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<The universal structure of realities of the experiential world, and its grounding structure „nature“. Regional sorts of self-preservation and of the change of concrete realities>[[1]](#footnote-1)

<Content:> The method of the conception of the experiential world’s invariant form. The main structures of this form. The universal structure of the realties and therein the unconditionally universally grounding regional structure “nature”. A piece of general description of this region. (Finally the kind of change of the division analyzed in a special way.)

<§1.> Method <of the conception> of the invariant essential form of a possible experiential world as such

The world is given as continuously experienced and experienceable in harmonious intersubjective experience as spatiotemporal allness – “world” – of realities, we still better say: all-inclusive unity, since the realities separated within the spatiotemporal mutual externality are combined with one another in the allness.

However we do separate between the world given to us singly and respectively in community experientially accepted as being and being thus, and the world being true in itself, and we know thereby that <that> which is now accepted by us through experience as world-being and world itself, can lose its acceptance for us in further experience. Thus we always have a new world accepted by us, and yet throughout all changes [we have] the conviction of the same world, which in changing just appears to us to be now thus, now thus.

We will consider the **world now accepted by us** the way it shows itself within harmonious experience and [the way] it has shown itself up till now (whereby of course some illusions had to be cancelled which inhibited the harmony of experience), [and] consider the **experiential sense** of this world, clarifying it and keeping it up, all round **[282]** till the end. We pursue the possible experiences beyond the actual ones as such [experiences] belonging essentially to this world as well, we consider the expected course of future experience with which the future of this world has to become given, continuously making it [the course] intuited for us in any form; but all that in a way that our actual former experience together with the possible, or rather still pending, but intuitionally imagined [experience] has to be considered as expanded in the style of some universal harmonious experience: Then we make clear to us thereby what this world, which is now accepted by us, is, or – in relation to the ambiguity of the ways of supplementation through experiential possibilities – the open range of possibilities for the determination of the being and being thus not predelineated by our experience in a completely determined way. If we consider us to be in another and yet another experiential present, then the sense of the accepted experiential world which in this mode had to be explicated in a clarifying way, **will ever again be another one**; and each will again have its ambiguity, [each will] itself again imply different possible worlds thought of as being accepted. Likewise the worlds as such will be different which are accepted by me and the other ones, by our <experiential community> and other experiential communities, and different [worlds] according to the different experiential presents.[[2]](#footnote-2) If we compare, something common everywhere comes to the fore under the title “world accepted by the respective subjectivity”. With all differences as to what is accepted as world obviously a **universal structure of form** remains invariant. And even more. If we consider, starting from these exemplary facts in arbitrary fantasy-arbitration, any de facto accepted and intuitionally explicated world to be varied in random pure possibilities as intuitional possibilities in the form of possible harmoniously to be further considered experiences and if we overview within the attitude of the pure Whatever [sic!] (of the unconditional and pure universality) the universe of such possibilities encompassing all contingent facts, then we correlatively find the infinity of pure possibilities (of pure conceivabilities) of subjectively accepted worlds, and all these world possibilities **[283]** by essential necessity coincide in an invariant structure of form, without which <a> world as such, accepted by whomever is inconceivable.

Finally we bring to our minds that this **essential form** which we respectively explicate to us in evidence from the fact of our now purely experientially accepted world taken as example, *eo ipso* must also belong to the **world which is true** **in itself**, [and] which we always contrast to the [world] de facto accepted by us, by anyone, by each multiplicity of subjects experiencing in a communalized way. It is obvious that this world being true in itself is nothing else but the **idea** being accepted by us in presumptive certainty of a world which is experienceable for everyone singly and commonly, which would be experienced in such harmony *in infinitum* and would have been experienced, and – however the subjects would freely pursue experiential paths – that never ever discordancies would emerge, [that] the subjects never ever were inclined to cancel something accepted as being and formerly verified in the way of an illusion, that any corrections would happen, and could happen which were related to the already accepted sense in its acceptance.

<§2. Modes of change of something real>

After having ascertained the method of conception of the invariant form of a possible world, we try to seize the main structures of this form in some steps. In other words: We concentrate to some extent on the conception of an **ontology of the world, purely as world of experience** or rather – and this is the sense of an ontology – with the Apriori not of the possible experiencing of the world, but of a possible experiential world as such.

Of course it is already something most universal of the form which we stated in advance by saying: The world is an all-inclusive unity of realities, more closely, it is an infinity of the mutual externality of realities. We leave out of the question what makes this “infinity”, and what [makes] the mutual externality be a connected allness. We consider the **world form of the mutual externality** as form for each and everything which is something real within the correlatively corresponding form **[284]** or [which is] a worldly being concrete single physical thing (object, thing in the widest sense). Each real thing is an **individual** within the mutual externality, i.e. it exists only once. This means: The form of the mutual externality is [the form] of an order of places in which at the same place <at the same time> only one real thing can emerge, and at different [places] only different ones, not identical real things. More closely, this order of places is a double one, and a togetherness in a way we call time-spatiality, inseparable and connected at each place. Each concrete real thing has its duration and [it has] its individual place within this duration, within the universal world-time, [within] the universal order of unique time-places ([within] an endless continuous linear order the closer description of which we can skip). Each real thing has its spatial shape-dimension and this has an individual place within space in each time-point of the duration, and included therein each point of the spatial dimension has its individual place in space within each of these time-points. The space itself is the endless individual system of places of the actual and possible spatially expanded shapes (of pure spatial bodies), and of the corresponding points as well as partial shapes in such a way that two real things <can> not be at the same point of time, or rather, within the same time-duration at the same place, that a shape, conceivable within the space of places <can> not be real shape for two realities, and two separate shapes cannot be shapes for the same real thing at the same point of time, that is, two real things, lasting together, cannot have an identical shape, or rather, an identically changing [shape] within the identical duration.

Here we encounter the **possibility of the shape’s changing** (deformation) at once. Something real has its determined shape within the duration, in which it lasts as the same, [it has] in each point of time its individual shape, i.e. [a shape] determined according to the location within the location’s space, but at the same time in a new sense unity of the shape within the whole duration, unity in the form of its continuously changing shape (or rather, not changing, i.e., remaining the same from time-phase to time-phase). This unchanging is obviously a borderline case of the change. A second change of the shape, or rather, <of the> shaped extension is the **change of place**, which necessarily is continuous: motion.

We proceed within the somewhat rough description, which needed to be performed in a much more concise way. Something concretely real is according to the former “individuated” through its spatiotemporal location. The temporal location and [the] stretch of time determined by [its] location is only individuated through the shape’s extension determined through [its] location. But it is concrete through the spatiotemporal fullness. (Whereby the shape has to be seen already as fullness of time, namely fullness of the individual duration. But this still belongs to the individuation, to the individuating form of the mutual externality.)

The **spatiotemporal fullness**, individuated along through the spatiotemporal location, or rather, [through the] spatiotemporal extension which is firm with regard to the location (duration, formed extension), is a fullness of **qualitative** moments; they are that which stretches through the expansion, [which] “qualifies” it. Here again the conditions for the unity of a qualification for the real thing, or rather, for the whole spatiotemporal expansion would have to be explicated, since each spatiotemporal point has its qualification in a singular way, and the unity of a complete quality belongs to the real thing as synthesis of all qualifying points into a unity of a concretely fulfilled real expansion. The qualifying results in new modes of the change in contrast to the motion <and> the mere deformation as change of the spatial shape of expansion. And both of course have their essential conditions. The new kind of change is the **qualitative change**, that is, change of the unitary qualifying together with the correspondent essential conditions during the duration.

Changes as such are not random as changes of a reality which shall be such a one, which changes and remains identical within the changes. The realities within mutual externality are mutually dependent in a multiple way; changes of a reality depend on changes of other realities, and then also mutually. Thus changes, in which something real preserves itselfre as identical - <as> the same within the ever-again-becoming-something-else -, are regulated, and these regulations are the regularities of causality (whereby we do not yet know, if “rule” shall have a lax sense, <the> [sense] of a possibly only vague regulation, or an exact sense).

But this explication still needs an essential supplement which also intervenes into the sense of the already stated concerning change and causality.

**[286]** The realities of the world – of a possible world as such – have their regional forms; its formal composition in regions belongs to the structure of a world as such. Realities are not of one kind, and all kinds do not belong to one highest genre, and cannot belong to it. But this, as was said, also determines the concepts of change and causality, or rather, the sense of the realities’ self-preservation as identical individual objects of the world.

<§3.> <Regionally specific kinds of self-preservation of concrete realities> and region-specific kinds of transition from preservation to destruction

In a different sense we can speak of **self-preservation**, and of its contrary which cannot be overlooked when by following the experience we speak of the world as world of experience.

a) Self-preservation in the form of lasting identity within the change. The real thing is preserved within its fulfilled duration by changing itself, and lies within the changing-itself– exactly therein persisting -: to be one and the same while being different from time-point to time-point of the proper duration. Essential conditions for the enabling of the unity within the being different are to be fulfilled here.

b) The word “change” is used in a lax way. Occasionally one could call the transition from life to death a change within organic nature. But a dead organism is not an organism any more. But it is still a body, temporally [it is] still a mixture of organic essence and merely unorganic elements, etc. One can still speak of unity of reality – lasting within the world -, but [one could] not [speak] of the unity of an organism. And if it is a human being, thus the “dying” of the organism is at the same time dying of the human being; but at the same time – and be it necessary as well – here is still another break of self-preservation: the self-preservation of the man as mind and as concrete man as such, to whom the self-preservation of the organism as organism essentially belongs.

If we speak of the **self-preservation of something real**, then we can be guided by a preservation of the reality’s unity in what way ever **[287]** it may “change”, in what way ever its fullness of time may change – insofar just any unity remains. Then we stand within the most universal category “world object”, and do not even stick to the pregnant concept of the identical individual substrate, then the unity of a process is sufficient. Or we do have some concrete real thing like a physical thing, or <an> organism, or an animal, a man, and considering this regional set of types determining the sense of our experience we let us be guided from the beginning by the regional.

Thus **self-preservation of a physical thing**. – Non-self-preservation is a decomposition into pieces and scattering to the four winds, whereby each element preserves itself again within the region “physical thing”.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Opposite the **self-preservation of the organism** is that “change”, that change of the real time-fullness, which designates its death, which makes <its> regional unity stop.[[4]](#footnote-4) An organism preserves itself in its actual, proper changes, in those in which it is the same, and constantly is – living.[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Self-preservation of the man** is likewise persisting within his human changes, to which the self-preservation and the persisting as organism do belong, and the self-preservation as intellectual person, lastingly as such a one within the peculiar mental changes. In contrast to that there is the mental death, **the death of the person as such**, in one with that the death of the man, as which organic and mental death are one.

Let us take some more examples. A city exists, it lives on, it preserves itself within the world as unity of a multiplicity of changes, changes in different regard, within the change of the living and dying ones, the ones born into it, immigrated, etc. citizens (the analogue of the metabolism in organisms), within the change of new buildings, the houses falling into ruins, being burnt to the ground, etc. within the change of their condition, etc. But it does not preserve itself, but dies, like being completely destroyed by a volcanic eruption; **[288]** but it revives as the same, when some of the citizens who fled rebuild “it”, continuing its historical sense.

A **work of art** preserves itself regionally as formation of art, and in particular under the idea “work of art”, as long as its physical body does not decompose, and that physical preservation takes place, to which the mental sense remains bound in identity. The physical thing, the block of marble, can preserve itself, and thus unity of a reality is still continued, but unity of reality in the most general sense “something real”, but not in the sense “work of art”.

Thus under the highest title “something real”, “something persisting which preserves itself within the world of the individual spatiotemporal being apart from each other”, we have a majority of regions and within each region [we have] sorts of concrete realities. **Each has its mode of being destroyed, destroyed as something real of its region**, or rather, of its region<al> sort, which does not say: destruction as reality in general. It can have the meaning of the still persevering itself of the real unity. But this implies that within the regional change called “destruction of the regional being”, or rather “transition of regional perseverance towards regional destruction” (e.g. not to be a human being any more, not to be an organic real thing), **<lies> a universal region which produces a unity <and> which has to be the grounding one in every other region**. The region “**physical nature**” reaches through all other regions, that is, in the sense of “physics” in such a way that every real thing is either mere physical object, or at the same time physical object, and through a higher layer of determinations [it is] something real of the new region, whereby the mere physical determinations being unified within themselves to a physical reality, and the non-physical [determinations] belong to the unity of a reality, which certainly means closer to be explored conditions for the form of the unity, which necessarily need to be fulfilled.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Thus a human being is not merely but also a physical object, closer: real physically as a certain unity of process, a reality of process, and as such [it is] persisting, more closely, in the way of the biophysical being of an organism. Physically the last physical elements persist **[289]**, streaming through the organism within the metabolism, and determining its unity of process in a grounding way. Moreover the form of this stream persists, and in such a way that it becomes a new kind of substrate which is already grounded, an organism as substrate of organic properties, preserving itself thus, persisting within the spatiotemporal world. But furthermore, the man has the mental properties, and again in such a way that he, the same concrete man, at the same time persists in these as the same man. He is the same, to the individual being of whom those elements (with which the organic being “emerges”) belong as elements persisting in themselves, persisting while functioning within the organic process; but certainly also in themselves, after they stop doing that. Likewise the man is the same in his being as a being (living) organism, the whole determinations of whom are also proper to the man, and eventually [he is] the same within his mental determinations. **The same man**, that is, the same real individual within the world of the mutual externality, and this **threefold self-sameness** does not designate a collective being together and being at the same time, being together within a duration, but it is same-selfness within the unity of a lasting in the special sense of a persisting real objectivity. That which this real being one as unitary persisting designates within the multiplicity, and how the grounding has to be understood respectively, that is a problem which needs to be put and solved. In other words: One needs to question the regional unity “man” (and thus each grounded region), as to how it is an **experiential unity**, one has to explicate its **experiential sense** in these directions, the way it originally shows itself.

We said: Each concrete real thing is also and in itself a natural object (physical) at first, and this can be seen at each real thing in an abstraction for which it is indifferent which extra-physical determinations are functioning as well as real determinations and how they change. Correlatively: The view is directed towards those determinations something real needs to have as such, to spatiotemporally “persist” within the mutual externality, and to persevere unitarily in this sense. They constitute the regional form “physical object” in its different original and grounded shapes (physical and biophysical), and at the same time it is shown as essentially necessary that all physical objects combine to the **unity of a universal** **[290] physical nature** (all-unity of the natural objects), or that **the world is universal nature at the deepest layer**.

If the world is “more”, if the concrete realities of the world for their part are more than mere nature then now it needs to be questioned first, what this empty-formal speaking of “more” may mean. And one may not, misled by the habitual attitude of the scientific observation of nature, interpret the “more” in such a way like in the observation of a natural object as a whole of pieces, whereby within the direction towards one piece the “more” is the physical plus of the supplementing pieces. Thus in what way ever we can speak of wholes and parts as such, of the whole man and of his grounding part, the “human body”, and of a supplementing piece, the “soul”, or of an objective co-existence of body and soul in an analogous way like of a co-existence of two bodies, e.g. of two bodies just having different colors and being “combined” to a double star through a special causal regulation, this needs to be investigated thoroughly, and may not dictate as prejudice anthropological and psychophysical and psychological investigations. Prejudices indeed can blind [someone] to facts; Misinterpretation through it is a glare which covers at the facts, at its details and ways of connection that which originally is there by necessity. Thus of course for each region in question, although here we shall be interested in man in particular as a possible theme of theoretical experiencing, as basis for each theoretical cognizing of a higher level.

To be put in advance.[[7]](#footnote-7) Discussed in general modes of change of something real as such, but the essential differentiation of realities in regions of the all-region, - like we had to add – “possible world as such”, necessitates a doctrine of the modes of change belonging to the essence of each region in itself as specifically regional [modes of change]. Thus, how will be discussed in a moment, for the physical region the mode of change of separation and connection. Yet properly speaking this is a mode of change and not the special kind of destruction, if we simply want to call destruction “change”. This destruction, this is stated there as well, is change of something real into something real here of the same **[291]** region: change while preserving the causal essence, but within the change of form of real independency towards dependency through combination and of dependency towards independency through separation.

Appendix XXII

<Natural modes of change of something real: Combination and partition, intermingling and separation. Natural causality and the possibility of personal intervention into the natural process>[[8]](#footnote-8)

Supplements: Nature forms a region, the “grounding” [region]. Each real thing has a nature which all regions are essentially related to. Corresponding to the divisibility of the spatial extension, each natural object has its divisibility as division into independent realities. Is thus a fragmentation not a natural mode of change?

A connection corresponds to it of independent realities of nature to make up wholes, into which these enter as pieces: thus the real combination as mode of change. That which changes there is the real which becomes a mere piece, on the other hand the real, which decomposes into a multiplicity of real things.[[9]](#footnote-9) But in the true sense these are no changes but occurrences which destroy real things and change them into other real things.[[10]](#footnote-10) Still, is it justified to say that something real gets its identical essence within the change of the becoming-a-part or the becoming-independent, and [that] only the form of independency and dependency had changed? The identical real essence also affects the causal behavior. Accordingly each physical real thing is regarded as a whole of part-realities related to a possible partition, and continuously, as long as a partition is still considered to be possible. “Accommodation” as a form of the experience’s continuation includes the idea of an accommodation *in infinitum*, and thereby [it includes] [the idea] of a divisibility *in infinitum*.

The counterpart of combination and partition is **composition and decomposition** (blending and de-blending). Two different realities cannot be at the same place, but they can intermingle, **[292]** or rather: they can blend into one reality and again be de-blended into separate realities.

**Wholes and sets**; secondary realities.

A set can show itself as unity of a reality, insofar as it can possibly be taken as unity of a dimension (by way of a shape of sets enclosing it) with the unity of a fullness, unity of a motion, of a qualitative change in unitary causality. Sets are also external of each other, and within the mutual externality single objects and sets can be.

Thus also **processes** and **processes of a collective form** can be seen as realities – a real unity, a unity persisting within the mutual externality. Processes have their sets of types, and within their sets of types [they] possibly also have a self-preservation, preservation of an experienceable identity in the sense of a persisting being in the set of types giving unity.

Organisms. Biology.

Physical-chemical attitude: directed towards the smallest pieces, or towards the from *res extensa* emerging realities of the physical original region in randomly to be continued separation, and likewise in continued decomposition. Idea of the legitimate cognition of all physical realities through their physiologically and chemically constructive elements, direction towards the realities’ universal legitimacies in separation and composition. But this under constant consideration of the causal peculiarities thus with regard to constellations of external conditions. From there consideration of the processes and attempt to clarify the set of types of the process from the elementary legitimacies and the construction of nature as such from the elementary of partition and combination.

Idea of the last substrate, the last substances within the sphere of nature, in contrast to logical changes.

Each **naturally real** thing has as determinateness of the form that – if considered purely in itself – all its actual and possible changes, also partition and combination, and all formations of the process, formations of substrates of a higher level are under **causal regulation**, that is, [are] **purely within nature**. This does not designate that within mere nature all processes are unequivocally determined, and that a hyper-physical intervention, intervention of Ego-subjects, is excluded, <that> particularly the personal acting work of nature was an illusion. **It may be that a universal causality of nature** (in which thus each change of nature is included) **is just the presupposition for personal “intervention”**, which thus can never change the system of nature, since it exactly presupposes it. Universal causality of nature necessarily leaves something open.

However, each physical real thing is still causally related to its physical surrounding world, and eventually, as open possibility, to the whole physical universe which is external to it, and [that] it has its causal style, its causal properties, its “forces” within all its conduct of change. In these [forces] is expressed that something physical real would behave similarly under similar conditions, and that its determined behavior would inductively be cognizable in advance. Each real thing as belonging to a region has the causal style in universality, which belongs to the region as such, and in which each physical thing is grasped in advance. This implies a formal construction from causal properties. The induction follows this predelineation, and enables the cognition of special kinds of reality of this region (and similarly for each region) according to the corresponding special causalities.

Different modes of change and modes of destruction are to be pursued in each region as being specifically regional; e.g. a picture, that is being cut, pieces which are still picture, [which] have a partial function within the whole picture. Cutting a bust from a statue; likewise “changes” of the picture as cutting, ripping up into fibers which do not carry any part of the sense in themselves. Changes of re-working, changes of the gradual ruin, of the fading of colors, etc. Changes of a symphony through “outrageous reproduction”, “corruption”. Changes of a machine through wear, changes through fragmentation, changes through division into parts of the machine which are functional in themselves: simply still machines.

The physical basis: the unitary mere natural body. “Spread out” above unity of the sense of purpose, of an artful sense, of a vividness through reflection, etc; the corresponding forms of the “change”, the destruction of the regional unity.

1. 1929. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. It is already coincidence without comparison – continuously within the representation of others *eo ipso* coincidence. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. = Destruction of a thing. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Destruction of the organism = death. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Living organism = preserving itself as such a one. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This holds also true for something real in the wider sense of „world object as such“. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Thereto appendix ρ1 ρ2 <= appendix XXII> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Probably 1929. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. That is destruction indeed. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Partition and combination. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)