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<Nature within the surrounding world and nature in itself.>

Habitual style of the surrounding world as causal style. In contrast to this “causality” of the surrounding world the exact causality.

<Homogenizing of the earthly surrounding world and the celestial world>[[1]](#footnote-1)

*<Content:> Nature within the surrounding world constituted as being “in itself”. The real in-itself in contrast to the de facto cognition. The fundamental problem of the constitution of the being-in-itself, initially already within the primordiality of the childhood’s first genesis. On the second level the constitution of the “mathematical” nature as nature in itself.*

If we question the “everyday” surrounding world while abstracting from all conceptions coming from science, then we have to say: To the “in-itself” belongs: The thing has its extensive being, its duration, its shape being changeable within the duration, its motion and movability, its change within the natural space-time. For each point of the same it is what it is, together with and among other things which are simultaneous in themselves. And thus for each complete duration. I could have approached, I and anyone. And the body of the one approaching then would enter ever new fields of perception; the thereby perceivable things and processes then would have led to the corresponding things, or rather, to the perceptual field in which it was given itself. Everyone then arrives at the same things on his ways, the way they are or were themselves at the corresponding spatio-temporal point or within the corresponding duration-extent, etc.

There is no talk of unconditional causality of nature here. Concerning the surrounding world I have the **habitual style** of the normal surrounding world, and belonging to this, that usually (“normally”) the motions and changes – in general – use to influence each other. This does not exclude that some things happen “randomly”, contrary to all habit. **[302]** And even if the random “explains” itself afterwards within the connection of memory (or based on the connection with others) as having been caused, then it is not given thereby that **a general and necessary natural causality** reigns in all happening. Without further ado thus it is not a part of the “in-itself”. Within nature reaching beyond the actual experience, mine and ours, something completely random could happen on its own accord, could have happened, and could happen in future, although a habitual style simply goes through the course of the process, according to which I can anticipate the future in an average way, and can act on it. Everyone does indeed have his individual habits intersubjectively, but it is the same world, which everyone has been given in his habitual style, and to which foresight, consistency of a style of change belong.

But, considered more closely, how about the mutual relatedness of the surrounding worlds which are familiar to everyone, [which are] respectively his own? It is a part of my apperception of the surrounding world as a being one that every fellow man, coming into a connection with me, has the same surrounding world in such a way that he can inform me with regard to that which is unknown to me from his experience and induction, and vice versa thus. Furthermore, that we can correct others thereby. This concerns nature’s being-in-itself, the “world for everyone” – as being experienceable for every man. Everyone has his respective actually experienced surrounding world, he is present at any real being and happening. Everyone with whom I am connected mediately and however mediately, could inform me of his surrounding world, and we all thus amongst each other. To each being object the possible perceptual fields correspond, in which it could be experienced, everybody’s perceptual fields – and from me saying this (and anyone who is saying this), the perceptual fields not only of the others known to me as being, but <also> of the unknown as being – but this implies: of the possibly being. And this “possibly being” (but within the open range of the typically familiar kind “man”, indeterminately general) is a mode of acceptance, a modalization of “being”.[[2]](#footnote-2)

**[303]** With all this it is only shown that de facto together with the constitution of an open community (an open “we home comrades” and the like) the <constitution> of a corresponding **surrounding world** comes to pass **with a normal style** (with one changing gradually and historically to be followed and understood).[[3]](#footnote-3) **To this a vague causality belongs**. The surrounding world has its **predictability** (and did have it always); and seeing things from the perspective of whomever we are able to construct his subjective “conception” of the surrounding world, and in it [we are able to construct] the predictability consisting for him, the respective other one, for each situation: Predictability is equivalent to causality – but by no means to a strict [causality] to which an unconditionally general legality had to be attached. One could even say: The **open possibility of random processes** belongs to the style of the surrounding world, and possibly even a predictability belonging to these incalculabilities: that, if everything went well for a longer stretch of time, it now had to be expected that – unknown where and wherein – something unexpected and unexpectable would happen: To constitutively clarify this is a first problem.

Furthermore we then have the big **problem of the endless enlargement** of the surrounding world towards the not just open earthly world, in which our home world is included, <that is> within an open being-next-to-each-other of foreign, known and unknown home worlds, but towards a universe, towards a universal nature of actual natural objects possibly being in themselves [and] proceeding from our home world towards infinity, with an actual endless space and an endless time as form – a form which could also be empty. The actuality of the endless spatio-temporality designates that something real in itself could be on every point, in every spatial sphere, real motion could lead something real towards it, etc. But also, as it seems, the space could within a time, e.g. [within] a stretch of time, actually include an infinity of realities or even in advance at all times; between them empty space. Or else, the world could include an endless number of realities, **[304]** and this number could enlarge continuously and in infinity, always filling some empty space, etc.

The question is: How does – from philosophy, that is, in worldly thinking from the surrounding world – the one and only endless nature and complete world constitute themselves? And second: How about the unconditionally general causality of nature thereby? Could not also endless nature indeed have its universal causality, but intermingled with casualties? Or is this excluded due to infinity’s constitution? Thus the question is, how the first and thus concretely possible constitution of the world as surrounding world in general enables a constitution going beyond that towards a “complete” world, whether different possibilities consist here, and then which sense of being has “originally” accrued from the constitution to the endless spatiotemporal world, which, in other words, is to be justified from actual evidence.

If we proceed from the surrounding world, we find a separation: **earthly surrounding world** (as world of an actual and in the proper sense possible experience, in which world <is> the goal of currently possible experience, and **celestial world**. – Namely “actual and proper experience” is such a one which makes us experience what actually exists, in its “it itself”: Each distance-experience is accepted as proper experience with relation to the possibility to convert the distant into something close and most close, and thus to verify the self-givenness of the distance as the [self-givenness] of appearance of that which was given in complete closeness.

The **celestial world** is not experienced in this way. If we take the concepts “perception” and “experience” more widely, then also the “celestial phenomena” are experienced. Or still more distinctly: The celestial processes are not actually and properly experienced if we let us be guided from their apperceptions as distant appearances, and thus have possibilities of approaching and close givenness implicitly co-accepted. It is to be questioned, what kind of apperception actually is motivated for the celestial phenomena, and thereby, which sense of being is accrued to them as lastingly being, as persisting in change and unchange, in motion and rest, from their proper way of perception ([the] experiencing ultimate verification) and constitution. In advance the concept of the **[305]** earthly surrounding world (of the persisting thing, motion, change, etc.) should not be supposed.

We could also say thus: We are what we are, as men within the world; thus we find ourselves necessarily as awake men. World, that is the all of the being for us, all time horizontally conscious to us, oriented from us, etc. If we reduce this world which is constantly accepted by us to that which thereby is purely accepted by us from experience, abstracting from all determinacies of thinking determining its being sense, but constantly having the experiential sense as basis for acceptance, then **the pure experiential world has two layers: earthly world and celestial world**.

Then the experiential motives need to be shown which suggest the apperception of the distant appearances for celestial processes by way of the (to be described) unitary connection of earth and sky, that is, initially in the form “as if they were distant realities quite like the earthly ones”. But now it needs to be clarified how the well understandable **inaccessibility** is viewed as a **casualty** without serious consideration, and [how]a real distant world [is]supposed as a possible hypothesis, and now the empirical world as such is accepted as endless world of realities with corresponding endless space, endless time, all-encompassing causality, inner infinity by way of the supposition of a separability *in infinitum* and exact natural causality, in which there is no casualty. This naïve substruction, although performed through thinking, lifts the separation of earth and sky, changes the sky into a sphere of something earthly ever farther away, creates a **homogenous world**, a universe of beings which as a whole stand under the one and only concept of being, the earthly constituted one. Just that **infinity is carried into the earthly**, and [that] the endless limes of the absolute closeness becomes a **mathematized limes**, encompassing already an infinity. On the other hand, also the distance is disrobed of its finiteness, and thereby ascends into the sky which has just become the excessive distant and eventually distance *in infinitum*.

The earthly world is a world of realities in the familiar sense of the human practice, constituted through appearances which as close-distant-appearances point back towards an actually perceivable **[306]** thing itself as measure of all distant actuality, distant experience, which is simply verifiable in “suitableness”, in leading back towards the complete close. The celestial world is a proper, in a certain way connected with the earthly [world] universe of beings, which are not constituted as unities of close-distant-appearances, – considered purely within the field of their experience. The sun and the moon are constantly there by way of perception in their beaming radiance. They emerge at the sky and [they] vanish, are identified as being the same in coming back, they have their changes, and their motions, they are thus persisting beings within the comprehensible “celestial space” which itself has its own being, temporally covered through something earthly, among that [covered] by clouds and by fog, etc. Likewise the stars. The fixed stars firmly belong to the sky itself, and we say due to their “illusory motion”: The sky itself, in which the stars are, moves. On the other hand, the planets are not fixed at the celestial place, they change it, etc. There is thus speaking of the persisting being, of motion and change, of the sky having places, and being a kind of space, etc. But all these concepts have, purely taken from the experience of the celestial, an own meaning indeed. According to the other concept of being.

1. Probably January (or February) 1934. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This is a constitutive theme: Surrounding world as correlate of anybody’s being-able-to-go-everywhere, with whom anybody could come into a communicative connection. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Thus this is an indication for a constitutive problem. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)