No. 21

<Special situation and the world as all-situation of all special situations. Life World and true world. Pre-scientifically, judging relative to the situation and within the science the judging overarching the situation>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*Content of the first pages: situation – tradition – all situation. From there: which theoretical tasks can I set as scientist? Course of the consequent self-experience as a primordial one towards the others, towards the world, towards us as active beings, as psychophysical unities.*

The purpose of science: the judging interest in being and being thus in the logical sense, as logically true being, and as that verified being. In advance there is the **judging within the** **pre-scientifical life (within the life’s surrounding world**). Possibly the judging will within life lead the course of his experience and of the verification of his judgment through experience only so far as his **practical interest** does demand. His (true being) and predicative truth then have a relative sense. There are “formally-logical laws” which are independent of this relativity towards the practical interest, insofar as they remain for each possible relative being (within the frame of its relativity), or rather, for each relative truth (like for example the syllogistic laws). But the interest in the being in its being and being thus, that is, in its judicial truth can overreach relativity in another way. This relativity is that of human subjectivity in its endlessness. The practice limits in its temporal particularity what should be accepted as (truly, theoretically) being and true judgment – as the practically sufficing. But within the **change of the practice** the sufficing for this or that interest and being completely determined for it perseveres as the same, and the **interest of being** (the theoretical) **can place itself above these respective interests,** **[201] and follow the identical in its being thus consequently**, and [follow] the differences of perfection, and the more perfect closer determination of the already determined in advance as something possibly *in infinitum* ever again to be more perfectly determined.

But here different things need to be taken into account. In a certain way the practice already presupposes something being for the acting one, but he does not aim at something truly being in the theoretical sense, even if only relatively. But the same sometimes begins to serve the practice afterwards. When speaking of changing circumstances of acting, and of the “interest” (<within> the situations of the acting one)[[2]](#footnote-2) effectuating itself therein, one thinks of the acting one within his experientially, in a core experientially given **surrounding world**, in which **the relevant for his practical purpose** is conspicuous. In this circle he has current non-theoretical, <non-> logical certainties of being and interests in verification, which themselves have their limit of relevance.[[3]](#footnote-3)

However, the further **world** being for him [the acting] as such, being world in naïve doxic certainty in which his situation takes place, and the different situations within the change of his acts, and of the changing interests, is itself something **relative**. It is his former life’s universal acquirement of being the way it happened in the mutual commerce with his fellow men from childhood on. This world, having in itself nothing to do with theory, thus is a **traditional world**, and as acquirement within the community stretching into the undetermined in its mediacies according to simultaneity and successive temporality, it has an open endless **[202]** traditionality. The world being my respectively accepted experiential world owes its being sense not only to me, but to those fellow men, at first to those with whom I have grown up; but since they for their part as well have been determined in their being sense of their world by the connection to those most close to them, and thus in undetermined infinity, thus my world is determined by all these fellow men – even if only mediately [determined]. Within the vivid connection of these connected humanities continuously a determining-each-other-mutually takes place, but not in a logically judging way, a transmissing vividly going through. Thus everyone has **his** **world**, as the one being subjectively, naively certain for him, and it differs from every other one’s [world]. And yet, “we all”, all men of humanity, connected in such vivid tradition (simultaneously and successively) do have a **common world**, <an> *opinio communis*, a common “picture of the world” (a general set of types). This means: Everyone has in his respective situation “the world” like a horizon, which, if he intuits it as “picture of the world”, has the sense for him: this was the world for everyone.[[4]](#footnote-4) But within the determined content it is not at all the same for everyone, but the set of types “life’s surrounding world” is common.

And this **all-situation of all special situations** of the singly acting ones, or of the currently acting together in groups (e.g. according to agreements, for purposes of the club, etc.) **always already determines the sense of the special situations and the being sense, the sense of truth being verified and verifiable within the vivid temporal particularity**. [[5]](#footnote-5) (Yet this **truth of life** is not a theoretical truth, but simply the “That is right” or “That is not right”, which after all happens within the experience as its modalization.) The **all-situation** in its being related to the connected humanity, in the middle of which the acting ones live as personal single members of their connection, usually does not come forward to the one living within the finite special situations. But exactly this humanity can stand out as a whole in one with its “picture of the world”. This already implies **[293]** that the man in his proceeding world experience grasps another world to which his own life-familiar humanity belongs among other “foreign” humanities which for their part live in their “world” (or “surrounding world”), and likewise possibly have already grasped our humanity and our other “surrounding world”. What designates “**world**” here for the respective humanity – **surrounding world of its life** – **is not simply a piece of a “true” world**, the piece that alone is experienced by each of the different “humanities” as living in its territory. If speaking of such a truth, each surrounding world of course is called “picture of the world” of the respective humanities, to which its single men are traditionally bound. At least we must not anticipate here the idea of a truth in theoretical, logical sense[[6]](#footnote-6), in the [sense] of the science – which, surmounting all traditionality (that is, all “relativity” of the being and of the truth in its relatedness to single men and human associations), determines a true being as a being in itself. Only that much is evident that humanities being foreign to each other still come to an understanding in a certain core concerning something being and not being by taking up a connection to each other, for example [they] experience others as human beings, and understand each other thus far that the respective foreign men “grasp” “the” world simply in a disconcerting other way, and that still the world is **one and the same**, which presents itself in this relativity to the men of the one humanity thus to the others in another way, each out of a “tradition”.

For us, if we investigate sense, the world of our experience is always already in advance a world, in which we are as children of our people within union with other peoples; and the groups of peoples again segregating themselves into humanities, which temporally have been “separated” from each other, i.e., [which temporally] lived without connection to each other, whereas in our present the earthly humanities have become a universal, although membered humanity. And yet not completely. We know that the connection that already has occurred, still has not resulted in a firm tradition, in an all-earthly humanity-like “picture of the world”.

**[204]** What **theoretical targets** are we able to set within the direction of true being and predicative truths with regard to that? Of course it is possible to occasionally be interested in the individual “picture of the world” of a man, that which he has gained and pursued in his traditional connection, and therein in his individual (although always co-determined from the outside) tradition. We, asking in such a way, reflect anthropologically in theoretical interest. What we discover by conceiving are cognitions belonging to the general anthropology as science of the man as man, i.e. as “living in his surrounding world”.

Appendix XIV

Practically understood situation and perceptive appearance. < Optima relative to the situation, and the pure and simple being as the absolute optimum>[[7]](#footnote-7)

*<Content:> The being of the situation’s interest within the actualization [of this interest]. “Self-givenness” not only as fulfilling an interest, but also self-givenness through perception.*

The perception has its perceptional horizon, and its own relative “closeness”, and with relation to this [it has] its fulfilling **optimum**, simply the perceptually meant along optimum of determinations, which is also an optimum for the interest.

**Within the change of the interest’s situations this optimum changes**. But the self-identity of the real is the identical of the possible lines of perception, which in a synthesis of interests transfer the perception and the multiplicity of perceptions – related to the one optimum – into the optimum of the other interest’s situation. The **theoretical interest** is the interest in the **being pure and simple**, i.e., in the **identical** within the change of possible perceptions, yet not generally, but in the identical which would emerge in possible systematic continuations from appearances towards appearances, and [which would emerge] as being the **most perfect** within going through the relative optima. Cognizance **[205]** in the theoretical interest as getting-acquainted-with <that> which is purely and simply, is a systematically going through the appearances under the guidance of their anticipated relative optima up to the **absolute optimum**, which presents itself within the relative (as “appearances” of a new sense) in constant provisionality. Cognizance in the theoretical interest thus differs from cognizance in the practical interest.

All that is based on the essential structure of the universal world experience as a universal single subjective and intersubjective consciousness life which, taken universally, is the unity of a (universal) self-giving (perception in the widest sense), according to which this is pre-giving for a being world – as world itself –, or according to which this universal self-giving is universal apperception, but wondrously intentionally implying in an explorable way in relativity of a different sense an articulation of apperceptive unities – eventually substrate unities –, a structure of relative poles as **relative optima** and these as presentations of highest and themselves again relativizing optima belonging to each [unity] as intentional pole of acceptance. This structure implies the substrate-structure as unity of properties and determinations of these substrate-beings, which for their part are again relative unities, presenting themselves in their relativities to the properties again in differences of closeness and distance as differences of appearance-like relative optima.

This is thus what matters, to clarify the disturbing of the talk of the situation’s actuality and [the situation’s] truth, and to reduce this to this systematic of actual and possible perceptions setting wondrous, overwhelmingly big tasks, or rather, <the task which> the systematic of the consciousness life functioning as subjectivity <for the> world, to explicate this constituting life actually in its essential set of types.

But the concept of situation needs not at all to be related to practical interests. I am also apperceiving the world as a theoretically interested Ego in a respective situation, center of orientation for the world pre-given to me as oriented, appearing as oriented, and likewise each we is the center of orientation for its surrounding world. Surrounding world is an expression of orientation. Thus [it is] the task <of the analysis> of the orientation’s structure.

1. November 1932. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Individual situation within the common all-situation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. But an interest being a „judging“ one in the pregnant sense, directed towards true being, interest in knowledge, does not at the outset belong to the practice essentially. Although it is due to the horizonedness of the pre-givenness of everything belonging to the surrounding world, that intention ever again is intended on defining the undetermined within the given more closely, to bring the empirically being indicated in a multivalent way to a univocal decision, but this is not in a proper way judgingly fixing intention, intention towards cognizance, cognition, knowledge, towards active acquisitions of being as available cognition. This of course does not exclude that “cognition” enters the service of practical purposes, that remaining purposes call forward the need to gain a fixed knowledge of truly being single things and something universal. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Individual situation within the general all-situation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. But this needs to be understood by me and by anyone else. In my life as mature man I have within the change of the single practical situations the universal practical surrounding world of the life, which I do accept as the one for all. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. And especially not <the> [idea] in the ontological sense. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. October 24th, 1932. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)