

ROLAND FABER

BECOMING INTERMEZZO:

ECO-THEOPOETICS AFTER THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE

(Eco-Sophia Lecture, *Sophia University*, Oct 26., Tokyo)

1 The Necessity of Wildness

John Muir, the whole-hearted naturalist who was instrumental in the creation of the first modern National Park worldwide, Yellowstone Park, in the Northwest of the U.S., understood the preserves of nature we create as ways to grant nature our absence. It is only when we recognize and experience the wildness of mountains, waters, and woods that we can perceive their own ways of being, beating in their own rhythms. In recognizing that *we* are the intruders, the foreigner, the strangers, we are granted the feeling of our own contingency within the necessity of wildness, in return. Nothing is just for our use—energy, water, and wood—but everything is a fountain of life in its own measures, rhythms, and harmonies. Only invited to listen to its own ways, the wilderness in return speaks with infinite patience, suffering our presence without being impressed by it: growing into the sky on its own, flowing down on its own, bending in the wind with its own voice.

Of course, we *can* misuse and misunderstand this patience. We *can* disturb the wilderness with our own clamor; we can dig tunnels through its mountains, cut its trees, and pollute its waters—and *still* it is patient; strangely reacting to our inflictions with its own rhythms of ignorance, degeneration, refusal, retreat, or disappearance. We can misunderstand this patience as passivity; we can try to fill its seeming silence with our bubbles; we can plaster it with our divisions of power; we can overlook its plenitude and mistake it for a wasteland that only waits to be filled by our human rule. We can mistake its voices as formless matter ready to be imprinted with our faces. We can waste it for our own sake. We can possess it.

I will propose that our ecological future is indispensably entangled with a very different view of nature that must become sensible to the necessity of wildness in which *we* are only strangers, guests, invited by incredible patience—*only in which* we become participants in what I will call “eco-nature.” In will argue that to recognize this necessity we need shift the way we experience and frame our world in such a way that we *become contingent* on this nature; that to homestead within the necessity of wildness means to let go of all excuses to justify the disturbance that our existence causes. I will propose to you that we

must become an *intermezzo within this necessity* and that to become such an intermezzo we must give up on all forms of power of control, manipulation, and destruction in the name of our survival. We must become what we always have been: an expression of the rhythms of necessity in which our contingent existence is an overflow of its patient grace.

As it is the *solitude* that Muir experienced in the wildness that made him feel a *solidarity* with its own ways and rhythms, so I am coming here as a stranger from the West who feels the otherness of the rhythms of the East. Maybe it is precisely the colonizing logic, economy, and philosophy of the West that is the problem. Maybe I should rather listen to the wisdom tradition of Asia. Maybe, if I finish here today, you will ask: Isn't that what we have sensed for centuries or millennia? Who am I to teach you about the ecological wisdom of interrelatedness with the All that you have already heard through the many voices of Asian wisdom? Isn't the *dao* one of the oldest symbols of such a harmony we desperately seek: of the necessity of wildness in which everything goes by its own rhythms, even if they cross one another, complicate one another, and sometimes, tragically, cancel one another out? Isn't the Buddhist realization of suchness (*tathata*) and all-relational interpenetration (*pratitya-samutpada*) a symbol for an immediate access to this emptiness of patience that harbors its own liberating plenitude? Isn't the eco-wisdom of the East all we need to understand? Maybe so, I am not contesting such a view.

What complicates things, however, is the very hybridity by which we live today in this globally webbed and mapped out world, an interpenetration of East and West that cannot be sorted out easily: technology, democracy, economy, spirituality—all mixed up. We have all lost the innocence of pure traditions both in the East and the West. And, maybe, these categories are wrong altogether, making us blind to other binary hybridities: North and South, for instance, or the “worlds” that we count so lightly with the ordinal numbers 1st, 2nd, 3rd. Maybe what we need is to realize our *common complex contingency* in the majestic necessity of *this* wilderness: the patience of all of these wisdom traditions for our little lives as they flow together and apart within us, between us, and among us.

All I can do is realize the *contingency* in my thought within the great streams of necessary wildness in their interflowing connections and diversions, consciously *deconstructing* my own Western baggage in the face of the confluent and diffluent, affluent and influent necessities that, from their own rhythms, connect and diverge. All I will do is, from my own location, contextualize my ecological deconstruction so as to take its

contingency seriously, opening it to the patience of wildness ever beyond and, yet, always within.

2 The Economy of Omnipotence

Science has always had its unexpected effects. In 1847, Hermann von Helmholtz formulated the famous law of the conservation of energy. Curiously enough, he had discovered it by investigating the neurobiological functioning of nerves. This law states that in a process of the transmission of energy, energy is not lost but only transformed. It became a universal law of physical, chemical, and technical transformations of energy, for instance, from kinetic energy in thermal energy. It expresses an important axiom of current cosmology, namely, that there is no “free lunch,” that is, that the differentiated energy in the cooling cosmos must have been the same in the point-concentration of the big bang. It insures that there is no energy coming in from any transcendent force, such as God, acting upon the world *ex machina*. Maybe this cosmos is just borrowed from nothing as it jumped into existence from a random quantum fluctuation, its missing part being dark energy. We have only borrowed this universe and we will eventually have to give it back. Furthermore, Helmholtz’s law allows us to travel through space. When we burn the thrusters full of rocket fuel we propagate in one direction because we leave a trail of burned waste of particles behind such that the sum of the energy in both directions is zero.

It is even more unexpected that this law became part of 19th century economical theory. Since there is no prescription for the form into which energy is transformed, we need not care what we leave behind as long as we gain *in* the process for what the process of transformation was invented. Since our economy can just use the sources of energy transformation, it can, like a rocket, also just carelessly leave a trail of waste behind. The world is a reservoir of energy that we transform according to our will, technology, and aims. The economic cycles are hermetically closed; we only have to sustain the process of economical transformation since the resources are either inexhaustible or replicable raw material; and after their economic transformation, only waste. Nature is a mere supply for the sustainability of an economic mechanism; it is a mere substratum, the exploitation of environments just the “outside” of economy, the mere passive material of transformation.

This mechanism is deeply engrained in Western thought. Alfred North Whitehead, the English mathematician and American philosopher, has called its inner mechanics “substantialism” and followed it back to two of its main roots: Christianity and Greek

philosophy. Philosophically, it claims that the true reality is independent permanence, that is, first, it is what it is without any relation to anything else except itself and, second, it is what it is through time without being affected by changes in anything else. Such substance, if it construes our understanding of reality, not only needs nothing to exist but has everything else in itself or, conversely, everything else is just a mode of dependent participation in its essence. Whitehead claimed that this mode of constructing reality is deeply inscribed in languages that use a subject-predicate form such that it divides our perception of reality itself into independent existents without any inner relation but only with derivative forms of participation.

Whitehead went even further and demonstrated that this installation of substantial reality, with its sole legitimate power which excluded the substratum of dead matter as a mere passive instrument to be imprinted by the activity of a substance, structured Greek society even in the form of Athenian democracy, which could only live from a substratum of slaves being the mere instrument of its own sustenance. As substances have all power of activity, so free citizens have all the power of the *polis*; and as the material substratum is a mere supply for the imprint of the substances, so slaves are the supply for the sustenance of the free state. Indeed, the economical application of Helmholtz's law is just a late insight in the substantialism that has haunted Western societies from their very beginning: that the human economy is a substance, an independent machine of the transformation of material for its own sustenance, and that the under side, the material, the slaves, the strangers, the others, are only waste products.

Theologically, Whitehead reconstructed the substantialism of the mainstream Christian notion of God as having been formulated precisely within this Greek context as the highest substance. In fact, if God is the independent permanent being, everything else can only be an inherent derivation from God, and in case of stubborn reservations, evil deviations. In fact, according to this marriage of Greek and Christian categories, the world's existence is a mixture of imperfection and evil. If substance is elevated to the eminent reality of God, that is, if it expresses the ultimate reality of everything, it must become the ultimate power from which everything else created *ex nihilo*, out of nothing. The wilderness, the chaos of a creative universe, is vampirized of its own life and bestowed to the highest substance, which as an independent being now grants existence like a substance to its accidents or the master to his slaves.

This is the economy of omnipotence: that substantialism from its barbaric origin in the relation of absolute rulers over their subjects is sublimated into “the one absolute, omnipotent, omniscient source of all being, for his own existence requiring no relations to anything beyond himself.” As “He was internally complete” (AI 169) so are God’s legitimate powers on earth and, finally, in ironic participation in this history of substantialism, so was humanity over against the wilderness and economy over its resources.

3 The Ecological Death of God

Everything changes with a different perception of an economy not based on substantialism and its philosophical and theological implications. God is dead, claims Nietzsche; meaning that the substantialist illusion that roams through our abstractions with which we order our world is obsolete. Indeed, with the fall of the substantialist God *a whole cascade of deconstructions is initiated* of which we might not yet have seen a bottom. Most of the atheist rhetoric in the 19th century might be dismissible, that is, it is not radical enough to overcome substantialism since it builds its very resistance on the same mechanicism that was the outcome of its substantialist forbearers. If we cannot experience God because we don’t have any organ for it as in Hume, referring to sense experience, the deconstruction of this divine fantasy only furthers a mechanistic universe which, in its own turn, sustains the economical omnipotence. It leaves the deep substantialism with its dualistic binary of economy and resources, inside and outside, form and matter, master and slaves, in tact. Nietzsche’s claim was different because it attacked the very underlying substantialism: that a God of substance is a God that upholds the regime of Being, of the economic laws of omnipotence, by granting what is life’s own: its becoming, the creativity of fluctuations that always escapes substantialism: the waste, the slaves, the underside. To dethrone *this* God is to give back the *power of becoming* to what has been excluded from Being. And in its groundlessness, *becoming* now, for the first time, appears in *ecological* terms: as “eternal return” of novelty, as recurrence of the cycle of becoming in itself, as an endless cycle of togetherness.

What becomes obvious is that the *mechanicism* in which substantialism began to structure economy as independent, all-present, omnipotent, internal infinity that can ignore any “outside” or is even the creator of it in terms of divine resources given to control them (make them subjected) must be overturned. It is clear now: the very dichotomy of mind and matter in Descartes that left our bodily existence outside the mind as the mere extension and

the mere coexistence of an almighty God with an infinite extended space, as in Newton, will only sustain a substantialist economy. Indeed, it was the Romantic movement of the later 19th century that questioned this very presupposition. It found in Schelling a proponent that not only shifted the view of the mechanist universe of exploitation but expressed it with a very different notion of the divine: that of the depth of nature that, in fact, is so deep—infinately deep—that it is even deeper than God. It was this *Ungrund* or groundlessness that he called the *nature* of God, that is, *that* in God which is *not* God but even God's groundless ground. Here we gain a first glimpse of “eco-nature” in which “nature” was given back its wildness, indicating the groundlessness of everything that happens. In it, we are at home and strangers alike; in this nature, we become—with God—contingent on its necessity.

The immanent vitalism of the Romantic movement dealt with the mechanicism in such a way that a new paradigm could emerge: that of a community of becoming in cyclic fate bound together in their becoming and infinitely hovering over a wildness of which humanity is only a contingency. With Whitehead, we enter a new phase of the exploration of this togetherness. Motivated by the hybrid confluence of science and religion in his philosophical encounter with mechanicism and in light of the new physics of relativity theory and quantum physics he might have been one of the very first philosophers who systematically proclaimed a new paradigm of organic philosophy. This paradigm “is neither purely physical, nor purely biological”; but is always “the study of organisms. Biology is the study of the larger organisms; whereas physics is the study of the smaller organisms” (SMW 103). His whole philosophy can be seen as making sense of an organic universe, or in more technical terms: that the universe is a groundless process of becoming and that this becoming is always an irreducible multiplicity of relations in the process of growing together and dissipating into a new multiplicity of relations. In this paradigm, everything is related and nothing is without “life”; everything is a becoming of worth (inner value) and nothing is just material or waste.

It was Whitehead's contention that if the universe is a process of processes of becoming relationships or relational becomings the most fundamental characteristic of this ecological complexity must be only *one*: namely that there is no other characteristic more fundamental and, actually, groundless, than this very togetherness of relationships in becoming. He called this most profound *ecological* character of the universe that “does not presuppose any special type of order, nor ... any order at all pervading its members”—“the general metaphysical obligation of mutual immanence” (AI 201). Its inner consequence, however, is the *ecological death* of the substantial God. Deeper than the death of God as Being in Nietzsche and the death of God as ground in Schelling, it *erases God's power*

altogether, only leaving a trace as a warning: If “there is nothing in the Universe other than instances of this passage and components of these instances,” then “the word Creativity expresses the notion that each event is a process issuing in novelty” such that its “Immanent Creativity, or Self-Creativity, . . . avoids the implication of a transcendent Creator,” only in an air of paradox, or pantheism” suggesting “the [immanent] origination of novelty” instead of “Creator” (AI 236). Strangely enough, as we will see later, this was only the birth of an ecological divine.

4 The Anthropic Fallacy

So deeply was the justification of substantialism engrained into Western experience that the *fact of its very inscription* came into question. Its easiest and most obvious version is this: that even the ecological death of God has left us with the dead body of this divinity, namely, with power-instilled, substantialist abstractions like Subject, Right, Power, Integrity, and Humanity. Point in case is Feuerbach’s analysis of substantialist power as a projection onto God by social and political interests of legitimizing certain power structures. Their rupture, however, would *not* lead to the ecological death of God and, hence, a new ecological paradigm of mutual immanence but straightly into *reclamation* of the diverted powers projected as powers of the *infinite* human nature. This is the Anthropic Principle: the half-death of God *in* its corpse—the superiority, even infinity, of humanity. The Anthropic Principle reverses the necessity of wildness and our contingency into *our* necessity and the contingency of nature.

This Anthropic Principle expresses itself most prominently and obviously in the form of the Anthropic Fallacy in the current ecological discourse such that to save nature *from* human influences is actually a strategy of *human survival*. We are not interested in ecological relationality in terms of Whitehead's mutual immanence in which we have to situate humanity anew by redefining what nature means for humanity and in what way it is part of its mutual environmental relations. Even Muir’s “necessity of wildness,” which includes the preservation of wilderness devoid of human influence, is not for nature’s own sake as the fountain of life but, rather, about strategies of restoration, manipulation, or development of the environment so as to allow human persistence in it. This Fallacy is *anthropocentric* insofar as its rhetoric of the integrity of nature is really about saving human existence in nature. Conversely, “nature,” is not viewed from its own organic integrity in which humanity is relationally “integrated” but from *techniques* of human survival. It is *anthropomorphic* insofar

as it presupposes that nature a whole *conspires* for our survival. In such an anthropocentric condescendence, we “preserve” nature because it *needs* our preservation. Nature is not the necessity of *our* contingency but the contingency in *need* of preparation, preservation, and manipulation.

The spiritual traditions have heavily contributed to this situation of the Anthropocentric Reversal of necessity and contingency. Again restricting myself to the Western heritage, it seems that the religious and theological discourses interested in ecological issues are still implicitly following the divine supremacy *before* the “ecological death of God” in order to establish the supremacy of their own orthodoxies. They take the environmental crisis as a chance to reintroduce the relevance of one’s own religion. With strategies that want to establish that the depth of the theological traditions was *always* “ecological,” orthodoxies are still following the Anthropocentric Reversal by claiming that it is humanity’s imperative to “preserve creation.” This so called “stewardship for creation” is, however, less ecological in essence than it is concerned with the survival of humanity. Even in this new context—ecological interrelationality—the argument from “creation” is still executing the old mindset for which nature was reduced to a mere background condition of human existence and salvation. As many traditional texts attest, this nature is not an *integral* part of salvation but only humanity’s background in which they repeat the wipeout of the integral plenitude of interrelationality transforming it into a mere extension, a place to be filled with humanity. We still repeat the guilt of the Christian heritage of disrespecting the Earth in her own right; we still make her necessity contingent on humanity’s destiny; we still “subject” her to humanity’s necessity.

The superiority of these “humanisms” was most prominently deconstructed by French poststructuralists since the 20s of the 20th century—including Barthes, Levi-Strauss, Lacan, Althusser, Serres, Bataille, Kristeva, Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Deleuze, Irigaray, Baudrillard, Butler, Spivak, and Žižek. In cascading down the ladder of deconstruction, they superseded the death of God with the “death of the subject” and “humanism.” The first one because it is a product of power structures, that is, of subjection; the second because it infects the world with a hidden claim to the superiority of the colonizing West. To be “human” is the *possession* of the one who is able, has the money, power, and means to “subject” the rest of the world: politically, culturally, technically, religiously. Humanism is about orthodoxies of suppression. Its deconstruction has led us a step closer to the composting of the “dead body of God.”

However, the *awakening* in the midst of an “ecology of power” in which subjects are always the surface expression of social, cultural, religious power-relations has lead, fairly unexpectedly, to another omnipotence, not of “God” or “subjectivity” but the *omnipotence of power*. For Foucault, power is not unilateral, a means of suppression of the “better ones,” but a relational, structural, objective infinity in which humans constitute themselves as humans. Again, as in the economic omnipotence, we end up in a *hermetic interiority of transformation*, not of economic objects, but of objects of power, itself remaining deeply (dialectically) dependent on the rejection of humanism. The problem of the Anthropic Principle is this interiority of omnipotence even in its negation of human subject; it negates the necessity of wildness and empties it into a contingency of human power relations; thereby it deconstructs *nature itself* as an essentialist illusion, as a mirage of a mirage; as a Romantic original that has been lost in all of its infinite reflections—nature as a projection of omnipotent power.

5 Ecology Deconstructed

Still following the cascade of deconstruction of the ecological death of substantialist omnipotence downward, the appearance of philosophical reflections within the ecological movement was equally problematic. Cases in point are Deep Ecology and Eco-Feminism. While Eco-Feminism succeeded in deconstructing the Anthropic Fallacy as an *androcentric* superiority, it is in danger of “identifying” the suppressed female with suppressed nature—suffering at the hand of unilateral, Western, male powers—such that it not only counter-substantializes the suppressed but remains within the old concept of unilateral power, overcome by poststructuralism. Its resonance with the *Gaia*-project—first proposed by James Lovelock—which has relativized our Anthropic Condescendence in putting emphasis on the inherent integrity of the Earth as a living being in its own right unfortunately also seals our complicity with “nature” as an integrity that must be “preserved” for human survival.

Deep Ecology also appears as the recognition of an internal form of the self-value of nature not only in its individuals as entities of life but even more in more complex living unities such as species and eco-systems. It overcomes the Anthropic Fallacy by integrating humanity within nature but, at the same time, remains complicit to it by its use of “subjectivity.” Arne Naess views ecological consciousness as a process of the widening of Self in which we overcome the egoism of human individualism in a process of identification with wider contexts: humanity, other species, eco-systems, and, finally with the whole ecosphere. But its compassionate altruism remains egoism: it becomes a new *omnipotent*

interiority of an infinite Self. Despite this identification, Deep Ecology becomes a counter-humanism that is not geared toward the *integration* of humanity into nature but towards a *legal battle* of “natural entities” over against humanity. As Arne Naess’s Charta formulates an *equality of the right of survival* among any species, this approach shifts the discourse again into the realm of substantialism: Humanity and any other species now appear as equal subjects of “natural rights” in a fight of survival over against another.

As both approaches imply a substantialism of viewing eco-systems as “subjects”—nature, Earth, species, eco-systems—they, in fact, only repeat the substantialism that *defines identities against one another*: not as relationships but in categories of war; not as mutual immanence but in terms of legal victory; not as diversity in inherent connectivity but as liberation of suppressed entities that are understood as *hermetic units*. In fact, this substantialism of the “identification” of legal, moral, or ontological unities of worth and action has pervaded ecological discourse proper and environmental ethics for a long time. While the “individualistic” approach just reduplicated the anthropomorphic reduction of humanity to individuals in viewing nature as an accumulation of individuals to be preserved, the holistic extended this individualistic view to groups of individuals like species or eco-systems as relationality between individuals. Even in the form of the acceptance of emergent features of eco-systems over against individuals such an approach remains bound by its substantialism of *properties* that are seen as principles or aims of ecological action: integration, balance, harmony, diversity, wholeness, and health become expressions of the new hermetic unity of ecological identification and action.

In an Anthropic Transfer, such holistic features of eco-systems widen human categories of value, integrity, stability, self-realization, or health to ecosystems as a form of universal “egology” expanded to the world as the body of such substantial properties. Nevertheless, they all remain problematic in their very substantialist independence. Integrity becomes static if we think of it as an a priori identity of any given eco-system; it ignores interrelationality within and beyond itself and the fact that it is always in its own flux of identity. Integrity is always ecologically surprised by novelty in the system such that the new system will find a new integrity that cannot recast the old identity and, hence, also has no internal value to be “preserved.” There is no wholeness to an eco-system as its aim (fixed identity or Idea) that can be used as a criterion of ecological action; it always changes in mutual interaction from diversity within and without.

The same is true for more dynamic properties suspected to define eco-systems as and ecological action, like self-realization, diversity, or complexity. Like stability which would

motivate us to “preserve” a certain “state” as exceptional, natural, or most whole, self-realization predefines a given substance of Self to be realized and not to be disturbed by human existence. This is not Muir’s fountain of life in preserved wildness—which is only a symbol of *our* contingency—but a call for the independence of such Selves in eco-systems by a projected human notion of Self-identity with its predominantly Cartesian necessity. Diversity and complexity, on the other hand, have been contested as aims because their *use* implicated the contention that if we let a system become complex enough it will result in a certain “natural” stability of that system like a nascent Aristotelian substance that is still in the process to become constituted as *what* it is (if you do not hinder a seed from growing it will become a tree). Although this teleology is not about a *state* of things but is open to a *process* that we “preserve” and from which we withhold intervention that would disturb it or intervene to get it flowing again, its aim is still such a state of balance. This is the final deconstruction of the Anthropic Principle inscribed in nature: that there is no fixed, final, or ideal measure; and no such balance of states, processes, and identities.

6 Eco-Nature

Have we reached the bottom of the ecological cascade down from substantialism yet? And where do we go from here? The first question relates to the deconstruction of world-conquering omnipotence of modes of wholeness, oneness, substantiality, subjectivity, and power-inflection that structures our conceptual framework and our experience in such a way that it eliminates any *outside*—as if the rocket is everything that exists and its propagation is just a matter of an *internal* transformation of a hermetic whole so that neither the acquisition of transformative energy nor the space in which it happens matter and that the propagation only leaves a wasteland behind that is not of its concern as are the wasted spaces the rocket transverses. The second question names a different *kind* of aim that we might have for such processes of transformation: non-substantial, non-static, non-wholistic (all-inclusive), nonomnipotent. I will answer both questions with a “yes” if we mean that such a new approach to nature that is beyond the Anthropic Fallacy is *eco-natural* insofar as it pertains to the necessity of wildness and human contingency and beyond that, *the mutual contingency of everything within eco-nature* such that there is no overarching aim, criterion, or final state except their mutual immanence.

If we begin with mutual immanence, as suggested earlier in Whitehead, the limitations of omnipotence we can discover are threefold: First, the approach to eco-nature is such that

we always find a *multiplicity* of becomings that are neither reducible to one another nor to any one pre-given origin or final state, and hence, to any kind of state at all. Second, nothing in eco-nature is isolated or, conversely, everything is in a mutual process of *becoming* that is as much unification as it is diversification; simplification and complexification, reduction and unfolding—always both at the same time. Third, no synthesis, element, moment, property, feature, concept, or character is absolute in the sense of being complete; rather everything we discover about the process of mutual becoming of multiplicities is a relationality that is always *incomplete* so that no conceptuality can ever be closed because of perfection. We can restate these three criteria as: *the irreducible multiplicity of becoming in a process of mutual reciprocity, determination, and incompleteness*. The ideal of eco-nature is infinite becoming without any fixed measures of relationality, criteria for aims, and presupposed directions of harmony.

Whitehead's vision of eco-nature is that of its "perfect incompleteness," that is, "complete" immanence in its becoming in which it never does become encompassing or complete but demonstrates a "necessity of universality" that is that of "relationality" (PR 4) beyond which there is no relationality that is not already part of the openness of relational becoming towards novelty. In the framework of Gilles Deleuze "transcendental empiricism," this formulates the conditions of a world in which novelty is possible such that the universal incompleteness of relationality is also its *rationality*, the measure by which we can understand eco-nature.

While William James in his *Pluralistic Universe* had already stated that the universe is plural in such a way that any unification is always a simplification of its multiplicity in which, hence, something always escapes, Whitehead, in reading James, was maybe one of the first philosophers to create an eco-philosophy of the entanglement of eco-relations and eco-events, eco-systems and eco-chaos in the mutual oscillation between organisms and environments. His "organic philosophy" proposes that all relations are in becoming, in the rhythms of repetition and differentiation such that they create events of novelty and structures of repetition as they vibrate within and between processes of synthesis and deconstruction like swarms or clouds of mutually compromising complexities. In always creating and recreating multiplicities on multiplicities, such processes condensate to social structures with reparative and competitive characters of survival and pleasure of organism within ever wider fields of environments *in which* they become what they are and *in which* define their rules of ascension, existence, and fading as much as they define the processes of their environments to which they are always related in complex ways.

Eco-nature, for Whitehead, is a vast interrelated multiplicity of entangled organisms and environments such that every organism is an environment for other organisms that, in its own turn, is enveloped by environments, which are themselves organisms in other environments. As all of these organisms are *not* related to one another as layers of an onion but rather in always immediately cutting through all layers, having all layers *inherent* to one another, all organisms and environments influence their mutual becoming. Insofar, however, as these organisms and environments also do not form one super-organism in which everything is balancing itself out so as to create a super-structure or super-symmetry, these organisms and environment are *externally limiting* each other as a matter of mutual enrichment by the always surprisingly unexpected other and, with equal importance, by struggling against each other for survival, attention, and satisfaction of life. The basic “relation” in Whitehead's eco-nature is neither mutually external nor mutually internal but *prehensive*, that is, re-enactive and creative of its relata; in other words: Eco-nature is a process of always new configurations of multiplicities of becoming as transformation of divergences into contrasts of novelty. This is the driving appetite of eco-nature: its creativeness as processes of intensification of contrast and harmonization of contrast of contrasts, infinitely recreating each other.

Beyond the Anthropic Principle, this eco-cosmos is, as Deleuze says about Whitehead's eco-nature, a *chaosmos* that is not defined by any substantiality as sublimation or derivation of human proportions for measuring everything. In the ever *disbalanced becoming* of new constellations of multiplicities of incomplete organisms and environments, humanity is interwoven as a product of serendipitous processes of precisely such constellations of the creative disequilibrium of intensity and harmony but also unhappy constellations of disintegration and chaos that together *are* eco-nature. To this eco-process humanity is neither an exception nor a peak; neither an isolated entity with unique rights nor unworthy to exist. Within the necessity of the wildness of eco-chaosmos, humanity is but a contingency: a serendipitous event of intersecting environments without necessity or exception from chaotic rhythms of becoming and fading.

7 Becoming Animal

While deconstructing the Anthropic Exception of humanity in its relational embeddedness in eco-nature, we still need to address the experience of nature within us as subjects of experience of such nature. The question is: Do we, indeed, experience eco-nature

and, if so, how do we understand the emergence of the Anthropic Principle? While any classical anthropology has differentiated humanity by either its capacity to think, reflect, and understand or its subjective inwardness or its ability to differentiate itself consciously from nature, the binaries of mind and body, form and matter, master and slave are attesting to this fact; the poststructuralist deconstruction of these binaries, however, has left us with a disappearance of nature into our cultural games of omnipotent power. How do we account for eco-nature in our experience as human beings and how can we overcome the binaries such that we do not diffuse eco-nature in the fiction of a new omnipotent “subjection” to power in which humanity becomes absolute again?

Deleuze has proposed this question in the form of his provocative imperative that we must become animals again. Becoming animals, however, does not mean to literally revoke human existence as *animal rationale* (Aristotle) or the animal that knows death (Heidegger) in order to become *indistinguishably united* with nature—this would contradict the mutual incompleteness of multiplicities in eco-nature. Rather a “becoming-animal always involves a pack, a band, a population, a peopling, in short, a multiplicity” (TP 239) that overcomes the dualistic differentiation between *res cogitans*, which is always distinctly human, and *res extensa*, which is always erasing our chaomic, organic, and environmental heritage, such that this eco-transfer can no longer be demonized as a diabolic state of perversion—as some, especially Western, orthodoxies suggest. Becoming wolf, becoming whale, becoming multiplicities!

I will mention three aspects of what Whitehead calls the mutual “pollution” of mind and body in becoming multiplicities/animals again (cf. RM 87). First, it is an appeal to a diffusion of the symbolic stasis of differences between humanity and nature in the form of recongizing of our internal *pre-symbolic multiplicity* that always supersedes our well-defined identities. Julia Kristeva has argued that our human difference from nature is the product of our birth into a world in which we seek through symbolic acts of longing, language, and stabilization to actually find our pre-natal state again. Expelled from its pre-symbolic, bodily, material cycles of being multiple, we always substitute the impossibility to reverse this process with differentiations from it that cope with existential feelings of abjection: becoming subject, becoming substance, becoming omnipotent. She suggests that we will only overcome this move toward subjection and substantiation when we allow for the porosity in these processes of absolutism, if we grant ourselves an absolution for being abjected from the pre-symbolic realm of chaomic multiplicity and invite it in in the form of *poetic inconstancy* in its material indirectivity. In the *poetic break of continuity* that *excludes* this Platonic *khora* of

mutual immanence and incompleteness, we will get a taste (*aesthesis*) of multiplicity beyond and before human identity.

Second, Whitehead addresses the same problem of exclusion from and of multiplicity in terms of our projective epistemologies in which, since Aristotle and with Kant, we have *closed* the human mind *of* from the pollution of the eco-chaosmos and isolated it from eco-nature with the help of its omnipotent thought-figure found in the divine realm of Ideas and Being. In breaking through such immunization tactics of omnipotence, Whitehead suggests that such isolation is an *emergent* in the evolutionary process for reasons of survival, orientation, and directionality of organisms. However, it becomes toxic when it closes itself off from its primary inclusion within a realm of feelings of the multiplicity of nature in us such that it actualizes ourselves within eco-nature always before, within, beyond, and across any constitution of subjectivity, intellectuality, and superiority. In criticizing this binary isolation from multiplicity Whitehead suggests, as Derrida would later, that we need to reconnect with the enveloping nature *beyond* all of our endeavors to constitute independent “presentational immediacy” (isolating self-presence) within ourselves, in which we become “one” *over against* eco-nature (as multiplicity in despair), elevating ourselves to the controlling kings of our desires and the eco-chaosmos. It is precisely releasing this *feeling of connectivity* that leaves “us a prey to vague terrors respecting a circumambient world of causal operations,” where we *become multiplicity*, finding “ourselves in a buzzing world, amid a democracy of fellow creatures” (PR 50).

In the dark there are vague presences, doubtfully feared; in the silence, the irresistible causal efficacy of nature presses itself upon us; in the vagueness of the low hum of insects in an August woodland, the inflow into ourselves of feelings from enveloping nature overwhelms us; in the dim consciousness of half-sleep, the presentations of sense fade away, and we are left with the vague feeling of influences from vague things around us. (PR 176)

Third, George Bataille in his *Theory of Religion* develops the intense suggestion that our whole human world is an excess of the inability to reenter the animal realm in which we were and now feel, in painful absence, to have been “like water in water” (TR 19), that is, in an *intimacy* that is permanently lost. Instead, the human world became one of the divisions of subjects and objects in the search for meaning, although all we find are devoid of aims that are only means again. This creates our world of wars and empires as it creates religions in the place of meaning with subjectivity inscribed to objects, spirits, and gods. Meaning, which

resides only in the directionless intimacy of animality, can only be returned to if we *consciously*, that is, *through* our human difference revoke the difference of subject and object and allow ourselves to be part of the animal kingdom in the depth within us as a multiplicity of becoming; not as the “romantic object” of a paradise—this is for him the “Poetic Fallacy of Animality” (TP 20)—but in all of its variety of mutual immanence and the monstrosity of mutual devouring.

8 The Theopoetic Difference

Eco-nature in us, bursting us inside out, and eco-nature between us, imploding the chaotic All within us—this is the unconquerable wildness, the necessity of which makes us its happenings, disowned of our “necessities” of possession. This consummation of humanity in the dispossession within eco-nature is for Bataille, after the ecological death of God, the *mystical* move of becoming-animal, becoming multiplicity. This *unio mystica*, however, if it is not the unification with the omnipotent God that has to have died first in this eco-chaotic death of substantialism, is also *not* a new indifference of the Oneness of humanity and nature but the consummation of all unity into the realm of multiplicity that, as Luce Irigaray puts it, is divine precisely by *not being One*. It is the *choric* realm of a paradox where we have to go through divergences, bifurcations, and antinomies *all at once*; in which we become empty and the All *at the same time* by being, as Deleuze puts it, One-All *with* multiplicity, infinitely moving through ever new multiplicities of mutual immanence and limitation, planes of immanence and consistency in constant refigurations within an infinite chaosmos of transformation.

This is the realm of *poetics*, of the rupture of the continuity of unification where, as for Kristeva, meaning is indirected. This is the poetics of the unprecedented in which, as Whitehead puts it, “philosophy is mystical. For mysticism is direct insight into depths as yet unspoken” (MT 174). Where the Romanticism of Bataille’s Poetic Fallacy is avoided by recognizing the monstrosity of becoming; in which everything, as Deleuze says, reappears “like a single and unique ‘total’ moment, simultaneously the moment of evanescence and production of difference, of disappearance and appearance,” “the moment at which difference both vanishes and is produced” (DR 42). In this mystical in/difference, everything is only *in* difference. Its poetics cannot differentiate God as cosmological function anymore. God and the world become “one” in being not differentiated *by any property* that would be reserved to God. As Whitehead says, in *this* in/difference

It is as true to say that God is permanent and the World fluent, as that the World is permanent and God is fluent.

It is as true to say that God is one and the World many, as that the World is one and God many. ...

It is as true to say that God creates the World, as that the World creates God. (PR 348)

If, however, in this *choric* realm God and the world are in/different as in the mystics, that is, if their difference cannot be crafted around any difference of property, why then not say that God *is* the world? To be sure, many philosophers would follow such a line of thought—pantheism as last resort of divine apophasis in the world. Deleuze became a Spinozist and many theologians today feel themselves to be ecstatic naturalists or mystical nihilists. But if, for many, eco-nature leaves a mystery of luminescent darkness—as for Nicolas of Cusa—that cannot be reduced to *unity*, we need still to differentiate between enfolding (*complicatio*), which Cusa named “God,” and unfolding (*explicatio*), which Cusa named the infinite “world” of multiplicity. We will be speaking of the multiplicities of God and the world in their mutual immanence, limitation, resonance, incompleteness, and determination. We will, with Whitehead, avoid the “identification” of God and world over against another not by naming reserved properties but instead will name God and the world as *multiplicities in mutual in/difference*, that is, only as *mutual embodiment* or, as Catherine Keller says, in mutual inter-carnation of multiplicities. This divine (in) multiplicity will insist *on* multiplicity and only “*ex-sist*” by “*in-sisting*” *in* multiplicity.

You may wonder how we got here. What does this have to do with eco-nature? I shall answer: everything! My answer follows the reasoning of the employed logic of multiplicity, namely, that in mutual immanence nothing can become complete or omnipotent, not even multiplicity. If eco-nature is nothing but the mutual immanence of all becoming relationality, externally and internally, in beauty and in monstrosity, in war and peace, we need to break open once again the creeping substantialism of such a statement by differentiating the poetry of breaking open the chaosmos of the creative multiplicity from its closure of omnipotence. Per se, eco-nature now appears to be a universality of relationality in a twofold danger of closure: that of a liberated multiplicity that is given back its own powers of becoming and that of the monstrous multiplicity that is haunted by the clash of its own powers—because both closures live (again) from the *omnipotence of power*.

This is the reason for a *theo*poetics within the immanence of multiplicities: that, as Whitehead's says, God is not identical with “creativity”—Whitehead's “ultimate” that is the *posse ipsum* that empowers the becoming of multiplicities in the fulfillment to all of their

different powers and that also created the monstrosities of power against power. If power is not absolute, either in the form of Foucault's power of subjection or in the form of Deleuze's (and Nietzsche's) power of becoming multiplicity, the *divine multiplicity is not identical with power*. I understand Whitehead's theopoetic difference between God and creative/destructive powers as that of power and love. It is the love of multiplicity—polyphilia! It is the love that cannot be addressed in terms of power. It is the *subtractive affirmation* of multiplicity that hinders its closure into power. *This* love is, as Whitehead says, a “reciprocal relation, [in which] the love in the world passes into the love in heaven, and floods back again into the world” so that “God is the great companion [of multiplicity]—the fellow-sufferer who understands” (PR 351). In its reciprocity, it is the *ecotheosis* of multiplicity, the mutual metabolism of the divine companionship with the chaosmos, and the *mutuality of compassion* in midst of the powers of multiplicity, the luminescence of dispossession and non-violence in midst of the wars of mutual digestion.

9 The Wasp and the Orchid

The insight into an eco-theopoetics of eco-nature after the Anthropic Principle is twofold: it is the recognition of the necessity of its wildness and our contingency in the mutual contingency of multiplicities in multiplicities; and it is the differentiation of polyphilia from power in a commitment to compassion. The first one activates us within eco-nature with *eco-consciousness*; the second activates us within eco-nature with ecological *conscience*.

Gilles Deleuze has conceptualized such an eco-consciousness with the poetic of the wasp and the orchid. Both organisms follow their own paths of generation and regeneration within their respective environments without having anything in common, *except* that they share the same environment in order to follow their eco-rhythms. They are not developing in their *own* stratum of a shared environment, in a parallelism of possession of substantial identity, so to say, but entirely differently: a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp.” It is an “*aparallel evolution*” (TP 10) of entangled multiplicities without internal recognition. This is the *external* side of eco-nature, the entanglement of mutual differentiation that copies itself *only* by enacting the other, by “preserving” the other's multiplicity in its own wildness. This preservation, however, is not that of a patient that is in need, but of a cross-pollution of each other's cycles. Its enactment in human action will not lead to any aims defined for the whole of the eco-process but arouses a desire for differentiation and complication of different multiplicities in their mutual touch. Their mutual

immanence does not reveal the *logos* of a divine plan in its pre-established harmony but an *eros* of touch, of intercourse, of mingling without a common direction, in fact, with a divergence of directions, with an indirection of consummation that is never One.

Aparallel evolution is not necessarily calm—it is wild in the sense that it can lead to a mutual occupation of the space of the others' metabolism. Viruses and bacteria use host organisms for their own generation and regeneration by virtually destroying the very environment of their proliferation. Pandemics are not only a phenomenon of human beings, they have created strange intersections and interferences between organisms as they have become a mutual environment for the respectively other. Such hostile relations are not unnatural or counter the mutual immanence of relationships but rather show the power character of such relationships that are neutral as to their moral implications, which are usually projected by human beings and their ethical impulses. An organism in its environment might function as its very nemesis insofar as an environment becomes hostile to an embedded organism without breaking the rules of external connectivity that grants mutual touch. Counter-reactions of organisms in their use as environments for the becoming of other organisms as well as counter-reactions of environments against destroying organisms are to be expected and are, in fact, widespread. Hence, the disturbances of any temporal organization of organisms and their environments into eco-systems is not the destruction of the value of ecological equilibrium but a *necessity of the mutual contingency* of all eco-systems in eco-nature—its wildness in constant change. The touch of eco-connectivity is *eros* and *thanatos*.

Eco-conscience, on the other hand, will address the *internal* relationship of eco-nature in its wild eco-connectivity—as that of mixtures of war and peace—for a post-anthropic human self-understanding and activation *within* eco-connectivity. In other words: we ask for the *transhuman* measure for a new eco-anthropic *intention* to live and act within the eco-constellations of intensity and harmony so as to always lead to their maximal unfolding. In light of the previous discussion of multiplicities, any intended *influence* of aparallel evolution in a post-human or eco-human sense regarding such a transhuman, post-anthropic measure will be a counter-movement of liberation of eco-multiplicity from substantialism and an infusion of human life within eco-nature such that its necessary disbalancing (its wildness) will foster our constitutional contingency within its wildness either by *unfolding* its polyphonic powers *or* by *limiting* these polyphonic powers by polyphilic love.

Deleuze has taken the first route in grounding the valuation of the differentiation of multiplicity that always avoids a transcendent One in the very *affirmation of the All of potentials* (virtuals) of limited multiplicities in the eco-chaosmos in which its dimensions come into their own power. Its ethical measure is accompanied by the avoidance of extremes in order to allow for the multiplicity in its very connectivity to organize itself regarding a polyphony of its internal and intermediate powers with other interfering multiplicities *and* by inherently including even the faintest potentials (virtuals) in the calculus, not just the overpowering potentials so as to avoid their occupying and colonizing tendencies. Although such an ethical impulse will seek to unfold the “creative” powers of eco-connectivity in their mutual beneficial or destructive determination towards a *maximum* of intensity and polyphony, it also inherently seeks to unfold the *minimum* intensities; in other words: it seeks the least, the powerless, the forgotten, the suppressed.

Whitehead follows the second path by refusing to accept the omnipotence of powers even in the form of the powers of multiplicities in their liberation from forced unifications in which they always would give up their polyphony for a forced harmony, a pre-stabilized harmony, or a pre-ordained measure of harmonization. Whitehead's transhuman, post-anthropocentric measure of intensity and harmony is the *subtractive affirmation of chaotic polyphony*—a love of multiplicity—that is not built on power but on its mutual limitation by, immanence in, and determination through *theoplicity*—*divine* multiplicity—that is *the transformation of relationality into compassion* and, beyond any fixed measure of intensity and harmony, of the *disequilibrium of powers towards ecotheosis* in the midst of *the potential (virtual) violence* of multiplicities. A theopoetics to this effect, I name *eco-theopoetics* after the Anthropocentric Principle.

It will not only be compassionate to the minimum of enfolded powerlessness in the midst of the polyphony of powers but also open to everything between the minimum of enfolding and the maximum of unfolding *beyond* power. This “novelty” cannot be grasped in terms of “creativity” but may be faintly approximated with a *divine poetics of salvation of multiplicities from the potential (virtual) omnipotence of their own powers*. It is this divine *poiesis* of which Whitehead's says that it does *not* create—as power—but that it saves in compassion (cf. PR 346). An eco-ethics under the auspices of the eco-theopoetics of polyphilia will be the “creation” of the transhuman, post-anthropocentric world *from* this sense of peace in the midst of the constructive and destructive power of creativeness. Mediated by this sense, eco-human life must become non-violent in the midst of power. In other words: it must become *intermezzo* in eco-nature.

10 Becoming Intermezzo

Eco-consciousness and eco-conscience have an ethical and a spiritual dimension. Both can be characterized as “always beginning in the middle.” Deleuze formulates this new categorial imperative of eco-ethics as letting “your loves be like the wasp and the orchid” and, without beginning and end, as being “always in the middle, between things, interbeing, *intermezzo*” (Deleuze/Guattari, *Rhizome* 17). To begin in the middle always means to follow multiplicities in their deconstructive complexity within and without, to unsettle the boundaries and clear borders of forced identities, which are always imposed measures of the One with its power-installed abstractions of unification and division. To begin in the middle is an ethical category that activates us *from* the middle of the happening of multiplicities and asks us to always *submerge* into their middle, the many folds of connectivity within and beyond, which always form *under the skin* of powers of unification and division and only come to life within, across and beyond the boundaries of power. To become inter-being, we need to leave the high states of unity to become actors of the folds *within* unities *between* their moments of unifications, and *between* unities *in the middle* of their artificial isolation. To become “in between” means to become *intermezzo*, that is, *less* than the abstract unifications that always feed the Anthropocentric Imperialism over nature, culture, and (human) Self. It means to become *minor*.

To become minor does not mean to reduce to lower unities; it does not mean to atomize reality. It rather means to become *uncountable* in terms of units, to become *intermezzo* within and between all abstractions like Self, Culture, Nature, to undercut “identity” with diverging dimensionality—like a river, a rhizome, *a* life. It is this access to becoming *within* and *between* culture, nature, and us in which we lose the Anthropocentric substantialism and, at the same time, become “events between” and a multiplicity of such events. However, in becoming a minority we become “universal” in a new sense: by becoming *ecologically connected* beyond any *structural* integrity. We become *subversively distributed* among all unifications. For Whitehead, this is the eco-ethical imperative of becoming multiplicities: In the “self-correction by consciousness of its own initial excess of subjectivity” it is the task of eco-philosophy (organic philosophy) to deconstruct subjectivity’s “selective character” in which “the individual obscures the external totality from which it originates and which it embodies” in order “to recover the totality obscured by the selection” (PR 15).

For a post-anthropic eco-ethics, this impulse of becoming minor implies a redirection of ecological action: With Deleuze, we have to become “molecular” not “molar”—not seeking higher or lower unifications. Hence, an eco-ethical imperative cannot be built on slogans such as the “preservation” of states—since their presupposed unity and identity is a mere abstraction from their becoming; or the “reparation” of an ecological equilibrium—because it is an abstraction of a certain state of nature as ideal (especially for human survival); or “eco-justice”—because it presupposes fixed identities with legal responsibilities; not even “sustainability”—insofar as it might already presuppose sustenance like substances. Instead, post-anthropic eco-ethics will direct us toward the compassionate life with the *multiplicities within and between*.

Post-anthropic ethics is a procedure for the emergence of “tragic beauty” in which humanity falls in place, the place of *khora*, the medium of intercommunication that, if it is perused as compassion, always leads beyond any “state” and “desire” into a depth of *love of multiplicity* as such—the “in between” of the wildness of eco-nature and, perhaps, its divine intermezzo. The emphasis on “wildness” does not seek “nature” over against “culture” as the “other” of culture that must be preserved. It is not presupposing any identity of nature *or* culture; it is in between; it is this in between as necessity in which we realize eco-connectivity as constitutional contingency.

11. Mutual Suspension

In their eco-*spiritual* dimension, wisdom traditions must be read from the standpoint of their ability of becoming molecular, becoming animal, becoming minor, becoming intermezzo in order to release the molar identities into their molecular connections, the subversive interaction within and between them. The new spiritual measure for religious multiplicity, beyond religious identity and plurality alike, *into* the differentiations of eco-nature between abstractions of self, culture, and nature, and, hence, into the multiplicities within and between religions, which consciously (or more often suppressed) *live from* their mutual incompleteness, reciprocity, determination, and becoming.

Whitehead's differentiation of the world of wisdom traditions in *Religion in the Making* is an interesting starting point. For Whitehead, three traditions have reached logocentric universality and, hence, Anthropic omnipotence as well as an obvious mutual limitation, namely, Christianity, Buddhism, and science. Since these traditions are universal insofar as they give universal answers to cosmological questions (cf. RM 141), they will

allow us to rediscover the “totality obscured by the selection” (PR 15) they made by imprinting their “identity” onto eco-nature, that is, the spiritual inter-being of humanity with eco-nature.

First, there is the odd dynamic of the mutual limitation of science and religion in which science has become the new “theology” of the cosmos and a medium of their cosmic, post-anthropic spirituality: eternal inflation, multiverse, quantum entanglement, chance and necessity, emergence, evolution—they cannot be ignored by religions. While its very spiritual impulse is always transcending its methods, it does not overflow into an indeterminate realm of the spirit but is already awaited by wisdom traditions such as Christianity and Buddhism. Second, there is the mutual limitation of Buddhism and Christianity in their cultural diversity in which they contextualized themselves as modes of living that we abstractly meet with the typology of the East and the West. In establishing their counter-identities, their classical opposition appears in the mutual feeling of superiority regarding their respective entertainment of a personal and impersonal understanding of ultimate reality. But interfusion in dialogues and transformations alike has unearthed a mutual incompleteness within and between these traditions in their mutual mystical approximation.

Third, there is the mutual limitation of all three traditions in relation to an avoidance of their omnipotence. In fact, there are the many other wisdom traditions, which are not forgotten but only obscured by the substantiation of these three. Then we can ask: Which Christianity (there is only a multiplicity)? Which Buddhism (there is only a multiplicity)? Which science (there is only a multiplicity)? Then, we can begin to see all of these obscured *molecular* connections within and between their molar unities and the wisdom traditions oppressed by their universal claims. This is the realm of eco-spirituality and its multiplicity of eco-theopoetics.

In such an eco-spirituality, many positions of eco-connectivity can be taken within and between wisdom traditions; but all of them will want to begin in the *middle* of the eco-connectivity as inter-being, as medium of intercommunication: *khora*, the Godhead, *pratitya-samutpada*, quantum nothingness, the enfolded multiverse, inter-carnation, *ecotheosis*. The ultimacy of such a mystery will appear as *natura naturans*, as creativity, as wonder of existence, as nothingness, as divine multiplicity. In the emptiness of becoming intermezzo, we might find its characters as wisdom and compassion: as overflow of *sunyata*, as persons of the infinite sea of the divine, as modes of creativity—Whitehead's eco-metabolism between the embodiment of God in the world and the embodiment of the world in God. But always,

ultimacy will be bound back into a *mutual suspension* of their claims—redirecting us back *into the middle of becoming intermezzo*.

If there is a place for eco-*theopoetics*, that is, for naming the divine in eco-nature, it will be that of polyphilia, the interval *between* power. After the ecological death of omnipotence, the divine will show its ecological traces only as divine (in) multiplicity, as being in the middle of the multiplicity of power—as love in its many folds: as *eros*, *philia*, *agape*; as *shakti* and *bhakti*. Maybe this is best addressed by the Lotus Sutra: While ultimacy of becoming intermezzo will harbour *skillful means* of the mutual suspension of ultimacy in which we become in between, a trace of the divine may be much like the appearance of *Indra/Śakti* in the midst of the infinite number of Buddhas and bodhisattvas of the infinite universes—divine but limited; in between Earth and *sunyata*, a place and a multiplicity (of mortal *devas*). If the divine (in) multiplicity is the symbol for such mutual suspension, we might, in following its traces, become inspired by the desire to become intermezzo in the necessity of the wildness of eco-nature.
