I would like to wipe out the firm borders, which we humans draw with a hardheaded certitude around everything that came into our area. I want to point out, that small can also be large and large also small; only the point of view, of which we started our decision, must be changed. I would show the world today from the view of an ant and tomorrow as the moon may see it.

Hannah Höch 1929; translation B.N.

Commonness happens in differentiating
A small Topology of Being and Appearance – or: vive la Difference

As a rule we do not doubt about the reality. In my Novel The Great Wood Raquel Starbosk has a philosophical dispute together with Professor Sugarbowl, whether this world is really this world. He becomes very indignant:

“[…] Certainly you have no doubt that both of us are located on the windy campus and speak with each other?” he asked and smirked complacently.

“Let’s say, rather I have faith in the fact, that never any doubt entered my mind. And I can put forward convincing reasons, which speak for this assumption, for instance the density of my sensory perception. […]”

But she raises some objections:

“All of this can be a gigantic delusion, lies and deception. […] Perhaps everything is only a dream within a dream, within a dream ad infinitum. That is not provable. “

Nevertheless, she insures that rather she has faith in it.

“Then you are a realist after all.” noticed Sugarbowl amused.

“Yes, for pragmatic reasons and not naive. I do not believe the fact that our perception is a point-to-point reproduction of everything, as it is. Now you imply that I locate myself and you on the windy campus, in addition you, that I imply the same to you. […] From this mutual implication we draw our certainty about the reality. This is not a proof of reality”. (Nunold 2008, 48; translation B.N.)

Our brain is an informationally closed system. What we perceive is not a more or less exact reflection of a reality independent of us. Our brain produces it actively.
Because the brains of all mammal, which concern the elementary perceptions, seem to operate probably similarly, we can share the reality with each other and come to an agreement about details, or stickle about the differences in our views. In my another Novel, which is still in work, Heather Morngleam notices:

*World is the exterior of our feeling and thinking. However we are free just only in our thinking, invent a cosmos and fathom its borders. Only in this cosmos, there are dispute, togetherness, commonness and common interest and loneliness.* (Translation B.N.)

Physically, we have already been in the picture all the time (with soul and body), immersed in a virtual reality of the 1st order (VR 1), which we call reality, world. According to Merleau-Ponty, this is the “primary presentation of the non-presentable,” “original presentation of the non-presentable” (Merleau-Ponty, 1986: 277, 261). Reality (world, VR 1) is a relational structure with individual topologies. We are involved in these topologies in an existential manner, in the sense in which Merleau-Ponty speaks of our “involvement into being” (1986: 117). The primeval presentation often happens directly, and we gain a reflective distance in our day-to-day accomplishments only occasionally. There is no emergency exit from the reality of immersion area (VR 1). It still makes the difference between VR 1 and a virtual reality of the 2nd order into which we immerse ourselves when we are reading, watching a movie, enjoying a theater play, looking at a painting, lost in our thoughts, or in cyberspace, etc. A Topology of Being is always a Topology of Appearance as well. A Topology of Being and Appearance is, at the same time, a topology of the physical-psychic-mental innate characteristic of humans, of the physical-psychic-mental structures of relationship and reference, or structural interrelationships (see Kettering, 1987, 223).

Generally speaking, topology as a mathematical discipline deals with the continuous transformation of structural correlations and their similarities in relation (homeomorphisms), but also with their ruptures and transformations into other structural correlations, i.e. other topologies (antimorphisms). The latter is referred to as non-standard topology (NsT).

**Two simple examples:**

1. The transformation of a cup into a Torus (doughnut) is an example of continuous change. The topological gender does not change.

   ![Cup to Torus](image1)

   Abb. 2:

   a, b, c are topologically equivalent (homeomorphous).

   d, e, f are topologically not equivalent (antiporphous). The topological gender changes from n-fold to 3-fold cohere.

   e: the infinitesimal bounding surface by the rupture in the structural correlation.

   The torus emerged from the cup. It is a reversed presentation of the cup and a homeomorphous representation of the cup.

2. The topological gender changes when the sphere is transformed into a Torus. There is a rupture in the structural correlation. The Torus emerged from the sphere, but it cannot be a reversed image of it. The Torus is an antimorphous representation of the sphere with emergent properties.
A Topology of Being and Appearance deals with the transformations and ruptures of physical-psychic-mental structures of relationship and reference or structural correlations of our being-in-the-world or of anything we call reality.

Topology is about representational processes and relational similarities. Picture is not a thing category, but rather a topological category. A picture is a relational structure with a specific structural correlation. The process of picture production is a process of representation, but not necessarily a homeomorphous process maintaining the structure. The picture theory is a representational theory if representation not only means a more or less successful copy of the archetype, but if, instead, it refers to the structural correlation.

A Topology of Being and Appearance refers to:

1. The historical, sociocultural, individual, etc. changes, to ruptures of the physical-psychic-mental structures of relationship and reference, of our being-in-the-world, as well as
2. Our being-in-the-picture in general as VR 1 and VR 2
3. The virtual physical origin, the primordial leap (Ur-sprung) which is meant in a literal sense, to the all-embracing beginning (archae) of every physical-psychic-mental structure of relationship and reference, every world and reality for us. In this sense, a Topology of Being and Appearance is also archaeology of being and appearance.

The primeval leap, i.e. origin, is the difference. It occurs as a universal rationality. Heidegger considers the “relationship of all relationships” to be the “location of all locations and time-play-rooms” (Heidegger 1959: 215, 258), and Merleau-Ponty sees it as a “universal dimensionality” (Merleau-Ponty 1986: see 279, 315; 1984: 33; Heidegger 1997: 189, 192; 1959: 13, 24 ff; see Nunold 2000, 2004, 42 ff.). In Buddhism, it complies with the concept of emptiness. However, emptiness, nothingness, as we know from East Asian thinking and as Heidegger predicts, is not nothing (see Heidegger, 1949, 1983). It is, though, nothing substantial, but it is rather something like a process-like thought of a substrate of our body-soul-mind existence, a physical-psychic-mental foundation and process of founding, our second and real nature, if the first nature describes our biological existence. In the sense of an NsT, one can speak of a physical-psychic-mental pre- or basic state, to a certain extent of a physical-psychic-mental pregeometry (see Eisenhardt/Kurth, 1993; Eisenhardt/Kurth/Stiehl, 1995; Kurth, 1997; Nunold, 2004, 42 ff.) out of which all other structural correlations, all other physical-psychic-mental structures of relationship and reference emerge. It is something like the matrix of every VR, a universal in-difference. An absence, which only makes a presence, a being-like-that possible. It does not possess any metrics; it is excessive in the meaning of the Greek apairon, and it is no continuum. Originally, the basic state is an indefinite and fissured (see Heidegger 1994: § 127, 156 ff.) or ruptured interrelationship. Kurth and Eisenhardt introduce the term fraktgen which stands for the rupturedness within the NsT (Eisenhardt/Kurth, 1993: 60). The NsT exhibits self-similarities, which are “less organized” or “more bizarre” than those self-similarities which are known from formations of fractal geometry due to the penetration properties of non-standard-topological structural correlations (ibid. 46; see Nunold, 2000, 2004: 44 f.).

The topology of the universal matrix of our physical-psychic-mental existing is not discrete only due to the broken NsT- interrelationship, but also because the information, from which for us reality (VR 1) constitutes, is fractionally or quantizedly abysmal coincidental. The smallest unit of information is a bit. That means, our reality cannot be continuously disassembled factorable ad infinitum. The VR 1 is only apparently a continuum. It is coincidental and discrete in the primordial leap (see Zeilinger 2005, 227 ff., Nunold 2009).

Reality is already infinitely differentiated and discontinuous in the primordial leap. There is no solid comment base, no solid reason on which we can build and to which we can hope to return to someday and in which the inconsistencies cancel each other out. They are sinking in the bizarre fraktgen
discontinuum. Everything, which emerges from it as a reality, is discrete, complexity-reduced, antimorphous and fragmentary primal presentations or archetypes.

According to Leibniz, the sum of all individual viewpoints results in complete perception. He illustrates this relativity of viewpoints in his example of a city (M. § 57) in which “one and the same city, viewed from different angles, appears totally different and, at the same time, in multiple perspectives again and again.” With Leibniz, the relativity of viewpoints refers to an absolute Sosein [i.e. being-like-that]. From every viewpoint, an aspect of this being-like-that is recognizable. Here, Leibniz emanates from the very optimistic basic attitude that surely the all-gracious God will not mislead us and that the “best of all possible worlds” cannot be an illusion. If there is no gracious God, then there is no unifying instance of a polyperspective world and, thus, no uniform standard. Reality is polyperspective and polycontextual.

Kafka’s land surveyor K. is incapable of surveying the strangeness since it does not organize itself in a uniform and a binding manner. He cannot reach the castle and does not get any legitimacy, no measure for his being-in-the-world. Sects, conspiracy theoreticians, false political prophets, and other fanatic people structurize a world system which allegedly has got out of joint with their samples of total explanation which are often quite simple. They provide a physical-psychic-mental home to those who lost orientation and to those who are homeless, and they provide them with standards for their actions, feelings, and thoughts. Descartes, who fell into a mentalistic crisis because he was doubting the reality from his perspective and that of the world, invented the coordinate system. The axis mundi has to be constantly reseted. It is no longer cantered. To a certain extent, the world no longer runs circles. No lamentation helps against the loss of the centre. If the worst comes to the worst an imaginary centre disappears. The disappointment, i.e. the clarification about a deception, may cause pain, fear, despair and disorientation. Everything is a question of evaluation. It can open our eyes for the space of our freedom with its great possibilities of the world- and self-interpretation, -producing and -design.

Caspar David Friedrich was probably one of the first artists, who are reflected in his painting the „shattering of Being “, to borrow Merleau-Ponty’s words. He designed most of his paintings according to the Golden Section such as Der Mönch am Meer [The Monk at the Sea]. The Divina Proportione was considered to be the divine measurement and stood for the indefinite and immeasurable. It is honored in the historic moment when God becomes an improvable speculation and just lives an undead, dire existence as a regulative idea. As a regulative idea, the divine becomes an intramundane provision due to the ultimately immeasurable (see Nunold, 2006 a). The Golden Section is the aesthetic concept of Kant’s idea of the regulative reasons, which has become a proportion; the aesthetic compensation of the Loss of the Center (Sedlmayr) and of a perspective, which donates unity. C.D.F reconstructs via Golden Section and its fractured dimensionality reconstructs the unity in a broken, discontinuous, and polyperspective and polycontextual NsT-correlation from any possible viewpoint in the infinite as self-similarity. It generates comparability and, at least roughly, the ability of surveying, metering, and measuring. Hope dies last (see Nunold 2006; 2008).

With his assembled and designed pictures out of sets of modular objects, Friedrich is a forerunner and progressive thinker of the modern trend, also of the Cubism, the Surrealism and the Dadaism. The Cubism maps different perspectives of the same object and resembles in its naive form (not Braque or Picasso) to the prospect of city of Leibniz. The Surrealism nourishes its hope from the alleged infinity of the unconscious, in whose metaphors, metonymy and displacement a deeper sense is to confess

Abb. 3: C.D. Friedrich, Monk at the sea, 1809 -1810, oil on canvas 110×171,5 cm, National Gallery Berlin.
itself. The Dadaism fudges the hope from the coincidental and simultaneous, which occurs sense-free. It borders on to an almost mystic expectation, similar to a Negative Theology or Metaphysic and Negative Dialectic of Adorno. The without-sense of Dada is an everlasting negation, to refer to the unutterable, inexpressible, non-representable and in this sense nonsensical or absurd. The nonsensical is equivalent super-essential, super-substantial like God of a Negative Theology or the inexistence (Non-being) of a Negative Ontology and at the same time the super-existence or “superessentialis”. (Beierwaltes 1976: 242). It is the extrasensory and super-meaningfully (see NUNOLD 2003: 149). Surrealism and Dadaism are late romantic projects, but different to the early romanticist Friedrich it they occasionally lost irony like Hegel (see Junk 1998: 165 ff.) It is typically for the early romantic form of the irony, that it always accented reflection and instead to annihilate contradictions reflected these and at the same time however anticipated their termination as necessary, even unattainable destination. Irony is a form of the self-transparency of art. It makes obvious the contradiction, from which alone it lives and whose abolition would be their death, about which Hegel mused (Nunold 2006). The Death lurks in the absoluteness, also in making absolutes of sense, nonsense or without-sense.

The without-sense will not only be reified, what is made by Dada to an immensely metaphysical project. Dada is consequently, within itself consistent and thus totalitarian. In its irony-less form it becomes a delusional system and intolerant. Dada is only one master-narration of many others. The masters are divided. Nevertheless every one of them meant to be in the possession of the absolute dada-truth. A master-narration, the attempt of an uniformed and therefore of an objective and for everybody obligatory world view, even if it is perfect Dada, is with all its negativity a hybrid project, a myth, which changes to delusion, if it is set as absolute. Nothing is as consistently as a solid delusion, at least for those who live in the delusion and who will always again have produced it. The technical term is pre-psychotic.

An exception, so it seems to me, makes the works of Hannah Höch. It comes along quietly, not with theatre-thunder or dada-rumbling, by which the absolute, also the absolutely sense-free announces itself. It is not necessary to interpret this neither as female modesty nor as withdrawing after her male colleagues. I think, it is just as possible to interpret this as a proof of great wisdom. Höch does not want to make invisible visible. She is superficial from depth in the best sense of Nietzsche (see KSA. 3, 352). She seems to know of a not illuminable Dark-ground in all Being and Appearance and also of the diaphany and the not fathom abysm. In her accurately glued collages she produces the disarrangement (Ver-rücktheit) of each structure of relationship and reference, of all our topologies, our small pieced together world. She shows in her collages that we always are focused on our idiosyncrasy. There is no reason for noisiness. It is argued for an appropriate deep understanding, the calm and gentle polyperspective-polycontextuale reality, but sustainable in its incompatibility, for their not. hardly, only partially or enforced fitting and its constructedness to disclose.

Her collages are monoperspective-monocontextuale worlds, like all worlds in our heads. Although cleanly glued, the distortions, disarrangement and forced fits are obvious for the viewer. The glue, with which the different parts and cutouts are fit together, corresponds to the emotional connective tissue, which glues together our world in the internal, our physic-psychic-mental structure of relationship and reference. According to Ciompi they “mobilize and energize (affects) our thinking, […] they are the essential engines (and sometimes also brakes) of the cognitive dynamics”. “Furthermore [it] the attention and perception focus selectively on specific affect-appropriate cognitions” and “produce an affect-specific cognitive hierarchy”. Thus they cause „a selective storage and activation of completely determined cognitions in the memory“. Ciompi speaks from “condition-dependent learning and reminding; gating of affects”. Affects connect “equal or similarly connotated cognitions context-adequately to emotional

Abb. 4: H. Höch: The strong men, 1931, Collage.
uniformly dyed operational whole. “They provide “as biologically and socially enormously important and meaningful complexity reductions in the infinitely various cognitive field. Initial they select, structure, combine and organize this field condition- and context-adequately by using the entire experience; after all the affective dye of cognitive figures of each kind and dimension, from individual objects, persons or ideas to whole theories and ideologies gives direction and meaning to our thinking, creates synchronous and diachronic coherency, donates value and sense. In this manner our thinking “develops and connects” „along affect-specific tracks“ or „guardrails“. Affects take effect on thinking complete similarly as „glue or connective tissue“ (Ciompi 1997:130). The moods glue together the world as a structure of the whole of relationship- and reference (see Heidegger 1999:140 f.). As a part of the logos, of the immanent logic they are some part of which, as Goethe says, holds the world together in the internal. Affects are glue or connective tissue only in their connection and interaction of an elementary understanding-process, which does not reflect yet in consciousness, anyhow they are self-reflexive, similarly and autopoietic. Merleau-Ponty formed the term *chair* (flesh) for it. (1986: 173). It is the connective tissue, the substance, the flesh of our world, which donates the physic-psychic-mental coherence, a structure of relationship- and reference, organization, sense and a hierarchy of values. (See Nunold 2004:89 f.)

The disarrangement of our small world, which appears to us unique, infinite and objective, are in most cases hidden to us. Obsessive fits become inevitability justified and rational interpreted. It feels correctly and naturally as well as perfectly logically and normally. But no rationality is completely consistent. No matter how the parts are cleanly emotionally glued together, total rationality is illusion, a Myth, which can turn into delusions. The illusiveness of a total logicality is possible only due to own routine-blindness. The emotional connective tissue suggests the natural inevitableness of a holy order and a self-evident seeming hierarchy of values. In a hierarchy stands the holy, a Summun bonum in the beginning and through-prevails as Alpha and Omega the whole structure. *Hieros* – the holy, *archae* – the beginning, sovereignty. A hierarchy is the condition of the possibility for us of transitivity, logic and rationality of our physic-psychic-mental structure of relationship- and reference. Perfect reflecting would make incapable of action. We would starve in a heterarchy, a co-subordination of values and possibilities like the Buridan donkey between heaps of hay.

In his article of 1945 *A Heterarchie of Value Determined by the Topologie of nervous Nets* McCulloch writes:

*Because organisms live for these ends, they are appreciated by them neither as means to other ends nor as conduct forced upon them, but rather as having that kind of power or importance which culminated in the notion of the sacred or holy *hierarchy* as applied to values. The second implication [...] is that the many ends are ordered by the right of each to inhibit all inferiors. The numbers of ends although large, is finite. The order is such that there is some end preferred to all others, and another such that all are preferred to it, and that of any three if a first is preferred to a second and a second to a first is preferred to the third. (McCulloch 1945: 2)*

Order, a hierarchy of values, an immanent logic and transitivity, as it was formulated in the last sentence, is the result of decision-processes, those usually we be oblivious, then unnoticed too late.¹ A decision passes, a point of view determined. Everything that follows out of it, a partial over- and subordination of goals, values etc. are monocontextual described and appears to us logically. (See Goldammer 2003).

Before the decision there were equivalent and equal possible points of view unmediated next to each other. Only by the decision the antinomy and ambiguity are waived or the complete matter is rejected (see ibid.). Between these co-subordination points of view is no transitivity. Unless we decide in the way that we set priorities and set up a value hierarchy, about in such a manner:

A is better than B,
B is better than C,
Then A is also better than C.

¹Transitivity is present for example, if for a binary relation is valid: R (x, y) ∧ (y, z) → R (x, z).
A binary relation (R) develops, in which the following relationship is valid.
\[ R(A, B) \land R(B, C) \rightarrow R(A, C) \]

**An example:**

A: Most of all I would like to go eating ice.
B: If that is not possible, I would like to drink leastwise coffee and eat cakes.
C: I would like in no case to clear up my desk.

So far so well, so transitivity, merely humans behave in this way only rarely. But also I can, in consideration of the chaos on my desk, decide what I would like to do at least gladly, namely clear up. Thus:
\[ R(A, B) \land R(B, C) \rightarrow R(C, A) \]

The appalled logician speaks of value-anomaly. My decision is circularly and contradicts all rules of the classical logic (see et al. McCulloch 1947; von Foerster 1998: 83 – 90; Goldammer 2003). McCulloch noticed:

*Circularities in Preference instead of indicating inconsistence, actually demonstrate of a higher order than had been dreamed of our philosophy.* (McCulloch 1945)

Decision-processes are inseparable, parallel-simultaneously mediated affective-cognitive-volitive processes, which produce an affect-specific- cognitive hierarchy (see ibid. Ciompi 1997: 130). World, the structure of relationship- and reference in the head consists of various monocontexts. It is in permanent change as long we live. Contextures are coupled structurally with each other; many are compatible with each other and organize into hierarchy. Leastwise as well many of the monocontexts probably collocate to each other unmediatedly. Some are, formal-logically considered, and not at all mediated with each other, because their points of view stay, as called so nice in a Marxist manner redundant, in an antagonistic-contradiction to each other. We can live with such contradictions generally very well. If we are addressed to this contradiction, we find good reasons in many cases, why it actually concerns no contradiction. For instance of that method:

- *Emma does not read woman-magazines of the Yellow press.*
- *Emma reads only feminist woman-magazines.*
- *‘Woman in happiness’ is a woman-magazine of the Yellow press.*
- *Emma does not read, ‘Woman in happiness’.*
- *In ‘Woman in happiness’ Emma found a fantastic cake recipe.*

Why it is possible, if Emma reads no woman-magazines of the Yellow press? Emma could argue as follows:

*Never I said never. I was at the hairdresser, I had forgotten my book about quantum-physics and I did not find anything better to read. But the recipe is fantastic.*

Decisions are always situation-dependent. Feel, cognition, decision etc. are physic-psychic-mental processes, no timeless conditions with alleged eternal validity value, like the objects of logic or mathematics.

We cannot only recognize contradictions; we can maintain it in thinking and tolerate it emotionally. We can ignore, deny, justify or waive it, more or less by arguing situationally and much more. Or we react completely stubbornly with: *A fat lot I care!* Often we are blind for these imponderables. Frequently blindly, rarely with open eyes we jump over abysses, whose transitivity-law and logic could never bridge a gap. Usually we already overlook the dark corners and abysses. At a pinch we euphemize the whole, suit according to us, assume it fits already somehow. Literally we are artists of life, who are in an existential way involved into producing of their world, in the sense, in which Merleau-Ponty speaks of ours “involvedness in being” (1986: 117).
The classical logic comes from a timeless valid monocontextual, causally connected total-interrelationship, which would in case of Emma result to a self-contradiction. Emma distributes, she must not be aware of this fact, the partial aspects upon several logical locations and waives in this way the self-contradiction. Polycontextual logic like Gotthard Günther raises the claim, which the involvement in the physic-psychic-mental process produced and based world-immanent subject into his producing consistent mapping and modelizing (see for instance Keahr et al. 2007).

Hannah Höch describes the genesis of monocontextual worlds of her collages, as a detecting somewhat before completely incidental ones, somewhat before co-subordinated and hence meaningless to us, something that she suddenly forces to a statement, a decision, position, from which she ejects her coordinates and sketches a world. Now nothing is coincidentally, nothing is only incidental. A whole with a holy order develops.

*I find somewhere something incidental, the more incidental the better - something meaningless, which suddenly animates my fantasy and forces me to a statement. This will systematically compile. That means, that from now on coincidental hardly still may penetrate, not in the structure of form, not in the color, not in subject matter (if one is aimed at). That means also that in the further progress of the work often a toilsome search does not stop.* (H. Höch: quoted after Döhl 1996; translation B.N.)

Hannah Höch assembles cutouts of different topologies to a new picture-structure. If something evoked its attention, then she does not leave anything to the coincidence. Changes within a contexture are homomorphous or antimorphous transformations. Höch does not accomplish transformations within a picture-structure. Under certain aspects she selects cutouts. She selects according to similarity criteria of the relationship, similarities of the constellation. *Similarity* is a topological category and refers to inconspicuous, an absent, to the relationship, the relationality, which determines all present in its being so as internalized emergence. Benjamin speaks of "non-sensual similarity" (Benjamin 1992). This requires a deeply mimetic competence and a conscious engaging and confidence in the emphatic system of evaluation operating in our unconscious structures ² Höch assembles from parts of different monocontextual picture-worlds, which are pieced together in a similar way, a new monocontextual picture-world. And the Logos, the Contexture became flesh (freely after Johannes 1), was cleanly glued together, incarnated into a new emotional connective tissue. The emotional cement covers the abysmal gaps between the shivers of the contextures and produces the illusiveness of a continuum. It enables even transformations, also antimorphous ones, not structure maintaining and thus new, emergences, which have never been there before and which are not reversely represented on the preceding contexture. Suddenly it is no longer alike as it was before. The opened world became different in essential aspects.

The glued together cutouts of pictures come from an only apparent continuum and may have been topologically likewise non-related and only emotional glued together. The new monocontextual structure of relationship does not seem to be a discontinuum. Cleanly glued together the gaps are calmly leapt. Over- or under-proportions are the expression of a hierarchy of value, similar to the perspective of importance of medieval pictures. Hannah Höch’s art achieves a rarely high reflection level, as we find it for instance in the art of Caspar David Friedrich. She reflects also, that she does not import reality fragments into her aesthetic realities. She uses cutouts of pictures from a VR 2, which are structurally coupled with our experienced reality, the VR 1. We immerse from one into the other one, without ever surface or win a reflexive distance. The borders between VR 1 and VR 2 prove not to be fixed barriers, rather as well, transitions, which, as long as they last, will have never turned into one or the other completely, but sharing both realities. Höch’s visual wittiness and subtle form of the irony makes our involvement transparent into the producing of Being and Appearance, our always being-in-picture.

---

² Inspiration, creativity, premonition have here probably one of their roots. They are a kind of feeling for non-sensual similarities. Premonition as the ability of the anticipation of such similarities in the future is based on the probability of continuing internalized emergent relationalities, and the fantasy for homeomorphous transformations. If the changes are of antimorphous nature, thus not to maintain the structure and so not reversely represented, it requires probably almost prophetic abilities, which we do not possess rather.
The processes of representation are at stake of similarities, which do not have to be structure maintaining, and not of truth. Similarity is a picture category. Truth or also only correctness too, also the true and the good etc. are only a function within the picture, of which we are a part of, and on the basis of the hierarchy of value of the monocontextuale world. If I claim, on the table in front of me there dances a unicorn, then this is only true, if in front of me on the table there dances a unicorn and is in this sense a part of the picture, thus our reality or the VR 1. Otherwise I have either lied, have made a joke, was in error or the unicorn has been a pure product of my fantasy. I imagined it. A VR 2 of my thought-cosmos breaks into the VR 1. The border blurs and at least the surface in the reality fails occasionally. The structures of relationship and reference called world is thrown out of joints. I am likewise disarranged as creative-co-produced part of this structure.

There is no requirement for absolute truth. For instance the belief in an idea forms, as Kant calls it “a focus imaginarius “, a light-cone, within reality for us opens up. It donates order and sense and a hierarchy of values and goals. These must remain at any time adjustable and changeable. That differentiates a good metaphysical ladder, which we can, according to Wittgenstein, throw away after using it, of bad ideology and of delusion-systems with requirement for total explication and exegesis, as we find it for instance at religious or political fanatics and sects. Reality will always have constituted itself to us in individual structural correlations. It will ever been shattered in poly-contextual multi-verses (cf. for example: Günther 1978; 1976; 1979; 1980). There is for us no meta-system that subordinates other systems, worlds or realities and forces their being together in a structure of a holy order, just as well in a holy without- or super-sense. The individual worlds may be more or less hierarchically structured; the relationship among them is heterarchic, at the best a can-be-possible-together (compossibility).

Each world is individually, culturally, historically different from the other one, depending upon world relationship and from this resulting ontology. Structurally coupled they can cooperate as a unit, without having to lose their autonomy to a super-ordinate system. There is no master-narration. Reality is not only one and differently than demagogues, dictators, political and religious fanatics, a patriarchal metaphysic or also the so-called common sense want to tell us, reality is never perfectly transparent and consistent. Each reality is antimorphous, multiple pieced together and patched and, as it is for us being finite creatures as only possible, an actually complexity-reduced picture of presupposed reality. Every one of these Patchwork-Universes is individual and singular exactly by the difference and the differences, through which commonness occurs and where it is kept in the threefold sense of Hegel. In the variance, in differentiating and not by the invariance community and identity happens. Always we are in the differences and are about to differentiate and to distinguish, identifying the world, the inventory of a world and ourselves. Differentiating and identifying are at the same time locating, finding a point of view, a place from where we eject our coordinates and which determines and tunes the physic-psychic-mental basic-perspective and basic existential orientation in our world and its periphery.

Invariance’s do not donate a community. Invariance, which concerns the elementary perceptions and functions of our nervous system, is the basis, on which we can share our reality with one another and can argue about differences. If we all would tick in the same way, there would be no individuality, no identity, neither could we be this nor differently, neither free space nor freedom. Probably there would be not even a trace of an idea of freedom. Only in the free space of difference, in which everything can behave either in this way or different, genuine human community is possible, we can detect differences and learn to love and to hate and discover similarities and commonness based on similar structures and contexts. It is common to us that we are individuals with individual worlds in the head and very different reality-experience. We demand the freedom to be that, which we will already have been. The In-Difference of freedom of a universal relationality or physic-psychic-mental pregeometry is the matrix, from which every one of our virtual realities emerges. They supply the substance, the material, from which the collages of our reality are assembled and to which we always are fallen for someone’s line. This fundamental unfathomable and unavailable of our freedom is what makes us human beings to human beings, to a Subiectum or - in Greek - Hypokaimenon, something, that underlies our being-in-the-world. This is the real common in everything what we otherwise suppose to have in common with each other. It is at the same time our fate (see Nunold 2004), to a certain extent the inevitable facticity of our Being, the fate or destiny. Hence the necessity or need
(from turns out of the need: Not-wendigkeit – aus der Not gewendet) to take the responsibility for this unfathomable and thus for the freedom, which we do not possess but in which we will have been already. This Freedom can be deprived from us only for the price of our destruction. Freedom is not a soft pillow to sleep in thunder. We are condemned, like Kant demanded, to rule ourselves, to give us the laws, voluntarily, autonomously, not heteronomously. The adoption or acceptance of this autonomy, the freedom, far away from any heteronomy by whom or whatever - self-determination instead of external determination - is the basic condition of succeeding human community commonness and common interests. It presupposes the acknowledgment of the other as someone „different“ and nevertheless someone, who is equivalent to me.

For us women that means that nothing and nobody, no tradition, ideology, religion, no Patriarch, Mullah, Rabbi, Pope, no man, husband, father, brother, uncle, no government of the world, where- or whatever have the right to tell us, what we have to be or what we should have to be or how we should live, and neither has this right any other women, also nor well meant feminist or emancipatory theory or ideology. We are neither Eve nor Maria, neither Lilith nor Kali, not the daughters of the Great Mother, no Witches or Wiccas, no Holies and no bitches, no mother-animals, no career-women, no sweet little silly, not the fair, not the different sex Simone de Beauvoir, neither the sex which is not one (Luce Irigaray) and by nature already not at all. All these – and there are more – are monocontextuale fixings of an immanent hierarchy of values, which are externally determinating us. But they deprive us the possibility in addition as well the burden of the decision of the choice from heterarchical possibilities and remove from us thereby our responsibility for ourselves. Freedom and the acknowledgement of differentiating as this, which is common to all of us, are uncomfortable and can be frightened. The fear leaps to us out of the alleged Nothing, the indifference, the unfathomable, the freedom. This is not anything for weak minds. It demands courage to face the fear and the ability of self-reflection and self- dissociation. But who says that we are the weak sex and that we are not able to face the fear and twisting it? Not to feel fear is an indication of lack of fantasy, of unreflectedness and stupidity and tempts to feel in security of an allegedly firm conception of the world. Our world is neither a disk nor a square, practically neither good nor bad. World, reality already shattered into polycontextuale multiverses, and is never as consistent as bad ideologies, delusion-systems with requirement for total explanation, religious or political fanatic and mysogynists of this world, dictators and sects and patriarchs want us to believe.
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