



**California Institute
of Integral Studies**

Journal of Conscious Evolution

Volume 2

Issue 2 Issue 02/2006

Article 7

May 2018

Life and World

Mickunas, Algis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/cejournal>

Recommended Citation

Mickunas, Algis (2018) "Life and World," *Journal of Conscious Evolution*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 2 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/cejournal/vol2/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Newsletters at Digital Commons @ CIIS. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Conscious Evolution* by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ CIIS. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@ciis.edu.

Life and World

Algis
Mickunas

Ohio
University

Copyright author
and Journal of
Integral Studies.

By now it is no secret that most diverse, opposing and even contradictory trends claim Nietzsche to be their progenitor. From life philosophies, through feminisms, anti-feminisms, postmodernisms, new agisms, biologisms, evolutionisms, nihilisms, moralisms, to psychologisms and anarchisms, Nietzsche is extolled, reviled, contested, but never ignored. He is the killer of god, the anti-christ himself, and the last theologian, the proclaimer of will to power and the aimless wanderer. Various reasons can be adduced for this state of affairs. The style of writing, the turn of phrase, the metaphors, allegories, and allusions to esoteric texts, open a horizon for opposing interpretations. Indeed, even the "great thinkers" and commentators of twentieth century come to opposing conclusions, from Heidegger, through Jaspers, to Kaufmann and Volkmann-Schluck, there is no unanimity concerning Nietzsche's philosophy. What would be then the reason to open the "pit of biting snakes" only to throw one more antagonistic snake into the pit?

This brief venture into Nietzsche's philosophy is not to contest, cite and argue for or against the sundry and various interpretations and offer a "truer" version, the "latest" so to speak "critical" reading of Nietzsche, but to explore within his works the challenges that his own proposed theses might have compelled him to reevaluate his own reached views and to transgress them in favor of some other view - or even a non-view. It is an exploration of Nietzsche's toying, testing, and contesting his own understanding of life in light of the changing problematic of what the world is all about. And what the world is all about is, in many cases, what the others, such as astronomy, has opened, leaving Nietzsche to point out that it is not he who is proposing such uncomfortable views; rather he is only making them known. The same can be said of his dramatic proclamations concerning the death of some divinities and even their mothers. By pointing an accusing finger to the actions of the "believers" Nietzsche need not hesitate in pointing out the disparity between the words of the faithful on holidays and their deeds on the working days. Do not blame me for what I say; I am pointing out what you are actually living. This aspect will appear as an implication of one phase of Nietzsche's understanding of anthropomorphism. Yet it is also important to note that anthropomorphism is not necessarily a founding form of understanding of human life, since anthropomorphism is one variant of a variety of "human" ways. No doubt, the perspectivism of Nietzsche's time would lend credence to the reading of all theses and theories as interpretations of a given life, but a recognition of perspectivism could not be obtained without a dilemma. In the course of this venture this, and other dilemmas will be derailed. Such a derailment will require the expositions of various theses Nietzsche offers and the way such theses find their limits within the very context of constantly emerging problems of the sense of life and world. The two latter terms are, in the context of this venture, quite central. They reappear in various guises in their mutual relationships and topical expositions, from language, perspectivity,

nihilism, history, purpose, and ontology and metaphysics. In this sense, the various themes will also comprise an exposition of life and world.

No doubt, some of what shall be said in this writing may have been said before - and even better. This simply means that others have wrestled with the dynamics of Nietzsche's efforts at philosophizing. Such a state of affairs is not most laudable, since philosophizing might be the very way that philosophy is maintained, enhanced, self interrogating, and even full of daring to laugh at its own folly. And there are innumerable places in Nietzsche's work where this attitude is paraded and lauded as worthy of Socrates and Diogenes. This venture will be also composed in this spirit of playful philosophizing with a worthy enemy that everyone finds in Nietzsche's texts. But how else could anyone want to engage another without insulting his/her philosophical prowess. Let then us begin our quest, fully knowing that it will not be the last, the first, or the first of the last.

LIFE

Countless members of the human species attempted to tell all about life, its nature, its origins, its activities, its complex variety, and even its place in the grand scheme of all things. Yet very few paid close attention to life as phenomenon in its own right prior to Nietzsche. The sensitivity with which he expounded on the uncomfortable aspects of life was one of the reasons that created such vehement reaction to his works. Yet even the antagonists, in their very antagonism, were one way that Nietzsche's understanding of life was being confirmed. Such a confirmation did not answer the simple question "what is life," but it certainly brought into the open the phenomenal side, the side that living events are constantly exhibiting and experiencing before all explanations. What is purported in this text is a trace of the way the multitudes of phenomena exhibit the most preeminent, even if deliberately disguised, processes comprising life.

The first set of arguments that lead to the understanding of world propose to demonstrate that all that is must be in constant flux - becoming. In other words, the being of all beings is flux. Although various theories purported to "show" some "underlying" substance that remains constant through various and changing characteristics, all the efforts to dig up such a substance were to no avail. Any stripped characteristic revealed other characteristics, but never a final core that would remain forever. Hence, all that can be said of substantiality is that humans invent metaphysical underpinnings for their own convenience. In one way, it may be a result of a particular grammar - an Egyptization of language - where every noun presumes to designate something, and every predicate is supposed to be an appearance of such a something. But this is a human all too human map that does not represent "reality.": After all the variety of languages also suggests their human side, wherein different humans map out

the flux in their own ways. If there were such a "something" that would cause a linguistic structure, then the latter would have to be common to all. In brief, all that is available in living experience is in continuous tumult, unrest, "dissatisfaction" and all that is totally static is dead. This is the first reason for the claim that god is dead. If all that lives is in flux, then what is immobile, absolutely permanent, is non-living and hence non-existent. We must think this to its limit, specifically since Nietzsche offers us a way to think metaphysics without qualifications in order to note its breaking point. To engage such a thinking, we must also point out that Nietzsche employs modern preunderstanding to explicate what would comprise metaphysics without qualifications: perspectivity. We speak of perspectivity as "world views" such that there is the world view of the Greeks, of religion, of science, of language, and any other sundry designation. This requires a clarification: a world view is not something one adds to a preexisting world, but comprises the very framework in which we live. Apart from a world view, there is no "world in itself." What Nietzsche does is think this way of understanding to its limit. This means that the totality of being is a perspective wherein all beings and their relationships are comprised. Now, the perspectival character of totality is thought by Nietzsche from the essence of life as *self relationship*. Life has its basis in itself and cannot be regarded as a result of any other domain. Any perspective that attempts to explicate life comprises the way that life understands itself and hence this perspective constitutes ONE SELF RELATIONSHIP of a given life. No doubt, this argument might also be contested as still another perspective of another life, attempting to be all encompassing while having a right to be explicated as one among many. The resolution might appear at the end of our venture that comprises a cosmos wherein life is bereft of perspectivity and hence could be called cosmically aperspectival. Whether we succeed or not will appear at the end.

Second: life as flux, in order to live, must violate other life, and thus must be power. In order to live, all life must exercise power and overcome resistances. Life that ceases to exercise power, ceases to be. Moreover, there is no permanent point at which life can have a reprieve. It either exercises power, overcomes resistances and thus gains in power, or declines. The logic here is unique. Only resistance increases strength and increments power. Hence living events that accept and challenge ever increasing resistances, also expand, grow and continue to live. All living events, including humans are in constant striving to overcome ever greater obstacles and thus elevate power. The battle among various members of a particular species is to demonstrate those of superior strength who will be the propagators of the species. This suggests that living events strive to reproduce the strongest members in order to secure the continuation and strengthening of life. The weaker members who fail to meet challenges will have to continuously exert effort against resistances in order to increase their strength or vanish. The meaning of "obstacles" and "resistances"

are to be understood as follows: to confront a resistance that is beneath one's power leads to weakening; only resistances that require exertion, effort, indeed greater than one's current powers, will lead to incrimination of strength. To play chess with amateurs will not lead to a greater ability in playing chess; to play chess against a master will lead to the development of chess playing powers. No doubt, one will be defeated many times, but the exerted effort will lead to development or even creation of abilities that will constantly grow. In this sense, all living events are defined as "will to power." This phrase ought not to be psychologised as if there were a function called "will." The seed that sends shoots toward the surface of the earth and roots toward moisture overcomes obstacles and hence is "will to power." It cracks stones and hard clay and thus lives.

At this juncture of our explication, life as self relationship is will to power and any world view is a way life has a world that relates to life as will to power. This means that each being attempts to expand its power over others, and thus comprises the very perspective as the sphere of its power. In this sense even knowledge is perspectival, since it is not an elicitation of truth but submission of the known to one's power. Whatever is held true, is true only as self relationship of a particular life. Hence, truth is an appearance, a phenomenon of a particular life. But then how are we to speak of life in its totality in face of multitude and variety of living events? Is it possible to establish a metaphysical way to explicate life in its totality? We know that metaphysics was an effort to decipher all beings in terms of the highest being, but Nietzsche opts for another way: all that is becoming, and all becoming is will to power as a reach beyond itself, constant self relationship as self surpassing. But what is becoming? We shall speak of this at the end.

How are we to understand this riddle? First, it seems that Nietzsche toyed with eternal recurrence of the same of the science of his time which is metaphysical. Yet this is resisted by the very notion that all knowledge is a perspective, and thus the metaphysical notion is equally a perspective.

Another option is equally problematic to the extent that Nietzsche demands that at each moment, and from the totality of all life, there should be a desire that life should return eternally. But this elevates life to human desire and hence it demands a return of the human. If eternal recurrence stems from the effort to understand the totality of life as becoming as will to power, then it cannot be for the sake of elevating the human to the highest position. To avoid this, we must read becoming as life's will to power from the totality of life from the perspective of self relationship and in this sense discover that the most varied life and their perspectives are self relationship as will to power. The realization of this perspectival self relationship of all life as the becoming of will to power and as coming and passing is the place of overmann. Hence the human is not the highest becoming but a bridge to the overmann, since the human is still mired in

the metaphysics of "*no saying*."

How shall we understand the metaphysics of negativity, indeed of nihilism? Becoming is the being of all beings; this is the reversal in totality of all metaphysics. How is this to be understood. What was claimed to be *being*, the self identical and permanent, is a perspective established by life. What was regarded as being, the permanent and enduring, ceases to be being and becomes a momentary perspective of life as becoming and thus an appearance needed for life. Thus what once appeared as being turns out to be non-being. This is to say what appears to be most and absolutely permanent, turns out to be the least on being, indeed nothing. Whatever is untouched by becoming, is nothing. But this was regarded to be the being of the divine. Thus the latter is nothing and compels the devaluation of all values.

Value for Nietzsche is a condition which allows life to live. Now in metaphysics the divine is the highest value, since it is the condition of all beings. But this means that to subsume all beings under this value is to subsume it under nothing. Thus we open up the will to nothing. At this level Nietzsche's efforts are directed to decipher this will to nothing in all of its forms and under all of its masks in order to force the West to decide between will to power or will to nothing. If we are to transform all the traditional values, then we must also give an account as to how the non-existent, the nothing, became regarded as the most on being and has been made the measure over and above life. Moreover, how is it that it had lost its power and its value became devalued. With answers to these questions it is hoped that the more intense understanding of the death of god will appear. Now if values are the way that life lives and advances, then the positioning of the permanent as the ultimate being and as the highest value, must be understood from life that lives in accordance with this value. In brief, what sort of life posits such a condition for itself, and why such a condition lost its appeal? Now, values are of the type of life which lives in terms of them. Thus life that posits the most permanent and lives in accordance with it must be understood from this positing. This is to ask, what life says about itself when it submits itself to the domination of the most permanent? This is very peculiar: if life is becoming as will to power, what kind of will to power appears in this understanding of being, how is it that will to power would be placed under the sign of something that it is not? After all, if life as becoming is truth, how could it be signified by untruth? This metaphysical NO to life announces that metaphysical positing of such a value is life that turns against life, a life that cannot affirm itself and to establish itself as will to power. Is it then that the powerless life that sets up nothing as the highest condition of life? But this cannot be, since all life as becoming is will to power, and must want to expand its power and perspective over everything. The manner in which a powerless life aims at power is by denying the very being of becoming and by elevating this denial as the incessant and determining principle - incessant negation of life. Powerlessness as will to power, self affirmation takes the form of the *no* and the

nothing as the highest standard called "the true world," in contrast to the world of becoming as merely apparent. Thus, metaphysics subjects life under the sign of negation and hence under the downgrading of life by the will of the power of the powerless. This has led, according to Nietzsche to the "last man," the most decadent life. This shall be mentioned later.

But then how this value lost its hold, how did one dare announce the death of the "true world?" This announcement comes from its own necessity. It is to be noted that metaphysics regards the true world to be distinct from the world of becoming as appearance, requiring a constant effort to adequate the apparent to the true. This very composition necessitates to regard will to truth as the basic striving of life. Once this becomes unconditional, then it must turn against itself as true; one discovers that a specific life posits it as its own condition of life as the highest value. In short, it is interest laden search for the permanent as self relation of a particular life, one whose will is counter will to its own passing. This will is revenge against the universe as time, as all devouring flux that disregards the human all too human efforts to counter its force. The discovery of this life's truth as value is also a discovery that this truth could not be maintained due to the clash among numerous truths, each claiming to be "final." In this sense it turns out that all truths are valuations of life for its own self relationship and power.

What is equally relevant to understand that the only truth as value of a particular life is present only in living. Let us make that clear. Any will to truth that is designed to maintain a particular life is relevant only if there is a life that embodies it. Hence, Viking gods were true, because they were the values of a farmer-warrior people. Once these people ceased to live this kind of life, their Viking truths as values, their great divinities, ceased to be alive. This is the same case with Western metaphysical inventions, including the highest one - monotheistic patriarch. Its edicts, exhortations, commands are un-lived and if constantly reiterated, they are transparent with power aims of some meager, shriveled life which, in its turn, does not live its pronounced truths. In this sense that sort of monistic patriarch is dead. This can be extended to all the moralizers and their sisters: if they do not live their moralities, then the latter are no longer relevant to life. And this is the point where Nietzsche points out to the faithful that it is not I who have killed your god; it is you, in your actions that have murdered him. I am simply announcing this unpalatable truth.

After the conception of the "true reality" has no longer any claim, life is open to its genuine sense as becoming, and hence as a loss of whence and whither of activities. This lack of direction and value leads to the much lauded nihilism. The latter forces a decision between two options: if the true reality no longer holds sway, then having no directions and paths life must turn against itself in dismay, or recreate itself by devaluing all values. If this is not undertaken, then life is left only with the *will to nothing*. If the transformation is accomplished,

then life is open to the complete enactment for what it is: becoming as will to power. The irrevocable devaluation of all values discovers becoming as being itself which has no aim for repose, but that it is itself complete in each phase as eternal return: beginning and end as the same. For life as will to truth and hence nothing, the recognition of the eternal return is absolute nihilism, but for life transformed in its self recognition as a constant flux, a becoming, then it is the highest cosmic recognition, full of laughter, exuberance, without any consequences, without aims, continuities or expectations. A wanderer, a cosmic life.

The will to power as life is in constant tension and transformation in face of obstacles and tasks, and thus is composed of multiple events that are pitted one against another. In this sense life consists of multiple powers each elevating its strength in confrontation with other events. This suggests that living events are constantly creating powers, abilities, and transformations to overcome challenges and thus to grow. Indeed, in the final analysis, some life processes create abilities that begin to supervene over other abilities and thus become more cunning, devious, and gain power by deliberately setting up tasks and challenges that require the creation of increased abilities and strengths. Others, who cannot accept challenges at one level, will invent means to overcome the challengers at another level. This is one origin of moralities and divine powers. It is impossible for me to challenge you and surpass your powers; hence, I shall have to subject you under my will by inventing a power that is greater than you, who is on my side. If you do not obey me, I shall not be able to defeat you, but the power on my side, my god, will punish you eternally. This life that has no courage to accept challenges, still it is will to power and will use all devious means to obtain power. Here lies the source of Nietzsche's notion that there is no negativity, no lacks in life's will to power. The very nihilism of religiosities, claiming that this life is worthless, that there is a better life "in another world" is immediately transgressed by the use of this negativity, this negation of life, to implement power over others who will become subservient to such proclamations. In this sense those who proclaim such nihilisms are themselves expressing their will to power. From this Nietzsche derived minor psychological consequences (for others they formed entire theories) such as resentment and revenge. Unable to exercise direct power against those who live fully, the meek invent power to threaten the evil ones, from resentment due to cowardice or weakness, and threaten them with unimaginable punishments - revenge. All moralities are efforts to attain power and hence reveal resentment and revenge.

Regardless of the means, power confrontations are the way that all life constitutes itself, i.e. creates itself. This implies that the world is a multiplicity of shifting and challenging powers such that there cannot be one power, the infinite. If there were an infinite power, then it would have nothing against it and hence cease to be power. But if it has resistance, then it is not an infinite power. In this sense, no infinite god exists. God is dead. This comprises the second

argument leading to this proclamation. What is significant for Nietzsche's thought of will to power is that either life elevates power, or vanishes. The elevation of life's power requires the elevation of other powers as challenges, resistances and obstacles. In its resistances, life finds ever more cunning, more terrible ways to create and marshal forces, to become more terrible. This also means that no particular life form that reaches a stage can rest. This applies to entire civilizations. When Rome sank into a decadent life and stopped fighting its own battles (by hiring others to do their fighting) it lost its strength. This is simply an extension of the logic of life as will to power. It must either elevate its strengths or decline, die, and disappear. In turn the elevation requires an acceptance of greater challenges, even if one must invent them oneself.

The proof of the daring of life to increase in strengths is that no life form remains constant, but gives birth to other momentary forms that surpass the previous ones. The apes had the "courage" to give rise to humans, the late comers who became the most efficient and terrible killers, always hungry for blood. As many wise ones have noted, human history is a cradle of blood. It must be pointed out that this thesis is not a rationale for evolutionary theory of survival. Survival is not an aim but a result of increase and maintenance of power. In this sense, the purpose of life is its self-maintenance as power.

Yet, the cunning may also lead to the weakening of life, as it happened in the case of humans. In order to overcome otherwise insurmountable resistances, some life invented negation of life, inventor rules and prohibitions, set limits to daring and demanded submission to such rules. Indeed, such life invented the notion that the best life is one of inactivity, of little pleasures, and finally of sleep. Those who do the least, and finally do nothing, do not violate all the possible prohibitions, and hence are the good. The least activity is the best, and in this sense must fail to set tasks and challenges and grow in strength. To be weak and meek is to be admired - the meek shall inherit the earth. Of course none of them would have the courage to claim that wild and furious female. And this is decadent life; unable to face great tasks it proclaims that it has reached the epitome of all life and need not change: the last man. Little poison, little sex for little spasms of pleasures, little tucking into soft beds for a cuddly and pleasant death. We have found pleasure and thus happiness; but as Nietzsche quips, only the British seek pleasure; the rest of us have more exuberant tasks. What is a distant star, what is a great destiny asks the last man and blinks.

But this life too wants power. After all, demanding pity from others, is an effort to use the strength of others to do what such a meek life is incapable of doing. It is self degrading life and demands to be insulted. And those who submit to the demands of pity obviously engage insulting life. On the basis of becoming, they forget the basic tragedy of life: the forces one confronts are the very forces one is and hence will be dissolved by them - in innocent play. This is to say, the moralizers are devious and attempt to overcome their meekness by other means.

In order to obtain some living semblance, they will want the strong to dissipate their power to be moral and help those who dare not do. Moralizers use rhetoric to threaten, to impose guilt, and hence detract from life in order to maintain a semblance of "being alive." Obviously, this is a variant of metaphysical nihilism, the no saying to life's dynamic surge. Yet this very no saying is a will to power and hence innocent. There is no accusation of the moralizers of being immoral; they too want power, even if they surrender they pride, nobility, and lust for great challenges.

Either the decadent life wins and vanishes without a trace, or accepts life as constant increase and elevation of power and hence a self transgression, a bridge to a more daring, more intelligent, setting challenges for itself in order to play with its own creation of powers, subservient to no invented moralities, breaker of all tablets, even of those that were self imposed and shackled its own limitations: beyond good and evil.

This is a challenge that most have shied away from; the challenge was accepted by those who have recognized the shackles imposed by others and accepted as if by metaphysical necessity. Thus, various women and feminists have recognized that impositions by metaphysical patriarchy of negativities, prohibitions need not be heeded. The liberation from such imposition cannot be gained by appeals, by asking for rights, but by taking them. No one can bring liberation unless one is willing to accept the task. This simply means coming down from the metaphysical mountain, realizing metaphysical redundancies, abolishing them for oneself and only then be able to laugh like no human has ever laughed before. As Nietzsche quipped, let no right be given me unless I can take it. No joyous and self creative life can be crowned by anyone, unless it can crown itself.

This life, then, will give rise to something greater than itself, to an overman. Indeed, this life will be a bridge perhaps to the unknown, beyond the finite and infinite. We must recall, that this life has no cause, it is not an effect of substances; rather it is self-generating and no cause could elicit such self generation. Yet it is also self destructive, since in order to overcome greater tasks it must recreate its powers and in turn destroy those abilities that have become a hindrance, a redundancy, what has been, and indeed suffer. The greater the challenge, the greater the marshaled forces, the greater is the joy, but also the greater the destruction of what has been and thus a greater suffering. Yet there is no turning back for some nostalgic glance, no reprieve, no sympathy, empathy, or pity. But in this sense, we have already lived many lives, have become others than what we accomplished before - without some self as a continuous thread connecting all those achievements, victories and loses. All is being lost anyway.

COSMOS

The challenge to life's will to power does not come from some greater power, but, as already noted, from the notion that the being of all beings is becoming and the challenge presented by cosmic thinking. For Nietzsche, only the most profound and voiceless thought will open the deflection of life from constant incrimination of will to power and also reinstate for life as becoming a full joy. If we recall that metaphysics, in the final analysis, is revenge against time, then time must be at the base of counter-metaphysics. While Nietzsche has deciphered all sorts of metaphysical *nihilisms*, his opening up of the time issue led immediately to the issue of *time nihilism* in two forms: truth and praxis. First, it is the case that human life has been and continues to be replete with theories, theologies, metaphysical-scientific exhortations to "the last truth just around the corner of the next experiment" wherein each is positioning against the others and going into the snake pit of bloody battles to establish a truth, and hence reveals theoretical nihilism. Not having *the truth*, each adherent will subject life that is richer and different to destruction, negation, and thus reveal the truths nihilistic violence. Second, the efforts by any theory to offer "the explanation" by causes, divine or otherwise, is also nihilistic in the sense that life is denied the very richness of self creation as self relationship. Third, and this is most relevant to metaphysical revenge against time, is practical nihilism. We work, we grunt under the efforts to build Apollonian monuments to last, above all last as memories and continuations of us. We attempt to proffer somethings that are signs of our "real achievements carved in stone" that remain "eternally." Moreover, we have inscribed images of heavens and hells that will offer us eternal residences - although by some accounts not too desirable, but nonetheless recognizable and substantial. After all, they too provide revenge against time. Imagine the "age of the pyramids:" they have endured beyond their builders and hence the practical deeds are not in vain. The pyramids will dissolve into flux, the grand texts of hells and heavens will be eaten by defecating bugs, and all the profits made by the builders and writers will have been squandered on efforts to repair the decaying body ravaged by aids. And it too will vanish. The middle aged star whose energy we continuously appropriate and whose energy will shed itself in supernova to dissolve our monuments into the world - becoming without any traces of truths and values, innocent events. But even the monuments and texts are will to power; after my passing the generations will read my texts and "carry on the truth" and hence carry my continuity. Indeed, my truth will someday be really understood as the *only truth*. Wonderful am I, adoration to myself. While passing, and hence revealing practical nihilism as "all for nothing," there is also the other side of practical nihilism: the generations to come will kneel before my moral tablets, before my monuments and be subject to their requirements. Their lives will be negated, constricted, insofar as such lives are in flux.

So what is encountered, then, as the most silent and disquieting thinking? How must all varieties of metaphysical thinking, of permanence be dethroned so that

no metaphysical godhead will reappear in our fishing nets? This disquieting thought is the most silent; after extolling the highest thought of becoming and one of its form - life as will to power, Zarathustra is cringing before a voice that is silent, yet that speaks: "you know Zarathustra," cringing Zarathustra announces "No I do not know," and the silence speaks again "O yes you know Zarathustra." Here we find Zarathustra climbing the highest mountain to reach beyond the highest star. The highest star is the discovery of all life as will to power. At the peak of the highest mountain stands a door between two infinities - the past and the future. The silent voice is the cosmic time, since it is not anything, not a position from which it arises, and hence dissolves the human effort to speak from a position. What if time as past and future are infinite, what if there is no beginning or end, and thus no point of departure and a point of arrival? This is the question of cosmic time, and not a time of relationship among things. What opens up here is an indication that all metaphysics, all first philosophies, ultimate theologies, divine erections protruding into earthy vaginas assume a priori time. It is impossible to think about anything, any event, any point of inception without already having cosmic time awareness. Hence the opening of this awareness is the most shocking of all thoughts, the most disquieting of all human efforts from which all metaphysics deflected us into *nothingness of permanence*. Once again, if past is infinite, and given the notion that all powers, confronting other powers must be finite, then all events have happened again and again simply by chance. Everything that is crawling up this mountain has crawled many time in the same way; and you and I have been here many times - déjà vu and reincarnation. This is the point at which one must toy with "eternal recurrence." And this is the terror: permanent return of the same. What a boring metaphysical consolation. Yet the real issue comes up with the infinite future. If life is will to power, incessant transgression and elevation of challenges and abilities to match and overcome them, then the finite events doom all efforts to failure. Why struggle to overcome the decadence, the last blinking man, to become a bridge to a more terrible, perhaps even honest exercise of power, the overman as an innocent rolling wheel, when the decadent will return again and again? Is this the happiness of poor Sisyphus - perhaps the first pleasure seeking and happy Britisher? Although this is another form of metaphysical consolation, it stops the thesis of life as will to power at its limits. If future is infinite then will to power fails, or, and this is more profound, there is no direction wherein one could judge that there is a constant incrimination of power. Here we find a most joyous and exuberant challenges. At infinity, all the directions disappear; hence any judgment concerning orientation toward an overman cease to make sense. Any point of departure and arrival is already adrift in infinite cosmos, and thus any event cannot have a direction - apart from human all too human perspectives. We are at an impasse: will to power needs a direction, but the cosmic awareness abolishes the possibility of direction. Indeed, the very notion of infinite past and infinite future must destroy the very notion of past and future and hence of present as a temporal perspective from

which life can judge events in the past and in the future. At this cosmic level of thinking, even the question of will to power as orientation from here-now to then-there, the whence and whither of events cease to make sense.

Yet an issue still remains of eternal recurrence in infinite cosmos. As already argued, finite events in infinite time, even dancing on the heaven of chance, will give hands one to the other and hope to return again in the same way. This is, indeed, even one of the scientific speculations that attempts to articulate the universe as cyclical. As a matter of course, one aspect of Zarathustra aims to state this in a metaphoric way. Climbing to the peak of his highest mountain Zarathustra encounters the midget who proclaims that "all that is thrown high, will turn back" and the "path of eternity is bent." This is an intimation of cyclical cosmos; after all any deviation from a straight line, the line of eternity, leads to a cycle. Hence, the eternal recurrence of the same in the cyclical cosmos. But why is the cyclical cosmos proposed in the face of the problematic of infinite cosmos? Here one must discover the fishhead of an old god dragged from the mud of nostalgia, reappearing as nostalgia for permanence. How is it possible to speak of cyclical eternal recurrence unless there is a presumed component that is recognizable, repeatable even if by chance. This is to say, the cyclical time assumes metaphysics of "scientific components" which are finite in number remain constant and form repeatable combinations, leading to chancy recombinations again and again. In other words, cyclical cosmos is premised on the eternal recurrence of the same, because such recurrence presumes to possess permanent, localizable entities that can yield repeated combinations. Hence, whatever crawled up this mountain, has crawled many times before, and will crawl again and again in the future. This metaphysical underpinning of permanent aspects that despite their chancy dispersals and encounters will force the cosmos to be cyclical.

We are now at the brink of thinking that requires the overcoming of last metaphysical vestiges in order to think cosmically. Metaphysics is the joy of the West, and as long as its head appears in any fish net, then it is best to forget the cosmos. And this is the final request that we ask of Nietzsche: dare to abolish the door of now between two infinities and also the last consolation. Being at the now, there is a possibility that whatever I do will have a cosmic significance: the slightest action, in the infinite future will be a cause of an infinite difference. Hence the very desperation that the last man will return is surpassed. But here the assumption of direction and a causal nexus is reintroduced and thus the cosmic is subsumed under a sequence of causal events one after the other. This also is a residuum of the thesis of will to power and its constant self surpassing to yield more power - and the overman. Here is also the last residuum of perspectivity wherein a given life subsumes everything from the perspective of its powers and the aim of their incrimination. It is to be recalled that infinite cosmos, in the final analysis, offers no orientation. Thus, no causally directed sequence makes sense, and no power perspective, as a position remains.

Therefore we need no longer belabor the modern-postmodern proclamations of perspectivity and multi-perspectivity. To speak metaphorically, no spider webs tie events across the universe. Indeed, Nietzsche hints at the aperspectival and atemporal aspects of life that no longer require will to power. In a poem *among the daughters of the desert* Zarathustra finds himself in an oasis in a desert. The oasis contains a palm tree, a dancer who stands on one leg and cannot make an oriented step. Zarathustra is also *entsphinxed* by dancing girls, and immediately quips "may god forgive me the linguistic sin." Various levels of experience are offered in this brief text. Oasis is life in the spreading desert of constant coming and passing, a dissolution. The oasis is pervaded by nondirected metaphors of dancing and musicality. The dancing girls are not entities but activities and hence they "sphinx" without a substance - a pure becoming. This is a verbalization of a noun, proclaiming that the Egypticized language of nouns and predicates, of fixed points of reference, is replaced by verbs, becoming. Thus god has to forgive the linguistic sin, since becoming is the place where all permanences, and above all the permanent of all permanences dies. But here also dies the perspectival thesis of life as will to power.

It is possible, now, to decipher the cosmic traces that abolish any hint at human-all-too human fabrications, and open up the thought of becoming. Becoming must be understood most radically. It is not becoming of something, such as an entity that would maintain its identity. There cannot be any underlying entities, substances, particles that would be the ground for change. Every changing phenomenon does not reveal a substratum of which it would be a characteristic, but it is a phenomenon that comes and vanishes, encounters, transgresses and yields to other phenomena in incessant transition. This discards all such conveniences as "cause and effect," and thus all claims suggesting that while everything changes, there are laws that regulate all change. This intimates that the laws remain constant. But why should laws remain constant, unless one still presumes a godhead lurking under the turbulences of the stormy ocean. Such a godhead might still be lurking behind scientific search to discover the truth once and for all in the form of all ruling laws. This would be the residuum of searching for spider webs that connect everything. But even spider webs come and vanish. If becoming is the being of all events, then all is a chance, all dance on the heaven of chance. All such stabilizing notions as order, regularity, providence, lawfulness, schemata are "human all too human," stabilizing valuations of a specific life that needs such stabilities. If they are stripped away then the inhuman, the terrible thought of all is becoming, all comes and passes, all is innocent appears. All stabilizing truths will vanish with the disappearance of a life that needed such truths as values.

It seems to be a movement ranging from whereto and wherefrom - on the way from - to, and that means on the way from what it is no longer to what it is not yet. It is self initiation and hence determined by nothing. Let us be careful; if becoming is the very being of all that is, then becoming is the totality of all that

it can be. Its whence and whither must be contained in every phase. This sort of containment must be a circle. This is to say that a circle is a movement which,

among all movements includes in itself the whence and the whither of becoming, such that each phase is the beginning and the end. Thus a thinking that regards life's becoming as a will to power, must regard life as circular motion of eternal recurrence of the same - ring of eternity.

We have attained a final understanding of becoming that is always at a beginning and at an end, and, as self initiation never to be found at a position. Hence it has no whence and whither; it is a cosmic wanderer that, as becoming is apositional and atemporal. In an infinite universe it cannot be located insofar as its very wherefrom and whence cannot be located without immediate dislocation and hence no possibility of returning to any specific space-time location. The same can be said of where to and whither. This means that there is no point of departure or arrival, no up or down, forward and backward, inner or outer, and above all no relativity. This is to say, even relativity posits metaphysics such that the movement of *something* can be measured only relatively to the movement of another *something*. But becoming is not something that can be positioned relatively with respect to something else, as if two becomings were localizable, as if a dynamic event had an edge that could be bounded. It would be similar to claim that a hurricane is a thing and we can locate its position, and indeed we know that it will land on the coast at 2AM. The winds, the gusts and the drizzle cannot be regarded as something apart from a hurricane, somehow not coextensive with it, and then comes the real hurricane. This becoming has no specific limit, no location, because its forces are of all shades of turbulence, of moves and countermoves and intensifications, relaxations and sudden bluster. And the calm "after the storm" is not a limit but a becoming of the storm, as the latter is the becoming of the calm. And calm is an event, a becoming without underpinnings, except for our linguistic conveniences. "The weather is calm." This presumes that there is a thing called weather, possessing a characteristic called calm. Or, "The storm is furious," does not indicate a thing with characteristics, but the tumultuous buffetings in all "directions" that intensify, slacken stream, dissipate and vanish or transform without any presumption of causes: the dissipating of a storm does not cause calmness.

But a linguistic sin was committed: the term "directions" is already a perspective, and becoming lends no perspectivity. Is an event, a surge coming toward us, is it already beyond us and indeed moving away from us, and the us, equally becoming, cannot have a core position and hence cannot say that the event is moving toward or away from us. It would be like asking is the sun coming closer to the earth without realizing that the sun is not an entity but a constantly glowing becoming, in whose becoming we already are.

