Plurality Without Foundations

The Dioramic Method and the Reinstallation of Priority

Ton Haarmans

Abstract

Philosophical approaches that resist reduction sometimes restore hierarchy by assigning a privileged role to transcendental constitution, embodiment, ontological disclosure, or immediate experience. This article examines that recurrent move and proposes the dioramic method as a discipline of description. A diorama makes visible how a world holds together through relations among distinctions, practices, expectations, and norms, while withholding the claim that its description supplies an ultimate foundation. An illustrative account of experimental physics shows how such description can preserve empirical constraint without treating science as either the foundation of every meaningful world or a mere product of social agreement. The article distinguishes this proposal from a general theory of truth and addresses its relation to perspectivism, relativism, and critique. Its central claim is that situated comparison and judgment need no final standpoint outside the situations they address. The method offers a way of clarifying plurality while remaining accountable for its own position and limitations.

Keywords: phenomenology, pluralism, anti-foundationalism, normativity, dioramic method

1 Introduction

Philosophical reflection encounters plurality both between traditions and within ordinary life. Scientific inquiry, religious practice, aesthetic attention, and personal relationships organize experience differently. Their differences concern more than competing answers to an agreed question: they can concern what counts as a question, what matters in answering it, and what would constitute a satisfactory response.

One philosophical response seeks an underlying order capable of explaining these differences. A particular form of access is identified as more fundamental, and other forms are understood through it. Transcendental conditions, embodied experience, ontological disclosure, and rational justification can each assume this role. An inquiry that begins by defending difference may consequently end by arranging its terms in a hierarchy.

The concern of this article is that movement from clarification to foundational priority. It does not follow that every distinction between levels of explanation is illegitimate, or that an account becomes objectionable simply because it explains another account. The difficulty arises when a situated mode of description is promoted into the authority that determines the ultimate standing of all the others.

I propose the dioramic method as a way of resisting that promotion. It asks how a world functions as a meaningful and normative configuration before asking what might ground it. Here, a world is a field in which practices, distinctions, expectations, and concerns acquire their operative relations. A diorama is a selective description that makes those relations visible. It is neither a replica of reality nor a view from outside every world.

The proposal is methodological. It does not establish that reality is ultimately plural, or that foundational accounts are impossible. It asks what description can accomplish when it does not assume that plurality must be resolved through one final ground. Its restraint applies to its own claims as much as to those it examines.

2 How priority returns

Phenomenology provides an instructive setting for this question because it resists the reduction of lived meaning to an external causal account. Its attention to experience makes visible dimensions of significance that an explanation in other terms can overlook. The issue here is not whether that resistance is warranted, but what happens when a form of access acquires foundational authority.

In Husserl's transcendental inquiry, constitution concerns how objects and world-meaning are given, rather than the psychological production of an external reality. The movement from the natural attitude toward phenomenological reflection, including the suspension discussed in Ideas I, §§27–33, changes the status of the world within the inquiry. The dioramic question is whether the resulting clarification must also be granted authority over every other meaningful mode of access (Husserl 1983).

Merleau-Ponty's emphasis on bodily involvement challenges the idea that reflection begins from a detached spectator. In the preface to Phenomenology of Perception, reflection is understood in relation to a life it has not itself initiated. This can illuminate the dependence of reflective activity on embodied involvement. A further question remains: does that dependence warrant treating embodied description as the final measure of other descriptions (Merleau-Ponty 2002, preface)?

Heidegger explicitly distinguishes ontological inquiry from the investigations of particular sciences. Being and Time, §§3–7, explains the priority of the question of Being and develops the terms of that inquiry. From a dioramic position, the concern is not that this distinction exists, but that scientific and everyday practices might receive their philosophical standing only through the authority of the ontological account (Heidegger 1996).

These brief readings identify a methodological tension; they are not refutations of three extensive philosophical projects. Nor do they show that all forms of phenomenology reproduce the same hierarchy. They isolate a recurring possibility: an account that clarifies a condition of meaningful activity can come to serve as the ground by which all such activity is ranked.

Rejecting reduction therefore does not, by itself, prevent the return of priority. The decisive question is how an account understands the reach of its own authority. A dioramic reading can draw on phenomenological insights while leaving that reach open to examination.

3 Experience and the demand for a foundation

Immediate experience can appear to offer a secure alternative when abstract foundations become doubtful. An experience may be undeniable in its occurrence, deeply convincing, or transformative. None of these qualities alone establishes that the interpretation attached to it must govern every other domain.

The distinction matters because an experience and a claim about its ultimate significance do different work. A moment of bodily presence, a religious disclosure, or a non-dual experience may alter a person's orientation profoundly. Describing what happened does not yet demonstrate that the event

reveals the foundation of science, ethics, or ordinary relationships. That broader conclusion requires an argument.

Dioramic description attends to the setting in which an experience acquires significance: the distinctions through which it is recognized, the expectations it unsettles, and the practices it changes. This attention does not reduce the experience to its setting. It asks how the claim made for the experience relates to the way it functions in a life.

Situatedness alone is not a proof against foundational knowledge. A claim can arise in a particular setting and still aspire to wider validity. The more limited point is that immediacy does not discharge the burden of justifying such validity. The method withholds the promotion of an experience into an ultimate ground while preserving its force within the world in which it matters.

4 Worlds as configurations

The term world is useful because differences in experience are not always adequately described as alternative views of an otherwise agreed object. Two people may disagree about a measurement while sharing the procedures by which it should be checked. A disagreement over whether measurement addresses what matters may involve the procedures and concerns themselves.

A world, in the sense used here, is a configuration in which distinctions, expectations, practices, norms, and affective orientations sustain one another. It shapes what becomes salient, what can count as evidence, and what follows from an action or statement. Its coherence consists in these working relations, rather than in a single explicit doctrine.

This is an analytical use of the term. It does not divide reality into separate universes or imply that each person inhabits an inaccessible enclosure. Worlds overlap and change. People participate in several configurations, borrow from them, and encounter tensions among them. What appears coherent in one practice can be questioned through commitments encountered elsewhere.

Coherence is also a matter of degree. A world can function despite inconsistencies, suppressed conflicts, or unexamined assumptions. To describe its coherence is to identify how it holds together, including the work needed to maintain it. It is not to certify its truth, justice, or completeness.

The method gives coherence descriptive priority over the demand for an ultimate foundation. This is an order of inquiry, not a new hierarchy of being. Before deciding what supposedly underlies a practice, it asks how the practice distinguishes success from failure, sustains expectations, and responds to disruption.

Normativity is present in this functioning. An experimental result can fail a relevant check; an action can violate a commitment; a religious practice can conflict with the tradition it invokes. Such failures have force because standards already operate. Their operation does not settle the separate question of whether those standards deserve to be maintained or extended.

Kuhn's discussion of normal science offers a useful point of contact: scientific activity involves shared achievements that organize further research, rather than isolated judgments made without a practical setting (Kuhn 1996, ch. II). The dioramic method uses this attention to organized practice without assuming that every kind of world follows the structure of a scientific paradigm.

Worlds can consequently be described alongside one another without making one the ultimate ground of the rest. This laterality does not require equal authority on every question. Experimental physics can be more authoritative than religious interpretation on a physical measurement without thereby becoming the foundation of religious life, ethical obligation, or aesthetic significance.

5 Describing a diorama

A dioramic inquiry begins with a bounded situation. It identifies what participants take to matter, which distinctions guide their activity, and how claims become answerable to relevant checks. It then examines how these elements reinforce or unsettle one another. The result is a selective account of a functioning configuration, with its scope and omissions open to challenge.

This procedure can use causal explanation, historical inquiry, and comparison. It does not ban synthesis. A provisional synthesis may clarify relations among practices without claiming to encompass every possible standpoint. The restraint concerns the transition from a useful account to an account that presents itself as the final authority over all others.

The metaphor of a diorama draws attention to the arrangement through which a world becomes visible. A description has a position, a selection, and a frame. Making these features explicit helps prevent the frame from disappearing behind a claim to unrestricted access. It also allows another description to reveal what this one leaves out.

5.1 An illustration from experimental physics

Consider a schematic situation in which an experimental team obtains a measurement that differs from an accepted prediction. This is an illustration of the method, not a report of a particular experiment or a claim about every branch of physics.

A dioramic description would examine how the discrepancy becomes a scientific problem. An instrument produces a reading, but the reading does not function as evidence independently of calibration, an experimental procedure, a model of relevant influences, and an account of uncertainty. Mathematical relations connect it with a prediction, while shared procedures make the resulting claim available for scrutiny.

The team may recheck calibration, examine its analysis, repeat the measurement, or consider whether a background assumption needs revision. These alternatives have different implications. A faulty instrument and a reproducible discrepancy are not interchangeable descriptions of what happened. Their distinction is maintained through practical and conceptual work.

The configuration therefore includes material resistance as well as social organization. Equipment can malfunction, observations can resist expectations, and a proposed explanation can fail a check. Agreement among participants does not by itself make a result adequate. Conversely, empirical constraint becomes scientifically articulate through procedures that specify what is being measured and how an error could be detected.

A dioramic account makes these relations visible without deciding that science derives its legitimacy from an ultimate ontology. Nor does it infer that scientific truth is merely whatever a community accepts. It leaves substantive scientific claims answerable to the procedures and evidence relevant to them.

This change of attention does not invalidate questions about objectivity or the assumptions of physical theory. It postpones the demand that their answers ground every other meaningful activity. A scientific account can deserve strong authority within a defined inquiry while the philosophical claim to unrestricted authority remains unestablished.

5.2 Comparison without a final overview

Describing several configurations requires some capacity to move between them, translate their terms, and compare their consequences. The dioramic method cannot coherently deny this capacity while making claims about plurality. It should distinguish a situated overview from a final overview that claims to escape all conditions of description.

A comparison can be explicit about its purpose and criteria. It may ask which procedure predicts a measurement more accurately, which interpretation accommodates an experience, or which arrangement permits those affected to challenge a decision. Different questions authorize different comparisons; no single comparison automatically settles them all.

Such judgments can be argued for, revised, and extended. Their situated character does not confine them to the private preferences of an isolated group. It means that the standards used, and the proposed reach of the judgment, remain part of what must be defended.

6 Objections and limits

6.1 Does the method become its own foundation

The vocabulary of worlds and configurations can itself look like an account of what every meaningful activity really is. If it claimed to expose the ultimate structure beneath all descriptions, the method would reproduce the priority it questions.

The proposal must therefore remain revisable. A diorama is offered because it can clarify particular relations, not because every practice has first been proved to instantiate an exhaustive theory of worlds. Its adequacy depends on what it makes intelligible, what it distorts, and whether those addressed can challenge its terms.

Reflexivity alone does not solve this problem. Saying that a description is situated does not make it fair or accurate. The method requires the further work of specifying scope, acknowledging omissions, and answering objections. It proposes restraint as an argued philosophical commitment rather than announcing a universal prohibition from outside plurality.

6.2 Is this perspectivism or pragmatism

There is substantial affinity with approaches that emphasize situated access and the practical life of concepts. The dioramic method should not claim originality by reducing perspectivism to multiple pictures of a fixed object, or pragmatism to the slogan that truth is whatever works. Both labels encompass positions more complex than those formulations.

The specific emphasis here is on the configuration through which objects, concerns, and standards become connected. A diorama asks how those relations operate and limits the authority claimed for its description. This emphasis can be compatible with forms of perspectivism or pragmatism without supplying a general theory of truth.

The proposal consequently does not depend on proving that it constitutes a wholly separate philosophical school. Its value lies in the discipline it brings to a descriptive task. Whether that discipline adds something useful must be assessed in its applications.

6.3 Does plurality imply equal validity

Withholding an ultimate foundation does not entail that all claims are equally sound. A faulty measurement and a carefully checked result can be distinguished without resolving the metaphysical status of every possible world. Likewise, recognizing the coherence of a belief does not establish that it is true.

The method preserves a distinction between explaining a standard's operation and endorsing it. It also permits standards to be criticized through evidence, consequences, competing commitments, and encounters with other practices. Evaluation need not remain confined to standards already accepted by everyone involved.

This does not dispose of every problem associated with relativism. Deep disagreements can persist over the criteria themselves. The dioramic method identifies where such disagreements arise; it does not provide a guaranteed procedure for resolving them. Its contribution is to make the grounds of a judgment available for discussion without presenting them as a final court beyond possible challenge.

6.4 Can a coherent world still be oppressive

An oppressive order can possess considerable internal coherence. Its distinctions and practices may support one another precisely by excluding the testimony of those it subordinates. If coherence were sufficient for justification, dioramic description would provide little resistance to that order.

Coherence is therefore a descriptive feature, not a moral warrant. Immanent critique can expose a contradiction between an institution's declared commitments and its practices, but this is only one form of criticism. Where an order consistently endorses domination, showing inconsistency may be impossible or beside the point.

Criticism can also proceed from the experiences and demands of those harmed, from commitments developed elsewhere, and from arguments about suffering, freedom, or equal standing. Such criticism crosses a configuration's accepted boundaries. It need not pretend to be neutral in order to challenge those boundaries legitimately.

For example, an institution may reserve authority to a group defined by inherited status while presenting that exclusion as essential to its coherence. A dioramic account can explain how its rules, narratives, and sanctions sustain the arrangement. Opponents can nevertheless contest the arrangement on grounds of equal participation and the harm it causes. Describing the institution does not require its opponents to suspend that judgment.

The method supplies no ethical theory that by itself vindicates those grounds. That is a limit, not a proof that moral criticism is unavailable. The substantive ethical argument still has to be made. Dioramic restraint asks the critic to acknowledge and defend the commitments through which the criticism speaks, rather than treating a claim to ultimate access as a substitute for that work.

7 Responsibility and transformation

Worlds are not maintained by ideas alone. Habits, institutions, resources, bodily capacities, and relations of authority can sustain a configuration. A description that attends only to conceptual coherence may therefore overlook both the conditions of its stability and the obstacles to changing it.

Conflict can reveal these conditions. A failed expectation, a disagreement over evidence, or a demand previously excluded from discussion may make a familiar arrangement questionable. Change can involve repairing existing relations, adopting new standards, or abandoning commitments that once seemed indispensable.

No final synthesis is needed for every such change. A person can revise a practice through an encounter with another without integrating both into a complete philosophical system. Conversely, synthesis can be useful when it remains answerable to the problems it addresses. The dioramic method has no reason to prohibit it merely because it brings several descriptions together.

Responsibility remains with those who describe, judge, and act. Appealing to a principle does not automatically evade responsibility, just as rejecting foundations does not automatically deepen it. The relevant demand is to answer for the application of one's commitments and for consequences that a description may conceal or make visible.

Dioramic restraint can contribute to that accountability by exposing the position from which an account speaks. It cannot guarantee openness or prevent domination on its own. Those outcomes depend on practices of criticism, participation, and revision that require more than methodological declarations.

8 Conclusion

The dioramic method addresses a recurrent risk in philosophical description: the promotion of a particular form of access into the ground that determines the ultimate standing of every other world. It asks instead how configurations of experience hold together and how the description itself participates in what it makes visible.

This change of attention preserves a place for empirical judgment, comparison, synthesis, and criticism. What it withholds is the assumption that these activities become legitimate only when secured by a final standpoint outside all configurations. Their authority must be argued for in relation to their purposes, evidence, and consequences.

Plurality does not thereby become harmonious or immune to judgment. Worlds can be mistaken, exclusionary, fragile, or oppressive, and their coherence does not excuse them. The dioramic contribution is more limited: it clarifies the relations at stake while keeping the authority of its own account open to examination. It offers a discipline for philosophical description, rather than a final description of everything.

References

Heidegger, Martin. 1996. Being and Time. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. Albany: SUNY Press.

Husserl, Edmund. 1983. Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book. Translated by F. Kersten. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1996. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 2002. Phenomenology of Perception. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge.

Note on AI assistance

ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used for editorial assistance, structural feedback, and language refinement in the preparation and revision of this article. The dioramic proposal and the philosophical project developed here are the author's.