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The all-embracing world consciousness as world perception.

<The all-embracing synthesis of horizons implied within the world’s appearing.

The mundanizing apperception of every appearing that belongs to the natural world consciousness, and the mundanizing horizon of possible reflection>[[1]](#footnote-1)

World as world of experience – this is a ticklish theme.

World as it presents itself in actual and possible “aspects”, appearances, by way of the conscious life – my conscious life, in which the conscious life of everyone else is implied intentionally – through which a **synthesis of unanimity within the total synthesis** runs that combines <the> appearances of all modalities, or rather [that] continuously predelineates itself as such [a synthesis of unanimity] which will come out in the way of a correction, which has to come out, be it passively, be it in active engagement of the ego-subjects with the course of the “appearances”, “perceptions”, these are perceived objects within the How, that is, a perceiving mental living, wherein something perceived as such is conscious within the How. They are perceptions pure and simple, within the primitive mode, perceptions in modifications of recollections, an awake stream of manifold such single kinds of consciousness in changing modes of acceptance, but always combined as unity of an unanimity within the general unity of the stream, or combining within correction: a unity being perception itself, within the streaming life continuously changing itself together with the perceived that is combined to form a respective “world aspect”, but for its part a **synthetic change of world aspects** correcting itself towards unanimity, and in future and now predelineating all-embracing, worldly unanimity. Of course I need to be cautious here. I may have my field of perception now as the world’s [field of perception], that is, as my world aspect, without currently remembering in an intuitional way my past world aspects **[131]** and <their> worldly past, and thus my past field of perception; if recollection comes to pass then what is recollected without more ado is in synthesis with what is now originally perceived, “making” its past horizon “intuitional” in one piece, clarifying. Both synthetically combined aspects themselves form an “aspect” **of** **the** world. The world appears, is perceived, that is, it is originally perceived within the primitive mode “present”, and at the same time as past [world] of a certain past present in a secondary mode which is a primitive mode with regard to the modificate “being past”. The synthesis which obviously is not a connection within the juxtaposition, since the recollection as “uncovering” of the perception’s implicate of the horizon is founded on it, adopted by its intentionality as **explicate, the synthesis**, I say, **is itself a world-”appearance**”.

And so on for chains of recollections <and> for expectations as anticipating intuitions stepping in (“explicating” intuitionally the future horizon).

But likewise regarding the “empathies”, the representations of foreign men and of animals and of their conscious life, [and] therein [of] their world perceptions. Each of my world perceptions, even if I do not have any current representation, any currently intuitional representation of foreign consciousness and of foreign perception in my field of consciousness, “implies” through its horizon foreign waking life in open infinity, and that part of it that respectively becomes intuitional currently. In my conscious life is implied the all-embracing synthesis of appearances, of my very own present [appearances], and the remembered [ones] <and of> those of foreign subjects, “foreign” to me, as endless horizon of my current respective total perception, which is a synthetic formation of special perceptions, [of] primary, secondary, tertiary (empathizing) [perceptions]. Within the flowing of these synthetic formations they combine again to syntheses, to “**appearances” of a higher level**; while sinking they modify the constantly implicit world horizon, bestowing new sense on it, and yet constituting a **certain self-sameness** therein – the world determining itself therein more closely, but also correcting itself. Therein is implied (in this horizon ever shaping itself anew) **[132]** that which arrives at the actualization of the horizon acceptance, at performance, by way of “explication”, through production of perceptions in the respective modes of perception (modes of intuitions carrying acceptance of being, or rather, which I perform in the consciousness of the acceptance of being) – thus also the egoical communalizing with the others as existing for me within perceiving, the receiving of messages from them, and the communicating with them, the engaging with the perceptual world in acting, nay in every doing, also in the perceiving [doing], and not only as my solitary acting, but also as communal acting within the social combinedness of the acts as communal acts. All this manifesting itself is itself **mundane**, respectively already implied within the world horizon, and [all this] is respectively something appearing in modes of appearance, entering in syntheses of appearance, determining the horizon anew as belonging to it under the title of the already known, but yet determining it more closely – in the way that for the future something individually known does not become individually but typically known – and thus generally determining the course of the future implicates with “possible” perceptions. These are thereby themselves as intuitions of the perception’s possibilities a mode of perceptions, not “objectivations” without acceptance (that properly speaking do not exist), nor [are they] mere fantasies with their acceptance within the quasi-mode; they are <rather> special “perceptions” of possibilities that exist, that have their acceptance of being within open ranges, etc.

But now it seems that the question concerning the world as world of actual and possible perception (experience) shall express a **barrier**: that we would have to juxtapose perception as appearance and appearing – contrary to that further consciousness, and therein something conscious, e.g. thoughts, opinions, grown within tradition, thoughts concerning the world, [thoughts] attributed to the world, imposed on the things in verbal doing as verbal imposing of meaning, i.e. added as sense content to the appearances, the appearing things as such. Pertinent are also the theoretical thoughts, formed within theoretical thinking, and eventually still on the ground of world experience in which the world always constitutes itself as appearance, and [in which world] already exterior and prior to all theorizing in syntheses of unanimity is accepted as being with that sense content that constitutes itself within these syntheses. **[133]** The **thinking**, also the acting one is used to oppose to thinking, seems to be juxtaposed to the **experience** (rather: the experiencing). And thus correlatively: The content of experiences, the appearances, and the “objects” that remain in continuous and secrete synthesis (itself an appearance of a higher level), poles of objects, differ from the **thoughts** in verbal formations, the words (with their expressions), the sentences (statements with their statement-significations, the “judgments”), and these again differ from the other act-formations, among them those that as correlates of the acting doing are called “**actions**”, possibly included therein work formations, work phases as preliminary drafts, etc.

But now we face the difficulty that world **comprises everything**: also the thoughts as thoughts of men are within the world like their thinking, in which thoughts are formed, belongs to the psychic field. Moreover, as uttered, spoken, written, printed thoughts they have their place within the spatiotemporal world, namely through “expressions”, through these corporeal occurrences. The mental significational formations are accepted by us as the same, as bestowing identical meaning on many corporeal expressions, and on the other hand as to be formed by many men, and to be reproduced as these same; they are experienced as the same without further ado within the synthesis of mutual understanding. But although we thus speak of the ideality of the thoughts, [although] we do not confer any worldly individuality to them themselves, any spatiotemporally individuating place that is peculiar to them, they still do not hover. Without realization they are ideal possibilities of their formation that are to be projected in backwards direction from, as we say, their historical actuality – in another time of others and of what men ever -, which projected thus of course are identified. Likewise we can also imagine men of fantasy in a fantasy world in which they would be thoughts thought as the same and embodied in documentations. But let us stick to the thoughts themselves under the purpose of their documentation. Do they not have different modes of their actualness? Or rather: Do they not also have their subjective modes in which they “appear”, [in which] they have their perceptual acceptance of being, in which they are conscious within their original **[134]** actuality, modes of continuous appearing in continually varied modes of appearance with differences of the “being properly actualized themselves” and “being presumptively anticipated”, modes of the discrete modes of appearance, and of the synthesis within the discretion: like originally first formation, called “primal instituting” (for example within the first “discovering”), and merely repeating giving of something itself which takes up and reclarifies the already founded and fixed conviction? Do these appearances not have the signification of perceptions, that is, [do they not] again [have the signification] of something mundane although they are not body appearances, but [are] only combined with body appearances?

This relates, just in another kind, to the **modes of consciousness** of any kind, also that of thinking, which the appearances “carry within themselves”, but [which] are not appearances themselves – insofar as the appearances themselves are appearances of the inner, immanently yielding consciousness, and [insofar as they] have as that their deeper modes of appearance which we are not used to call “appearances” (body appearances, and thus appearances else). Taken as a whole, **everything is appearance** on different levels and [in different] modes that is **contrasted to the objectivities**, **and [everything] lies within the unity of the subjectivity of consciousness** which always combines appearances with appearances in an **all-embracing** **synthesis,** and which in a flowing way has appearances in its streaming, and centers all special appearances within the ego-pole. But **all appearances as modes of consciousness are themselves conscious as being mundane**, as belonging to the world under the title “psychic” – while the world is a constituted unity of appearances, only achieving acceptance and verification as appearing unity within the intentionality of the appearances. Is there thus a difference at all between experiencing and not-experiencing life within the conscious life? Is not the conscious life indeed experiencing, indeed giving something itself, perceiving in the different intentional modes of giving something itself: primitively modal perceptions in the narrower sense, varied memory (re-representing body perception, conceptual perception), etc.?

Indeed we will have to say: The all-embracing consciousness in natural attitude in which I experience myself as a man, living in a mundane way, **perceives in a mundane way** **[135]** in all its processes of consciousness, implying thus within its horizon world as such as synthetic unity of manifold and predelineated appearances. Of course we have to add the inventive consciousness, representing the consciousness in the mode of the as-if, and quasi-perceiving therein objects, whereby the modalities of being have the sign of the as-if.

On the other hand, my current inventively representing consciousness not only perceives the world (in our wider sense of this word) in itself like all actual consciousness, and thus the whole stream of consciousness, but it is itself apperceived as mundane, namely as **my psychic**, insofar as it is my primordial [consciousness], or as foreign psychic, insofar as it has acceptance of being from its perception of foreign in my primordiality.[[2]](#footnote-2) It is apperceived, thus it is itself content of perception, [it is] itself only something appearing of an appearance accepting it as object. Thus again the same is accepted for these – and so on *in infinitum*.

Of course this progress can only be released by way of differentiation of presentness and horizonlike potentiality. The current total consciousness with all its processes of consciousness has an apperceptive **horizon of possible reflection**, and this reflection “mundanizes” that which it reflects upon, apperceiving <it> currently as something psychic, and so on *in infinitum*.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Since all potentiality points to presentness, thus reflection must belong to the necessary content of the world experience. Does this not indicate that all psychic as such exists due to reflection? Is it not empathy that presupposes reflection upon things the way they are primordial for me, that is, [reflection] upon physical-thing appearances, and that it simply comes about just by way of foreign animate bodies motivating a reflection upon myself in my primordiality, and [motivating] my bodily functioning within the “similar like I was there physically”? Men as psychophysical units thus are based upon reflection, and it remains to be shown how the reflection’s horizon of iteration and its [the reflection’s] objective-psychic apperceptions become understandable. Is the following a possible way? – If I understand the other one, I use self-reflection; but **[136]** within [the self-reflection] I do not have any psychological “knowledge” of my understanding as of something psychic, as of something intersubjectively identifiable, I only have it by way of reflection which initially is not motivated. But in understanding the other one I also soon understand that he in a similar situation – like <the one> which I call “to view my body with his eyes” – does understand me as someone looking at him, as understanding him. But I understand that by having been led back from him towards me and my understanding. That is, I am motivated to reflect upon me as [upon] **someone understanding**. But I also understand the other one as understanding a third one (looking at him), and this one <as> <understanding> a fourth one, etc. And again I understand another one as being within this mediacy: to look from one to the other, to understand him by understanding him as the third one, etc. Are there not mediate reflections implied that motivate me to **reiteratedly experience myself in a reflexive way**?

Thus the all-embracing natural consciousness is in its activity and affectivity completely **world consciousness**, that is, perceiving world with an all-embracing horizon of perception.

In my all-embracing natural conscious life (which at the same time is my human psychic one) is implied as something psychic objectively accepted: foreign conscious life as world consciousness of the foreign which at the same time is foreign psychic life of the foreign man. And this again likewise does imply. Each of us thus has a world-experiencing, and the world-experiencing is our flowing waking life, and experienced therein world as an open universe of men (and variations of the same as animals), each one has his conscious life therein, wherein he has conscious the world, thus also himself as man in explicit and implicit perception that is as something psychic intersubjectively accessible for everyone. Conscious life is everywhere through and through perceiving [conscious life] in which the world as something being constitutes itself for the perceiving ego, and thereby <it> perceives at the same time in relation to itself, and [to] all possible self-reflective reiterations of the perceiving.

The men are subjects for the world, and at the same time [they are] objects within the world. They are <subjects>, each one <is> a subject for the allness of the others; they <are> its objects, and each one is at the same time subject and object for itself.

1. 27 September 1932 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Consciousness as something psychic. Constitution of the psychic through reflection. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Constitution of the psychic through reflection and in relation to others. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)