

1. Consciousness is simply the being or it-is-there-ness of the world and *not itself a being or stuff* that is there. It is the there-ness of what is there.
2. What is there has both a *from-a-point-of-view-ness* (immanence) and a *between-us-ness* (transcendence.)
3. This *between-us-ness* is logical-linguistic-conceptual. It manifests a communal subjectivity and a more specialized personal subjectivity.
4. This *from-a-point-of-view-ness* is sensory-emotional but also linguistic-logical as world-structuring belief.
5. The perceived object is present in a “perspectival” sensory-emotional way *and* as a recognizable (speakable) entity in the space of reasons.
6. The object gets its transcendence or “between-us-ness” *through* being recognized *as* an entity. Apperception brings it into the “communal subjectivity” of language, of the “Forum” or “the space of reasons.”
7. To recognize an object is to conceptualize or idealize it as fundamentally “also-for-others.” Toothaches are *logically* just as “public” as tornadoes.
8. A perception of an object is the “capture” of an aspect or moment of that object by an intrinsically interpersonal idea or concept. The “aspect” is only an aspect *of* the object through this “constituting ideality.”
9. The *empirical* object is roughly an enduring interpersonal *possibility* of perceptual presence.

10. Object-hood *in general* requires only a “co-intending.” Empirical objects are a subset of the objects in general. *All* objects (including toothache and day-dreams and theories) are “intentional objects.” Some of these intentional objects are understood to empirical, others less so or not at all.
11. Objects as logical-intentional entities are transcendent or “between-us.” This depends on (or expresses) language as the “essence” of our “communal subjectivity.”
12. The “I” that discusses itself is not essentially personal. Rather the personal “I” is primarily social. *We* think (doubt), therefore *we* are. The “I” is basically a “we.”