No. 17

<Concerning the orientation of understanding: Domestic world and foreign world. Understanding of foreign men and foreign domestic worlds.[[1]](#footnote-1) Religion and science as all-embracing world intentions. The mythical of the others. Objection of the relativity of scientific interpretation of the world. Intersubjective critique as way towards universal world cognition. Descriptive science>[[2]](#footnote-2)

*<Content:> Man as theme. The man over there, within his surrounding world. Man in his cultural surrounding world. But the foreign man, the Chinese. To get to know something real of the world – to cognize the surrounding world like it is in truth as special intent. The psychophysical man as theme, the person as theme. Constantly world apperception in advance. Within the togetherness: harmony and dispute. The others within my surrounding world. We, <having> the same actual world within the connection: common surrounding world with the same set of types. Message, expression, indoctrination – belongs itself into the world. In advance the world is for me an apperceptive being sense, experienceable in a familiar set of types, every real thing <has> its own [set of types]. Core of proper and actual experienceability. Then with the help of others. Sphere of possible intuitability and corroborability – directly and in a mediated way. But within the horizon the mutual not-understanding. Everyone raised in his class. The way a unitary traditionality still encompasses everything within our nation. Surrounding world like it is acquired and experienced in the normal course of the community’s life, in the continuous progression of vital present. Contrary to that co-contained (retentional) past within the not vividly proceeding life- and world present* **[158],***and the return to it [to the past]in its vividness. The awakening of distant pasts – generatively.*

*Understanding the Chinese – understanding his domestic world. I would have to “grow into” it like a child [grows into] the world of the adult, eventually [I would have to] learn to understand his past.*

*One and the same world is always indeterminately pregiven within the certainty of being, for everyone from his domestic world, and its generativity, for everyone in his temporal private shape, and at the same time anticipated in a horizonlike way apart from the real [community] the possible community with its members, and thus “the” world, the known (also already from others), and unknown [world], etc. Furthermore horizon of the foreign men as subjects within their communities and domestic worlds – thus prior to all question of science. Special goal-setting of scientific world cognition.*

*Excursus: universal world intention, religion, and science. Religion and universal human life task. Religious and religiously ethical life. Way towards God, etc.*

*Universal science, breaking into humanity. Way towards science.*

*Again prescientifically: way from the domestic world towards the foreign. Following and understanding the foreign men and their world. The “core” and the unintelligible foreign. Thus the mythical of the foreign men. Does this not presuppose a core to be intelligible as such?*

*Objection: All our explication of the pre-scientific life world, and from there of the science, and all results of radical elucidation of science on this way is explication of my, of the European’s [life-world]. The primitive man has a completely different life world, there is no way for him towards European science. Our logic – logic of the primitive man. But it is me who makes these differences, etc.*

*Elucidation of the intersubjective understanding, and of the intersubjective critique – I arrive at accordance of a world cognition under the critique of foreign cognition.*

*Descriptive science.*

*Reason “presupposed”.* **[159]**

Text No. 17

<§ 1.> Man as theme. Behavior of man. Man within the cultural surrounding world

The man over there, what he is doing. He governs within his body while perceiving, he is moving his eyes, is focusing that thing over there, then that one, he is moving his hands fumbling. But he is intending on doing something within the perimeter of what is experienced by him. He takes an object (some paper), lifts it with the one hand; with the other hand he holds a pair of scissors and cuts off a stripe, etc. I understand that without further ado, and in an individually typical way. He behaves in the typical mode of behavior of “a” person, cutting with “a” pair of scissors. Thereby he is intending on doing something else. This will become intelligible within the connection of his action which is already intelligible in its single steps. – Man is cultural man and within one of the cultural spheres that are understood in advance [he is] according to the type scholar or bookbinder, and the like, intelligible within the soon understood, apperceived surrounding world “study”, “workshop”, etc.

But I do not always understand him beyond the next animate organism. For example I do enter a foreign surrounding world. The individual set of types is known to me in an incomplete way: a plant, but of a foreign kind, a field, but covered with other cereals <than those> I am familiar with. The handling in the field: I do not know what typically belongs to the cultivation of such fields. A house, but its character of a foreign kind. Is it a temple, is it a public building? – I am in China. Doings and dealings on the market, but with a foreign set of types. I know it has a set of types, but I do not know it; but obviously the people over there on the market [do]. The set of type does not alone lie within the external handling which I am able to understand quickly, but <it also lies> within the final sense, the typical intent of the people, and the ways to actualize them in commerce.

To get to know the people as persons within the world, to get to know men as psychophysical realities, to get to know stones, mountains, things, but also cultural objects within the real world, to get to know <something> the way it actually is, in truth, - this is a goal within my already familiar personal surrounding world. It is pregiven for me; I have my apperception of the surrounding world in advance and always, and therein the goal [is] already familiar: How something being for me in advance is in truth – and if it is at all or eventually is not.

**[160]** But of course it can happen that others get other results. – Of course others belong to my surrounding world (in truth); and if I am in a connection with them, <then> we have the same or essentially the same familiar surrounding world, also familiar by way of anticipating possibilities which are intended to be made familiar, which we do not have yet, and <that> others do already have that which I do not have yet, and [that] I can learn from them what is there, like what kind of set of types is to be presupposed, and is accepted, etc. I know as a townsman, that the rural man knows how to cultivate the fields, etc., whereas I hardly know anything of it. He can teach me, [he] can make descriptions, etc., and mediately I gain some knowledge. – But this itself belongs to the unity of the common surrounding world, that we do not have identical elaborate apperceptions without much ado, but [do have] such a connection (synthesis) of our apperceptions that anyone could mediately acquire those of the other one as closer determination of his own [apperceptions]. True being of which I am talking, which I can strive for, presupposes my world horizon, my world apperception; and this implies fellow men whose world apperceptions together with mine have that kind of unity due to which I can say: We live in a unitary humanity with a unitary world. I have a universe of apperceptive familiarities within my world. That which belongs to my world is experienceable for me. – What does this mean? It has **an apperceptive sense in advance**, designating a telos of possible experiencing cognizance: a typically familiar object the type of which I can construct any time, which I already know from former cases in which I have become acquainted with such kind of things.

But in this way this is only accepted for a **core** of this my world. To it also belongs that which is not only individually unknown to me, but also according to its type, thereby especially such things that I can become acquainted with in their kind on the way to indoctrination through others, with whom one is eventually able to exchange views concerning all being as something commonly and harmoniously to be experienced: Horizon of a world sphere which is to be gained as sphere of possible intuitability and corroborability. I do not have this relationship to the Chinese. For me they are subjects I cannot get to know in this way, or rather, whose world (that one I ascribe to them as men!) I cannot get to know, in relation to **[161]** which they behave within a familiar way which needs to be made familiar for me, whereby this behaving belongs to their world as determining them themselves. One will say now: My world as such reaches further than my originally familiar surrounding world. It is a world the meaning of which is determined through the community with others who are familiar to me in their human type in correlation with the familiar world which we can harmoniously cognize in exchange and in mutual understanding and <in> mutual critique. I have some experience of “foreign men” beyond this world, whom I cannot completely understand, but only indirectly as men of my surrounding world which is theirs but not mine, without the ability to question them, or to otherwise get a balance.

But is not this whole presentation precipitant? The classes and ranks within my nation, initially within the broad present of men’s current present life. The roadman, and the decent, cultured man, the military type, etc., the creative artist, the scientific researcher – men with different vocations which are only partly or rather not intelligible at all for each other. And on the other hand I do communicate with the Chinese, of course in a more limited way. What is the difference?

I am raised as a German, not as a Chinese. But also as a small-towner within a middle class domesticity and school, not as aristocratic big landowner within a cadet school. Yet a **unity of traditionality** goes through all unintelligibilities – **a unit of the surrounding world with its partly already familiar set of types, partly to be further formed in an acquiring way**. I so to say get to know the military man and the military part of the surrounding world externally; And if I have done my voluntary military service, I do actually get to know one side of it, but still [I do] not [get to know] therefore the actually inner specific of the professional military man. Instead the set of types of his more external doing and acting steps in, his ways of talking, his modes of proper practical reactions. I have my apperceptive type of the professional military man, and [I] know in which way he will behave, and still I do not have the central personal empathy I would have if I were raised myself in that way, [if] I had built my personality accordingly. I could approach an understanding in an indirect way **[162]** through following and understanding the motivation for generating, like if I try to get to know the training course of the cadet school, enter the historicity of the development of military, of the military sense of honor, etc. But this has to be separated. Because first of all it is about the surrounding world, how it is acquired through the normal course of the individual life within a normal community simply as normal life surroundings. Thereby life is that which continually goes on within the continuing life present, like the surrounding world is the present world in which one immerses while continuously living with and among friends [and] thereby getting to know it as presently being, though being with its changes, upheavals, revolutions, etc.

The continuously living within the present while conserving and continuously forming apperception of world present, we have to distinguish this constant process from the past life that needs to be evinced and to some extent to be made objective in the present, [the past life] of the generative community and its past surroundings. A sphere of the past belongs to the lively present: what everyone can awaken from his own recollections, and what we <and> what any convening nonhuman community can reconstruct as past stretch of its present in exchange with its memories, and supplementarily in mutual adoption. The human present implies the learning from experience, and this means as a rule: to reawaken the past in memory, and to understand from it the developing of the present, and to correct the present in its being or [its] should-be.

The understanding-a-Chinese already presupposes understanding the current domestic world, and life within the home human circle. Like I was raised as a child into my generative human world, thus I need to be raised into the Chinese world if I want to understand the Chinese and his world; by immersing I need to acquire the apperception of the foreign world however and how far ever this is possible, which would designate: to become an ever more complete Chinese man among the Chinese – while still being German and not losing my German surroundings. And thus likewise the Chinese within my world. I would have to arrive at adopting the Chinese concrete life surroundings like a Chinese **[163]** with its included lively past, and after that of course also the lively future horizon, belonging to it in a flowing way. This [is] then the foundation for the making possible of the reconstruction of “historical” traditions, and of the building of an intelligible – completely intelligible in a Chinese way – Chinese history.[[3]](#footnote-3) But of course this is not possible in the complete sense, like it is not possible in the complete sense to adopt in complete concretion the type of a squire, etc.

Thus the world is within the course of human life and its necessary communalization **a world which gains its familiar sense constantly from new apperceptions, an ever newly to be determined sense** – although unmistakably and necessarily in such a way that it is always accepted as the same world for all men ever possibly entering this circle of communication, and with a most general sense, a constant form, whereby everyday distinction between the world itself and the changing modes of objectivation by individual men and peoples, cultural circles with regard to the world become possible. To elaborate this would be the task for a separate analysis. But here it suffices for the ascertainment that men living in the world, individually and mutually understanding each other do this by being conscious of the world, of one and the same, that they are constantly certain of it in awake existence, but that this one and the same world is only known to anyone in the shape of his generative domestic world – and this itself in the private and temporal shape peculiar to him – and that by understanding the other one, and thereby his world relatedness “the” world becomes conscious as the world conscious to the other one in other private <shapes> and home shapes, in the latter regard with the difference that the fellow man can be apperceived as home companion and sharing the same domestic world, or as a foreigner and sharing some foreign, unknown world, common only to him and his home companions.

What has been ascertained obviously is true prior to all question as to whether men do have a science, whether they do live within a surrounding world with scientific culture, or, if this <is the case>, whether they themselves within their life perimeter do know anything of something like science, **[164]** of its creative and receptive and other actions as well as of its results.

Human life, to have in a conscious way as surrounding world (domestic world and foreign world, both on different levels), and to certainly immerse into it within the respective content of objectivation, proceeds in interests, in more or less already organized purposes and systems of purposes. These lie within the persons as being individual and as persons interconnected to higher personalities as their habitualities. Current life proceeds in acts, in single intents, aims, actualizations of goals, complete [actualizations] or those coming to a standstill, etc. For every personality the surrounding world it has is “the” world as the one currently apperceived by it, content of its apperception, being accepted within its habitual factual possibility, and continually being accepted <as> the universal field of its whole practice (in the widest sense), its realm of typically familiar availabilities, of presences, to which the universe of its intents relates, and in which its actions take place. They themselves as human persons, as existing in an organismal way, are contents of this world; constantly everyone is currently there for himself in certainty of being, and belongs for himself and for his friends to the availabilities, to the objects with which one can intend on doing something, that are and are at the same time in another way possible, maybe possible in another way, influenceable, creatable in limits that need to be considered, etc. Thus everyone for himself to some degree (like objects as such), and thus the other ones for everyone.

<§2. Excursus: Universal mundane intentions: religion and science>

The invasion of the practical idea “science” into the history of humanity as something new in basic essence is a special kind of possible intent. What kind of goals being new in basic essence could be set, could for the first time emerge in persons, and could be striven for in communalization (of the scientists working together, and for each other) for an endless future, principally not to be concluded, thus in infinity?

**[165]** Infinitely directed intents related to an endless human future as an endless produced formation. But the theme of this intent <is> cognition of being, and, what is essential, occurring as all-encompassing world cognition. “Theoretical” or “scientific” interest in a single thing belonging to the world thus in this sense of scientificalness (determining the original meaning of “philosophy”) always serves universal cognition, without any question as to whether individual persons eventually specialize in a special task. The philosophical community carries the all-embracing interest, and everyone actualizes it for his part, for his special tasks he rightly sets serving the all-embracing cognition.

We will ask here: Are there any other all-embracing, worldly intentions, intents? One can answer: If an absolutely all-embracing religion has been instituted within humanity, in whatever people, that is, <in which>, in what shape belonging to the surrounding world ever, or rather, in what mythical shape ever, God, simply speaking, **is** **the one and only God being the God of the all-world** (who has “created the world”), has emerged, has been discovered (spoken in religious terms: has revealed himself to men), thus “God” does not designate a god of this or that man, of this or that family, <of> this or that people, but the only one for all human beings. This relation to all men means – if we consider the emergence of the idea of the one God on the historical way via myth and multiplicity of “godly” powers, and <via> the corresponding norms of religious behavior – a system of normative demands being valid for the man **as such**, i.e., as [a man] having intents within the world, setting goals within the world, living in respective interests, for the man as such, i.e., for **any** man, where and when ever, in whatever people he lives within the world, however his home land may look like, however his traditionality, his historicity. The one God, **God pure and simple**, is the correlate of the **man pure and simple**, that is, of every actual or conceivable man, and again [he is] the correlate of the world **which is the one and only**, presenting himself to men in whatever surrounding world. The all-embracing human religious demand thus is nothing else but the demand of that absolutely all-embracing religious **[166]** ethics, the ethics of that humanity transcending all peoples, terrestrial ones and peoples on Mars: by way of the singularity of God.

Obviously these are essential connections, regardless of the question as to how far the empirical shape of an “absolute” or “true” religion (in contrast to which all other religion is idolatry) can keep away from the pure form of the religious in its mythical and revelations and dogmas presenting themselves in an empirical way belonging to the surrounding world, in its religious regulations, symbols, or how far the empirical is consciously empirical presentation, mode of appearance, symbolical allusion to something absolutely religious or human-ethical.

Of course, since man only has the being world in modes of domestic worldliness and foreign world, and [since] all his world life in all his purposes is related to that which belonging to the surrounding world is accepted and verified by him within the set of types of the being of the surrounding world, thus it is obvious without further ado, that each concrete ethics or religion (system of concretely universal demands for this humanity), relating to the concrete men of his people and of his home country, indeed has a relatedness belonging to the surrounding world, a relatedness to the set of types of the concretely human behavior, namely the behavior for example of the Jew in the ancient world, or of the Jew and the Christ in the historical European world. All-embracing ethics and religion obviously are only pure forms, abstract in their all-embracing universality, leaving openly undetermined the concretions of man and surrounding world, and exactly thereby [leaving open] the norm of genuineness, that always has to be co-understood in that way that each concrete thing is only concrete in its universal and yet not to be abstracted out type. Many a special thing needed mentioning here.

Absolutely religious and ethical life coincided here – regardless of the possibility that the historical starting of a philosophy as all-embracing science could result in a way towards God and towards an absolute ethics, on which God becomes appropriated by the universal humanity not by way of “revelation” in historical founders, and makes his all-embracing human claims. In a certain mode is this latter way the way of the naturally naïve historicity of the development of man from home man to universal man, and to his all-human compelling humanity. The way via philosophy <is> the **[167]** unhistorical way, [the way] through the emergence of the autonomous cognition, and of a new, all-embracing testing by norms of the practice, motivated by this [cognition]. The God of all men and all world who emerged on the one way, after historical revelation has been transmitted, is co-understood without much ado as being revealed for all men within this tradition –also for the “atheist”. Accordingly the afterwards emerging science, insofar as it takes him into account, relates all existence and all human willing or decisions to him, is *eo ipso* theological; but a science which does not presuppose revelation, a kind of the universal science that does not know any revelation or recognizes as pregiven fact (although afterwards to be treated cognitionally), is atheistic. Accordingly, if such a science still leads to God, its way to God would be an atheistical way to God, like an atheistical way towards the true, unconditionally universal humanity, and this understood as substrate for an overnational, overhistorical normalization of what constitutes true humanity as such overtemporally, overempirically.

But now, what can a universal science (philosophy) wish for but a new kind of something emerging in history, breaking in to it?

<§3.> The <understandable apperceptive> core <of a foreign life world> and the not understandable foreign. The foreign-mythical.

Transition from the firm apperceptions of the domestic world towards the following and understanding of the apperceptions of the foreign – to learn to understand the foreign world. At the beginning one preferably transfers one’s own familiar apperceptions, according to the analogy, and thus gains experience; one gets to know, one moves on, as long as the accordance does sustain thereby – or discordancy results as an incomprehension of what is the foreign people’s surrounding world in its acceptance and harmonious verification.

But what one has within the certainty of the according understanding (although discordancy may come out afterwards), and [what one] ever achieves, is still always determined by one’s own domestic worldly apperceptions. **[168]**The supposed foreign world is necessarily a transformation of the domestic world. Within the first connex that is established between us as home comrades and the foreign companionship’s foreigners *eo ipso* a common individual world wins acceptance, and within the encounter a common near world of individual realities mutually identified in common experience – something identically existent, but the identical apperceived differently. But the question is how far that which is supposedly followed and understood by me, determined by my native experience with men and the world, is exactly what the foreigner apperceives on his own accord, that is [what he] possibly experiences.

Being within the world as a man – on my own – I am already a man in advance who understands foreigners as foreigners, and **already** **in advance within a core understands** **something foreign quite like something local**, and already understands it with what is not understood, that is <as> a variant.

But initially there is no dispute if I want to learn a foreign culture and <foreign> people within a foreign country. Because I apperceive the foreign cultural objects and the foreign people not in my local set of types. They are understood by me in analogy, but quite indeterminately in a general way, and according to their determinancies they are simply unknown. They point to foreign persons the acts of whom I truly understand within a core sphere, and their objectivities with a core. And there I need to be able to reconstruct by moving on what lasting interests, purposes, tools they do have and have produced, etc. for their practical handling.

The **mythical** in what is not understood and in what is unintelligible within determinacy. How about the **mythical apperceptions** of the foreigners thus? And are we Europeans, raised within our de-deified world, allowed to presuppose ourselves as normal men? Instead of [presupposing ourselves] as an abnormal case? What is the core within all world-apperceptions that makes possible a mutual understanding and a common world <and> also the understanding of the mythical like of all other? How does within the domestic world the mythical differ from the non-mythical? – Is it necessary to distinguish? Is there not necessarily there a **core**, in all apperceptions which is **presupposed by the mythical**, may it co-enter each concrete apperception, [may it] belong to it as a concrete [core] for the people of the domestic world?

**[169]** And finally: **Who contemplates all this**? Who explains analytically the style of his own domestic world <and that> of the foreign one? Who follows the universal analytical necessities, and offers a “scientific” information, a “theory”? – If I say: “I, **the** **European**, I within the historicity of the Greek science, and holding its methodical habitualities”, and if I say: “The **primitive** man, the Roman living in mythology, who had not yet been Hellenized, and the like, **was not able to**, and also the Chinese man today is not able to if he has not been Europeanized”, then actually I again presuppose that I, the European, do know the primitive men, etc., the “prosaic” objective scientificalness, and especially <the> scientificalness of history. **My reflection** concerning human existence, human surrounding world, human having-a-world prior to science, and concerning the intent of a universal science is in itself **reflection of the European man**. The fact that it is thus, that I am a European, that I am a German from the determined Moravian home sphere, having developed thus by a certain schooling, etc., this **in advance is part of my reflection’s horizon**, like the European We, the European horizon of the surrounding world with scientists, philosophers I internally and externally debate with, lies within the we-reflection. Each universal reflection has its base within my individual being-on-my-own, and within my respective individual surrounding world. And within it I also have the others – everything my reflection teaches me -; within it I perform the variation of all conceivabilities and as the one of my thinking. Am I able to enounce something else than what I am thinking in a reflective way within my being? And if I speak of people and of the world, <am I able to> <speak> of something else than of people who are experienceable and imaginable within the horizon of my surrounding world, among them myself as human being among these human beings? Am I able to imagine something concrete concerning the world and objects of the world in another way <than> as something experienceable from the set of types of my surrounding world, etc., from my actual core of experience?

While reflecting I find that all my apperceptions, all the familiar apperceptive types of my world, exactly those for which I can find verbal expressions, are **my life’s acquisitions.** And even this goal, this intent of a universal reflection! **[170]** And likewise the scientific habituality, the consequent reflective theoretical interest in explaining and judgingly, truthfully fixing of what is in truth for me in extreme universality. Thus it is natural that in **my world** I find myself as a human being of this habituality, but next to me animals and primitive men, who do not have this habituality, i.e., who are experienceable and cognizable for me in this being-sense, <a being-sense> that excludes the same.

<§ 4.> Objection of historical relativity: All our explanation is European, etc.

Does it make sense to accept the **objection**: “This is your European (and eventually your personal) way of thinking, it results in a European truth, in a European logic, in a European world view, or rather in a being world in accordance with Europe, further in European theory of cognition, etc. Primitive men have their own logic, their own world view, and thus every other humanity that truly or possibly differs completely from your own. Like man like his world, his science, his art, his God, etc.”?

What does this designate? **To me**, as objection? <The primitive man> is the man being in my world for me, and as such the one for whom I am in his surrounding world then – but what I myself cognize within my conscious life, have as content in my world. Is not **each and everything** I enounce, cognize concerning possible world views, kinds of logic, theories of cognition, supposed worlds of any people, peoples, cultures, primitive or not primitive ones, an **explanation in my own realm of cognizable being**, a subjective result of my reflection, of my thinking, my possibly apodictic truth? Is it not science as my originally own acquisition in which everything is included that I am able to know as science and knowledge of foreign men, and imaginably am able to have? Is it not therefore a nonsense that the universe of my truth and my being could be in insoluble conflict with the universe of what is cognizable by any other one, e.g. a primitive man, if those primitive men and their universe **[171]** (according to all I can say about it in truth) are included in my universe? Is not therefore the possibility given to me not only to arrive in a proceeding way at the truth of what they are themselves, what their universe of possible opinions is to them, and of possible verifications that are sufficient for them, <what> the truth of their surrounding world is for them, and the logic being its norm? Is there not also the other possibility for me to **confront** their and my truly beings, their and my “world” and supposed world cognition, and to perform **critique**, that is, to arrive at a universal ultimately valid truth eventually, according to which the truth of the primitive men is not a truth pure and simple any more <and the world of the primitive man is not a world pure and simple>, but is one of those types of existent surrounding worlds that already in multiplicity belong to the unity of a human life, then to the unity of a homeland, and again to the unity of a peopled world with many homelands, etc., domestic worlds in which a true world presents itself, and the intentional unit of which – unity of reason – is this true <world>.

I may encounter Chinese men, Indians, Hottentottens, etc., surveying prescientifically. I experience them as foreign men who are in the world and know themselves within the world – **the** world. Although I soon note that our mutual understanding does not reach far, and that the things, the men, etc. of the world we all experience do not designate the same for them as for me, that our apperceptions differ widely, as it is obvious from their behavior, whereas I am not able to copy their apperceptions for me, to follow and understand their way of “seeing” and to be motivated by the things app<arent> to them. **Within communication the understanding is enlarged** although it always remains precarious. Practically I proceed with them due to my continuing actual or supposed understanding, and thereby at the same time I gain ways of verification or correction of my following and understanding. The world knowledge, the world experience is enlarged for myself exactly by way of the experience of their existence as apperceiving the world in such and such a way, and acting accordingly. In communication with my home companions I do not only get to know them as human beings within the world, within our domestic world, and thereby the world as such, but we are **in a community of experience**, and within the other community **in community of thinking**. This implies: My **[172]** harmonious experience as world experience so to say goes through their [experience], which is generally taken over by me; and we do not proceed in these communities singly, but in togetherness and through each other in the knowledge of the world existent for us. This also concerns our experiences not **with** but **of** foreigners: We help each other to get to know their foreign kind. In contrast to that they can only serve as co-subjects for the world experience only within a small circle, the [circle] of the already successful and verified communication with them – like something similar, although in a still closer circle, is the case for higher animals (for example dogs).

I cognize all that, the reflecting scientist; I cognize my behavior and the behavior of all, and the horizonlike having-a-world and world life of us all, wherein prescientifically all that lies pre-cognized. If we take ourselves as scientists: We gain a method in which we on our own apperceptionally build the set of types of our surrounding world in an ever more perfect way, [in which] we get to know the pre-given apperceived surrounding world ever more closely as being the same, in its set of types ever more perfectly determined, and are able to anticipate thereafter also in an individually relevant way something individual according to the cognition of types by way of subsumption what needs to be valid for it in advance, according to its universal which then further determines itself within the situation and actual experience. **Descriptive science of the surrounding world** on the **basis of the pre-givenness**, and of an experience and experience statement observing in a theoretically purposeful way, and fixing according to the individual-typical. This concerns dead things, plants, animals, also human beings the way they are pregiven **according to the surrounding world**, and apperceived as objects. Methods of determining the individual objects – namely methods to be able to identify them anytime by recognition also by way of indirect determinations to secure the identity of the things experienced at different times and in different places – concern time- and place-identification and –determination. Science of the experienced world becomes possible reaching beyond the “present”, the broad present; the world becomes descriptively-historically cognizable with regard to the history, and to some degree the future of the world. The method is evident – it has the evidence of a familiar practice which at this point is the practice of recognition and of the knowingly determining.

**[173]**

Appendix XII

<Concerning the plurality and actualizability of the home worldly we-horizons depending on the situation >[[4]](#footnote-4)

One understands the foreign man as a foreign human being, as a man of a foreign home community and domestic world. I am with my home companion without further ado within the world which is without further ado accepted as the one common to me and him, as the one in which **we** are living, in which we exist as the ones living within it, as being conscious of it in the respective ways of consciousness while living within, while being conscious of it being also conscious of others, having certainty of others’ <lives>, and of our life in respective kinds of consciousness, etc. But foreign men do also belong to the world, to the one for us, to the one in which we exist in the way of the living-thus-within-it; they also live within this same world which is ours, and by including them within our “we”, we can call them fellow men with whom we are living in the same world.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Obviously a phenomenological characteristic of the world is needed which as constantly accepted surrounding world is the ground of acceptance, to which **all** affectivities and activities of the awake life are related; and thereto already belongs that the world exists as mine and every home companion’s <world>, with whom I live in community. The personal horizon needs to be characterized in which I am a companion as the integral-unitary personality (therein community of consciousness, community of awake life, community of act), which has <the> world <as> its correlate being constantly the world of “our” life. In addition the **layers of this personality**, according to which the local we, the national we or [the we of] thepeople, the European we, etc. agree, are unities within higher <unities>. – Thereto different attitudes: I have a local-Alemannic attitude, if I, the Alemannic, speak to Alemannics, and this concerning themes that transfer me without further ado into the Alemannic way of life, of language, of “world view”. But the pole can <be> for me and for those communicating and being focused in an Alemannic way the German Reich under the title of “homeland” **[174]**, or under the title “German nation of the people”, and “German culture” something reaching much further and which above all comes into question through the unity of language and the verbally conveyed community of living. – I adjust myself immediately in accordance, thus I do have a different horizon of humanity and of the surrounding world than the “living” one.

1. Texts concerning the themes „domestic world – foreign world“ have already been published in *Husserliana XV*: text No. 27 as well as appendices XI and XLVIII. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. November 1933. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Like the child as well has to learn the historical past while growing. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. July 1933. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It needs to be heeded that this itself belongs to the being-sense of the domestic world, and then this that those presenting themselves as foreign men within it (within and without the home territory) imagine the same world differently, therein in conflict with us, with another being-sense <and> again <this> that the same holds true for the others in contrary relation, the [relation] towards us. Two possibilities: I “convert” to the foreign opinion – my home people converts to the world view of the foreign people – then my people merges within the distinction of foreignness – both <are> one people. And individually? Likewise in a certain way. But complete unanimity is inconceivable, neither with peoples. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)