

## The Integral

Algis Mickunas  
Ohio University

Because of its compass, complexity, and depth, Gebser's work has been highly regarded, both by serious scholars of comparative cultures, and by a variety of seekers for a new age and salvific spirituality. While such regard may be warranted, the task Gebser assumes is much more profound and indeed relevant for deciphering diverse human cultures, their interconnections, and above all the ways that the so-called "past" human modes of awareness continue to play a dominant—although unrecognized—role in our times. Moreover, his work has shown correlations among the most diverse domains of cultural creations, from poetry through sciences. The correlations led Gebser to the conception that despite various proclamations of the end of the Western world, there is evidence of an emergence of a different mode of perceiving—the integral. This emergence offers a clue to broader scholarly ventures and correlations of cultural phenomena during different periods and at different places of cultural creations. This is to say, Gebser points out that our age is not the only one that experienced a vast transformation in awareness. He undertakes the task of tracing the correlations of such diverse phenomena in order to show their connections and through the latter to decipher the types of structures of awareness that connect such phenomena. To Gebser's own surprise, the phenomena suggest vast periodic transformations—mutations—of awareness that restructure human modes of perceiving, conceiving, and interacting. Such mutations not only yield novel structures of awareness, but also integrate and position other modes of awareness within the requirements of a predominant structure.

### GEBSER'S MODE OF RESEARCH

Gebser's achievement hinges on his mode of research. He does not proceed from a presumed method or system, but follows the clues discovered among a variety of cultural phenomena. He avoids the stock of methods available to, and used by, the sciences and humanities. The reason for Gebser's reservations concerning such methods rests squarely on their limitations, and specifically on the recognition that they belong to a particular structure of awareness, and thus cannot be deemed to be universal. Moreover, Gebser is quite cognizant of the various conceptions belonging to our own century that suggest the impossibility of an impartial observer, or an application of something without distorting the subject matter under consideration. This is important, above all, with respect to cultural studies of linguistic, aesthetic or even ritualistic phenomena, since these phenomena are the very fabric that suggest the awareness required to access such phenomena.

Gebser suggests in his *Cultural Philosophy As Method And Venture* that cultural philosophy deciphers sense connections among various cultural phenomena. This should not result in an abstract set of conceptions but in a concrete understanding of the origin, position, and tendency of our own cultural ventures. In this sense, Gebser does not posit a dualism wherein one would have an external view toward one's own culture; he includes our own tendencies and participation in cultural ventures. Thus, his research is done partially to avoid fragmentation and isolation,

predominant not only in various scientific areas and constitutive of a pervasive attitude, but to show that what is fragmented in one mode of awareness, is integrated within another mode. However, the fragmentation cannot be overcome without showing the connections among diversities.

Gebser accepts a major modern division of thought into the sciences and the humanities. While the sciences are oriented toward control and possession, manipulation and prediction through the method of induction, and humanities confront understanding and deduction, the practice of cultural philosophy is reduction. In order to be clear about this practice Gebser points out that the reduction is a final outcome. The practices that lead to this outcome are, first, phenomenological, second, comparative, and third, coordinating. This suggests that the results of sciences and humanities must be understood and regarded as given cultural phenomena. At this stage we practice cultural phenomenology. The given phenomena require comparisons in order, then, to decipher their common elements. Reduction follows from the explication of basic structures that integrate such elements. It is to be noted that the practice of comparison is not equivalent to inductive generalization, but is a discovery within a given phenomenon of its basic invariants; the latter, in turn, comprise the basis of comparisons leading to reductive recognition of basic structures across most diverse phenomena. In other words, the variation of any cultural phenomenon yields an invariant which becomes an element among the invariants discovered among other phenomena; such invariants manifest all-pervasive structures of awareness that connect them. It is to be noted that any complex culture exhibits a variety of such structures; hence, whereas in one culture and in one sense rationality may be the predominant awareness, in another rationality may function within the domain of a very different structure. Thus, in one sense, modern rationality is purely logical—all the way to quantification—in another sense it is magical. Care must be taken to discern differences among such structures, lest we become subject to unrecognizable forces.

What Gebser proposes to avoid is a one-sided scientism, (i.e., positivistic methodological absolutism), and in turn, also an historical relativism that leads directly to irrationalisms. Implicitly such a rejection is equally an effort to avoid system construction. Thus, if science, even a Weberian non-positivistic system, pretends to build an all-encompassing explanation, then for Gebser it belongs to modern Western culture with its pervasive and rigid spatializations. System carries with it the notion of dualism, basically of space and time. These can be expressed at other levels as object-subject, inner-outer, chaos-order, and even divine-worldly. In brief, a system can only be built on the basis of a static metaphor of space and time and reification. By noting multiple, intertwined consciousness domains, Gebser uses, what he calls, *systasis* to articulate the ways in which such domains integrate. The integration does not posit some static whole, but an incessant integrating that constantly traces the *origin* and latently prefigures consciousness in its entirety. The latency is what provides clues for the active co-presence of all domains of consciousness. One must not regard *systasis* as a method that deciphers consciousness historically. The latter is neither wrong nor right, but belongs to a mental structure and, in this sense, cannot be regarded as an all-encompassing thesis, rather other theses depend on the specifics of a given consciousness structure.

## THE STRUCTURES OF CONSCIOUSNESS AS INTEGRATIVE

Gebser's investigations indicate that there are distinct structures of consciousness, each having a predominant mode of experiencing. He articulates at least five structures, ranging from the archaic through magic-vital, mythical, mental-rational, to integral. The predominant mode of experiencing in the archaic structure is one of unity. The human is completely submerged in, and is coextensive with the world. It is an awareness akin to dreamless sleep, and has been intimated in numerous metaphoric expressions, such as an initial human oneness with a divinity in paradise, or the mystical visions of merging with the one, or the spontaneous rituals that dissolve the participants into a state of trance. It is a zero-dimensional consciousness in the sense of not having any objectifying, vitalizing or psychologizing valence or distance.

## Magic-Vital Consciousness

The magic-vital awareness is one of identity. Every event is vitally connected to, and can be transformed into every other event. One can become the other. In vital awareness, the human has no specific egological identity or psychological self image; rather, it is identical with the powers that it enacts. Thus, a hunter who performs the hunted animal's movements in dance, or wears the animal's skin, consists of the very powers of the animal. The hunter does not symbolize the animal as if he/she had a permanent identity and then enacted the animal. In magic there is no symbolic distance.

Magic-vital awareness can assume a variety of forms. Thus, instead of a ritual, one may engage in incantations, appropriate sayings, assumption of names, and even prayers. As long as the performance is regarded to be identical with another event whose powers the former incorporates or becomes, magical awareness is at play. Nonetheless, attending such awareness is the vital want as a source of will to master and control, to make things happen, and to obtain power. The very term *magic* unfolds into European terms such as "to make," Germanic "Macht" (power), and "moegen" (to want), and "machine." In this sense, magic awareness tacitly integrates vital interests, technical production, rhetoric, and theatre. For example the latter is premised on the understanding that the actor "becomes" the role, that Burton disappears and Hamlet appears. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is not only a transparent attempt to convince, but more fundamentally an incantation that identifies the addressee with the slogans, sayings, promises, and images of stars in advertisements, as well as identifying with the power of an office holder, a nation, or a flag. Moreover, making of implements, technologies, that transform nature in accord with human vital wants, human will, scientific designs and rationality, is modern magic. This consciousness is one dimensional in the sense of identity of one power, one event, with another. Thus, in its own context magic integrates other modes of consciousness.

The integrating reveals how a given structure bears within its own predominant mode, other structures. Magic-vital mode of awareness, while functioning in a vital identification of any part with any other part, also includes wants and desires that are magical modes of willing. Willing, as an aspect of directed and rational activity, is equally contained in magic insofar as the latter exhibits an implicit ends-means correlation. While magical activities preclude symbolic distance, they contain *tacit* polarities that are an aspect of mythological psyche. Thus, the predominance of the

magical structure does not mean that the other structures are completely excluded. The integrating mode of analysis offers a way of accessing the ways in which a particular structure situates the factors from other structures.

### Mythological Consciousness

The third structure of consciousness is mythological. First, it must be emphasized that this structure has very little to do with story telling or fables, although stories and fables usually comprise the ways, the images, the sayings, and human relations, in which the mythological structure appears. While the magical structure contains point-for-point identification of every vital event with every other vital event, the mythical structure relates the events polarly. The latter is to be distinguished from duality insofar as polarity means the dynamic movement of one event, image, feeling, that provokes, attracts, and requires another event. The appearance of sky is also the appearance of its polar aspect, the earth, the appearance of love is also the appearance of hate, the appearance of high demands the polar presence of the low—one is never given without the other, and one may replace the other. Thus gods and demons may exchange their positions through various deeds. Demons may become good and thus may rise to the heights, while gods may become corrupt and sink to the low region. While this movement comprises a rhythmic, and indeed dancing and oral mode of awareness, such an awareness is temporic in a cyclical sense. The cosmos moves in cycles that repeat themselves: from spring to summer, from summer to fall, from fall to winter, from winter to spring. The periodicity of mythical rhythm leads to cyclical repetition, still resonating in Nietzsche's eternal return of the same.

Being temporic and not spatial, the mythical consciousness is expressed in images requiring, for their movement, no spatial traversal. Thus, Gebser notes that myths are usually expressed by psyche and its polar arrangement of dynamically interchanging images, among which oral imagery predominates. The genuine researches in psyche belong to the mythical world. This should not be regarded as an identification of mythologies with method. Rather, the way mythical consciousness integrates all human awareness within its own requirements, including the function of the psyche, makes up the very access to the mythological world. It should be emphasized that this world is fundamentally oral and musical, and both are direct expressions of psyche.

As with other modes of awareness, the mythical mode has its own way of integrating the other structures of consciousness within its own parameters. Vital wants turn to psychological desires and passions, peopled by imageries that are attractive, repulsive, and indifferent. Such imageries, nonetheless, are bearers of magic power that can affect human lives and their destinies. In this sense, psychological imagery contains desires that have their own "will" and rationality. The imagery bears an explanatory power focusing on the "reasons why" events happen the way they do. It is to be noted that these modes of awareness are read both polarly and cyclically, and numerous magical sacrifices comprise the powers that insure the recurrence of the cosmic and human rhythms and cycles, and in turn guarantee that the explanations maintain their coherence.

### Mental Consciousness

The mythical consciousness does not retain its polarizing and psychic character indefinitely; it undergoes a mutation that leads to the preeminence of a mental structure of consciousness. Its characteristics consist of various radically fixed aspects. First, it is dualistic with preeminence given to the function called mind over matter. Second, mind is not regarded as an entity, but a function of directedness, orientation, and finally of linearity. Third, the orientation originates with a center called the ego—at least in the modern configuration—with a propensity to lend it a spatial position from which perspectives become constituted toward the "object." Here we acquire ego–subject in opposition to material object. Fourth, the ego–subject as an orientational function, may be treated, at a deeper level, as constitutive of linear time, while the other, the material side, can be regarded as a representation of space. This would mean, according to Gebser, a division of space and time. Is then the mental dualistic consciousness coextensive with the separation of the awareness of time from the awareness of space? This, for Gebser, is taken for granted by modern thinking, and leads to the reification of time as an indifferent measure of linear motion of spatially located objects. It seems that modern mental consciousness is constituted fundamentally on a spatial metaphor. Indeed, all events and phenomena, in order to be real, are to be reduced to spatio–temporal positionality, and thus to perspectival fragmentation.

Despite the fragmentation, integration plays an essential role in the mental consciousness structure and provides for its maintenance in the face of fragmentation and disintegration. Integration is an unavoidable aspect at the directly lived level of consciousness. Thus, a person living in mythical consciousness does not question her integration. Indeed, such questioning would make no sense. In turn, the explication of a given consciousness structure requires recognition from the backdrop of another consciousness structure, or from the same consciousness structure in its deficient mode.

This double possibility of reflecting one mode of awareness offers one profound solution to the incessantly discussed theoretical and methodological issue concerning the access to one's own culture and to other cultures. This is to say, how is it possible to step outside of one's own culture in order to regard it and other cultures objectively. Gebser's analyses of consciousness structures as coextensive with cultural life, shows that each culture bears within itself consciousness structures that are accessible to all and provide reflexive moments from which the dominant consciousness structure can be recognized.

### Deficient Mental Consciousness

In this sense, if the deficient mode of a given consciousness structure reaches a point of excessive fragmentation, other modes not only reflect it but also may provide the moment of integration. Thus deficient mental awareness may revert to the magical consciousness in order to maintain its power; such reversion may lead to the deliberate multiplication of a consciousness that has begun to fragment itself. Both, during the mutation from mythical to mental and from mental to integral modes of consciousness, the deficient modes were proliferated by the invention of new myths or by the production of new logics and ever new calls for the subjection to quantitative research of all areas of cosmic and human processes. Nonetheless, in both cases a modicum of integration is achieved. Quite frequently

such efforts are most virulent; each new invention or efforts to maintain the deficient myths or rationality make a claim to being the sole myth or reason and demand the suppression and indeed destruction of their own efficient forms. Such phenomena are prevalent among contemporary fundamentalist trends. Each claims to be the sole truth, and calls for the destruction of all evil enemies. This is also present among the political technocrats with their best "humanistic" efforts to improve humanity.

One characteristic of a deficient mode of consciousness is its inability to maintain itself as qualitatively lived; thus it becomes an indifferent division and subdivision, fragmentation and refragmentation of all events. Mental consciousness presumes that its rationality has the sole claim to truth and objectivity, while other modes of experiencing are dismissed as subjective. As suggested above, its proliferation rests on a willful effort to maintain the deficient mental mode not by a rational debate, but by the technological power of sciences. Indeed, qualitative rationality that would maintain a domain for public and open discursive practice, is usually rejected as utopian and replaced by experts with their fragmented advice. The legitimacy of advice is also premised on quantitative and fragmented knowledge. Thus, rationality manifests its own exhaustion to the extent that its persistent self-proliferation is a repetition and incrementation of the same mode of deficient mental consciousness.

This does not mean, for Gebser, that the deficient mental consciousness accepts other modes of awareness in their efficient modes; rather other modes of consciousness may breakdown under the deficient mental. Thus mythology assumes the form of progress. Progress is not a sign of purposeful activity, but has become a self-referring and self-enhancing repetitive structure: progress is for the sake of progress. It turns back upon itself and assumes a mythological structure of cyclical repetition. Magical awareness is equally included in the deficient world of mental awareness. The form that magic assumes is technology. After all, the latter bears the marks of want and willing, making and fulfilling of individual or social-national vital interests. If one couples quantification as the mode of deficient rationality with the ability to make and control, one notes that this coupling is coextensive with the incrementation of power. Power pervades all magical practices to the extent that initially it deals with the making of equivalent identifications, while with instrumental rationality it serves volitional designs. If one were to push this magical base to the limit, one could say that modern magic is will's empowerment of itself, empowerment of its own self-proliferation as will.

The conditions for the possibility of mental consciousness, as noted above, is a specific constitution of time and space. The issue, for Gebser, is the extreme dualism of subject and object, and more fundamentally, of space and time. Kant expressed this dualism in its basic configuration by showing that space is the external mode of perception, while time is the internal mode. Yet it is precisely this type of duality that cannot be integrated by mental consciousness, specifically in its deficient mode. Hence it must presume magic as an integral structure in the form of a modern insistence on making—technology—and a continuous emphasis on the fulfillment of material wants. It is a culture obsessed with the magic of production as the common denominator and the final purpose of all activities. Dualism is avoided at the level of magical consciousness in the form of rampant materialism

with an attendant glorification of power. For Gebser this state of affairs explains contemporary power confrontations.

The current debate concerning the viability of qualitative methodologies is not a novelty, but an effort to enhance the continuity of the mental consciousness structure. Certainly, the significance of this debate cannot be overlooked; it reveals the inadequacy of both, the qualitative and the quantitative methodologies, and opens a methodology of integration. This is to say, the objectivation of the two mental methodologies manifests a consciousness structure that defies the magical integration, and opens the ever-present *integrum* that is prior to parts and wholes, to the one and the many, to unity and diversity, and even to time and eternity. *Integrum* it not a whole that unifies the parts, that is more than the sum of the parts; rather it frees the diversity from the constrictions upon openness and releases it from succession and structural rules. This, for Gebser, is the case of the twentieth century.

### Integral Consciousness

The integral consciousness, manifesting its predominance in every domain of this age, from physics to poetry, and comprises an explicit presence of what has been latent or implicit in all the modes of awareness. This immediately precludes the notion that integration is an arrayment, recognition, and acceptance of the different structures of consciousness. The diversity traces in each the commonalties that are *transparent* precisely because of the diversities. Gebser's understanding of the integral, manifest basically by transparency, requires meticulous articulation. It should be clear that transparency does not mean seeing through things by some mystical vision.

At the first level Gebser accepts meaning as a phenomenon of consciousness that does not signify (so called) reality, but comprises an event of mutual relationships and dependent differences. If we take a material object, every aspect of it means other aspects and thus integrates, and is in turn integrated by them. One side of the object means other sides and thus is both different from them and yet transparent with them as they are transparent through it. In this sense, meanings point to other meanings, that are different from, and yet related to one another. They integrate in their mutual call for each other and in their mutual differentiation.

The second basic feature of the integral awareness is *atemporality*. Once again, some basic misunderstandings should be avoided. This term signifies concrete awareness of time as integral, prior to its abstract and linear division into past-present-future. Even such a division at the level of meaning suggests transparency of one through the others and differential integration. Indeed, as numerous researches into time awareness have shown, a purely sequential experience would not yield any sense. Such an experience would be totally fragmented into disconnected temporal quanta. Any connection already takes for granted a presence of concrete awareness that is integrating. The atemporality of such integration means that prior to various functions introduced to account for time, such as memory, images, projections, and expectations, the consciousness of the presence of the whole is required. Thus, the integrating process of the previous, the present, and the subsequent is prior to their sequence, and allows their perception

of one through the other. For Gebser this perception is atemporal concretum and is at the basis of aperspectival awareness depicted by the artists of this century.

Without atemporality there would be no aperspectivity as a way of seeing something from all perspectives or as omnipresent. Atemporality integrates spatial perception of perspectives, allowing an awareness of something from all sides without the succession of mental functions. This state of affairs can be explicated even in the familiar language of mental consciousness. To have the presence of a perspective requires the co-presence of a previous or the subsequent perspective. But such a requirement is possible on the condition of the presence of atemporality such that the latter makes co-present the previous and the subsequent perspectives as integral aspects of an awareness of the whole. Thus, atemporality is an integration of spatial perspectivity *by* atemporality.

It would be a mistake to speak here of wholes as if they were a pre-given structure in contrast to the parts. In other words, this conception presumes the controversy within the mental consciousness concerning the priority of parts over wholes and conversely wholes over parts. Indeed, this controversy reflects the difference between the qualitative and the quantitative mental structure, or between the efficient and the deficient phases of any structure. Thus, the notion of the whole within the integral consciousness must be regarded non-dualistically, such that even the notion of one aspect becoming the other, of energy changing into matter and matter transforming itself into energy, or psyche being the other side of the body and the body being an appearance of the psyche, must be avoided. Gebser demands that we think the integral in a way that avoids dualism without the assumption of holism wherein everything is a night in which all cows are black.

While dualisms are premised on the separation of time from space consciousness, the integral consciousness is a concretization of time in such a way that the space is dynamized. Indeed, the very separation that led to mental, linear time resulted as well in a reified time and an appeal to spatial metaphors for its explication. The difficulty in grasping the integral consciousness as atemporal and aperspectival may be attributed to the hindrance of the prevalent discursive language with its mental emphasis. On the other hand, the possibilities of other modes of expression lend themselves to the task beginning with the conceptions of openness, probability, chance, and even chaos. Such terms preclude conceptions of spatial closure and strict localizability. They suggest the irruption of atemporality within the spatial rigidity and thus disruption of such rigidity. This irruption, for Gebser, is not an intellectual invention, but is traceable across the diverse cultural phenomena of our century, from poetry to physics. The irruption of atemporality avoids dualism and abolishes the language of inner-outer, expression-expressed, and even meaning and the meant, or the now famous signifier-signified.

It should be noted that the integral does not abolish the other modes of awareness; neither does it simply aggregate them and tolerate their differences by allowing each to have its say. Rather, the other modes of awareness become subject to, or even subordinate to the integral. In this sense, rationality ceases to be fragmented and merely instrumental but assumes a sense-making function that is never closed. The sense-making is not purely logistic and argumentative but connecting within the context of the integral. It plays a role of tracing out sense implications and their never finalizable intersections. Thus, rationality sets the transgressible

limits that allow for openness and integration. Once again, the notion of integration is to be dynamized in the sense of "continuous" and atemporal *integrating*. Integrating does not lose differentiations. To the contrary, the differentiations comprise the very factors of transparency of the various modes of consciousness. As already noted, rationality becomes one aspect of the integral consciousness, but it also makes transparent the mythical, not by reflecting on it, but by incorporating the very differences that make them transparent. Rationality, in integral consciousness, has its myth of perfectibility, but in such a way that the presence of the future is what explodes the rigidified, spatial present. In brief, future is not something that is coming but it is co-present as the difference between the given and its variants of perfectibility. The latter, in turn, integrates and is vitalized by the magical transformation of the given to perfectibility. It is a magic transformation which is atemporally present such that what is to be transformed and its variations are co-present. Apparently, such a copresence includes the very structure of aperspectivity. Aperspectivity and atemporality are key for the integrating differentials that allow for openness and yet transparent comprehension.

The task, for Gebser, is to articulate the integral without a loss of significant differentiations. The latter become most important in face of various contemporary socio-political and theocratic movements. These movements seem to be reasonable, and yet what is to be noted is their immersion in various deficient modes of consciousness structures. The cognizance of such modes is a way of avoiding the pitfalls of becoming subjected to the deficient, and at the same time extremely virulent enchantment, commitment, and action on the basis of such modes. We know well the magic of Hitler and Regan, the mythical sayings and magic rituals of all types of fundamentalisms—whether theological or political—that ply their trade under the protecting guise of rationality, the right to speak and "convince," and even the violent right to impose their "truth" on all for their own, although unsuspected, good.

#### THE INTERTWINING OF CONSCIOUSNESS STRUCTURES

The intertwining of the different consciousness structures, their constant integral presence, poses equally unsuspected dangers. Since, as noted above, each consciousness structure may integrate other modes, then during an age of mutation, one may be tempted to select any one of them as preeminent and exclusive. This temptation is the more prevalent when humans are faced with a disintegrating and fragmenting mode of awareness. One seeks for any integrating mode and falls prey to an exclusive emphasis on one consciousness structure.

For Gebser this state of affairs cannot be rejected; what is required is a cognizance of the limits of one mode of awareness vis-a-vis the other modes. Magic and myth integrate rationality, yet if one were to shift to rational mode of awareness and its ways of integrating, one would be able to appreciate the limits of the other modes, and thus would not fall prey completely to the direct, lived solicitations of the other modes of awareness. The same can be said of the mental consciousness; in the context of the integral the limits of the mental become transparent not only in relation to other modes of awareness, but also through their all-pervasive integral dimension.

The cognizance of the integrating differentiation also shows the common *integrating* ground. The latter is *ever-present* and in one mode or another precludes a complete fragmenting collapse of any mode of awareness. At the same time, the integral awareness escapes, at a more fundamental level, the above mentioned issue of theoretical and methodical access to one's own and other cultures without having to transcend them. Due to the integral consciousness, one can regard the events within the contexts of the preeminence of one or another structure of consciousness of any given culture by noting the recurring, even if diversely expressed integration. This is to say, one can access them both atemporally and aperspectively. Thus, one need not appeal to some unconscious reality, some material base, some instinct in order to extricate oneself from inner-cultural positionality. These tandems, regarded as an explanatory base, attempt to avoid cultural closure and inevitably introduce elements which are both outside of culture and consciousness. For Gebser, even such explanatory offerings presuppose a specific mode of awareness that integrates them with other modes of awareness and does not allow one mode to be completely supreme. Indeed, the explanatory components are not dead substances or mechanisms, but are borrowed from another structure of consciousness. For example, the vital-magical consciousness that intertwines with all vital events may become hydraulic biology that explains human behavior in terms of blind drives. There are two aspects of this that show the relevance of Gebser's thought concerning such explanations. First, the blind drives, apparently, are quite cognizant of what they want, otherwise one could not speak of them in various purposive terms; and second, such drives become transparent as consciousness on the reflexive grounds of another consciousness structure that is already integral to the very drives, e.g. their directionality and, in case of magic, their vital nexus that is both effective and protective. The latter two are quite apparent in events from current religious practice to sport mascots. The point is that all explanations are one aspect of integral inter-reflexivity of different modes of awareness and play a role in allocating to certain modes of consciousness their specific meanings.

#### FRUITFUL HORIZONS

The understanding offered by Gebser's investigations into specific consciousness structures—as coextensive with cultural structures—rejects both, the evolutionary thesis as well as the teleological thesis of western philosophies, still preeminent under the silent sway of Hegel, Marx, and even the mythology of progress. For Gebser, such teleologies are neither right nor wrong; they must be located within their proper consciousness structure and evaluated with respect to their limits and their manifestation within the preeminence of specific modes of awareness. Indeed, in the context of integral consciousness, the teleological aspect is not abolished; rather, a multi-purposive horizon—an aperspectival understanding—is opened. This need not be regarded as a fragmentation of a teleology, since in the efficient mode of integral awareness the multi-purposive telos is mutually interconnected with and reveals the efficiency of other modes of awareness. It is otherwise when a preeminent mode begins to be exhausted, repetitive, bored to tears, that one can speak of fragmentation and a transition to a manifestation of another mode.

The fragmentation of a given consciousness structure opens two options: first, the intimation of an emergent integration that is both a mutation and restructuration

of other structures of consciousness; second, the reversion to a culturally available mode of consciousness that promises "salvation" from the ravages of the dissolving consciousness structure. Salvation no longer offers an integration. In one sense, this is not a problem of the fragmenting rationality, but a lack of awareness of a mutation of consciousness toward another structure. While the latter may not have become prevalent, in the sense of being "lived," it appears on the ground of the fragmentation of a prevalent structure and what is sensed as missing in it. The missing aspect dominates the fragmenting consciousness and—as noted above—can be filled either by reverting to magic and its power to regenerate myths, or by tracing out the constitution of an emerging awareness. The latter, according to Gebser, prevails only through a commitment. Yet the most important methodological consideration focuses precisely on the missing aspect that lends access to the fragmenting and upsurging consciousness structure. This upsurgence has been always atemporal and aperspectival, although not explicitly manifest within the diverse "time" structures belonging to the various modes of awareness.

No doubt, Gebser's work is not complete; yet its depth offers multi-dimensional access to human awareness and culture. The vast correlation of cultural phenomena, the analyses of all the consciousness structures intersecting such phenomena, provide a contribution that is novel, profound and replete with fruitful suggestions for future research. Much of this volume is, in fact, devoted to such research. After all, to be true to Gebser's work and insights, one need not repeat what has been done by Gebser. Rather, the task is to extend human awareness concerning various current phenomena. ★