

## How Can We Say That the Hierarchical Order Is Authentically Inclusive of the Horizontal Order in Ecology? A Response to Steve Odin, “Whitehead’s Eco-Philosophy of Nature & Japanese Shizengaku”<sup>1</sup>

Tokiyuki Nobuhara

### **Introduction**

Steve Odin examined A. N. Whitehead’s organic process cosmology in relation to Green Buddhism and Japanese *shizengaku* (nature-study), on overlapping topics including environmental ethics, ecology, sustainability, and philosophy of nature. Thus, in his paper “Whitehead’s Eco-Philosophy of Nature & Japanese Shizengaku” he has come to opt for the view of nature as ranked into a hierarchy of degree of values, including aesthetic, moral, and spiritual values by Whitehead, Kinji Imanishi, and even some Japanese Buddhists. Significantly enough, this view of nature is *authentically inclusive* of the view espoused by most advocates of Deep Ecology and Green Buddhism emphasizing biospheric equality while rejecting all hierarchy. Inasmuch as Odin proposes to say that “...in addition to the horizontal axis of interconnectedness and biospheric equality, there is *also* a vertical axis establishing a hierarchy of compassion involving the expanded awareness of an ever-widening circle of relationships in nature,”<sup>2</sup> I would like to use the expression “authentically inclusive” in describing his stance of ecology vis-à-vis the view of nature in Deep Ecology and Green Buddhism throughout this response. Odin’s inclusive view of nature is a Whiteheadian attempt at establishing a new vision of ecology while at the same time learning afresh from the Kyoto School of philosophy and sciences—this time from the Japanese *shizengaku* of Kinji Imanishi, which is influenced not only by the Japanese Zen philosophy of Kitaro Nishida, but also the modern environmental sciences.

Generally speaking, I would say that an inclusive language of philosophy or ecology must presuppose that which is included as having a power of its own to go deeper than the former. This is a paradox,

in the sense that inclusion can only take place authentically insofar as that which is included is endowed with the power of preceding and undergirding inclusion significantly: the inclusion in one's bosom of a meaningless and vacuous entity/experience/eco-system would be a disaster. A meaningless and vacuous entity/experience/eco-system would not contribute anything great to the including subject while enriching and enhancing the latter's world of experience. Therefore, inclusion is to be negated once by the power of presupposition/precedence in order to be authentically inclusive on its own. If the former did not presuppose the latter (which is a language of the deeper realm of being, at any rate), it would merely be adding something in a shallow, mechanistic manner to the latter which might also be a mechanistic description of the hidden reality of some kind.

A language of the deeper realm of being must be interconnected in some meaningful way or another to an inclusive language of philosophy or ecology. If it was actually done so, it would enable an inclusive language of philosophy or ecology to be authentically inclusive—and this in an interpretive fashion. In my opinion, an inclusive-interpretive language and a deeper-ontological language (i.e., a language for elucidating the deeper reality of being) can go paradoxically hand in hand. This state of affairs I might propose to call the “inclusive/ontological” paradox in philosophical-ecological language.<sup>3</sup> In the universe there must be the hinge (symbolized by the slash) by virtue of which inclusion and ontological presupposition can go hand in hand—but only paradoxically.

In what follows let me contextually articulate and utilize my thesis of inclusive/ontological paradox in philosophico-ecological language in order to adequately provide my comments on Steve Odin's excellent paper.

To begin with, it may be in order that I pay attention to the general description of Odin's enterprise just as is made clear by himself in these words:

I would argue that a deeply ecological worldview and environmental ethics requires an axiological cosmology which rejects the fallacy of vacuous actuality, whereby things are material substances

devoid of life, experience and value, for a panpsychist view of living nature as a society of occasions of experience realizing some degree of intrinsic value as beauty or pervasive aesthetic quality. The main problematic taken up in this essay, is whether a deep ecology in both its Western and Green Buddhist variants requires a doctrine of biospheric egalitarianism, as argued by most deep ecologists, or whether it entails a hierarchy of intrinsic values, as held by Whiteheadians? The Whiteheadian position adopted here, is that while all events in the interconnected web of life have moral standing and biospheric equality as sentient occasions of experience that enjoy attainment of life, experience, and beauty. However, at the same time, they are developmentally organized into a hierarchy of degrees of values—including aesthetic, moral, cognitive, and spiritual values.<sup>4</sup>

I think I can bring in here a passage on aims of education by Whitehead which makes sense of what Odin designates as the Whiteheadian position—one which he tries to articulate to the effect that “...while all events in the interconnected web of life have moral standing and biospheric equality as sentient occasions of experience that enjoy attainment of life, experience, and beauty; at the same time, they are developmentally organized into a hierarchy of degrees of values—including aesthetic, moral, cognitive, and spiritual values.”<sup>5</sup> Whitehead writes:

Education must essentially be a setting in order of a ferment already stirring in the mind: you cannot educate mind in *vacuo*. In our conception of education we tend to confine it to the second stage of the cycle, namely, to the stage of precision. But we cannot so limit our task without misconceiving the whole problem. We are concerned alike with the ferment, with the acquirement of precision, and with the subsequent fruition.<sup>6</sup>

What Odin regards as the “biospheric equality”<sup>7</sup> as found in sentient occasions of experience universally is assuredly implied pedagogically by

Whitehead in his phrase “a ferment already stirring in the mind.” . If the biospheric equality is accepted as a universally prevenient ferment, it should be accepted on the ontological level in terms of what we earlier referred to as a deeper-ontological language. What then about the fact that all events in the interconnected web of life are “developmentally organized into a hierarchy of degrees of values”? Is it related to the stage of precision? I think so. And if so, I further think that the view that a deep ecology as espoused by both its Western and Green Buddhist variants requires a doctrine of biospheric egalitarianism, is not really precise philosophically. For whereas the biospheric equality is a rightful recognition on the ontological level of reality, as is typically manifest in the Buddhist enlightenment that “*everything* is empty,” a doctrine of biospheric egalitarianism is essentially ethical in nature. Accordingly, it needs to have an adequate precision in terms of an axiological cosmology which, as Whitehead claims, rejects the fallacy of vacuous actuality, whereby things are material substances devoid of life, experience and value. Hence, it has to be inclusive of the growth in life, experience and value as found in sentient creatures, both human and nonhuman; and the growth in this sense signifies a hierarchical evolution in cosmology.

### **I. Regarding Whitehead’s Eco-Philosophy of Nature: Is It Possible for the Temporal Irreversibility To Occur Without a Retreat to the Past?**

Thus far, it has turned out that the encounter among a hierarchical view of ecology in Whitehead and some Buddhists and an egalitarian vision of nature in Deep Ecology and Green Buddhism is actually taking place on the plane of what Whitehead calls “precision” while presupposing, on the other hand, the dimension of “a ferment already stirring in the mind” that has something to do with the biospheric equality as it is meaningful ontologically. It would be precise for us to say within this context that a hierarchical view of ecology opposes and rejects an egalitarian-ethical vision of nature, while definitely tending to be inclusive of the biospheric-ontological equality. But how can we say so?

In order to answer this important question in ecology we have to

find some precise way in which we can properly connect the biospheric-ontological equality to a hierarchical view of ecology. Can David Ray Griffin's view of Whitehead's radically different postmodern philosophy (on which Odin bases his understanding of Whitehead's "Eco-Philosophy of Nature") provide one?

Basically, my answer to this question is in the affirmative—but on the condition that proponents of a hierarchical deep ecology as opposed to a "deep ecology-e or egalitarian deep ecology," such as Odin and Griffin espouse, can explicate how their option for the temporal irreversibility is philosophically compatible with their acceptance of what Griffin calls "deep ecology-na or non-anthropocentric environmental philosophy" as well as of "deep ecology-b or biocentric deep ecology"

It seems to me that Odin is certainly well aware of the issue I am presenting here, as is clearly shown in the following passage:

Although Whitehead's ecological vision of nature recognizes intrinsic value of each occasion of experience by virtue of its attainment of aesthetic value quality for itself, for others and for the whole community of living nature, as well as for the dipolar God-in-process, it also recognizes a *hierarchy of values* arising in the developmental aspect of nature as a process of creative, emergent and holistic evolution-striving to attain greater wholeness as well as autonomous self-creativity through occasions which include yet transcend lower occasions of experience. Whitehead thus sets forth a doctrine underscoring the irreversibility, or asymmetry, of the temporal evolutionary process as a creative advance into novelty, wherein the higher developmental stages include yet transcend the lower stages, but not vice versa.<sup>8</sup>

Yet, it also seems to me that Odin's portrayal of Whitehead's view of the irreversibility, or asymmetry, of the temporal evolutionary process as a creative advance into novelty can be challenged by a question such as is raised by Kitaro Nishida regarding Bergson's parallel idea of creative evolution. Nishida writes:

Though pure duration is unrepeatable, in creative evolution the entire past acts as present, and the more we attain the deep foundation of the self, attaining a state of pure creative evolution, the more we are able to transform the past into the present. Bergson compares memory to a cone, with the past as its apex. Developing this image, we can say that the farther back we go toward the broad base of the cone, and the more concentratedly we assume the movement from base to apex, the more the entire past becomes the present, so that the present becomes the center of gravity of the totality.<sup>9</sup>

As is well known, Nishida's philosophy of pure experience was basically schematized by these words appearing in the Preface of his maiden work *An Inquiry into the Good*: "For many years I wanted to explain all things on the basis of pure experience as the sole reality."<sup>10</sup> The scheme of thought herein involved is of threefold development: it begins with "pure experience" (which might be considered in parallel with Whitehead's phase of "ferment" in his pedagogy) which is then reflected upon by way of the stage of "onlooks" (as manifested by his wording of "on the basis of [my looking upon] pure experience as the sole reality") which is further connected to the stage of "explaining all things" (which might be correlative to Whitehead's third realm of "generalization" coming up in education after "romance/ferment" and "precision").

Now, what appears in the afore-cited second volume of Nishida is a new thought culminating in the following dictum: "When absolute free will turns and views itself, or, in Boehme's terms, when the objectless will looks back on itself, the infinite creative development of this world is set up. That is why history is the first, immediate object of cognition. How is this reflective moment of absolute will possible? Absolute will, as both 'creating and uncreated' and 'neither created nor creating,' includes the possibility of retreating (Lat., *regressus*) as well as advancing (*egressus*)."<sup>11</sup> What appeared in the first volume in terms of "pure experience" is now taking shape as the twofold possibility of retreating and advancing; and the function of Onlooks is to mediate between retreating (*regressus*) and advancing (*egressus*).

When viewed from this point of view delivered by Nishida, Odin's reference to Whitehead's idea of the temporal irreversibility is too simplistic, it seems to me. Odin goes hand in hand with Griffin's grasp of Whitehead's worldview as deeply ecological in that his position supports deep ecology in the first two senses: deep ecology-b (i.e., biocentric deep ecology) as well as deep ecology-na (i.e., non-anthropocentric deep ecology).<sup>12</sup> And he rejects, with Griffin, deep ecology-e or egalitarian deep ecology.<sup>13</sup>

I understand that if deep ecology were biocentric and non-anthropocentric, as professed by Odin and Griffin, it would mean that humans are preceded by the biosphere as a whole. If so, we have to acknowledge our natural/earthly dependence on the biosphere—even through our confessions of sins of overlooking and damaging it by our modern industrial, petroleum-consuming, civilization over the past three centuries. Within this specific context, Whitehead's idea of education as that which must essentially be a "setting in order of a ferment already stirring in the mind" is interchangeable with the role and responsibility of civilization as a whole vis-à-vis the biosphere, isn't it?

We have to reflect on the past acts in our civilization of ruining the biosphere reflectively: the Cenozoic Era is terminated. Then, it seems to me that Nishida's following words are really to the point at the present moment:

The present is both the apex of creative evolution and the point from which we look back to the past in reflection; it is the point of fusion between the will's advance to the future and reflection's return to the past. But here we are contradicted by the fact, insisted on by Bergson, that we cannot return to the past of even one moment earlier. How can we square reflection with the unrepeatability of the past? ...Only in that which is morally dead is the past entirely fixed. We can take this to mean that in teleological causality the past is a means to the present and the future, and its meaning changes in accord with the path on which it advances to the future (whereas mechanical causality supposes an immovable past). Thus the meaning of Augustine's previous

life was changed by his conversion.<sup>14</sup>

By the same token, we can change the ruins of our civilization by initiating, with Thomas Berry, a new era—the Ecozoic, which I believe is the conversion of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Despite all of these critical words I heartily affirm Odin's and Griffin's explication of the difference between "compound individuals" like humans and "aggregational organizations" having no experience or spontaneity, such as sticks, stones and mountains.<sup>15</sup> I especially like to see Griffin mentioning the following dictum: "Animal liberationists and humanitarians ... focus primarily upon intrinsic value and therefore primarily upon individuals. Given this focus, animal liberationists rightly see that, among the nonhuman forms of the higher animals, especially mammals have the greatest capacity for intrinsic value, and thereby the greatest capacity to suffer and to have their potentials for self-realization thwarted."<sup>16</sup> In my case, what is most crucial is the principle that retreating (*regressus*) is advancing (*egressus*), which, in my perception, is shot through with the ontological/inclusive paradox.

## **II. Regarding Hierarchy of Nature in Whitehead & Green Buddhism: A Proposal for a Hierarchy of the Stages of the Subjectivist Principle**

Given my aforementioned critical articulation of Nishida's idea of the *regressus/egressus* or retreating/advancing principle of philosophy against the background of Odin/Griffin thesis of the hierarchical deep ecology, it is now well conceivable to me why it is proper for Odin to consider Alan Sponberg's vision of "the hierarchy of compassion" in tandem with Whitehead's doctrine of prehension dealing with causal efficacy, concern, and sympathy. For what is important now is the business of making sense of the third stage of philosophico-ecological inquiry into nature, "general explanation" of the universe in which we find ourselves, namely, metaphysics proper, including metaphysical moral theory.

In this context, it is really enjoyable to read Sponberg's idea of the vertical axis of a developmental hierarchy of compassion and Odin's consideration of Whitehead's organismic process cosmology together.



Let me quote two passages, one from Sponberg's essay "Green Buddhism and the Hierarchy of Compassion," the other from Odin's essay under consideration:

This is a model of what I would call a "hierarchy of compassion." As one ascends the vertical, developmental axis ... the circle of one's interrelatedness increases ... In the hierarchy of compassion, vertical progress is a matter of reaching out, actively and consciously, to affirm an ever widening circle of expressed interrelatedness.<sup>17</sup>

Likewise, compassion, concern, or sympathy is a cornerstone of Whitehead's organismic process cosmology. According to Whitehead, perception in the primordial mode of causal efficacy involves prehension or feeling of feeling, otherwise understood as an act of sympathetic concernedness. Whitehead asserts that the object-into-subject pattern of causal transmission is the "concern" structure of immediate experience: "The occasion as subject has a 'concern' for the object. And the 'concern' at once places the object as a component in the experience of the subject" (AI 176). Whitehead continues, "Concernedness is of the essence of perception" (AI 180). This moral sense of causal perception whereby living organisms have a vague awareness of social relations to the surrounding environment is called perception in primordial mode of causal efficacy in terms of "sympathy" or feeling of feeling (PR 162).<sup>18</sup>

Here either of them, Sponberg and Odin, has come up with an elevation of consciousness beyond a mere egalitarianism in ecology, Buddhistically or in terms of Whitehead's Eco-Philosophy of nature, to see all things as interconnected universally. But we have to know that this mode of elevated consciousness, namely, "compassion," has just resulted from a new way of philosophical precision in which we look upon the interconnectedness lying at the bottom of all things as ultimately or ontologically real. From my viewpoint of the ontological/

inclusive paradox, I prize the following conclusive remarks by Odin: “It can be concluded that for Whitehead, as for Green Buddhism, moral compassion or sympathy is not merely an abstract ethical principle, but requires a shift in perception that directly sees [as pivotal] the interconnectedness of events in nature, whereby an occasion has value for itself, others and the whole.”<sup>19</sup>

I inserted two words here: as pivotal. The reason is this, that the ontological “subjectivist principle”;<sup>20</sup> whereby “I see the interconnectedness of all things as potentially lying at their bottom” is transfigured and lifted into the actual-ethical inclusive “subjectivist principle”; whereby “I see all things as interconnected universally in our actual world.” Interconnectedness-o or ontological interconnectedness in deep ecology has to be creatively transformed into interconnectedness-i or inclusive interconnectedness which is at the core of what is designated as “the hierarchy of compassion.” Here “I” am pivotal in elevating my consciousness, constituting the reformed subjectivist principle, from the bottom of all things into the hierarchy of compassion.<sup>21</sup> There are some different stages of the subjectivist principle: romance, precision, and generalization. And the subjectivist principle performs the game of Onlooks differently in accordance with the different stages.

### **III. Regarding the Japanese Shizengaku of Kinji Imanishi: A Process of Organism-Environment Interaction Reconsidered as “Kyodo” (共働) Rather Than “Kyosei” (共生)**

Odin’s essay is uniquely intercultural in that he pays due attention to Japanese Shizengaku (nature-study) as developed by Kinji Imanishi in his pioneering work *Seibutsu no sekai* (The World of Living Things, 1941), now translated into English as *A Japanese View of Nature: The World of Living Things* (2002). Odin thinks that there are so many parallels between Imanishi’s Shizengaku and Whitehead’s organismic process vision of living nature that a much longer treatment is needed to do the topic full justice. Their common denial of the scientific materialist view of nature as constituted by lifeless substances, in Odin’s view, results from an organismic process model of living nature, grounded in both scientific

method as well as immediate experience through radical empiricism.<sup>22</sup>

Odin comments that Imanishi was especially influenced by Nishida's chapter on "Nature" from *An Inquiry into the Good* (Jpn., *Zen no kenkyu*, 1911), which analyzes the continuum of living nature with a Zen-like interpretation of William James' radically empirical notion of "pure experience" (Jpn., *junsui keiken*) devoid of subject-object dualism (Imanishi: 2002, xxxvi).<sup>23</sup> If I am correct, here Odin is paying due attention to the "non-dualistic grasp of pure experience"<sup>24</sup> as perceived by Imanishi in accordance with Nishida's philosophy of pure experience. However, as a scientific biologist, Imanishi's orientation was more clearly geared toward elucidating how the organism as subject (turning to be object) and the environment as object (turning to be subject) are "interactively interrelated."<sup>25</sup> Hence, the following passage by Odin is both to the point and beautiful.

Imanishi, like Whitehead's philosophy of organism, views nature as a society or community of socially related creative organisms interacting with their environments, so that each part is related to the whole biosphere of the natural continuum (2002, xlii). According to Whitehead, nature does not consist of independent, atomic, and lifeless substances. Likewise, for Imanishi, nature is a "society of living organisms" (2002, 61). Thus, both Imanishi and Whitehead develop variants of an organismic process model of living nature as a dynamic relational continuum wherein each living event is a field arising through a process of organism-environment interaction that both contains and pervades the whole ecosystem, such that each part contains the whole and the whole is manifest in each part.<sup>26</sup>

Odin also mentions further parallels between Imanishi and Whitehead such as the "recognition" (or intuitive grasping of relationships in nature) and "prehension" (or sympathy or causal feeling of relationships to the environment), "a ranked society" (2002, 70) and "a hierarchy of societies" (PR, 96-109), and "integrity" and "creativity."<sup>27</sup>

*Concluding Remarks: Toward an Ecological Civilization of Co-Creation* (Kyoso: 共創)

However, it seems to me that the greatest parallel would be the one between Imanishi's thesis to the effect that a "peaceful existence" as equilibrium within the whole biosphere of nature is the goal of all living organisms in their adjustment to their social environments (2002, 24) and Whitehead's chapter on "Peace" at the conclusion of *Adventures of Ideas*.

What is involved in the concept of peace is, if I am correct, self-transcendence by us humans in conformity with the Divine self-forgetfulness in Adventure. Whitehead writes:

[1] This feeling requires for its understanding that we supplement the notion of the Eros [i.e., the Primordial Nature of God] by including it in the concept of an Adventure in the Universe as One [i.e., the Consequent Nature of God as containing the Universe advancing adventurously]. This Adventure embraces all particular occasions but as an actual fact stand beyond any one of them.<sup>28</sup>

[2] It is the immanence of the Great Fact including this initial Eros and this final Beauty which constitutes the zest of self-forgetful transcendence belonging to Civilization [i.e., the divine-human co-creation] at its height.<sup>29</sup>

[3] The Adventure of the Universe starts with the dream and reaps tragic Beauty. This is the secret of the union of Zest with Peace: —That the suffering attains its end in a Harmony of Harmonies. The immediate experience of this Final Fact, with its union of Youth and Tragedy, is the sense of Peace.<sup>30</sup>

I believe these three passages can thoroughly be understood only by reference to Whitehead's final words spoken before Lucien Price on September 11, 1947: "In so far as man partakes of this creative process does he partake of the divine, of God, and that participation is his immortality, reducing the question of whether his individuality survives death of the body to the estate of an irrelevancy. His true destiny as co-creator in the universe is his dignity and his grandeur."<sup>31</sup>

In the midst of our co-creation with the divine-in-process does Peace lie as a Harmony of Harmonies. This level of a deep divine-human co-creative ecology is to be called in Japanese: Kyoso—共創, I believe.<sup>32</sup> Whitehead passed away December 30, 1947 in peace.

\*

In order to celebrate the legacy of Whitehead's organismic ecological philosophy culminating in the above-cited final dictum, let me try to articulate what I think I must present as my answer to the important question, "Co-creation of what?," in these words:

"Of course, co-creation of some appropriate planetary way or ways in which we humans on Earth might be able to (i) include in our communal and individual lives belonging to the Earth-civilization more fully reflectively-appreciatively (ii) what has been undergirding us by the 'Adventurous Grace of the Universe as One'<sup>33</sup> running through the ecosystems and our human history graciously-benevolently until today (iii) for the purpose of adding something really new on our own ecologically."

And I should not fail to add these words immediately: "What is inherent in this answer is the vision of "the Co-Creation of a Planetary House (Eco/Oikos) of Life-into-Civilization Communities." This is the vision I hold throughout the entire essay. Now, an explanation about it may be in order.

The first element in my answer relates to Whitehead's notion of precision, in terms of which we can do justice to both the second element, romance/ferment, and the third element, the creative synthetic drive of a civilization. Precision helps romance to its truthful accomplishment. In our planetary age, this means that we are asked by the Divine to engage ourselves in co-creating a Planetary House (involving in itself ecology, economy, and ecumenical or interreligious/intercultural dialogue giving rise to a communal-planetary task, or what Thomas Berry calls "the Great Work" in the Ecozoic) which might do full justice to the

appearance of what I want to call “Life-into-Civilization Communities” on Earth.

Romance into its truthful accomplishment is coterminous, in my vision here, with the idea of “Life-into-Civilization” as it is embodied in “Communities”; hence, “Life-into-Civilization Communities.” The mediation between Life and Civilization is designated as the “into,” thereby pointing to the inclusive/ontological paradox inherent in the entirety of the coming to be of the universe, non-human and human. The real meaning of the Whiteheadian “precision” is nothing other than this paradox, I would assume. It is a living principle which is at work as at once retreating (*regressus*) and advancing (*egressus*), to use Nishida’s phraseology.

---

#### Notes:

- 1 This paper is my response to Professor Steve Odin’s presentation “Whitehead’s Eco-Philosophy of Nature and Japanese Shizengaku,” at the Eco-Sophia Symposium at Sophia University, February 20, 2010.
- 2 Steve Odin, “Whitehead’s Eco-Philosophy of Nature & Japanese Shizengaku,” I, emphasis mine; hereafter cited as “WENJS.”
- 3 I have already clearly discussed my overall proposal of the inclusive/ontological paradox in philosophy/ecology in my Ph.D. dissertation (Claremont Graduate University, 1981) entitled *Analogy and God: In Search of a New Possibility of Natural Theology* (Ann Arbor, MI and London: University Microfilms International), Ch. 6 “Conclusions,” pp. 406-427. With the three ultimates—Creativity, God, and the World—in mind, I have proposed to schematize a process analogical metaphysics as that which is co-constituted by the logic of inclusion, in the sense that the World includes in itself God and Creativity (insofar as God is “in” the World, and Creativity is embodied in and through its creatures in the World), and by the logic of ontological presupposition, in the sense that God and the World are in the grip of the ultimate metaphysical ground, the creative advance into novelty, in the sense that either of them, God and the World, is the instrument of novelty for the other (PR, 349). Both logics are analogically at work in my creative uses of the Thomistic analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium* (two to the third). See also Tokiyuki Nobuhara, “Portraying ‘Authentic Existence’ By the Method of Analogy: Toward Creative Uses of the Analogy of Attribution *Duorum Ad Tertium* For Comparative Philosophy of Religion,” *Bulletin of Keiwa College*, No. 1, February 28, 1992, 61-83; No. 2, February 28, 1993, 27-50; and No. 3, February 28, 1994, 1-19. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/search/?author=Nobuhara+Tokiyuki> (click this address and go to the essays Nos. 15, 16, and 17).

We have to know that within the context of the above-mentioned renewal of the picture of the analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium*, God's position is really unique because, while at once including and being undergirded by Creativity, God is the ground of our hope and the urge toward a perfect inclusion of God's aims in us. I can find in this unique locus of the Deity in the universe the supreme embodiment of the ontological/inclusive paradox.

Incidentally, the afore-mentioned analogy of attribution *duorum ad tertium* was discarded as theologically untenable by Aquinas himself because he sensed that there would be no tertiary reality which goes beyond and above the reality of God and the world. By contrast, in my own novel creative uses of the analogy, I go hand in hand with Whitehead in perceiving there are three ultimates, God, Creativity, and the World. As is well known, Aquinas developed the Analogia Entis by way of approving of two types of analogy, namely, (i) analogy of proper proportionality in terms of the analogical exemplification of being; and (ii) analogy of attribution *unius ad alterum* (one to another) in terms of the relation of creatures to the Creator).

4 "WENJS," 2.

5 Ibid.

6 Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (New York: The Free Press, 1967), p. 18.

7 Cf.: "When the Creation is completed, God views the whole and *sees* that it is very good. Not only are individual species and their members of value in themselves individually, but the total creation with all its complex patters of interdependence has a value that cannot be reduced to that of its individual members" (John B. Cobb, Jr., *Matters of Life and Death*, Luisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991, p. 25). John Cobb thinks that although deep ecologists do not have their views on the Bible, they could gain support from some of these features of the Genesis account. He knows that their approach is to argue that it is indeed the complex interrelated whole that is of supreme value. At any rate, I might say that what is important here is to regard this Whole-centeredness of deep ecologists as pointing to the ontological dimension of the eco-systems, which surpasses its axiological dimension. This judgment of mine is true even in relation to the Deity. I prize the following passage by Charles Hartshorne in this regard: "The infinite fullness of the divine life is empirical not metaphysical. Empirical science and theology (revealed theology is in this sense empirical) are the sources for any knowledge we have of God beyond the bare outline of the dimensions of his being. *That* he has an infinitude of contingent features is metaphysical; what these features are is not" (Charles Hartshorne, *Man's Vision of God*, Hamden, CON: Archon Books, 1964, p. 345).

8 "WENJS," 3.

9 Kitaro Nishida, *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness*. Trans. Valdo H. Viglielmo, Yoshinori Takeuchi, and Joseph S. O'Leary (Albany, New York: SUNY Press, 1987), p. 132; hereafter cited as IRS.

10 Kitaro Nishida, *An Inquiry into the Good*. Trans. Masao Abe & Christopher Ives

- (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), p. xxx.
- 11 IRS, 143.
  - 12 See David Ray Griffin, *Whitehead's Radically Different Postmodern Philosophy* (Albany, New York: SUNY Press, 2007), p. 71; cited in Odin, "WENJS," 3; hereafter cite as WRDPP.
  - 13 Ibid.
  - 14 IRS, 129.
  - 15 WRDPP, 76; cited in "WENJS," 4.
  - 16 WRDPP, 84; cited in "WENJS," 5.
  - 17 Alan Sponberg, "Green Buddhism and the Hierarchy of Compassion," in: *Buddhism and Ecology*, eds. Mary Evelyn Tucker and Duncan Ryuken Williams (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), p. 366; cited in "WENJS," 6.
  - 18 "WENJS," 7.
  - 19 "WENJS," 8.
  - 20 Here I am utilizing in a different context (namely, ecology) Whitehead's reference to the reformed subjectivist principle in terms of an important phrase: "my perception of this stone as gray." If one failed to speak of "my perception," while accounting for the proposition that "this stone is gray," one would be doomed to fall into a subject-predicate metaphysics, like Hume's. See Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, Corrected Edition, eds. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne (New York: The Free Press, 1978), p. 159; elsewhere cited as PR.
  - 21 Here I am finding the locus of the "I" as coterminous with the fact, which sums up my reply to Professor Uwe Meixner in Chapter Four "How Can We Co-ordinate the Vertical Order to the Horizontal Order and vice versa, in Metaphysics Cogently? Uwe Meixner, Process Thought, and Nishida-tetsugaku," that "...humans are created creators (*creata et creans*) in philosophical terms" (p. 12).
  - 22 "WENJS," 10.
  - 23 Ibid.
  - 24 It seems to me that this non-dualistic grasp of pure experience might be in continuity with today's general sociological shift toward the symbiotic union (Jpn., Kyosei: 共生) in Japan. However, this is a kind of metabasis of ontology into the area of sociology.
  - 25 I propose to call this state of affairs in Japanese: Kyodo: 共働.
  - 26 "WENJS," 10.
  - 27 "WENJS," 11-13.
  - 28 Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: The Free Press, 1967), p. 295; elsewhere cited as AI.
  - 29 AI, 295-296.
  - 30 AI, 296.
  - 31 Lucien Price, ed, *Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead* (London: Max Reinhardt, 1954), p. 366.
  - 32 There is a crucial question regarding the divine-human co-creation, such as "Co-



creation of what?" Professor Haruo Murata raised it during his presentation entitled "Horizontally Opening through Vertically Closing: For Philosophy of Sustainability" (hereafter cited as "HOTVC") in the "Eco-Sophia Symposium" of February 20, 2010 at Sophia University. What he had in mind, it seems to me, was his intention to solve his own issue, sustainability. So the question is intermingled with another one, "Sustainability of what." I have given my answer to this important question in the text right after this note. Significantly enough, it is shot through with my acknowledgment of Whitehead's notion of "precision" in tandem with my own notion of the inclusive/ontological paradox which has been amply discussed throughout this essay.

Now, I am attentive to Professor Murata's creative wisdom of precision he manifests in these words:

"In contemporary world we have four major models of human cooperation: state, corporation, organized religion such as church, and family. These four models are respectively in the process of closing themselves [in the manner of 'conrescence'] to entertain their own subjectivity and opening themselves by way of projection [or 'transition' or 'objectification'] into the actual world. In order to expand cooperation and construct better social institutions the heights of vertically closing of each cooperative system and of concomitant humanity must be higher. The moral codes formed by the self-closing of corporations, for instance, are called private codes. And the process of self-opening through the act of objectifying themselves might open the common codes, which are to be called public. The breadth of human activities can be conceived as a category of objectifying interactions. Let us call such a category horizontal. The breadth of the morality of public codes must be getting wider and wider in the face of new occasions and incidents, good or bad" ("HOTVC," 4; the original text arranged by me).

Murata thinks of the mass recall/repair case of Toyota of recent months in the United States and beyond within this context, very attentively. And I think it is a very reasonable way of dealing with it. At any rate, to think of real issues in our real world in precise terms we Whiteheadians need to use creatively Whitehead's categories, such as conrescence and transition/objectification, like Murata does in correspondence with the world of management theory.

- 33 Cf. Whitehead's concept of an "Adventure in the Universe as One" in AI, 295. Capitalized words in Whitehead's writings, especially in AI, are intended to show that they are divine in nature.