

THESIS OF THE PAST AS TRAVERSAL

The unlived remains future in every time

FIRST STATEMENT

What has not been experienced does not belong to the past. It remains future in every time.

Everything begins here. It is not a law of the stars. It is a law of lived time.

Binding reading of the statement

“Does not belong to the past” means: does not belong to the lived past of a consciousness.

“Remains future” means: remains ahead. It does not yet have a “has-been” for that life.

“In every time” means: on any worldly date. Even yesterday. Even a century ago.

Forbidden reading

- that the fact did not happen in the world;
- that cosmic time bends;
- that a future self touches the present;
- that “future” is a calendar date.

The world may have already consumed the event. Experience has not. Therefore the statement is not a physical paradox. It is the short name for the disagreement between the two clocks.

The rest adds no mystery. It protects this sentence from being taken on the first clock.

0. Field of validity

Sole object: the time of a consciousness — that is, the way a living being possesses a behind and an ahead.

Does not concern:

- the metric of spacetime;
- physical causality;
- calendar dates as facts of the world;
- the prediction of events;
- the demonstration of time travel;
- a general theory of mind;
- a psychotherapy.

Two clocks remain forever distinct:

- Clock of the world (tM) — before and after according to causes, documents, births, deaths.
- Clock of experience — behind and ahead according to what has been traversed.

The thesis speaks only of the second. It recognizes the first and does not touch it. Whoever confuses the two clocks does not refute the thesis: they step outside its field.

Nature of verification

The criterion of this thesis admits no extrospective verification, because its object — the lived status of a content — exists only for a consciousness. The only possible verification is introspective: the criterion works to the extent that, when applied, it lets whoever uses it distinguish more clearly a then from a still. This is not a limit to be corrected. It is consistent with the field declared at the opening of this section.

1. Primary terms

They are not defined with other words from the same theory. They are pointed to.

Consciousness. The place by which something can be for someone. Without a for-someone there is no lived time. No theory of mind is claimed here.

Content. Whatever can stand within a consciousness: a fact, an image, a pain, an idea, a scene, a piece of news, a gesture, a possibility.

Worldly occurrence. What has taken place in the world regardless of whether you have lived it.

Contact. A content touches perception, body, or thought.

Recognition. Contact ceases to be mere impact and becomes this.

Placement. The content finds a place behind. One can say, even in pieces: it has been.

Traversal. The unity of the three operations: contact + recognition + placement. Only traversal converts a content into lived past.

Experienced. Here it does not mean “happened near you” nor even “known.” It means traversed.

Future, in this thesis. Is not a date. It is a status: the ahead. Sober equivalent terms: not-yet-lived-past, unplaced content, open task. The word “future” is kept because it is the word of the first statement. It is kept only with the constraint stated above.

2. Central theses

These are not axioms of a science. They are working theses drawn from the first statement. If the terms are accepted, they follow.

T1. Duality of times.

Every content may have a worldly date and a lived status. The two measures do not necessarily coincide.

T2. Criterion of the lived past.

A content belongs to the past of a consciousness only if it has been traversed by that consciousness.

T3. Persistence of the untraversed.

An untraversed content does not fall behind. It remains ahead. It remains future, on whatever worldly date one stands.

T4. Locality.

Lived status is relative to a consciousness, or to a we only if that we has a shared traversal.

T5. Factual neutrality.

“Past for you” does not mean “true in the world.” “Future for you” does not mean “did not happen.”

T6. Conversion.

Only a sufficient experience — contact + recognition + placement — turns the ahead into the behind.

These six points are the entire machine. The rest are consequences.

3. Derived definitions

Lived past. The set of traversed contents. The behind.

Persistent future. The set of untraversed contents that nonetheless press on a consciousness. The ahead that does not depend on the calendar.

Memory. The resurfacing of a content already traversed. It comes from behind. It has, even if faint, a then.

Return. The resurfacing of a content not yet placed. It comes from ahead. It has the form of a still, not of a then.

Sufficient experience. The one that completes the three conditions and closes the status: from “still must” to “has been.”

Insufficient experience. Contact without recognition, or recognition without placement. The content may have already happened in the world and remain persistent future.

Contested behind. Content already traversed and then denied, rejected, rewritten. It is not the unlive. It is behind in conflict.

Partial placement. Traversal successful only for part of the content. The core of the scene finds a behind; one or more fragments — a sensory detail, an isolated image — remain disconnected from the rest and retain the status of ahead. It is not a contested behind (there is no denial of

the placed core). It is not pure persistent future (the core no longer presses). It is a patchy placement: behind for the whole, ahead for the residue.

4. Propositions

P1.. The past is not what happened. It is what was traversed.

P2.. The future, in the sense of this thesis, is not a date. It is a status: what has not yet taken shape in an experience.

P3.. Therefore a content can be yesterday for the world and tomorrow for a life.

P4.. What has no experiential archive cannot withdraw. It returns. The return is not proof of a future self. It is proof that the status is still ahead.

P5.. Two consciousnesses can assign opposite statuses to the same worldly fact without contradiction.

P6.. A collectivity can possess a documented past while an individual, on that same fact, still possesses only an ahead.

P7.. Intensity does not change clocks. It only changes the force with which a content demands placement.

P8.. The thesis does not grow by adding mystery. It grows by removing field.

P3 is simply the first statement said across the two clocks. P4 is the first statement seen from the side of the return.

5. Protocol of use

Facing a content, five questions, in this order:

- 1. Does it have a date in the world?
- 2. Was there contact with this consciousness?
- 3. Was it recognized as this?
- 4. Does it have a placement behind?
- 5. When it resurfaces, does it arrive from a then or from a still?

Reading:

- 4 = yes, and 5 = then → lived past; the resurfacing is memory.
- 4 = no, and 5 = still → persistent future; the resurfacing is return.
- 4 = yes for the core, no for the fragment; 5 = then for the whole, still for the residue → partial placement. The fragment's resurfacing is a return; the core, if it returns, is a memory.
- 2 = no → the content is outside that consciousness's time, or it stands ahead only as an empty possibility, not as pressure.
- already traversed and then denied → contested behind, not pure ahead.

This grid is the tool. A thesis is usable if someone else can apply it without the author. It does not measure seconds. It distinguishes statuses.

6. The double date

Every content should be written as follows:

- worldly date: tM
- lived status: behind / ahead

Examples:

- A war from the last century. tM = past. Status for a child who only hears the name = ahead.
- The death of a loved one, already occurred, not yet inhabited. tM = past. Status = ahead, until mourning places it.
- An exam passed yesterday, already recounted, already settled. tM = past. Status = behind.
- A film scene that arrives as though it concerned an afterward. tM = the present of viewing. Status of the evoked content = ahead, if it finds no has-been.
- A trauma touched but not placed. tM often past. Status = ahead. Hence it returns.
- A false memory. It can stand behind as lived and be false as world. The thesis is not a tribunal of external reality.

In every case where tM is past and the status is ahead, the first statement applies literally: it does not belong to the past; it remains future in every time.

7. Memory and return

Memory can hurt. It can be confused. It can be incomplete. It remains memory if it possesses, even faintly, a then.

Return can resemble memory. It can dress itself as déjà vu. It remains return if traversal is missing and it presses as a duty yet to happen.

Errors to avoid:

- Treating every intensity as proof of another cosmic time.
- Treating every memory as closed forever.
- Confusing a contested behind with a pure ahead.
- Confusing poverty of behind with absence of behind.
- Confusing a scene already placed with its fragments still ahead.

8. Public history, private life

There are three pasts, and only one is the object of the thesis:

- Cosmic past. Things happened.
- Historical past. Someone recorded them, narrated them, made them common.
- Lived past. Someone traversed them.

The thesis does not cancel the first two. It explains why one can inhabit a world already full of yesterdays and yet feel that one's own time, on that content, is still to be made.

This is not solipsism. It is a double register.

A people can have a documented behind. A single person, on that same fact, may have only an ahead of pressure, of gap, of unfinished task. Public behind, private ahead.

9. Limit cases

Extremely distant fact.. Cosmic past. Personal ahead only if it enters that consciousness as pressure or as knowledge to be inhabited. Otherwise it is outside its lived time.

Dissociated trauma.. Occurred, often touched. Placement is missing, sometimes even recognition. It remains ahead and therefore returns. Here the thesis is descriptively useful. It does not explain the mechanisms of the body.

False memory.. It can stand behind as lived and be false as world.

Déjà vu.. The ahead imitates the behind. It does not prove an already-consumed future.

Dream.. If recognized and placed, it stands behind as a dream. If by day the content presses without a place, it can remain ahead.

Distant news.. Poor behind: faint contact, minimal placement. Distinguish poverty of behind from absence of behind.

Sleep, anesthesia.. The world continues. That consciousness does not convert. Nothing passes for it. The cosmos is not erased.

Two witnesses.. Same tM. One places it, the other does not. Behind for one, ahead for the other.

Denial after traversal.. Contested behind. It is not the unlived.

A place for which no experience is possible.. No consciousness has traversed it. Ahead for everyone. A limit-image, not a foundation and not a laboratory.

Addiction.. A repeated behavior, even one involving a substance, may be accompanied by an unplaced content that presses. The substance itself, when it returns as a still, is already a content. There may also be, alongside it, another scene. The thesis offers a vocabulary for naming these aheads. It is not a diagnostic tool, not a therapy, not an exclusive etiological hypothesis. With use and time the behavior can also take root in its own ways — physiological adaptation, conditioning, habit, context — independent of the original content. Identifying an unplaced ahead, when there is one, remains useful and partial work with respect to the behavior as a whole.

The five questions do not apply to addiction as a single content. They apply to the content that, right now, arrives as a still.

Partial placement. A scene can be traversed as a whole — tellable, placed, even light — while a specific fragment of it remains ahead and continues to press on its own. The main fact need not still be open for an isolated detail to be. The residue can demand its own traversal, independent of the one already completed on the rest.

10. What the thesis forbids itself

- It does not predict the calendar.
- It does not prove that a future self touches a face.
- It does not replace physics.
- It does not cure. It may illuminate why something returns; it is not a therapy.
- It does not say that the unexperienced does not exist. It says it has not yet become past for someone.
- It asks for no faith. It asks for use.
- It does not grow by over-explaining.

A theory that explains the cosmos, the clinic, history, and destiny explains nothing. This one must remain small: a distinction born from a sentence.

11. Relation to those who have already passed here

The statement has predecessors. The cut is local; the substance is not.

Augustine.. The past lives as memory in the present. Close. Different: without traversal there is not even that past-in-memory. It remains future.

Husserl.. Retention and protention articulate the lived present. Close. Different: here the internal flow is not reconstructed; a criterion of belonging to the behind is given instead.

Bergson.. The past presses as duration. Close. Different: the un-lived, here, is not a past that presses. It is a future that has no right to the behind.

Heidegger.. Dasein is ahead of itself. Close. Different: the being-ahead is specified as the untraversed that cannot fall behind.

Freud / Nachträglichkeit.. An occurrence becomes psychic past when it is taken up again. Close on trauma. Different in generality: not only the repressed; every untraversed content. This generality is a thesis of reading, not a demonstrated clinical result.

Trauma clinic.. An event can have occurred and not been integrated; it returns as alarm, flashback, repetition. Close. Different: that clinical field has hypotheses about the body and about implicit memory. This thesis does not possess them and must not borrow them.

None of these authors is bound to sign the statement in the form:

what has not been experienced does not belong to the past; it remains future in every time.

The possible novelty is the cut, not the invention of the sky.

12. Four working theses

- I. The lived past is what was traversed, not what happened.
- II. The untraversed remains future in every time.
- III. Return is the ahead pressing again; memory is the behind resurfacing.
- IV. Sufficient experience is the only conversion.

Around these four, everything. Outside these four, nothing.

It is the first statement. The other three make it usable.

13. A version even a child can hold

There are two drawers.

First drawer, behind. Put in it only what has happened to you and that you can now say: it happened to me.

Second drawer, ahead. Here stands what you know, feel, or receive, but have not yet traversed. Even if it already happened in the world. For you it is not yesterday. It is still to be lived.

If something returns from a “that time,” it belongs to the first drawer.

If it returns as though it were still to arrive, it belongs to the second.

The clocks of the world do their job. This rule does yours.

14. Measure of seriousness

A thesis of this kind is serious if:

- it has a field and respects it;
- it offers a grid that someone else can apply;
- it survives hostile cases without changing meaning;
- it does not borrow prestige from physics or medicine;
- it can be said in two sentences and articulated without contradicting itself.

Two sentences:

What has not been experienced does not belong to the past. It remains future in every time.

Gloss, if needed:

Lived past is only what you have traversed.

What you have not integrated remains ahead, even if the calendar says otherwise.

It is not measured by comparison with a theory of the world. These are different magnitudes. This one grows strong only by not pretending to be the other.

15. Closing

The world may have already happened. A life, on a given content, may not have.

What has not taken shape in an experience has no behind to hide in. Hence it returns. Not because cosmic time bends. Because the status is still future, in every time.

This is the entire thesis. Born from a sentence. As complete as a distinction on lived time can be. Finite because it knows where it does not hold. Usable because, in five questions, it separates what stands behind from what still presses.

What has not been experienced does not belong to the past. It remains future in every time.

COMMENTARY. WHAT IT IS FOR

This thesis is a tool for reading and orientation. It does not explain how the world works. It serves those who find themselves in the gap between the calendar date and experience.

Selective use

It is one tool among others, available to those who work toward their own improvement in a voluntary and orderly way. It claims neither exclusivity nor sufficiency. It offers a vocabulary for ordering thought. It applies to the content that presses — including, where present, an addiction to a substance or otherwise. It distinguishes what has already been traversed from what still presses. It does not replace concrete action nor the other tools available.

It applies above all in the following areas.

1. Writing and narrative analysis.

A character's past fact should not return only as a painful memory (then). If it has not been traversed, it returns as still. The arc of transformation does not consist in making new things happen nor in erasing the fact. It consists in completing the traversal and changing status: from ahead to behind.

2. Self-understanding.

It removes the guilt of "I should have gotten over this by now." The world may say: it happened ten years ago. For you it may still be ahead. This is not a moral failure. It is an unconverted status. Facing a tormenting thought: does it arrive from a then or from a

still? If it arrives from a still, filing it away as a memory is not enough: it calls for recognition and placement. The thesis does not authorize leaving the content there.

3. Clinical work and psychoeducation, as a map, not a cure.

It can offer a shared language. Return is not time travel and is not “madness”: it is a sign that placement, often, is missing. The three phases can help name the work. They do not replace therapy and do not set its pace.

4. Historical and collective conflicts, with caution.

Documents, museums, treaties close tM, not the status of a life. Two people on the same event can live in two different times. A single status is not attributed to a people by decree. A collective behind exists only where there is shared traversal.

5. Cultural critique, as a hypothesis.

Contemporaneity multiplies contacts and shortens recognition and placement. Many contents remain poor, some press as ahead. That a widespread anxiety arises from this is a possible reading, not a proof of the thesis.

In sum: the thesis classifies a status. The commentary points to where that classification is useful.

What has not been experienced does not belong to the past. It remains future in every time.

Note for section 11 — reference readings

Paul Ricoeur and Maurice Merleau-Ponty touch the cut of this thesis most closely: the former on the difference between chronological time and narrative-lived time, the latter on embodied temporality. Jean Laplanche refines Freudian Nachträglichkeit without taking the thesis outside its own field. Bessel van der Kolk offers the clinical counterpart, useful precisely so as not to borrow language and authority from trauma clinical work. These readings serve section 11 — as context and comparison — not to validate the first statement, which remains an autonomous thesis of reading.

THESIS OF THE PAST AS TRAVERSAL

© 2026 Alexander Antonino Luciano Hart. All rights reserved.

Original work of practical phenomenology and lived time theory.

Official Website: <https://alexanderhart.it/>

Contact & Correspondence: alessandrohart2001@outlook.it

No part of this document may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form

or by any means without the prior written permission of the author, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews, academic citations, and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law, provided full credit and citation are given to the author.