

COSMOS AND ATEMPORALITY

Algis Mickunas

Ohio University

INTRODUCTION

The venture that demands to be undertaken requires not only a shift of awareness toward integrality, but equally a cognizance of a specific, even if not explicitly articulated, problematic of the *cosmos* in the context of the mental-rational tradition. The Gebserian explication of diverse modes of awareness has offered clues suggesting the impossibility by the mental awareness to be able to think the world, although he also demonstrated that such modes of awareness are not *of things*, but specific articulations of space-time, even if the latter are radically distinct one from the others. Using Gebser's ways of explicating the complex and diverse phenomena as indices of structures of awareness, it should be possible to bring to the fore the clues to the ever-present cosmic awareness. One specific issue calls for immediate attention: the reappearance of mental-rational mode of awareness even among the efforts to overcome its limitations. Thus, various current "deconstructions" of modernity (deficient rationality) maintain that the modern perspective is one among many possible perspectives. Yet the metaphoric extension of *perspectivity* to be an all-encompassing theory is, as a matter of course, a final articulation and affirmation of modernity and indeed an unquestioned acceptance of the deficient mode of mental-rational awareness. In turn, there are various sciences attempting to devise means to measure the vastness of the universe, and even the possibility of peering into the beginning of time, and thus opening the door to speculative mysticism. We do not challenge scientific claims—the latter may be true in the context of mental awareness—rather the task of articulating cosmic awareness appears within the very mental-rational consciousness parameters, whether the latter are in the efficient, qualitative, or in the deficient, quantitative mode. Yet the parameters appear on the ground of tacitly present awareness which makes the parameters recognizable, and comprises the necessary background allowing the parameters to appear as a foreground. Thus, the mental-rational awareness intimates more than it can contain without being in a position to encompass the more. The *more*, we contend, is the *cosmos*. The tracing of the latter through the mental-rational awareness requires a careful exposition of the fundamentals of such awareness.

THE ONTO-METAPHYSICS OF REASON

At one level, Gebser's work has suggested that consciousness structures are coextensive with specific space-time morphologies, not as variations of, or deviations from, an identical and forever valid space-time structure, but as diverse modes of awareness. The only space-time structure that is available to a specific culture is its space-time consciousness. The latter is the basic context within whose parameters all events—including the humans—are articulated. In this sense, one specific space-time structure, the objective, is available, and completely tied to the specific mode of awareness—the mental-rational. The parameters of this space-time consciousness have framed Western metaphysics and ontology, i.e. the symbolic designs of ultimate reality and of the composition of nature, and indeed set a stage for various theologies of teleological and eschatological types.

Because of such parameters metaphysical-ontological thinking became, not only available, but also a hindrance to the understanding of the world. Indeed, the very language of this way of thinking comprises an over-determination in favor of specific prejudgments, above all in favor of *thing* and *Being-In-The-World*. This is not to say that the mental-rational awareness rejected the world; to the contrary, all efforts in the construction of metaphysics and ontology were and

continue to be founded on the tacit rejection and thus continuous presence of the world. Yet this presence, in its mental interpretation, led to the reification and finally to the *deworlding* of the cosmos. Again, this is not to imply that this process was initiated by some malign genius; rather, given the mental-rational consciousness, the *deworlding* of all events, including the human, could hardly be avoided. This simply suggests that in this consciousness space-time-movement, as cosmic dimensions, play no essential role in the understanding of objects and subjects. Lending preeminence to the permanence of substantial things and their relationships, traditional thinking covers over the questions of the cosmos. Attributing preeminence to things—and by extension to Being—and in modernity to reified reality and the metaphysics of logic allows the presumption that as things and material objects, so can the worldly dimensions of space-time-movement be regarded as "objects," although inessential among other objects. If things are constantly *in* time, *in* space, and *in* motion, then this very *in-hereence* does not make an essential difference to the things that are *in*. Although modern reification of nature led to the positing of atomic and sub-atomic building blocks, the latter are equally *in* space-time-movement. This form of reification was one of the reasons for the appearance of *mind* as a counterpart to matter.

This onto-metaphysical thinking extends all the way to the constitution of *laws* of things *in* space-time-movement; yet the laws ought to be *indifferent* with respect to space-time-motion, i.e. they are changeless since they regulate the motions and location of things. In brief, while the ontological composition of things is substantial and permanent *in* space-time-motion, the metaphysical givenness of laws is regarded as transcending the vicissitudes of *being in*. Indeed, the metaphysical articulations may extend to encompass space-time-movement to the extent that these two are subject to transcendent laws, i.e. laws of space, time, and movement. Although such laws seem to cover over the presence of the world, they are, nonetheless, completely bound to the sense of the world *in* which the laws of time, space, motion determine the directions, locations, and speeds of things *in* the world. This would then suggest that what comprises the mental and rational space-time consciousness is equally a tacit presence of the world. How one mode of awareness becomes a tracing of another mode, i.e. how a mental-rational awareness shifts to a trace of integral, atemporal world awareness, is yet to be deciphered.

Granting that a mental-rational consciousness lends priority to stable substances and transcending metaphysical compositions, the question must still be asked concerning the origin of this *stasis* and its duration. It is possible to suggest that a linear time allows a reading of events as given at a temporal point, such that the *now point* remains forever constant. The *now point* never changes and is the condition for the direct presence of all things. All that is must be given *now*. The latter assumes an inordinate preeminence of staticity such that all ontological conceptions signify the permanence of things and the latter point to their substantiality and duration in the continuous *now*. Thus, the consciousness of *the given* assumes a stability insofar as the consciousness is *present* to the things at *present*. The present of the *now* is deemed not only changeless, but eternally present, and in this sense provides the metaphysical hinge for the various contentions against motion as either inessential or nonexistent. This is to say, the metaphysical arguments of the Zenonian type, leading to their expansion in Platonisms and mathematicizations of all phenomena, are pegged on the argument of the eternal givenness of the *present*, i.e. *always there*.

The puncti-formity of *now* constitutes as well the flattening of time to a line such that the present *now*, instead of revealing the world time, covers its depth. This leads to remarkable and complicated phenomena. Since the *now* is deemed as always *present*, it not only guarantees the permanence of *thing*, but can also lend an appearance of priority to things over time and allow that time will be measured by the criteria of things. This would lead to the conclusion that since the thing is *now* and not yesterday, therefore yesterday is *no longer*. In this sense the thing not only over-determines the modality of the givenness of time (the past and the future), but also

creates an appearance that just as things past and future are equally given as *no longer and not yet*. Of course, the priority of the *now* is the condition for this syndrome.

Some efforts to extricate the world from the impalement on the *now* reverse the order of temporal phases and propose that the projections of the future possibilities are prior to the *now* and the things in the *now*. According to Heidegger, Sartre, and others, such projections allow us to transgress the present and thus to avoid reducing consciousness to a *present thing*. What is of note is that the projections are equally expectations of . . . something. The future comprises possibilities of the appearance of objects or Being. This means that the projections of future possibilities are directed either toward fulfillment or disappointment of such possibilities by *things*. The future can be a project simply because the things that supposedly shall fill the expected possibilities are not yet there. A reified thinking dominates the effort to avoid reification. Possibilities are none other than reversed actualities. Indeed, the projections can be regarded as stretches of time: some are longer, others are shorter *in time*. This is to say, the future consists of empty stretches and possibilities can be projected as diverse distances *in* the future horizon. But the latter is regarded as a possibility of temporal continuation and thus a world horizon. This fails to realize that the *cosmos*, in which the future horizon appears, is already presupposed.

The priority of the *now* and the *thing* that allows the appearance of the world as spacio-temporal does not even exist. The future is not yet and the past is no longer, and hence the dimensions of the world do not exist. Yet even the *now* embodies a paradox: since it is not a stretch but a point between past and future, it cannot exist; it is nothing. We are facing a curiosity: the past, the present and the future are nothing. Hence what are we talking about when we speak of time? How can one measure and have stretches and continuities of nothing? It is the case that when we speak of such stretches we use a spatial metaphor in such a way that given spatial distances we can measure them; but how can one measure what is either no longer or not yet. We may be able to measure spatial distances to the extent that we may presume *returning* to the same place—even if this returning is problematic—but how can we return to the no longer? This paradox is the catalyst for the search of a *locus* where time can be measured. After all, measuring assumes that what we measure must be. Even if the no longer and not yet were to be regarded as not something that is not, but as something that is empty, i.e. empty time and empty space, we would be at a quandary to speak of directions in such an empty container. Indeed, emptiness discards the very understanding of world and returns us back to the nothingness of this world. All this leads to the efforts, as already mentioned, to locate time.

In one instance there are various metaphysical efforts to locate and guarantee the world in and by some ultimate *Being*. Since things and their continuity are deployed in spacio-temporal sequence of movements and locations, this very continuity must be guaranteed by some metaphysical powers that are deemed to be the glue of the succession. This is to say, since the *now* point has no extension, then there appears an abyss between the *now* and the next moment. If the continuity is threatened by fragmentation, then one introduces something transcendent to fill the gap left by the metaphysical and ontological, i.e. rational rejection of the *cosmos*. This is not only the constitution of the Cartesian problematic of rational time, but also leads to Leibnizian monadology and theodicy, and above all to Whitehead's efforts to save metaphysics without giving up the *now* point. For Whitehead, the entire problematic of metaphysics was its impalement of all reality on the *now* point, allowing for no possibility of shifting from the *now* and yet maintaining a continuity. Yet his efforts did not lead to worldly awareness, but to a reshuffling of the metaphysics of Being. He had to locate past and future *in* something. Thus, the shift from future to present and from the present to the past is a shift from the primordial nature of Being to the actual nature of Being. Here we find the limits of the thinking of Things and Being. Cosmic time is possible solely by its being inherent in the ultimate Being. In this sense, the cosmic domain of space-time-movement depend on Being. The latter, we suggest, is a

way for mental-rational consciousness to deal with the inevitable question of *cosmos*. Being is regarded as the connection and continuation of things. The latter are tied to the ultimate Being that guarantees their transition from the past to the future. Yet in this sense, the world is excluded from awareness. Although such metaphysics avoids the pure linearity of temporal phases by locating them in an eternal being, the latter, as eternal, does not allow us to understand the various modalities of experiencing time. Eternity excludes such questions. What is suggested here is that for Gebser the integral and atemporal awareness (*Wahrnehmung*) is neither eternal nor a mental-rational sequence, and not even a mythological or magical structure, but precludes such dualities, polarities and puncti-formal identities. To say that it is eternal, is to say that it is opposed to temporal and thus to return to mental-rational mode of awareness. Such an awareness is not only dualistic, but in its deficient, quantitative mode, it establishes a metaphysical way of treating all phenomena on the background of *eternity*. This is to say, mathematical definitions are not atemporal, but eternal, and are in no position to deal with cosmos that involves time. It is clear that regardless of how many mathematical points one may add, one will not derive extension or duration from them. Thus, mathematical measure of time is completely impossible. We shall return to this discussion shortly.

The glue of Being excludes the understanding of world. Thus, one seeks other options—beginning with Augustine—to extricate the problematics of the cosmos from the onto-metaphysical context of *being in* and *being*. One major option is the way through the *psyche*. Although the latter is mythologically laden, it assumes mental rational status in the context of temporal constitution of linear past-present-future. Here, the world dimensions of time, and its tripartite division, depend on the experience of the subject. Strictly speaking, there is no experience of the cosmic phenomena; rather, the very experience comprises these phenomena. The recollection and expectation are not *of* something, but are the very temporal extensions wherein things appear as past or as still-to-come. In brief, these extensions serve as a framework for the loci of things. The emphasis is on the thing, since the latter marks the very spot that, in turn, can be measured. This primacy is expressed by Augustine, who points out that neither past nor future exist if no things are recollected or expected. In turn, if the recollected or expected things are not given as *real*, then the temporal phases cannot be real either. This would shift us back to the previous problematics of the non-existence of the world. Moreover, the efforts to locate time experience in the psyche, even in the most rarefied sense of a pure form of one event after another event, or a succession, would fail in the effort to grasp tri-partitional time. A succession does not show traces from past to present, and from present to future. But even taking for granted that such a succession of events or things were to intimate, in some mysterious way, past-present-future, the recollected image and the expected image have no indices of coming either from the past or the future. An image of a friend who is not with me, whether recollected or expected, does not trace any difference in itself. And since it is the image that we have to mark the points of time in order for time to appear as either past or future, then the very marking already assumes such temporal orientations instead of being their source.

The problematic can assume other variations. If time is *in* the mind, or *in* the psyche, then the problem of its measure is merely postponed but not resolved, and for the following reasons: First, psyche is not given as something extended and offers no possible means of being extended into the past. Second, if all that is must exist *now*, then psyche is equally *now*, and hence does not offer any intimation of time. Third, since all the images and acts inhering in the psyche are also now, then they too cannot offer any measure of time and cannot designate time awareness; they do not, purely by themselves, have an intimation of time, and above all cosmic time. In this sense the latter cannot be grasped from the side of the psyche in its rational mode. Moreover, rationally speaking, the psyche is also *in* time, and thus reverts us back to the problem of *being in*. The initial question of Augustine *ubi tempus* remains tied to indecipherable riddles.

If we return to the most fundamental expression of the *being in*, we discover a more fascinating paradox: the world is regarded as the biggest among all big things and it too is developing and unfolding in space-time-movement. Thus it is thought that the world began sometime in the past with some sort of a Big Bang, and from then it unfolded in all directions and up to the present and shall continue to unfold into the future. This image suggests that the world is in motion in some space and time; yet such an image presupposes a time and space different from the world. How could this be if apart from the cosmos there is no space and time and thus the cosmos could not be *in* any space-time-movement. In this sense, the cosmic space-time-movement cannot be equatable with any awareness of development, directionality, or cyclicity of repetition. All directions, developments, and repetitions are *in the world*, but the cosmos is not one of the events *in*. Cosmos cannot, thus, move from a particular time point to another time point, or from a particular place to still another place. Yet it is equally important to note that when one speaks of things and events, temporal durations and directions as being *in*, the latter does not imply that the cosmos is a container, a box wherein all events have their residence—as bees in a beehive. It is equally important to note that the cosmos is not some finite or an infinite expanse, or a region apart from events which could be discovered by sending an expedition. We can send an expedition to discover events that are not yet known and remote, but no expedition, as an event, can discover cosmos. The latter cannot be discovered somewhere and sometime. All this suggests that the cosmos cannot be grasped within the context of mental and rational consciousness and its two possibilities: spacio-temporal events as measured in the psyche from its positionality in the present, and the metaphysical concept of Being designed to provide the glue of, and a transition of events from, one point to the next.

THE DIFFERENCE AND THE FIELD

Mental-rational consciousness fails insofar as it is in no position to lend us any understanding of the cosmos. Such an understanding swings dualistically, and as we know from Gebser's work integral awareness both surpasses and subtends dualisms. But this also means that one cannot presume that the integral lends priority to a fixed unity in opposition to multiplicity, or some form of spirituality in contrast to materiality. Indeed, they are not abolished; rather their meaning subtends their entitative divisions and spacio-temporal locations. Thus the spirit is seen as *outside* of space-time, while the body is *in* space-time. As a way of avoiding such dualisms, Gebser traces an awareness that is neither temporal nor eternal; it is integral. In order to articulate the integral, it is best to begin with an event called *perception*, or what Gebser calls *Wahrnehmung*—truth taking. It is of note that this term surpasses the duality between rational and empirical modes of awareness, and may offer more appropriate clues to cosmic consciousness. We must be reminded of the shift in terminology; we are no longer talking of consciousness of the world, but cosmic consciousness; the former still contains residua of dualism, while the latter is a way of avoiding it.

Perception avoids the positional metaphors without falling prey to rigid oneness. If that is the case, then a careful step-by-step investigation of this awareness requires not multiple parts, but a process of differentiation. The latter was already traceable in our discussion of the things *in*, and the pervasive cosmic awareness. Despite sophisticated analyses, the rational consciousness could not access such an awareness. Since Gebser suggests that integral consciousness is perception, then it would be appropriate to initiate the investigations of the cosmic from the constitution of perceptual awareness that pervades both, the metaphysics of empiricism and rationalism.

Each perceptual event transgresses the puncti-formal now, the presumptive present by pointing beyond itself to an aura of other perceptions that are neither past nor future, but comprise a self-differentiating field. The latter cannot be delimited, since any attempt to posit a limit is equally

a perception that signifies more than itself. In this sense, the perceptual field cannot be located, although everything that is localizable from here to there, from now to then, comprise perceptual phases of the field. This intimates that the distinction between space and time becomes redundant. From here to there is from now to then. While the events of the field may trace various directions, the field does not suggest directions. The field phenomenon is not a container or an enclosure against which the self-differentiating events would strive. The events are equally field phenomena. This is to say, every perception surpasses its own parameters to the extent that by signifying other perceptions announce their own differentiation from and dependence upon one another. In this sense, there are no singular perceptual moments which do not demand synchronically other moments that are different, such that there is a mutual significative differentiation. Thus the field is traversed by mutually differentiating phenomena which, in their constant transgression articulate the alocalizable field. To say it in other words, the perceptual field is articulating itself by way of the differentiating perceptual phenomena. What ought to be emphasized is the dissolution of the rational and empirical epistemologies wherein the perceptual phenomena and the field would be deemed as appearances to someone distinct from these phenomena.

This awareness also reconfigures the presumed presence of things *in* something. The very awareness of a *thing* breaks up into a field of differential depths and horizons, such that the sides point to other sides in their co-presence and one through the other, into overlapping perspectives constituted by movement that both transcends the momentary and resonates with all that is to come and has been. At this level there is no subject-object, no spirit-body division. The phenomena cease to be material without becoming mental; they are, according to Gebser, meaning that is the consciousness of integrating transparency. Simply stated, transparency is not an ability to be a Lynx who can see through things, but the emergence of the signitive awareness. The latter permits the poly-critical differentiae or continuous differential of integrating and opening. Thus, the integral time awareness is not a balling together of all events into one and squeezing them till they yield eternity, but the copresence of temporal articulation of past-present-future such that neither one means anything without the others, and that they do not point to their unity, but to their co-present difference and thus their mutual visibility one through the other. Although we use the term "visibility," any other term may do, such as audiality, tactility and even sensuality. The signitive phenomena appear one through the other in mutual copresence such that tactility is resonated through audiality, the latter shakes up visibility, and so on. Thus, two points can be adduced. First, there cannot be awareness of visibility without it being resonated through its difference from, and yet copresence with audiality, tactility, and basically kinaesthetic constitution. Second, perceptual dimensions can trace any signification that crisscrosses the field. The hand, the eye, the pivoting, and the audial attending, are coextensive with and trace the signitive events both horizontally-laterally, and vertically—in depth.

These modes of signitive articulation of a field comprise a reconfiguration of awareness away from temporal succession and eternal repetition to the awareness of every signitive event as a deformation of signitive formation, and thus a trace of the copresence of the deformations *in depth*. To speak in human terms, a smile is a deformation and a trace of a frown whose mutual differences comprise their copresence and appearance one through the other—both laterally and vertically. To make the obvious thematic, in this awareness there is no appearance of pregiven spacio-temporal loci, and no container *in* which such awareness and events would take place. The formation, and the tracing of copresence of deformational differences constitute an upsurge of spacio-temporalizing prior to locations and positionalities. To speak with Gebser, we come to the *origination* and not to the readily made movement *in* space-time. Here *field awareness* lends itself to spacio-temporalizing movement that precludes any notion of a fixed unity or identity, but rather swings as forming deformation from the vertical horizons of the

field. Thus the formation cannot be impaled on the now point, since it traces and is transparent through the deformation. In this sense the forming-deforming spatio-temporalizing upsurge is atemporal. Any attempt to grasp a formation, such as the present, shifts to the deformation of the past and a tracing preformation of the so called future so that what appears is a self-*atemporalizing* and self-*aspatializing* field.

As already noted, the field does not indicate any boundary, since the latter pretends to maintain an inner-outer duality. The field is traceable as a play of signitive events, and in turn it is a trace of *cosmic* awareness. Every shift of signitive events of a field, is also a non-predictable shift of the field. In this it is possible to espy the cosmic time as the shift of *presence* in a way that the signitive events do not vanish *into* the past but rather transform the depths of fields. The *shift of presence*, traced by the field with its signitive transformations of forming and deforming events, is atemporalizing and aspatializing play that can be designated as a *cosmic difference*. This suggests that cosmos is not identical with the sum of things; that it is not a synthetic unity of all things and their relationships, possessing specific characteristics of this synthesis. The latter case would presume substantiation and a subject-predicate logic that takes for granted its positionality of *being in* and thus its incapacity to exhibit a worldly consciousness. In turn, the very awareness of the cosmic difference implicates an awareness both of the things *in*, and the cosmos. At this juncture consciousness must transgress the totality of all things and the very being of things in order to differentiate them from the world. The cosmic awareness, or as some traditional notions would have it, the human *world openness*, appears by virtue of the cosmic difference.

At this juncture a remarkable coincidence between the cosmic and the human begins to emerge. While the perspectival givenness of things, and indeed a multitude of *world views* are bound to the metaphor of *being in*, and thus to spacio-temporal positionality, the world openness is alocal and atemporal. One does not have a direction from here to then or from now to there, but provides a region of all possible orientations prior to the differentiation between past-present-future or from here to there. This is the event of the difference that maintains this openness and sets up the field of differentiations. The latter is possible because the open awareness is constantly maintained so that the field cannot exhibit any boundaries or locations. Indeed, it allows the notion of the *more* in awareness than the presently given field is able to grant. What is now obvious, requires extreme care, since the most obvious is usually the most difficult to articulate. To say that the cosmos *grants* the openness for the *more* of the field, is also to say that there is a radical indistinction between the subject and the object. After all, the open consciousness is not related to objects, and its openness does not confront the open cosmos as an object; rather, the open cosmos is what grants the human openness and in such a way that such a mutual openness is what allows consciousness to be open to things and objects as intersections of differential field significations. Indeed, as Gebser shows, even the humanities, such as social and political sciences, are no longer regarded within the closure of medieval and aristocratic systems, but are open both statistically and with respect to activities (sometimes regarded under the rubric of *free choice*). What is at issue for us is to show that integral consciousness is cosmic consciousness without any reifications and mythical deployment of psychic images or spiritual entities.

TRACING THE COSMIC OPENNESS

First, we shall consider the ways that some twentieth century thinkers have traced the cosmos. By tracing we do not want to say that they were positionally aware of the cosmic. After all, one cannot take a position to cosmos, as if it were an object *of* consciousness. Here, the prepositional thinking becomes redundant. It is equally redundant to speak of world in rational terms of *transcendence* and of consciousness as an effort to reach some domain *beyond*. The

world is not beyond, and in turn there is nothing beyond the world. All such claims are within the context of rational positionality. Indeed, to think cosmically is both, to think arationally and atemporally. All theo-metaphysics are equally traces of the world articulated from the consciousness of *limits* and of rational positionality of *being in*.

Traces are not traces of, do not point to some domain beyond themselves, are not signs containing signifiers and signifieds; they are phenomena, and the world is the phenomenality of such phenomena. Let us exemplify the ways of the traces by a couple of major theoretical types of field awareness: the transcendental and the hermeneutical (historically effective consciousness). The transcendental is the more difficult to articulate, yet it also comprises an obvious trace of the cosmic. If we place ourselves at a level of awareness of time constitution we discover a self-temporalizing event that is a simultaneous protention-retention wherein the present appears irrevocably as open, and in a way that the protentional-retentional phases have no demarcations, and indeed do not suggest directionality; the latter would call for positions which, at this level, have not yet appeared. The self-temporalization is a condition for any positionality, and thus it is atemporal. The latter, as noted, is open without any demarcations, and in this atemporal openness it is a trace of the cosmic openness. The latter is equally atemporal apositionality. What allows the self-temporalizing awareness its atemporality as open, is its transparency with the atemporal openness of cosmos. This is to say the self-temporalizing event is nothing else than the awareness that traces the openness of the cosmos. We are not contending that cosmic awareness is prior to, and somehow founds all other modes of awareness; rather, it is the most immediate and pervasive presence in all modes of awareness.

The hermeneutical, the historically affective consciousness, may also be regarded as an awareness that traces the cosmic. As is well known, the historical type of hermeneutics shows that any awareness merges with the horizons of historical preunderstanding such that the latter surpasses one's present and subtends the assumption of linearity. The language we speak, the customs we inhabit, the heroes we emulate are not our past, but also our future. We find our way and indeed are an aspect of this entire preunderstanding and its open horizons of interpretation. Our singular awareness is not *in* a hermeneutical context, but appears as a trace and a manifestation of that context such that our shifts in awareness are equally the shifts of the historical and interpretive horizons, and conversely, the shift of the latter is the shift in our awareness. In this sense, the prejudgment of objectivity and subjectivity must be surrendered. One cannot posit the historically effective consciousness as an object of investigation; the very investigation will shift the horizons of such consciousness. Indeed, every positionality, perspective, and every effort to establish the present, or an identity, will be transgressed by the open horizons of such consciousness.

The historically effective consciousness, in turn, cannot delimit its own parameters and must comprise a trace of an open cosmos. In order to be such a trace it too exhibits its atemporal and apositional consciousness. Indeed, it abolishes the rational mode of history as oriented, developing, or evolving. This also includes the manifestation of the limits of teleological and eschatological rationalizations of human life—inclusive even of Marxian theology. Literally speaking, to think integrally is to think purposelessly. I am cognizant of the Gebserian emphasis on our contemporary need to take up the integral awareness, but such a taking up is not a purpose to be achieved in a linear history, in some future; rather it is a call to live an awareness that is present without being locked into the *now*.

Although it may seem that we have reached the traces of the cosmic and of our openness, as apositional, and thus atemporal and alocal, we have also mentioned that another aspect of cosmos is movement. As we know, rational mode of awareness calls for a movement from here to there, from now to then and thus presumes that a thing is moving *in* space and time and is *in* motion. Not to speak of the simplistic logical dilemmas of defining motion in this context, the impossibility of articulating cosmic motion in the sense of the world being *in* motion from here

to there or from now to then, is quite apparent. This was implicit in the above discussion of the cosmos as beginning in a point of time and a location in space and then unfolding toward the present and the future. In addition, we cannot allude to the rhythmic–cyclical motion of the mythological awareness: everything moves *in* cycles. Regardless of the mode of awareness, it simultaneously assumes the immediacy of the world, and deflects itself metaphorically from cosmic awareness. Yet what we have reached are phenomena that defy positionality, and hence rational and even mythical awareness of space–time, and show up as apositionality, and in turn as traces of the cosmic consciousness. Yet as traces, that are completely transparent with the cosmic, they ought to yield the cosmic consciousness in its movement that is equally apositionality and indeed adirectional. This is to say, we cannot be satisfied with the possibility of some suggestions that atemporality shows up if one can demonstrate that at the micro level time might be reversed. This is still directionality and presumes the already discredited *being in* metaphor.

What is to be traced across the phenomena made transparent as cosmic traces is the cosmic movement. The latter is not in or out of anything. Literally speaking, the world is going nowhere. But this is not to say that its movement is eternal. The latter is no movement and besides, it only lends itself to comprehension in a dualism between eternity and time. Thus we must revert back to the phenomena already available and trace them as clues to the cosmic movement. Although varieties of metaphors offer themselves as clues, from dancing to play—currently very much in vogue to explicate Gebserian thinking—they may be misleading as clues to the cosmic adirectionality and arrhythmia. In other words, the metaphors of dance are appropriate if they can exhibit the cosmic phenomena and not lead to speculative claims requiring mystical insights. No doubt, Gebser's thought would lend itself to such an explication without mystifying self destruction. This is to say, it is inappropriate to think with Gebser in terms of a return to an archaic consciousness of nondifferentiated oneness. The latter would be read—willy nilly—as rational effort to find a unity of a dark night in which all cows are black. After all, at the end of the modern tradition, Hegel has shown that an absolute and undifferentiated consciousness is for us impossible. *