No. 27

<The natural core of the world in its respective experiential sense is a product of the experiencing doing. Equation of the natural ways of appearance and of the cultural formations. Ways of appearance as objects of the practice>[[1]](#footnote-1)

The **personal world**, the world the humanities (history, cultural science) deal with on a higher level, is **always the currently experienced world in its experiential “how”**, whereby the experiencing identification and determination is directed towards the **unities of reality**, still thereby remains interested in the intersubjectively understandable and determinable “As it appears to the respective persons” as well.[[2]](#footnote-2) This of course also pertains to the temporality. Something is stated concerning present, past, etc; and one thousand years later everyone understands this completely subjective-relative way of determination; he identifies that which used to be “present” earlier with that which for him is a past of one thousand years, and yet knows how to take into account what it means, historically speaking, that it was present for the past subject, and thereby original sphere of actuality, whereas one thousand years later the same is finished as past for the later historian, and [is] lying outside the sphere of practical possibilities – for him.

Thus with regard to the experiential world, being accepted by us now, we[[3]](#footnote-3) need to study a **double system of forms**: that of the real experienced world itself, accepted by us, and that of the multiplicity of “presentations” in which it presents itself for the experiencing ones, that is, in such a way that these presentations in their multiplicity and **[276]** each possibly to be experienced itself constitute in its “how” of the presentation a content which is no less intersubjective and accordingly experienceable in an “objective” way.

But a remark is needed here: It is part of a personal subject’s essence (of the individual within a community) to be **practical**, to practice activity, and to thereby create formations and physical, since a real surrounding world is always presupposed for the person, which necessarily appears as real within a “how” of orientation, etc. Thus we have always some “**material**” **preceding** within a “how”, and that which is **produced from it**, having its **cultural sense** as a product.[[4]](#footnote-4) But the proper producing, that of a new real thing from real material, is not the only performance of action, and not the lowest. The material which is being formed, is being changed within the proper producing (like in modeling, woodturning, carving, etc.). But it can also remain unchanged, and just take over a new cultural sense, for example a tree receiving a religious meaning, single subjectively or intersubjectively.

But if we now consider the action of the external experiencing, of the experiencing with regard to natural properties, this action does not change any part of the experienced real thing, it changes apparency into new apparency; it performs a continuous enlargement of cognition by “keeping” that which has been cognized[[5]](#footnote-5) within the earlier [apparencies], as proceeding experience of the same real which ever <more> uncovers itself according to its bodily being. Accordingly one can say: The already experienced real thing, experienced in an experiential sense, gains an **ever new experiential sense**, and this new [sense] is the “**product**” of the experiencing doing.

Accordingly the ways of appearance belonging to the natural core of the world, close ranks into one class together with the spiritualizations of any kind of reality, like those making art objects and other cultural objects with spiritual characters appear.[[6]](#footnote-6) As soon as nature is exhibited as core structure we have on the one hand the multiplicity of the subjective “ways of appearance”, **[277]** or rather, of the “subjective” shapes, which nature itself can have within the personal surrounding world as being identically accepted, verifying itself, - on the other hand the manifold subjective ways of appearance, belonging to the surrounding world as being no less practically actualized and to be actualized, belonging to the natural realities as such.

Certainly, the mental meaning as instrument, as work of art, etc., is a purely mental-personal performance, and is thereby not equal to the natural ways of appearance, as they already need to be existent from passive constitution, and predelineated as systematic horizon of appearance in order to be changed within their system. But all the same it is agreed that the world, within the subjectivity and subjective practice, always is a **surrounding world** as being given subjectively, and changing from actions of subjectivity, and that the personal practice has its practical sphere of action within a world of realities which is only a practical world, a personal surrounding world within its subjective shapes, shapes changed by subjective activity. Thereby of course the **concept of surrounding world** becomes **ambivalent** since it now designates the realities themselves within their preservation of identity with their real properties, now [it designates] the properly practical and for the subjects in experience, in emotional behavior and in the behavior of the will properly accessible world, the world of realities in the respective “how”.[[7]](#footnote-7)

But thereby something else comes into consideration. Everything being or becoming objective for the subjectivity, necessarily is included itself within a change of subjective modes. This also holds true for the objects within the subjective how-character of which we are speaking. But also **subjective modes** can become objective, or rather, the objects within these modes, i.e., they become substrates of actions, e.g. of cognitions and else cognizing actions. Instead of getting to know a mountain in its reality, e.g. with regard to its geological properties or its spatial form, size, etc., and [instead of] thereby initially proceeding in cognition from appearance to appearance, from apparency to apparency, from aspect to aspect, whereby these modes of appearance are not objects of cognition themselves, I am able to make this or **[278]** that among them an object itself, an object of consideration and evaluation, e.g. a certain “view” from a place, from a free crest. But this [view] itself has its changing modes of appearance. We say “We have no good view today”, if a veil of mist “covers” the landscape – the aspect of the landscape. And if we do get the view by changing the site, but are still searching for the place, from which one “properly” gets the true, beautiful view, thus the views respectively changed in a conscious way are incomplete presentations of the one view, of the true one which we mean through it, and [which we] finally actualize.

And eventually each and every subjective which we consider by grasping ourselves as human beings belonging to the world has an endless change of subjective modes of appearance. If we look at those we again find the same. That is, this as well belongs to the practical surrounding world, at least insofar or initially insofar as it can become a cognition-theme for us. Because, as has been said, the experiencing doing is already personal practice. And each ascertained being is in its way something practically finished, a personal possession (and thereby a lasting formation of our practice), like any possession in the common sense of property.

We thus have an incessantly changing multiplicity of something subjective, but through the same [we have] a multiplicity of identity, and unified multiplicity – that of world realities, or rather, of the one real world. Thus the realm of the subjective is so to say **polarized** in a manifold way, it eventually carries as experienced a **system of poles** – **that of real nature**. It is equipped with subjective characters on the most different levels, which on the other hand still are identifiable in common experience for all communalized subjects of the “we” together with the natural carriers. **Everything subjective**, also the concrete subjectivity itself, presents itself within the experiential world as **something naturalized**, equipping something natural with a subjective sense or content.

We thus have an “objective world” constantly pregiven as universal field of possible experience, of possible thinking, but also of possible valuing and acting. We can direct the thematically experiencing universal-theoretical view towards nature, **[279]** the core structure of this world. But we can also, without making nature a theoretical theme, rather make the personalities, ourselves and the fellow subjects a theme.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Still more concise: As child of the world so to say I can be directed towards the persons and the personal life with regard to, and <in> the view’s natural passage through the bodiliness, and then I find, whereas I have been “given” in an experiencing way the world within the universal space, etc. as **being existent** in a familiar way of givenness the persons with their rational life and therein their experiencing with all the appearances, cognitions, etc., wherein the world and its natural as well as supranatural (subjective) properties are given.[[9]](#footnote-9) But I do not only find them (them, the bodily-worldly [subjects]) as **experiencing**, but also as **practical** subjects else related to the experiencing surrounding world, the same which for me, the viewing, is mine, just in another subjective content, so that my practice cannot be the same as that of the viewed persons.

In such an attitude[[10]](#footnote-10) I can pursue psychology, and the concrete humanities like linguistics, cultural science of any kind, political and social sciences, etc. They are based on the different directions of experience possible in this natural attitude, and consequently experiencing special attitudes, thus for example towards the persons bodily being within the world, having a practically apperceived surrounding world as personally practical [surrounding world], and achieve performances in all their acting directed towards the world, which now are firmly fixed within the common surrounding world as objectivities of a new, practically mature sense, which everyone now is able to understand, and which can motivate everyone in appreciation and depreciation, for the pleasure of and desire for the possession, etc. The bodily persons, the men, are bound in social communities due to mutual or one-sided social acts; and this performance as well designates for each man being present, and <for> the community **[280]** itself, the one thus formed, or one being present as well, a growth within the spatial world, within which the communities, like the individuals forming them from inside by way of communalization, belong <to the surrounding world>.

**Natural life is prior to the sciences**, it is **world life**. We are always directed in a space-worldly way within life; the world is constantly pregiven, “experientially there”, is **firmly accepted** within the habituality of the original acquisition as universe, whether we are exclusively directed towards something most single, and some most single subjective like a momentary psychic movement. The single thing is a single thing from the frame of the experiential world, which is experienced within the universal flow of experiencing – also where the experiencing has exactly the shape of an experiencing which is not actively performed by the Ego, [which is] acting in a grasping way. The single thing has its surrounding world which we do not pay attention to, and which is still there as well, like the open-endless surrounding world.[[11]](#footnote-11)
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