PHENOMENOLOGY WITHOUT CONSCIOSNESS

1

There is only the world, but this world is given in streams of (so-called) "phenomenal consciousness." Each stream, as far as we know, is associated with a sentient organism. In the human case, each stream of phenomenal consciousness is like the stream of experience of a person.

I use the word "like" because these persons are themselves part of the stream. The person is "given to" that person. I can see the reflection of my nose in the mirror. I can bite my finger. As Husserl emphasizes in "Ideas II," the body is like the origin of moving coordinate system. The world "gather around" this person, with whom the stream of experience is associated. It is as if the world streams "through" or "for" this person.

2

If the world is only given through or in such streams, then "phenomenal consciousness" is just the being of the world, the aspectual or perspectival or situated partial being of the world.

"Being" is not understood here as some kind of primal stuff. Streams of the world are "made of" or constituted by **particular** entities. The point is only the "streamings of the world" really just **are**, taken as a system, the world itself. Phenomenal consciousness is not made of representations that refer beyond themselves. The world is (to put it crudely) the system of all phenomenal consciousness. But, for just this reason, the phrase "phenomenal consciousness" becomes misleading and should be dropped — like a ladder that has served its purpose and now is in the way, as something we might trip on.

3

As discussed in previous, also-brief papers, being "is" time in the sense that entities need time in order to reveal themselves through their aspects or moments. The entities of the world are just the temporal and interpersonal syntheses of these aspects/moments. And this is revealed through analysis. We mostly take our ability to intend the same objects for granted. We mostly don't even notice that they are given always

only through aspects or moments and therefore within or "by the grace of" time.

This is one reason to use the metaphor "stream." But an even greater reason is that "human experience" is person-centered, built around a particular identity. Such streams are full of motive and articulate self-clarification. My own ontological offering are part of my own project of self-clarification that I hope will be of value to others. Brandom's work is also useful here. Streams are narratively and rationally unified. This is their deontological structure.

My current work is focused on a relatively narrow issue. I claim that a coherent nondual ontology has already been achieved. There are many ways to summarize it, but we might look at Mill's phenomenalism (offered in the last paper) coupled with Leibniz's shattering passage in the Monadology.

> 57. And as the same town, looked at from various sides, appears quite different and becomes as it were numerous in aspects [perspectivement]; even so, as a result of the infinite number of simple substances, it is as if there were so many different universes, which, nevertheless are nothing but aspects [perspectives] of a single universe, according to the special point of view of each Monad.

The town is the world, and the world only exists "through" or "for" these "simple substances" which are of course streams. It is "as if" each stream is its own private world. But logic is public, shared, glues us together. The same objects in the town/world appear differently in different streams. So the varying aspects of worldly entities constitute the streams. And even the persons associated with streams have all of their being only in such streams, most prominently and centrally in "their own" stream.

4

We need a touch of "neorationalism" to get free of a typical difficultly. Are tarantulas more real than toothaches ? No. Toothaches are entities in the world. All entities that appear in our reasoning are public, even if access to them varies. You can't feel my toothache "directly," but you can intend it. I can use it as an excuse which you find valid, etc.

All concepts ("mental" or "physical") function in the same system.

How do we make sense of the streams of others ? They see now the aspects of objects that we saw then or might see soon. Objects are "shattered" in a temporal sense. Streams are like melodies constituted by such aspects. I need only project by analogy a different "melody" of familiar aspects/moments.