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<The traditional idea of the being in itself and the essential relativity of the world’s being and of all worldly acceptances of being>[[1]](#footnote-1)

All that which is at the base of all talking about being things, of opinions, of experiences of something being and not being, in a further succession of verification and truth, or rather, of something true as original sense, remains completely hidden to the classical idea of the “being”. What we mean “lies” as meaning within the mental meaning-process itself; that which we experience, <lies> within the experiencing itself as “experience” (in the ontic sense), as appearing therein itself, as the self, at which we are experiencing ourselves. “Mere” opinion (pre-opinion in the normal mode “certainty”), which is not experience itself, implies a pre-certainty, namely the possibility (facultative possibility), to be able to convert it into an experience of the same in the mode “it itself”. The pre-certainty verifies itself at the certainty in the mode of the self-having, whereby though the familiar possibility is open, that, like it happens occasionally, this pre-certainty is disappointed and cancelled through the following experience, through experience giving something as being there itself, with which the opinion struggles as to the being and the being-thus. But now perception of something worldly itself is in one pre-opinion and self-opinion and essentially in its continuous progress (and thereby forming a unity of ever further extending perception) a continuous verifying-itself-within-itself, bringing something continuously pre-meant in itself to the fulfillment of the “self”. And still, however the perception is extended, it remains a having something itself, which is an opinion, and stands in the de facto possibility of a break of the certainty of being, of a modalization of the same, of the change eventually of the being in illusion or of the being-thus in being differently.

The elders did not get themselves into such sense-investigations of world opinions and of all backward relation of opinion to perception; their further step was sense-investigation concerning the essence of perception as for its part being a perceiving **[725]** opinion, again concerning the perception as continuation of the perceiving in a univocal verifying context, which can still turn into discordancy. - Therefore they did not see that the world and the being, world in general has only a sense as opinion and experience from this way of being for us, and is nothing else, <sense> being valid into infinity within a relativity of being accepted, and <that> something correlatively **being** is only and de facto only **within relativity of the being, or rather a de facto relativity of verification**, that thus an absolutely being thing, and thus universally an absolutely being world is a non-sense, that a world is inconceivable (whether for our de facto respectively discontinuing experience and our limited possibility of experiencing or for an ideally perfect invented experience) as being “ad<equately>” experienceable. It is inconceivable within a closed experience, in which any worldly being was explicated in a totality of properties as something which only these and no other [properties], which could in each new experience ever again show only these and no other ones (of course one has to abstract from relations).

“Adequate perception”[[2]](#footnote-2) was imagined with the supposedly conceivable sense of a perception not presuming anything, which in each phase brings the real on all sides to givenness in one stroke, and not respectively on one side like our de facto perception does (e.g. the *intuitus originarius* of God viewing in one stroke, and does not need to construct it from its appearing sides); but one needs to get clear about [the fact] that not only this adequation, but <also> the lesser one, being based upon the presumptivity of the world experience, is **countersenseful**: The conceivability that something worldly, thus being presumptively perceived, arrives at a total cognizance, or rather, could have a true being, which was given in a closed verifying experience.

The true explication of that which the world consciousness, constantly happening within the awake life and unifying itself, performs as an “empty” opinion and as experience, leads to the cognition that opinions being hitherto valid within the progress of the life are cancelled, forfeiting their continuing acceptance through the conflict with **[726]** experiences (possibly in mediacy and within the inductive connection), but that also experiences are accepted only so long as they combine to a univocal experiential connection, that is, to the synthetical unity of a univocal experience. Each cancellation reaches back to the whole experience being again available memorially; and in each moment of life, of the single or the communalized one, in which no objection can be heard, is accepted as world that which from proceeding correction of the being always having a backwards effect stands firm as being. Eventually that which is now being accepted as purely and simply being, that is, from univocality of the experience up to the now, being a univocality, which at the same time predelineates a horizon of future univocality with all closer determinations of the being presumpted, but still being undetermined (as suchlike was already valid for all past as past present with its being world present). Thus something **being** is always **something being** **up till now and for us** and at the same time [being] afflicted with the **presumption** that like up till now conflict, conflict within one’s own experiencing and conflict within the experiencing together of known and still unknown (that is being presumed themselves) others, will eradicate itself through correction and produce a new univocality.

**A being world is nothing outside of the relativity of this acceptance of being**; and that which “something being” means is always and necessarily nothing else but – as far as an experience having been corrected towards univocality reaches – something verified and to be verified in further corrections, and as far as life as something to be experienced will ever reach, ever again likewise: with the sense “as far as the experience reaches having been brought to univocality up till then, something verified and to be verified under correction”.

A being which could not be thought, which thus could also not be experienced – although all conceivable talking of something being, and even if we say “uncognizable being”, is the expression of a meaning, and can only designate something meant, thus as that points to possible verifying experience and to all further appertinent -, is senseless. And thus is senseless a world being in itself with the sense of the in-itself, which ascribes to the meant an irrelative being beyond the essential relativity of the acceptance of being.

Everyone living along in a naïve way as an awake ego has in an unexplicated way and in general, without the need for sensuous explication, a world, his relatively **[727]** being world, and his horizon of the proceeding situation of univocality, in which the unity of a world perseveres, always as a world the way it has been up till now, and has a verified right <up till> now. He has within foresight – likewise in a naïve-unquestioned way – a future being world before him, and “the same” which has always been, and which will always be. This of course means: the same under correction and closer determination of indeterminacies, which with regard to the future means a new determination *in infinitum*, correction *in infinitum*, and still pre-certainty of a univocality coming about.

Within the certainty of the world, of an all-temporally, all-spatially being world, space and time are of course horizons of the univocality in transiency to be produced, and at the same time systems of the points for the univocally being, which themselves as determinations of the being come to verification and correction. The certainty of the world happens without any explication of its sense, but within the vividness of an activated sense. And in fleeting, but simply not sensuously entering reflection the reflecting subject says to himself, especially the subject reflecting in theoretical interest: “In truth it is a world, it is now present, it has been and will be, and always the one world”. And now he says: “This world, which in truth, which is always and for everyone, is not the world of meaning and of his supposedly being which changes, which could be devaluated as falseness. Of course there must be an in-itself. Within the overview of the infinity of the actual and possible experiencing life of the actual and possible experiencing subjects of all conceivable times there is still a complete certainty, it becomes evident that a world, which is one and the same world, is alltemporal as the continuously meant one, continuously experienced with undetermined horizons, continuously appearing in correctable appearances, subjectively being one-sided, incomplete, presumptive, swaying in acceptance and being correctable, but always still remaining certain as the being one. That which is posited and presupposed as being in these appearances and opinions but [which] often becomes illusory, is always the What of the world, the special content of actual being things and their properties. But **that it, the world, exists and [that] not all being can be an illusion**, that illusion always already presupposes a being and in all relativity of **[728]** illusion and being something remaining itself is out of the question, - that is a matter of course.”

Doubtless, but one needs to be cautious here. The world is not an illusion. Illusion is an appearance (something appearing in a certainty of appearance), which within the unitary connection of appearances loses its acceptance by way of contradiction with continuously being accepted appearances. The whole experiential stream in its intersubjective progress lacking a beginning and an end is a connection of verification, constantly verifying, as long as a univocal connection currently is produced, always in infirmation, and again going over into correction, and thus in continuous relativity. But that which the revaluation experiences within the “not” and the “otherwise”, always only concerns the single thing. But world, understood in complete universality, that is, in all-temporality, is thought of as preserving itself as unity within the universe of all appearances – or rather within the universe of all universa of appearances being accepted in every present – as unity of a correction ever again emerging in infinity.

“Appearance” thereby means for example this tree, as that which and the way I perceive it, as that which and the way it is accepted by me as being there for me within perceiving, and likewise within memory as “reproduction” of my perceiving and his being perceived – the way it <and> as that which is accepted by me within memory as “having appeared” to me within “former” perception. If I am in a vivid perceptional community with someone else, like when we are conscious within it, to be facing by perceiving the same, this tree, or [we] are conscious with another one that it is now mediately there for both of us in a perceptional way, then I have my “appearance” of this tree and I experience him, <the other one>, as the one having his experience of the same – and thus *vice versa*. This implies: Communalized in empathy with him, I not only accept my perceptional appearance, but also the perception “represented” for me within understanding the other one; and within the unity of a synthetic certainty my self-own and the represented perception of the other one is accepted by me as perception of the same – similar to the way the realm of consciousness of my self-own, of my own perceptions, my own memories, different appearances, **[729]** perceptional appearances and remembered appearances come to the synthesis of the identity of that which appears. But everywhere this synthesis, the way we thought of it initially, presupposes that the respective “appearance” within its moment stands up to the certainty of being. This can simply experience a modalizing, in that the certainty of being of something thereby conscious as being “struggles” with the certainty of being of someone else, is not compatible <with it>, and possibly the sustaining “annuls” the struggling. Thus an uncertainty results, doubtfulness, likelihood, but also nullity. The appearing has only one mode (the original mode of the acceptance) as a simple existence (or having been or else going to be), as long as it is not modalized with a still coinciding content; and it is an illusion, if this simple being-for-me or being-<for->us takes on the mode of the cancelled, null sense, <of the> not-being. Thus through my, and, within the communalization, <through> our life runs the open-endless stream of unmodalized appearances and of modalized changes, among them illusion. But that is the way our life is, therein it brings about from its activity (mine and, entering into communalization, our), and [from] its passivity always a universal synthesis of univocal acceptance.

This in advance is the basic fact of our life, that within each life present a universe of sustaining certainties of being, connected to a unity of an immediate and mediate synthesis, exists and that only single modalizations, always already standing within a field of universal certainty, emerge, but in the certainty that they will enter the new universal certainty through change into fitting certainties. The universe of the “appearances”, of the simple certainties of being, in its transiency belongs to a life present which implies the whole past, one’s own and that of the fellow living subjects in open endlessness – in the way of a horizon and not as a current inferring. Each past being co-conscious therein in a horizonlike way, insofar as it is intuitionally thought of, ever again is a life-past which had already effected a univocal universe of being things, that is, of being things which are still accepted, as far as they have not been cancelled as illusion in later pasts through modalizing. **[730]** But only the phenomenological method, to which we just conduct a way, can offer more concise analyses. Anyway, world is always accepted in an endless relativity in the form of an already successful universal synthesis of appearances and always within this universal synthesis, that is, a universal system of appearances as respectively being world is always already the ground on which a new modalization emerges. All illusion has already underneath and behind itself a being “world”.

If now the sense of “illusion” taken from the single appearances and acceptances of being has no applicable sense for the acceptance of the world, then this does not designate at all that now the **being of the world** – of the one world, <which> for us all, the actual and possible human subjects of the world experience, is in constant acceptance and verification – is being in the same sense, being derived from the **sense of single realities** or finite combinations of single realities, and <being is that which> has a constant sense within the human experience of everyday life. This experience moves within infinity and has no interest in inferring the endless horizons of the total experience, in which the world is experienced respectively, and to become clear about what needs to be said within the endless possibility by way of current experience or of one’s own or foreign possible experience predelineating itself in explicite evidence concerning the being sense “world”, constantly identifying itself in a vivid way.

Man within the infinity of his interests has his true being within them, his constantly and completely verifying as **being within the situation**; and this being in its temporary acceptance is related to the current interest and the current piece of life and of the finite circle of fellow living subjects <and has> indeed its completeness of acceptance and thus its truth, being justifiable any time and by anybody – by anybody and any time within this realm of endlessness and its interests. **From there the concept of the true being and of the true statement is taken**. But this being sense changes essentially if we transcend the open endlessness of the life world, of the world of our actual universal experience within the conception of the “idea” of **infinity** of space and **[731]** time and thereby of the world infinity, and now give this idea the sense of a **being-in-itself** with determinations of the being-in-itself which shall be like an optimum of the world of experienceability, “just lying within infinity”. This is a **complete shift of the sense**, annulling the being sense of the world and of its realities. That such an ascription is close at hand due to the iterability of the enlargement of the univocal intuition while enlarging the world according to space and time, this is clear, and it is not surprising that the beginning philosophy and science and within its tradition the whole following philosophy resorts to it and had to remain resorted. It had to, since simply the apparent matter of course sticking to it may have played a big role in preventing a consequent sensuous explication of the being “of the” world lying within the consciousness life itself and always predelineating itself.

The world is according to its being always and forever evident – the **absolute matter of course** – and therefore unquestioned as that. And it immediately suggests itself to say: “**doxa**”, the experiencing with its experiential appearances, is fallible, that is, its being is not a being, the human truth being accepted in everyday life, is not a “genuine” truth. Nay, even if it actually gave the being itself, we could never know it, we can never be safe from <a> shift into illusion. But does not the wise man stand above the stupid everyday man? Does not the wise man cognize in apodictic evidence the beautiful and the good of human behavior within human things and contrary to that the ugly, the ethically reprehensible? (**Socrates**) Is there thus not an **absolute truth** which is the most important for him, if not for the world and for all human in general then for the human at least in this regard? But should, since here a not sensuous, not empirically bound cognition lifted above the random fact of these men and these situations respectively, an absolute, all-temporal and for all conceivable men accepted truth shows itself, and thereby a new kind of cognitional ability of the “**episteme**”, - should this not reach farther and let us, having been bound within the dark cave of sensuality with its swaying and dull shadows, view the being in itself, of which they are sensuous adumbrations? **[732]** (**Plato**) Instead of the empirical seeing thus we have the viewing of the episteme.

But even earlier the sharp distinction between sensuousness and ration is broken into different forms and levels of formation. Anyway it furthermore determined all following times and all sciences shaping themselves within the branching of philosophy together with the essential same sense. Thus the science is afflicted with a “**metaphysical**” **substruction** and a speculative metaphysics is made possible being **countersenseful** in its purpose and therefore in its method as well, since it rests on supposed matters of course, the inner wrongness of which would have emerged by way of a radical sense-investigation concerning the consciousness life, in which all world sense, the sense of mundane being <and> of mundane truth has its place and constant source.

Indeed especially the platonic theory of forms had a groundbreaking effect on the grounding of an exact mathematics and mathematical natural science, but exactly this performance and this fertility of its ever more astounding and evidently into infinity to be continued theoretical truths seemed to confirm the leading basic apprehension. The exact science was there as a constant verification for the working of a ratio performing that which experience cannot perform. Indeed also disciplines inevitably accrued within the theoretical interest, moving within the frame of experience, of the experience of nature and of the mental existence, but now the apprehension up till now prevailing within the stream of development determined by the formation of the exact sciences, that only the exact sciences accomplish an “explicating” performance, whereas <the> describing disciplines only prepare that which only by the exact sciences can be lead to a cognition of the true being – of a metaphysical in-itself. With all other shapes of the philosophical world apprehension and with all differences of the sense of won and kept scientific theorization the innerly always leading substruction is adhered to: The world is of course being in an “in-itself”; to this belong the true elements being unavailable for sensuousness (the simple experience), and the order of its laws, may this now be a teleological one and has its principle within **[733]** an unconditioned mover as the absolute principle teleologically animating the world or whether it is a mechanical or otherwise exact one, also included that exactness which in the form of objective probabilities makes the elementary happening be regular. If eventually the subjectivist turn of modern philosophy takes away the metaphysical character of that which natural-scientifically is true in itself, then in favor of **new metaphysical substructions**. It rests at that: The world has its in-itself as an oversubjective true being, although it is not to be understood that way that experience and attached thinking (describing, inducing) teaches it. And even the exact thinking of the natural-scientific **ratio**, in the way it is based upon experience, does not result in the true being of this world; it is only the art of **calculating** the experienced happening, the future like the past connection of possible experiential givennesses. But calculating is not understanding. The philosophical ratio, the modern change of the episteme for **Leibniz** results in the monadological, for **Kant** [in] the transcendental-anthropological world interpretation. Within the latter, man, more concisely: the human soul, the ego, concretely, its being-in-itself and every natural emerging within the experience has its in-itself. But this metaphysical is de facto not cognizable. That which is cognizable in positive sciences is nature. It is a structure of formations running within the soul, according to the “transcendental” possibilities *a priori* proper to it. Of course these belong to the mental in-itself as we have to say to ourselves, since **Kant** does not; certainly they are not attainable themselves in their doing and performing, but they need to be taken on substructively due to the synthetic apriori, exhibited in the actual cognition – whereby thus again the old episteme comes into play. Although a core of true evidences within the actual execution of such philosophical theories shall not be denied at all, they all rest on the same counter-senseful prejudice, that is, on the lacking of those de facto sense-investigations which have to precede all theories.

1. Probably end of 1932. – Editor’s note. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Double sense of „adequate perception“. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)