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Paradox of the psycho-physical relativity. Nature and normal organism. Idea of the normality[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The world as being psychologically constituted within our human subjectivity, that is, correlatively to the constituting life and its psychic formations. But still all this psychic is something psycho-physical – conditioned through the human organism. Variation of the organism – co-variation of the world as such. Dependency of all types of realities on the human organism. Dependency of all animal species on men – of the extinct ones from times when there have been no men, on those men that have developed from them. – Peculiar causality of the later through the earlier, etc.*

<§1. Relatedness of the appearing world to the normal organism. Countersense of the thought that each experiencing subject could constitute another world in his experiences, and that there was no common world. Essential necessity of a harmony of all experiences>

The relativism of the experienceable nature to the organism of the experiencing subjects. Great issues are implied here: Paradoxes.

Nature is constituted within the intersubjective natural experience as appearing to each experiencing subject in its system of univocally actual and possible perceptions, and it is itself in its true being a unity presenting itself in these perceptual appearances. Through empathy the perceptual systems and thereby nature originially presenting itself arrive at a synthesis; and nature itself in its intersubjective truth is the identical, that which comes to original presentation in actual and possible empathy, and truly is only **[651]** within the possibility of this presentation.[[2]](#footnote-2) Also the organisms of the experiencing subjects belong to nature. Thus everyone has his actual and possible appearances of his organism and of the other organisms (of course we mean its system of appearances of the verification for them like for everything natural), and likewise intersubjectively. But now we know: If my organism becomes abnormal, then all my appearances of all natural objects I had as someone with a normal organism [become abnormal]. And I could indeed become thus abnormal that I was not only [abnormal] in single sensual functions, but in all [functions], and this eventually in a way that I was not even able to achieve an intuition of a world. On the other hand it could also be that I indeed gained a univocal experiential world, but a quite different one, from the one I used to have.

Now the talking of the becoming completely abnormal of my organism (which I made in the natural attitude) ends in the others being there, having their normal experience and their communalized [experience] and that accordingly they stick to the experienced world and say: This man over there is completely **mad**, he has become at his organism and then according to his subjective appearances, etc. completely abnormal.

Well. In any case we will agree that **abnormality is a change of normality**, and that with the keeping and changing of the kind of organism, to which a typical functioning of the organs of the organism belongs, the systems of appearances belonging to men do change. Obviously there is a regular connection between the organism and all single subjective and then intersubjective systems of appearances.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Let us present the issue in the following independent way. The world is constantly there for us within the never ceasing univocal (continuously correcting itself within communal experiential life towards harmony) intersubjective experience. Living in it as “natural men” this existence is accepted by us as “the” world pure and simple, and in such a way as it shows itself to us: as intuitional **[652]** psycho-physical world with psycho-physical causality. Within it we are simply men having experiences of this world within their mental life, and who thereby have an experience-based cognizance of everything belonging to it, among that also of ourselves as men in this world, and of our **experiences** with their respective aspects, their respective experiential sense, their respective syntheses of harmony and verification are **causally dependent on our organisms, those of the respectively experiencing subjects**. These are well-known facts. And how could one object to facts? Such an objection just emerges when we consider “transcendentally” and pore into the thought which no less is a fact and the most certain of all facts: **that we only have our whole knowledge of the being and the being thus of a world from our experiences and that by the kind of our experiences, of its contents, its continuous forms, etc. the world itself is determined, which is the being [world] for us, and how it is**. Nay, does this not even comprise that it depended on the shape of humanity’s experiential life and of a certain harmony, whether a world exists at all, of which we could talk with sense? If we now, and with reason, know from our univocal experience of the existence of men and of us ourselves as psycho-physical beings and of **all our experiences** as being our psychic mental processes according to their emerging and their whole contents being **conditioned in a bodily-physical way**, and if we now consider the possibility that for each of us not only such changes of appearances could be conditioned psycho-physically, according to which we now could not have a changed world in contrast to a main stock of men remaining “normal” (like the known visually, acoustically, etc. abnormal subjects), but rather that we all then - <and> everyone for himself – could have a system of appearances being consequent in itself, bringing a “true world” to well-reasoned cognizance, but **everyone another world**, - then we will possibly lose our bearings. We could also, and, as it seems, we may consider possible that all human and animal organisms (insofar as animals are together with us related to the same world in an experiencing way in likewise psycho-physical causality) would experience **[653]** such a change conforming in a certain way, like within the phylogenetical change of all species, that now again all gain a system of experience conforming thus and synthetically connecting itself through empathy, that they all experience an identical world, but a **completely different** one, and on the other hand again such a change that they, although forming an experience being accepted temporarily, could not constitute any **world or any common [world] at all**, to which they could ascribe a lasting acceptance as being true.

But all that, however possible it seems to be initially, is still, which is easily to be seen, **pure countersense**. The possibility of reshaping all species towards other directions like it is a fact within this de facto world, and according to our de facto experiential knowledge, indeed is unquestionable; but however we may shape it according to fantasy, - **we would presuppose us and this de facto world** as this objective one, being common to us all despite the subjectively changing ways of appearance, that is, already within the harmony of our ideas of the world. **Each actual and possible change of physical nature runs within this ever presupposed nature** as its actual and possible change. It is always presupposed as de facto nature, which we know from our communalized experiences, and in which objectively many changes happen, which we have not yet cognized, but as its own, and others, which are besides possibilities. And even as to these possibilities and to these conceivabilities as such, we are, already experiential men within the world, but the subjects of fantasies, and these themselves as something psychical belong to them. We always have an open horizon of unknown becoming, but that which emerges there, e.g. through change of the organisms and of the objectivations thereby awakened within the subjects, simply also belongs to the objectively common experiential world which can only be this identical through all times, if all appearances from which actual existence is caused always have and keep a single unity of harmony. Thus we now have to say again: Within psycho-physical causality, as long as we speak of human and animal organisms and of those developing phylogenetically, such new and generally according experiences and systems of experiences can never and de facto be possible, **[654]** (that is *a priori*) <not> on the psychic side, <that> through <them>a completely different world could get the imprint of a well-founded truth as the de facto [world], i.e. the [world] predelineating itself for us within our univocal ideas of the world.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Or do we hope to evade the countersense by saying: “Of course, the world exists and it has been created by God. He was able to create it randomly, but he created it as being equipped with organisms and souls in such a way, that all experiencing beings were equipped with harmoniously concordant organisms and souls, namely in such a way, that now **de facto** all experiencing subjects must coincide with each other in consequent experiential acting. Or he did that at least in the way that there always existed a normal experiential community, grasping the true being as manifesting itself within the normality, whereas the isolated abnormal ones could now follow the normal ones.”?[[5]](#footnote-5)

But if we leave aside here all theological, then this attitude implies that a highly wondrous coincidence, a *factum brutum*, had put psycho-physical organization and possibility of the world experience together into an order. But does not the thought impose itself, and as the ultimate contrast to this “system of preformation”, that such a harmony was an **essential necessity** instead of a coincidence, without which thus a world as such **[655]** could not be conceived of? Also it needs some serious consideration (later more about it), whether the naïve presupposition of a being world, to which belongs as a mere fact a coexistence of beings with a cognitive faculty having their place in it, possibly is an apriori countersense.

One more needs to be remarked. We find the cognition related to a normal human or experiential community within the de facto world. The world of natural life is the world of normal men communicating with each other in an experiencing way, with a normal sense, normally functioning within the sensual perceptions, also with regard to their kinestheses, and also intellectually normal. Abnormal men experience the world, the same world; they communicate thus with the normal ones, although they – and even more originally these normal ones – notice, that their world appearances deviate in certain layers from those of the normal ones. But according to universal conviction those [normal ones] have the bigger right on their side; and like already in detail the statements of single abnormally functioning senses are corrected through the normally functioning ones, thus here from man to man. This de facto structure of the natural experiential world cannot be random. In any case, the **truth** being valid within the sense of natural world experience, that is, the **world being true** in its sense itself, receives a **relation to normality**, which in the first place obviously designates a form of the experiential system univocally verifying in an intersubjective way itself, and then a psycho-physical organization connected to it, with corresponding psycho-physical causality related to this inner psychic normality.

Accordingly **natural science is related to a certain normality**, or: **related to a world, which in advance is afflicted with the relativity to the normal organism**. Natural science with the existence of nature already presupposes a universal world structure reaching beyond the natural structure: a spatio-temporal world with men, in which men do not appear casually. It presupposes that this world includes in itself a human community experiencing in a normal way, cognizing and owning a <normal> experiential faculty, and that it is in all its truths related to this, [that it] thus is relative to it.

**[656] Each world science presupposes natural experience**; the world or the realm of the world it wants to explore is the world formerly experienced in natural experience (or rather the realm of the world encompassed within it): But the scientific researchers are not only historically related back to any natural world apprehension, which unscientific, primitive men once had shaped prior to them, but they themselves are **constantly also subjects of natural experience** and have a world showing itself within this [experience] in a purely experiential way, and a true world in the sense of experience – of the univocal experience justifying itself in itself -, may this truth due to its open possibility of corrections be an idea. In any case the world of their natural experience is accepted by them as experiencing subjects in their vivid experiential community, and, insofar everything is correct within this experience, as truly being thus – “for the time being”. Just that this experiential truth is not a theoretical truth, [that] <it is> as experiential truth occasional and lacks the “objective acceptance” according to the predications following it in simple explication.

<§2. Considerations concerning normality. <Conditions, under which the consciousness of abnormality and normality accrues. True world and normality. The normal in the sense of the average and the normal in the sense of that providing the better right>

The normality is (genetically) not conscious for the single subject. Within the life of the developed man within the community of experiencing subjects the fact <of normality> known to him sometimes <on occasion of> other abnormalities happening at him<self> comes <to consciousness>. <Normality> does not <come> to current consciousness where he experiences normally, - like also correlatively the being-normal of his experiencing is not constituted as a special character of the same as long as no abnormalities enter his field of consciousness. The simple normal experiencing then consists in nothing else than in his having conscious by perceiving univocally and experiencing in a proceeding way, the experienced pure and simple as given true actuality and especially [in his] taking the respectively perceived in **[657]** most proper perception as indeed direct self-grasping and self-having of the being, simply the way it is conscious to him. Insofar as he knows himself thereby always as man among men, as a member of an open community of experiencing subjects, that which is perceived by him and his being in truth is accepted by him as something perceivable and true for everyone with identical content – for everyone being present here or who would be present, had he come here. Wherever the exchange of experiences or the experiencing being related in community to the same things **proceeds in a smooth way**, in unbroken concordance within mutual communication – within the self-evident community consciousness, that the experienced is experienced and would be experienceable by all with continuous identical determination content, and thereby at the same time with the consciousness that the things the way they are themselves and in truth, come to experience here -, there all these men act in the way of a **normal experiential community**, without shaping the idea and conceptual thought of normality. Just when the intersubjective concordance is **disturbed** this becomes different. Of course a complete discordance is impossible if we shall still call it a communication, if these men shall be there for others, that is [if they] shall know themselves as being related to a world and to the same world. Just that these same things being experienced according to certain determinations in a common-identical, that is, normal way, according to other <determinations> in an abnormal way, are not identical, are not experienced with according content. Just within this contrast the certain **consciousness of abnormality and normality** accrues, whereby the experience makes the bodily organization and its deviation of a regular form be responsible for those abnormalities. Hereby the passing abnormalities and the lasting ones can be distinguished as well as those being correctable and those not being correctable despite their content within the single subjective experiential life.

Within the community the single subject can know himself as being abnormal, as lastingly being abnormal having a completely univocal experiential world for himself, and originally within the consciousness of its truth – but of such a [truth] which in certain relations (blindness, etc.) deviates in a lasting way from the verified or true experiential world of the others. He will subordinate himself; but he can **[658]** also do this with the cognizance (like it usually happens) that **the “better truth”, the better right** is on the side of the normal human community. We notice in this indication that the situation is indeed not that within the experience a single subject or a minority of single discarding subjects stands out from a community of according subjects, as if, if this minority became a majority or the “almost all”, better and worse, more rightful and less rightful truth would exchange their places. If weak sight or blindness would increase in such a way that it became something “normal” in the sense of the average, then it thereby would not become something normal in the sense of the one giving the better right. Certainly the experiential world of blind born subjects or of weak sighted born ones, etc. would be the true world for the men, if all men in advance were born with this weak sight, and never experienced any improvement.[[6]](#footnote-6) But now that we have another norm with the better kind of our experiential constitution, the misfortune of a universal blindness would only mean a universal being abnormal. The blind sees worse, less, in a less distinguished way, more hazily, etc., than the normally sighted one, and both of them know it.

Accordingly it is **clear that the normal itself distinguishes itself as something optimal within experience itself**, so that even a single subject could become the norm of the experiential truth, - if the conditions were fulfilled therefore, that the superiority of his experiences according to the abundance of content, to the conciseness of determination, etc. could become understandable and acknowledged. But the community is antecedent, we men, being for each other through mutual communication <are antecedent>. Thus the common world being a matter of fact for us is antecedent, containing an all-time intersubjectively verifiable truth. Thus we still get to the demand of a **normal** community, that is, more closely, of a persistingly normal community connected within the course of generations through a unity of tradition of normally experiencing subjects, **[659]** and men usually according in optimum, whereas the abnormal ones follow them and have to follow them – insofar as they simply are abnormal.[[7]](#footnote-7) But the situation repeats itself if the normal subjects again indeed accord in the whole, but experience more perfectly or less perfectly, more or less now in this regard, now in that, or temporally in this or temporally in that.[[8]](#footnote-8) The main thing is that always and continuously – also within the course of generations – an experiential truth, ever again intersubjectively verifiable in this relativity, is provided for or can be provided for.

<§3. Relativization of normal truth to the respective stage of development of the machinery of world cognizance. Asset of the world practice. The one world becomes the pole of an endless series of approximation of relatively true worlds.>

It is likewise clear that as soon as normality and abnormality is sorted in this way (and it is in advance, insofar as men are present after all as subjects of a common world being accepted by them as being pure and simple and as being true through univocal verification), each improvement naturally accruing or being acquired under the guidance of human arbitrariness or of human ration – and correlatively each improvement of its psycho-physical organization –creates a new, relatively normal truth with new relative righteousness. The **discovery of a machinery** to improve the extent, in general, the perfection of the natural experience (microscope, etc.) needs to be reckoned here, which equals an improvement, a supplementing shaping of naturally developing organs. **[660]** Presupposedly or in an unquestioned matter of course, without reflection, this proceeds within the persisting continuity of a universal and intersubjective experience. Thus within this progress there is always constituted one and the same world, but in spite of all keeping of identity and of contents going through the identity, still not the same world according to all concrete special determinations of experiences. Men are separated into retarded (imperfectly experiencing subjects) and advanced subjects; and the advanced subjects now represent the norm, they are subjects of the world being relatively better determined, but still the **same**. Thus the world seen through the telescope or the microscope is the one offering more truth than the previously in the certainty of being purely and simply pregiven and rightfully being accepted [world]. The true being relativizes itself also for the experiencing subjects, as soon as they become conscious of these differences of normality and abnormality, of perfection and imperfection. If now the development of experience, or rather, that of the humanity opens a prospect to ever new possible experiential levels to be created through future discoveries, then there is **no world** any more ever being given or to be given through univocal perception (with however perfect organs and instruments), which would be the **ultimate true** [world]. The “sensual” world now necessarily has a relativity in its truth towards “sensuality”, to the stage of the “experiential perfection”. We now have an open infinity of universal world truths in front of us –each within the character of a world, the way it is itself in experiential truth, that of the empirical situation, each different from the other one, sorted into a series of levels of perfection, and each only an approximation of the same world, never experienced according to that which it is itself, since every experiential system with its normal level can be surpassed by an even more perfect one.

All that holds true in an even more radical sense than it may seem here, insofar as it emerges that, apart from formal structures, no individual determination can be ultimate, and that the situation is not that any contents of an ultimate world truth would accrue on each level as being more perfect, and could remain for the coming ones, and thus an integration of the lasting values would emerge within proceeding. It is not thus **[661]** with regard to nature, since nature constitutes itself not only through experience according to external infinity *in infinitum*, but according to an **inner infinity**, which makes each individual determination of the respective experiential content a mere appearance of that of the higher level, and thus iteratively *in infinitum*.

Anyway: If we *de facto* conceive of any normal level fixed as surrounding world of the practical man then we have a **truth** relative to it, an **optimum** being the norm of truth for all men, a truth human practice has to take into account, and the cognition of which is of the highest use for them, nay, is a norm for the already being which it presupposes,<and> enables **best possible practice**, insofar as it is in any way dependent on the cognition of that which is – for this level of experience. On the other hand, as soon as the relativity of the experiential truth or of the experientially true world is cognized, new goals open up for the practice: to heighten the level of experience, to improve the human organization itself by technical means, and to thereby open up again a new, further world (which is quasi “the same” as the former one, but in richer and better truth), and to thereby enable a richer world practice.

**The world presents itself now in a sorted multiplicity which is to be considered as ideally endless of relatively true worlds,** each of which according to identity enters the higher one according to its true realities, but in such a way that each thing pure and simple and <each> thing property pure and simple of the former level, or rather, <that> which there would have to be accepted as the true thing purely and simply – if not each thing would have to take on a corresponding change of sense in advance through cognition of this ever possible progress -, is the appearance of that of the higher <level>, this again appearance of the again higher [level], etc. At the same time appearance shows itself as self-presentation of the appearing, etc.

**[662]**

<§4. Dependence of the experiential content on the respective specific organization of the organism. Worlds relative to the species. Relating back of the sense of all development to the men. Relativity of the world to human organization. Dilemmas>

All this now is dependent on the organization of the organisms within the world. The experiencing men or animals are not only dependent on the surrounding nature as such, like things are causally determined within the causal connection, and [they are] not only as such determined in their psychic life, and among this [in] their experiencing [life] thus determined, but the **whole content of experiences** – the presenting data of sensation like on the other hand the kinesthetic data, the aspects, etc., that is eventually the world of the natural thing, the way it shows itself as being surrounding and as being true for the men communicating with each other (or the animals of this or any other species), in perceptual movements and within the functioning of the organs and within the mental exertion of the graspings of the mentally emerging data of sensation, of the verifying syntheses, etc. – **is dependent on the respective specific organization of the organism**, that is, psycho-physically determined (has conditioning presuppositions within the organization of the organism, of whatever kind this conditionality may ever be in specific). Of course, nothing is said here in advance of any uniqueness, nothing of a strict “parallelism”, etc.

**Each species has its relative truth, its relative true world**, and within its development – within the unity of its generativity -, [it has] a **changeable** [truth], but still [it has] within these changes, if they are just those transferring psycho-physical beings into psycho-physical ones in generative continuity, **one and the same** world presenting itself within these relative truths in levels of relative perfection. **But we call it “the same”, since it is cognizably the same for us**. We have with us ourselves the most original cognition of such an identity, namely there, where these changes proceed within the unity of a tradition, of an actually lived historical or reconstructive [tradition] (the researching history). The latter is understood within the relating back of all types of development of men and of all animals (as well as of their developmental levels) in this world and of their experiencing life **[663]** to the mature man encompassing them all within the universality of his experience, who not only within his historical life has a piece of actual tradition, and understands afterwards within his current surrounding world these and those animals momentarily, but also <has> an experiential consciousness extending into infinity with the ability to put himself understandingly into the place of the universal animal world in its complete development within a developmental system, and to thereby reconstruct all **species worlds** on the mediate way, if not actually in complete intuition, but still to understand analogically and as “**appearances**” **of the one and the same world** within the <species> being under the men, and of the human species, which also in future would persist within any future humanity or supra-humanity continuing it, always as unity of ever new actualized world appearances and of their harmonization.

But now the world is in advance nothing else for us than the world presenting itself within our human world experience as truth, and within the progress of the development of our levels of experience as “**the same**”, presenting itself originally within the ever new levels of truth (each of which is experienced as a true world), but only in original “**presentations**”, ways of appearance. All conceivable changes take this as their starting point, those we can expect human development of species and likewise all other species and their possible developments to put up with. **All interpretation is relative to us men**. All other organisms are to be biologically understood as psycho-physical only as changes of the human [organism] according to all their mental performances, to all their psycho-physical abilities, perceptual functions as well as practical functions. Just as that they make a sense for us. The human organism, the human psycho-physics, the human experiential life and mental life as such is the **prototype**. All species of animal beings, one would like to say, are constructed changes according to analogy – but this would be ambiguous, nay stated in an inverted way. An important issue lies here. Normally it is simple apperception, resting on simple empathy, and still with the obvious difference in contrast to the simple apperception of fellow men and even of men of foreign kinds of humanity. Obviously also the connection with them does **[664]** not immediately co-function for us for the constitution of the world, which is our [constitution of the world].

**Accordingly the world which is accepted by us**, which according to the cognition of the experience’s leveling of perfection has its true being only within the identity of a truth making itself known in the progress of perfection, is primarily related to us men, that is, also **primarily related to the organization of our organism**, however changeable this organization may be, and may be thought of as having been changed, as having arisen from or again changing back to animal, to a lower level species. The possibility of its experience or of the tentative interpretation as psycho-physical beings which are related to the same world like we are (and thus the possibility in general to conceive of any beings, übermenschen, etc. as being psycho-physical ones, whereby a world of objectivation as surrounding world shall be enabled and a world within the surrounding world, and in such a way, that all these surrounding worlds are appearances of the same world, <that> of our current experience), binds all possibilities. Thereby a rule is attached to them, to the possibility of a world. **The world and initially nature is essentially relative towards the human organization** and mediately <towards> the line of changes related to them, which possibly are to be regarded as lower levels of the history of human organization and partly as formations of parallel developments.

Since human organization only exists in its having-become and continuously becoming, thus we find ourselves in a **dilemma**. The world thus is not conceivable without a human organism with human mental life, experiential life. But if it exists itself only within the world of an [organization] having become real and developing within the world, then we would have to say: The world is only conceivable if always and necessarily there had been a psycho-physical organization and such an organization in different levels of the evolution up to the human being and from there onwards arbitrarily. This world had in its deepest levels only an identical sense of being – that is, the possibility and with regard to the past its past real possibility -, since also higher levels and eventually the human [level] is, or rather, has later become, which within itself is able to exert empathy and interpretation within itself. Thus, what may this “Men have not been within the world” mean? Well, this experiential world with its **[665]** colors, sounds, etc., cannot have been current experiential world as having been perceived and currently being perceivable, as long as men did not exist, and likewise for <the> future. And yet this world of these men has simply an endless horizon of past and future, into which men have put former men, things, other animal and plant species, etc., among them animals still living, or at least having their closely related psycho-physical organizations looking quite “similarly”. What does all this mean? “Back then”, in that one time, being an enlargement of our human, currently constituted experiential time, there were other animals upon which we bestowed a human-worldly look.

We say, we cognize: The world, and at the bottom physical nature has its “history”. But on the other hand we cognize that the world is an experiential world for us, has its truth **as that**, and when we dig deeper, [it has] a **relative truth**, which in its relativity is always still a unity of levels of phenomenological existence, presenting itself in these relative <truths>, but still not to be distinguished from them.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Do we not have to say: “Each and everything the world is for us, for me the experiencing subject and for everyone experiencing together with me, it is this purely as intentional unity within the multiplicity of appearances, of those being connected innerly, being thus and thus motivated, according to its actuality and possibility; and thereby this holds true like for all real beings thus also for the organism, which can be found as being physical within this world, within physical nature”? Do we not have to say that everything being under the title of appearances here – subjective ways of givenness of the world and subjective experiencing, identifying, differentiating, etc. – is completely something taking place simply within the subjective, within the psychic? But suchlike itself is something worldly, something which joins physical organisms from psycho-physical causality. And men have no advantage there. One will not have the absurd **[666]** idea in objectively scientific consideration to make the existence of all the other animal beings be dependent on the [existence] of human subjects, and to ascribe to the men, lately developing phylo-genetically, a kind of causality being directed backwards, and eventually to derive the whole world (which still implies them themselves) from their psychic – in a countersense psychological idealism.

Appendix LII

The difficulty of the psycho-physical relativism[[10]](#footnote-10)

Everyone has his universal experience of a certain structure of accordance, if he has an experiential surrounding world at all as being the one and the same his whole life through. If men, being and experiencing within a community, have one and the same surrounding world, which they know themselves being related to commonly, then everyone’s systems of appearance have to harmonize with those of all the others, that is, in such a way, that everyone empathizing with another one and thus understanding his appearances is able to and has to identify that which appears in these and thus his experiential world with his own. Let us add, that everyone experiences himself and everyone else as a subject of his organism, and only thereby is able to empathize, that constantly a regulated connection shows itself within experience between the organism and the mental life, and especially experiential life (with the corresponding appearances as worldly-physical ones). Thus the world is experienced by everyone in systems of appearance which, respectively related to its organism are psycho-physically conditioned by their way of functioning. Obviously this regulation in general needs not only to be of the same kind in order that all are able to experience the same world, but each organism has to harmonize with every other one with regard to its psycho-physical function.[[11]](#footnote-11)

If we call an organism “**normal**” if it has such a determined organization, and exerts <such a> psycho-physical performance, that the corresponding subject has to gain exactly such appearances which enable a unity of world experience, and within the connection of empathy the same as every other one with his organism, thus **“normality” expresses a peculiar concordance of all individual organizations and performances**, according to which that which is individually conditioned in a psycho-physical way conditions world experiences in every subject which in mutual communication result in the same world, the same individually identical [world] and of the same special content of truth.

This appears to be peculiar, since on the other hand a psycho-physical regulation is something factual, since every organism can be thought of differently, and indeed can be different, in such a way that the appearances depending on it become abnormal. If still the world shall receive a human world belonging to it, being capable of objective world-cognition, then necessarily such a harmony must exist.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Now we take heed of the following: We have a cognition and a knowledge of the being and being thus “of the” world only from our own <experience> within the common experience. We grasp it here within the consciousness of our personal existence, here it shows itself, and shows itself as exactly thus and not otherwise being determined. If the course of experience and with inner concordance <the course> of presentation had been a completely other one, then the world as well would have been quite another one for us, and only this [world] would have been and could have been accepted by us, nay, may have been accepted by us, since it can only have a being and a being sense from the original right of univocal experience. Accordingly the consequence seems to be inevitable: Another organization of the human organisms, only such an organization of a new normality, with completely different systems of appearance, but again harmonizing [systems of appearance], would mean a change of the world in all realities (a change of the whole experienceable nature and from there of the whole concretely complete world of experience) – of the world we are talking of, and can talk of as being initially experienced, and then however we may exactly make a science out of it, because an exact method at first presupposes a world of experience, a world of intuition.

1. September 1926. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Nature of actual and possible experience: not nature constructed ideally by science. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For this see appendix LII. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Preformation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If one now tries to say: “The sensual-vague coincidence of all experiencing subjects is an appearance of adaptation. It is just the rational cognizance which has to work out the objective truth”, then we ask again, **where the rational subject has got his being world from**, the truth of which <he> wants to cognize, **if not from experience**, and where all rational verifications go back to eventually, <if> not to the harmonies of experience. If the appearances are radically changed, if the experiences proceed in a completely different way, can nature be the same? Do not all natural laws have their de facto shape from the de facto course of experience in observations and experiments? If now the psycho-physical ruling would cause together with the de facto organism organization completely different courses of appearances than those leading towards nature and world which is our present one? Obviously: If we talk of psycho-physical organization then we have already **presupposed nature** as being partially determined, and then from universal experience which we now again for its part make dependent on presupposed physical realities, and indeed find to be dependent. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Furthermore of course, whereas they, knowing themselves as men within their world, would continuously construct harmony through mutual correction. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Bad presentation! [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Considered more closely we will have to say: This relativity of perfection, of single subjective and intersubjective [perfection], belongs to the essence of natural experience. Only on the basis of a normality can an abnormality also become a relative norm as a bigger perfection, e.g. abnormally clear sight. But it is correct, that not only an intersubjective, but a generative rule shows itself in this relativity. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The world is not to be separated from the worlds of objectivation – the world, universe of existence of being ones, of these known and still unknown ones; this is evident to us only through experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Probably September 1926. Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The de facto decisive concept has indeed next to it the normality of the abnormal men, but as far as community, understanding each other mutually reaches, thus far does “harmony” reach. Special cases are the mad people among those called “abnormal”, but the word then is not related to sensual abnormality. Of course “harmony” means harmony of acceptance; and nature is only, when within the connection each modalizing is excluded, or rather, is to be overcome, which accrues to me through the discordant experience of others as comrades of experience. Natural experience goes through others! Etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Of course not all modalizings are to be forgotten here, the illusions everyone can grasp, and which everyone, producing an accordance within the connection with others, can overcome; that he is capable of that from any experiential community, that is the constant anticipation, having accrued for all from <common experience>. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)