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<Near world – far world. The disclosedness of the next surrounding world>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> The homogeneous apperceptive extension of the actually to be experienced near world over the “distance of the sky” – constitution of a homogeneous world as such.*

First of all, what does “actually to be experienced near world” mean?

a) The originally constituted sphere of realities, the next, most original surrounding world in its form of spatial temporality and causality as well as the really being persons living with me and with each other – although with an open, unknown horizon soon. But this horizon is not yet completely constituted as “world”. The first near-sphere, having already the form of something belonging to the surrounding world, is e.g. for the child on the first level of world-childishness the children’s room, then the apartment and a stretch of the street in addition and the like. Here familiarity prevails and constant verification of the experience, in which under correction the apperceived things verify themselves through what is apperceived, from the old one the new one (which however is known in its type) [is verified], <which> also prior to direct experience is causally anticipated by processes being at once apperceived as causal consequences of currently not experienced things, and thereby these things being apperceived as being within the spatio-temporal field in a respective set of types (the respective causality points to). The directly perceived is apperceived as usually lasting – also when the perception is over –, or rather, the “induced” is something accessible, or experienceable, re-experienceable as approaching on its own accord, approaching possibly as a person.

In addition “induction” through communication. Enlargement of the personal circle through it [through communication], beyond the [circle] of the first near worldly personality (family, nurse, etc.), which is a requirement for the growing into the unitary personality and its surrounding world.

**[176]** This surrounding world is accessible for me and for anyone (in this personality, this people, etc.), and everyone is companionable and amenable, immediately and mediately, even if de facto there is no possibility to make a direct experience, a direct personal connection, let alone to get to know this whole first world completely and directly. Everyone has his “finitude” therein, the first finitude, namely his necessarily limited abilities of actual perception (after that [abilities] of direct memory), and of an indirect cognizance through induction (communication included); and yet he “could” get to know the whole surrounding world, and the persons co-functioning for it. Everyone has his own limited sphere of experience, and yet [he has] his own horizon of the unknown as being for him, though not de facto, still experienceable. It is mere random that [from there] where he had already been [he] did not proceed, that he de facto took <the> one direction and not another one; it is mere random that he heard from his parents only this and nothing else about what they could have told him from their own experience, that he did not ask them, and [it is] also mediately mere random that they had only the knowledge to say this and nothing else, since they had their contingencies within their own sphere of experience and communication. Etc.

Further, more precise considerations are needed here. Communication leads to verbal and other tradition, basically to be taken as its intrinsic part: <e.g.> through monuments that have been created for the descendants, as communication. Thereby the non-“verbal”, not communicative expression of human existence, or rather, of having existed (included therein then the surrounding world of their life) mediates by way of cultural things, also the expression of institutions (“public” baths, gymnasia, schools, churches, cult places, etc.).

Everyone, taken singly, is finitely limited by being unable to freely go through the “historical” past beyond his own possibilities of memory, i.e. the complete past of the personal humanity being his universal we, [limited] by being unable to get to know it completely in the mediacy belonging to it. In a certain way a “personal humanity” is limited in analogy to the single man and in an analogous way. The limitation on both sides concerns the experience (doxa), and no less [it does concern] the surrounding world of the being as practical field (world of practical possibilities).

**[177]** A closed humanity in functions of a personality of a higher order: Statism as highest level (with the personal “cells” family, family-community). Such a humanity among others – each <has> a closer surrounding world, that of the family, the tribe, the people, and another one comprising the fellow humanities. If we conceive of one as being the only one, it has its life territory, but above that [it has] an open “nature”, with things, animals, possibly men as well, this means: a horizon of de facto lacking knowledge, but apperceived in analogy to the familiar surrounding world within the territory, but also apperceived with the open possibility of some “foreign new” – that is a kind of modalizing of the set of types familiar from the formation of experience -, gradually universal set of types of the surrounding world, namely something well known and something new constantly belongs to its constitution itself, but not only something individually new within the old set of types, but also the novel, foreign, but within some relativity, ever again taken up into the old set of types.

What concludes the relative surrounding world? – We need to exclude there history as “science”, like any science in general. A humanity lives within an originally lively tradition belonging to the generative and peopled life of this humanity itself. This humanity lives within its flowing present, to which the respective knowledge of the single persons belong, or rather the respective evincings through communication, also the mediate stories of stories of fore-fathers. Furthermore the family documents, inherited family-“souvenirs”, public monuments, etc. All that has a “meaning”, is “understood”, although [understood] in vague indeterminacies and in apperceptive making-ups, mythical substructions (of course explaining itself as that only on the basis of a history). The life’s surrounding world is present together with a past that in a certain way is finding its place within it, and [with] a future pre-delineated from it. Within the closest surrounding world of the life – homeland – there is nothing foreign for the mature one (not for the child). Something foreign her is the contrast to home. It has the character of a continuous normality, within nature like within humanity according to things, to animals, to human beings, to things typical for the culture, etc. Only the abnormality of earthquakes does exist here, of other natural catastrophes, of plagues, of mad people, but recorded as rare, as **[178]** unusual incidents of an own set of types. One is able to get to know the foreign land, and thereby to make it quite familiar, and it will become an enlarged second homeland.

But how does this concern foreign peoples as well, foreign “races”, completely foreign territories with their own worlds of culture?
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