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<Relativism of the sighted and the not sighted. Relativism of the close world and the distant world.> Intuitional surrounding world for every man and together as close-distant world. Therein practical truth. <The relativism of life-worldly truth.> Accommodation and locomotion. <From the relative to the absolute relativism>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The intuitional surrounding world and within it true being and predicative truth as practical truth. It is for everyone and in community a close-distant world. The perfect close, the true. The single man as perceptional subject: closeness. Accommodation, distance out of locomotion. Apparency: The close-distant thing as correlate of purely perceptible self-verification. Normal common surrounding world – normal sensuousness.*

But within the progress of experience as being univocal, the presumption of the being and the being thus verifies itself, and within the attitude and experiential cognition of the practical life there is a consisting truth despite a relativism: the **relativism of the close and the distant**, of the experiential completeness and incompleteness, in which not only the same thing, but each objective property can be given. But within the experience of the common life there is something absolute, an **attainable final perfectness**. Each experience can be directed thus that it leads to its **optimum** and **the absolute true of the life is the integral of the optima so to say**. The unattainable within the world of the natural life, if it is still accepted as something real, is accepted only as something randomly unattainable (for example the stars), which if it would allow for an approach, (if we could fly), would also find its optimal shape and thus its truth.

The individual relativity of this optimal through gradual differences of the possibility of accommodation of the different individuals **[705]** and possibly of the same at different times makes it obvious to relativize this truth, but not to underlie the natural presupposition of a best accommodation, and in such a way like the life does, to stick to an absolute truth. Each best was random here and would leave something better to be conceivable.

But: Discovery of **instrumental means** of changes of appearances which are to be interpreted as approaches, as well as their perfection with the empirical-open horizon of ever again possible new perfection.[[2]](#footnote-2) Within the progress of times and of humanities the **levels** differ from each other. To each one an **optimal accommodation** belongs, and together with this always a **relative truth** or a world the way it is in truth, and ever again to be verified within a (though presumptive) univocal experience. Following the experience (from the invention of this accommodation <on>), the respective experiential world gains a **presumptive sense** as world like it is for our accommodation, but at the same time as world, which would have been given differently through ever new accommodations, on other levels of verifiable truth.

The basic fact of all accommodation, “to experience the same on different levels of perfection”, spreads to the levels of accommodation. The universal human experience within the **unity of human tradition** with its to be expected perfections of accommodation is itself a **unity of experience**, that is, taken as a whole, as world experience a *processus* of perfection within the experience of the world.[[3]](#footnote-3) All experiences being possible on each level of accommodation are concerned by this, and the relative truths being related to all single things. They are always truly being things verifying themselves as that within the experiencing life constantly happening in univocal style. However perfection takes place through a new kind of accommodation or not, the presumption remains valid, that the world is and that true things are, as such not only temporarily being within our life, but verifiably forever, remaining accepted. But for each new kind of accommodation the respective true of the former [accommodation]– the idea of an optimal and complete givenness of the thing being realizable within it – changes into something true of the later and thus of every later [accommodation]. **The optimum of the one level becomes an incomplete presentation of the true being of the later one, or “appearance-of”.** Exactly as within natural accommodation. The **natural relativism** of the givenness of appearance of the natural world experience, which has an optimum as final idea within it though, an optimum which being actually available at least with regard to many things and to these things according to certain layers of being like surface properties, changes into an **absolute relativism** of each and every givenness of appearance. The things of experience are relatively being with regard to **all** their experiential determinations however the accommodation may be perfected.

But insofar as the truth remains truth, as the idea of a connection of experiences of the same univocally being verified remains on each new level and also the same which is a truthful being of the former level remains being truthfully on the higher one. Just with regard to the being thus we have a constant change, but again of such a kind that each true determination of the former experiential level still remains on the latter one, in a closer to be described way. Above all, it is a sequence of levels of perfection within the experience of the same. De facto the new of the later level does not have the sense of cancelling the truth of the former one. Therefore each universal practice becoming possible with each new level does not have to proceed in another way with regard to purposes for which the higher perfections had the character of the practical irrelevance. For such purposes the old truth is valid, just that it now has the sense of acceptance of a lower one; but for such purposes <it has a> sufficient grade of perfection to which alone it comes down for them as being a relevant one.[[4]](#footnote-4) This could say: **The relative relativism has become an absolute relativism**.

But here some problems arise, relating to a comprehensive, and now again **absolute idea of the truth** and of the true being, in how far it is a necessary one in order to give unity to the respectively in infinity belonging together relative truths as truths in which still the same is continuous and true. The structure of these infinities of relative true being needs to be studied more closely. The true thing of a level is the substrate of these and those properties. This true is not lost. **The same thing** has its truth on the higher level which does no longer describe itself in the same way, at least is a different one according to the individually finally determined content. But to the true property on the one level a true one corresponds on the other one, to each true piece of determination <on the one> a true one on the other one, that is, with a continuous identity. What are the conditions of the possibility of this identification and necessary identification of something different which is within the relation of the rough and perfect <appearance> of the same? And what kind of essential necessities do result for an *in infinitum* in continuous iteration presupposed progress of perfection of true being of one and the same, if like it is the case here, that which is especially important, it is de facto excluded that an experiential truth was the last one, the last one in itself, but <it is this> simply at random.

Each one having been taken over as the last one, that is, such a one not leaving open any more perfection, would be the absolute truth for all relative truths of the former levels. But if the principle “open possibility *in infinitum*” is accepted, if it is postulated, or if it is even evident according to its possibility and necessity, then the question is what kind of demands result from the idea of such a line of perfection *in infinitum*. Still, prior to that of course it needed to be considered concisely how about this postulate or axiom and whether the idea of a line of perfection is not sufficient which must have an end which we do not know though, <so> that we have to leave it open, that ever again new accommodations could become possible until for example reasons become obvious that it cannot go on. With this infinity and relativity it is the same as with the external infinity of the world: We have to **leave it open** that **[708]** the more we proceed in our experience (for example astronomically), the more new realities become experienceable.

We say the world is endless and we treat it as an endless one. We will turn to that now.

The relativism we have talked about up till now, concerned the already experienced things or things in how far they are already within the field of our practical experiential accessibility. If we use the word “**sight**” in order to designate properly perceived realities then we do not have the **relativism of the sighted and not sighted** for every single thing, but also with regard to the world: the world in sight and the world out of sight, the not sighted world. **The sighted world is within the relativism of the close world and distant world**, a relativism which again is manifold.

The experiencing subject has a sensuously sighted world, oriented around his organism, he has a spatial and temporal present, oriented around his now and his here, related to this present his presently visible world, - a quite relative concept. He has within his present the co-present comrades and is in communication with them, in actual and possible [communication]. The men of the present – mine, our present – have a **spatio-temporal present being common** to them, oriented around their bodily-common present and a **common world of visibilities**: their natural experiential world in the narrowest sense. Within the relativity of the spatio-temporal present these visible worlds change; and as to the spatial ones they actually shift at random, if a locomotion goes that far that it reaches beyond the spatial present into a relatively “larger” present, one which is then to be constituted anew any time. By the way of the historical empathy or rather the awakening of the tradition continuities of the human, visible world spread with regard to their historical present in front of us, and at the same time we have an open horizon for such future relative worlds, all unifying into **one** **historical world**. On the other hand: The idea of an ever anew to be performed better locomotion creates the idea of an endless space-world as constituting itself as unity within a continuity of spatial presents. On the other hand: Each visible world gains an endless inner horizon of **[709]** visibilities through the completion of the accommodation which we separate from the locomotion, insofar as this is thought of as acquiring a space-world.

1. Probably September 1926. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Locomotion. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. But compare further the perfection of the locomotion, to which the function of the telescopes has a close relation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Here another kind of extension through locomotion, etc. is missing. Thus close and distant world. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)