

Horizon as the Problem of Philosophy

1. De facto there exist many horizons; this is also de iure since man makes man (generation, technique, society, culture) and within these limits man makes himself if he chooses or drifts into what he happens to be if he fails to choose.

2. This multiplicity may be considered as a mere matter of fact: history of culture, thought, opinion as a problem to be explained: Psychologie der Weltanschauungen as an issue calling for judgment, decision: philosophic issue

3. The multiplicity of horizons as philosophic issue arises when we ask

- a Is some horizon the field, or is there no field?
- b If some horizon is the field, how can it be determined?

To deny that there is a field, is to deny that philosophy has a positive content; still that denial is itself philosophic though perhaps unconsciously so.

- positivism: let's do science
- pragmatism: let's experiment, see what happens
- scepticism: let's inquire some more
- relativism: there are no definitive answers, just pts of view

To affirm that there is a field, involves one in the second question which is at once ontological and epistemological

It is ontological in its consequent: beyond such and such a limit there is nothing to be known and so no indocta ignorantia; it settles where reality ends, where meaninglessness begins.

It is epistemological in its antecedent: to define the field raises the question of the truth of the definition; and the definition is true in virtue of known evidence; what then is the evidence? This evidence is of some reality; hence ontological also in antecedent

4. The simultaneity of E and O is intrinsic to the positive answer.

Simultaneity: E as antecedent; O as included in antecedent, though not O as formulated in consequent. It is the antecedent ontological evidence or "ontic" evidence that in existentialism gives rise to metaphysics. In detail:

a Any determination, justification, evidence for a horizon, arises within a stream of consciousness and so arises within what already is constituted as a horizon

b The justification of the horizon cannot rest on the consequent ontology, on the realities known ~~ix~~ within the horizon, for then every horizon would automatically be self-justifying; and that is the negative solution.

c It cannot rest on the norms, invariants, principles that de facto characterize, determine, constitute any given horizon; for again on that showing, every horizon would be self-justifying.

d It has to involve a discovery of the evidence, norms, invariants, principles

that naturally, ontically, possess a cogency, inevitability, necessity, normativeness

that thereby constitute a self-justifying horizon, stream of consciousness, and so field

that none the less admits the possibility of other horizons, through the whole gamut of human differences

that accounts for the actual existence of these differences at least in principle

that account for them in such a manner that at the same time it discredits them, reveals them to be, not self-justifying, but self-destructive

that discredits them in such a manner that none the less their actual occurrence remains possible, plausible, convincing

e The prior reality that both grounds horizons and the critique of horizons and the determination of the field is the reality of the subject as subject

It is not any object known objectively and it is not the subject known objectively, for all objects are known within some stream of consciousness and so within a horizon; and it has been contended that such objects cannot justify any horizon without thereby justifying all horizons.

It is the reality of the subject as subject: for the subject as subject is both reality and conscious

the subject as subject is reality in the sense that we live and die, love and hate, rejoice and suffer, desire and fear, wonder and dread, inquire and doubt

it is Descartes' "cogito" transposed to concrete living

it is the subject present to himself, not as presented to himself in any theory or affirmation of consciousness, but as the prior presence (non-absence) prerequisite to any presentation, as a priori condition to any stream of consciousness (including dreams)

The argument is: the prior reality is not object as object or subject as object; there only remains subject as subject; and this s as s is both reality and discoverable through consciousness

The argument does not prove that in the s as s we shall find the evidence norms invariants principles for a critique of horizons; it proves that unless we find it there, we shall not find it at all.