

EXCELLENT YOUTUBE COMMENT

We do not and should not give up on a reformed understanding of internality. Heidegger had already started laying the groundwork for a revaluation of inwardness or internality, or better yet, intensity.

Internality or intensivity do not have to be reduced to an analogical position of the "external", as a kind of medium to traverse through.

Extensionality - Intensionality ; Extentionality - Intentionality, are perhaps better suited to deal with the phenomenological difference between the event of being- that-makes-itself-its-own, as for instance a horizon always makes itself its own, or Da-sein for that matter, and beings as determined as beings by Sein

What if that which shows itself from itself in its appearing, but itself is not an appearance, is also thinking? That being shows itself in its thinking, which is a kind of appearance or a mode to which extensive appearances owe themselves, but itself is not a thought. As such, the tree neither as a representation nor an "internal" concept to correspond to a percept, but a true *conception*, whereby thinking unsubstantiates the synthesis of the tree's extensionality and extentionality thus conceiving intensively an almost nodal entanglement, I want to say a kind of intensive sympatico between the tree as an existent disclosed to me as an ontically phenomenal whole, and thought itself. The ap-

pearance of the tree as a not showing itself is at once the very mode of showing itself, and so is thinking. But this to me requires a reconceptualisation and revaluation of internality. Perhaps more as an inclusive eventality that permeates and suffuses beings but not at all in the conventional dimensional sense.

Anyways, I'll more closely stick to the material in the videos next times. I find your thoughts and project intriguing. Only came across your channel earlier today!

Here is the line I understood best and very much agree with:

The appearance of the tree as a not showing itself is at once the very mode of showing itself, and so is thinking.

In some of my earlier videos, I actually tackle just this issue, at least from my POV. The entity is a "cloud of aspects." To grasp the entity as such (to recognize or conceptualize it) is to grasp it via a logical synthesis which is (equivalently) a temporal and interpersonal synthesis. *Because* the entity is "transcendent" through this "logic", the "aspect" is necessarily always a partial and never an exhaustive manifestation. Time shows one face only by hiding all of the others. This only makes sense if the entity is grasped as an interpersonal "open infinity" of "faces". More possible than actual, more absent than present.

I think I understand and agree with your opening

statement too. Dasein “is” transcendence. I try to capture this in my own lingo by insisting that so-called “experience” is best thought of as world itself, though with a non-detachable “from-a-point-of-view-ness.” The (ontological) subject is “empty” (in my lingo) as transcending or transcendence. But the empirical subject is an entity in the world that plays a special role (a locus of responsibility, as in Brandom’s work), as a component of the “forum.”

Some of the middle part remains obscure to me, but I also want to emphasize the tree as a “radiant” phenomenal whole, something like an “embodied” thought. I did some videos on signs and the world (and one on metaphor), where I try to question the conception of a “pure” meaning as opposed to another kind of stuff that serves as a vehicle. (Notice the anti-dualism theme ?) I don’t know if Derrida’s ghost will agree, but I understand myself to be developing or paraphrasing some of his early work. I’d say it’s more paraphrase, but others might accuse me of creative misreading. Actually I do add the aspect theme, so it’s an extension. In any case, perhaps you are saying something similar.