiar style of being as apperceptive universal form, wherein all individual wins acceptance, remaining always tied to it. This universally familiar constant world is our empirical surrounding world in its changeable being, breaking down in its single particularities of the flow into the manifold empirical situations; each possibly apperceived as familiar practical life-sphere, or rather, sphere of being, in which we are standing in doubtless certainty, ground for our situation acts, possibly situation judgments, for questions respectively motivated within the situation, doubts, considerations, considerations if something presenting itself as being thus and thus actually is thus, that is, [if it] has its truth, etc. Thereby we as men of our people, or else of our European humanity, are within a **universal situation** throughout our whole life: the German, the European surrounding world in which the countless special situations of our existence are included; within it non-selfsufficient special styles of a universal style.

<2)> a) Thereby we do not only have the relativity of the “modalization” of the certainty of being, or rather, the open possibility belonging to all situations that anything emerging within the situation or presupposed in advance [implied] can become dubious and denied **[192]** so that the matter of any being, of any truth may not have to rest in absolute final validity, in apodicticity. But the empirical doubtlessness in its empirical, continuous verification, and possibly purposeful testing provides me within the founding complete security of the situation with possibilities to distinguish truth and falsehood according to the requirement, and to reason in a safe way.

b) But I do also have the other relativity, namely the [relativity] of the change of situations, whereas within this change many a single being remains identical, but still changes its being sense which is determined by the situation, so that with the change of situation the truths become other [truths]: But each truth is related to its situation, and this change does not have the title “falsehood of what had previously been asserted as true”, but the title “truth as truth of the new situation”. But by the identical beings going through the changes of situations, nay, in that

c) if we go into the universal, [if] a universe of the being as something identical remains identical through all situations, only given in each [situation] in another sense of situation, and provided with the truth of the situation, it is the question what kind of being and being thus this universe of identical beings has. Now it is the case that we, considering the universe of situations, combine the multiplicity of situation truths of us and of all our fellow men, fellow peoples, fellow humanities in general – we conceive of the respective cases of falsehood as being already corrected -; and now we find them all in relation to an identical “world”, that is, merely in the sense, that different men according to their situation, and beneath that depending on them being men of this or that people and cultural circle – if they enter or immerse the new situations from their <former situations> - evidently become certain that that which has been recognized there in a well reasoned way as truth and true being in diversity, still relates to **the same**, and in such a way that something identical takes over a different being sense according to the situation which thus in the equivalence of the situation’s relativity designates with the relativity towards the individuality of the situation’s subjectivity and its individually emerging habituality **[193]** a relativity of the truths towards the respective subjectivities.

But now one may not remain at the surface: The truths of the situation are truths for their subjects as [the subjects] in their situation. What does this mean, considered more closely? The subjects are within vivid experience, they are within a current apperception, in which they apperceptively have their respective field of perception within an apperceptive near and distant horizon, which means **a vivid acceptance** for them, in vivid awakening.[[2]](#footnote-2) The apperception has as its core the “properly perceived” objects of the surrounding world, which for their part have their properly perceived “ foresides. Not enough, we needed to say, that the properly perceived objects are experienced as objects in a certain distance, that the same as such point to themselves in a closeness in which alone they quite properly are perceived and perceivable as they themselves, namely in continuous all-round perception, that therefore all-round distant perception would grasp an all-round relative self which is only valid for the thing in an improper way; rather, the proper self would be the correspondent near self.

This of course first and foremost concerns the corporeal of the real and concerns at the same time the other supra-corporeal, supra-sensuous, but with the sensuous predicates presenting themselves. But now all that is explication of the apperception with regard to the implied being sense as acceptances performed within the at once performed whole apprehension of the perceptual field or rather of its objects. Whereby above that something else would come into question, namely that which is connected to the differences of the grasping, of the Ego’s being directed towards any or many preferred objects, by paying attention and within the activity of its occupation, or rather [is connected] <to the differences of the> being affected thus by some, otherwise by others (primary and secondary affection, and again being within the center of the already actively being occupied Ego, and still being secondarily in one’s grip, being ready for further occupation, etc.) And thereby differences within the content of the perceptual objects go **[194]** hand in hand like they present themselves and change in a subjective way as a mental process.

If this is already complicated, especially if we enter a more concise explanation of the implicit and founded being-senses, then this is by far not enough to clarify the apperceptive being-content of the situation. Most of all, what has been brought out there is only a quite empty universality which is a similar one whether I consider my awake experiential life at the morning and in which of the normal special situations of the morning ever (in their familiar succession: bath, dressing, breakfast), or in the other daily situations that present themselves as typical unity of working hours, lunch-break, afternoon-work, evening leisure. In this or that **special situation** I, living in an awake way, consider special situations that combine to unitary **wholenesses of situation** which themselves again are special situations in comprehensive wholenesses, up to the highest [wholeness] determining my total life field – **my world**, that is, as the universal worldly present in which I am now standing at a place, a place which in the closest and nearest sense is my situation. But all that at the same time has **its way**, **to be awake “in a vivid way”**, [[3]](#footnote-3) and determines the being sense of my perceptual field and of my being within, <the way> to be affected and occupied therein. The few things that constitute it as being actual and as being perceived at the same time, or even the single ones I am directed to or which “attract” me already in advance do not constitute the perceptual field in which I am living; <this> rather <is> **my concrete “situation”** to which they belong, with the common sense of which they are afflicted. But, as I said, the “concrete situation” first of all is a special one which in truth is not concrete, but [is] only **part** of a chain of simultaneous and successive situations, and which for its part derives its sense <from these>, namely is in advance already **“vivid”** within a horizon-consciousness, or rather, has an implicit sense determination, through which alone it is for me this current situation, mine, as the one in which I am now standing individually, now as active Ego, moved by the now awake and continuously waking practical interests, **[195]** intend and do this and that. For example: I have just woken up and the day, my day “comes up” without my representing it intuitionally, and immediately the sequence of its normal, its habitual special situations enters the course of my actualization: bath, dressing, breakfast, morning work at the office or in the shop, lunch break, afternoon work, evening leisure. Being **within the special situation** it has its special **“actuality”** for me as whole closed in itself. The things, men, in short, the worldly real which thereby is perceived in the constant form “respective field of perception” (likewise in the case of lively memory the field of memory), only “belongs” to the situation; <but> as being horizonlike vivid it reaches farther. And above that: It has now, in this situation’s connection the situation’s sense for me as functioning thus and thus in this situation; or designated by me: I am interested in it as this and that, it now has this and that relevance for me, this being and being thus, this showing itself within the course e.g. of the harmonious perception with these or those colors, shapes, in this or that closeness or distance, apprehended to be moved or reshaped by me with these or those practical possibilities, thereby apprehended as instrument, as developing shape of the work, etc. But this whole special situation, for example the situation of a weekday’s morning has together with the apprehension as weekday’s morning situation also the sense of introduction for the coming office work with its familiar and articulated style, and thus for the whole further course of the situations constituting the weekday. And not enough, obviously the weekday within the order of the weekdays belongs to the horizon’s sense. With the weekend at the same time the coming Sunday, the whole periodicity of the year’s weeks, etc.

<§2. Our horizon of the situation within the horizon of the civic normal world. The world as total horizon of all life worlds>

Again what we have just pointed out is nothing less than a concrete, actually complete explanation of the respective concrete situation. If as **civic** **Ego** I explicate this my situation **[196]**, then it is a civic [situation] within the unity of the **civic surrounding world**. And thus it has the horizon’s sense of exactly this, for me and for anyone who for me belongs to it as fellow citizen, is co-conscious within it in a horizonlike way, as my acquaintance (my friend, my business partner, my companion from the faculty, etc.), if he is individually known to me as that, or else as the wide open horizon of unknown fellow citizens who as such still have their predelineated personal being sense as belonging as well in their ways to this civic world. It has its **general style**, its constant <style> of an all-familiar normality (generic), the periodicity of the year of this civic surrounding world of the life with the common special weekdays and with the Sunday, with the other civic holidays, etc. But thereby everyone has his respective day, his arrangement of the day, his day’s content, - his habituality of interests, his job, his religious convictions and respective order of the life, etc. Thus eventually the universal structure of this life-world as invariant form for all normal citizens would have to be re-written, as persisting unity encompassing all situations in which civic subjects are standing. But with regard to the situations again the differences of the private, **single subjective**, and of the **common situations**, in which the situations of the participants are synthetically unified, like e.g. the daily situation of the persons as functionaries belonging to the unity of a business as the unitarily all-encompassing <situation>, and encompassing the respective present situations of every single one. In the continuation of current situation to each new [situation], order of the sense and penetration of the sense, change of the sense and yet unity of the sense, and thus eventually going through the whole life of each participating subject, and above that encompassing the linkage of the subject’s lives who enter such a participation and leave <it>. The business, the firm, lasts whereas the functionaries change. Some remain their whole life, some retire; they so to say cancel their interest in the business. But it has not therefore become a nothing; everyone has, within the unity of the civic life in its horizonlike, everywhere sense determining form, his persisting personal style with his persisting interests, but also with his given up and newly founded interests.

**[197]** It would be too big a task to describe this whole and the way the unity perseveres in the change of the current situations. Only some important points need to be stressed here.

The persisting style in which this world exists, and this its being itself as persisting being have actuality only in the form of a temporality, in which communalized human subjects living next to each other and with each other respectively **live** in a single way and **within the togetherness in the way of a situation**, everyone in a momentary situation and <in> a universal horizon of his life situation, in a horizonlike predelineated, otherwise despite all relative determinacy of the predelineation yet undetermined style, but explicable in intuitions, in intuitionally ramifying open ranges of possibilities, in the sense: within the predelineated form it could in detail actually happen in this or that way, and I could proceed thus or otherwise; this will be determined if applicable in individual facticity. **The situations are all intersubjectively connected** and stand <in> an intersubjective simultaneity and succession related to that, [in] a concrete intersubjective time as form encompassing everything as being intersubjectively interwoven, or rather, penetrating themselves. The situations of the others lie within my horizon, and influence for me the sense of my situation, although mediately and in an undetermined way, and possibly immediately and practically determining. We do not live in this world as a heap of realities, but as subjects being there for each other, as human beings one can address, of whom one can receive messages, with whom one can negotiate, and act in general, connecting for common purposes, or who need to be opposed as enemies, the purposes of whom stand in our way, etc. In each situation there is a factual true or false, a practical right and a practical wrong, but the change of all is predelineated therein by the complete sense engaging in a sense-determining way in all situations.

For us civic men the **civic normal world** is always within the horizon as well, but in our special situation is the horizon unifying it in particular the one awoken in vivid actuality. In this vividness a relativity does lie, since the whole universal horizon is vivid; as a total one it is valid and has its **[198]** function now and here. And yet there are differences in the awakening, [in] the primary awareness and the implicit way of functioning, what would have to be called a **difference in the way of execution of the implicit acceptances**: current execution, way of the sensuous intuitability’s absence, and “unconscious” functioning along, being not awake, not awoken. This also becomes apparent within the intuition.

But with all that we still have not considered all horizons. Within my normal civic life I have as distinctive the style of the normal civic life, above all the [style] of my rank, of my professional association, this within the connection of the civic life’s jobs having the common life world in different ways, in different special horizonednesses. What again results in different types of situations. But beyond that the abnormal. There are vagabonds, rascals, etc. as personal types, setting themselves beyond the normal world.

Furthermore: This world also has for each person and eventually for the entirety of the persons living together as the total subjectivity for a life world belonging to them their **normal style** and their **abnormalities**: all those casualties that change the normal face of the world as earthquakes, inundations, etc., but as occasional abnormalities and open possible [abnormalities] themselves belong to the style of the world, as of a world, in which one has to be prepared for such things, and if it happens, has to react in a normal way. – Normalities within the overcoming of abnormalities.

Eventually all that belongs to our world, being sense-determining for our special situation, for us Germans the whole German people and its order of life, its cultured nature, and humanity. But apart from our nation there are other nations, with which our [nation] is connected, the members of which live in other traditions and customs, in other languages, legal systems, constitutions, the daily lives of which, and the surrounding everyday things of which (houses, furniture, streets, etc.) have another set of types, a set of types determining their horizon, but not ours – beyond that what is common and the quite general. But also this simultaneity of people’s humanities and their life worlds as well as the different historical succession within the “development”, the different historicities, **[199]** although very distantly, always co-determines. Eventually we get the **absolute totality**: the world in which our German surrounding world is a singular one within a multiplicity of surrounding worlds of respective humanities being connected with each other actually or possibly.
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