

## International Cosmos Prize Memorial lecture

### The mesological foundations of sustainability

by Augustin BERQUE

**Abstract** – *The modern-classical Western paradigm (MCWP), ontologically founded on dualism and logically on the law of excluded middle, has entailed modernity and industrialization. It has come to a dead end not only in biological terms (those of the Sixth Extinction), but also morally by decomposing the social link, and aesthetically by wreaking havoc in the landscape. In a word, the MCWP has decosmized human existence. For re-cosmizing ourselves, technical recipes will not suffice. We need to found anew, both ontologically and logically, our way of being and thinking. That is the aim of mesology (Umweltlehre, fūdogaku), which proposes a set of ontological concepts and logical principles enabling us to overcome the MCWP.*

**Keywords** – LOGIC, MESOLOGY, ONTOLOGY, PARADIGM, SUSTAINABILITY.

**Summary** – § 1. From Mount Horeb to transhumanism and geoengineering ; § 2. What is mesology ? ; § 3. From imprint-matrix to seeing as ; § 4. From possibilism to the logic of “as” ; § 5. Capsizing the logic of the subject into that of the predicate will not suffice ; § 6. Overcoming the MCWP with the meso-logic of mesology.

#### § 1. From Mount Horeb to transhumanism and geoengineering

That the present course of our civilization is not sustainable is by now common knowledge; therefore, I shall not, here, recapitulate the various reasons we have to change that course, which was entailed by the Modern Classical Western Paradigm (hereafter *MCWP*). Instead, I shall focus the problem on the ontological and logical – the onto-logical – grounds of, first, briefly, the

MCWP itself (§ 1), and then, more at length, an alternative paradigm, that of *mesology* (§ 2-6).

The MCWP is onto-logically founded on the principle of decosmization, by means of abstracting our Being from its milieu: 1. ontologically with dualism, and 2. logically with the law of excluded middle, both amounting, onto-logically, to the reign of Binarity (as exemplarily instanced, nowadays, by the binary “language” of our electronic devices).

The embodiment of this principle, which I shall call “the principle of Mount Horeb”, can historically be summarized in three stages : a) conceiving absolute Being, namely that of the God of monotheism, who is purely transcendental since he is both subject and predicate of himself, and correlatively depends on nothing but his own substance for existing; b) applying the same principle to the human, as symbolized by Descartes’ *cogito*, first expression of the modern subject, and correlatively of the modern object; c) implementing technically that same principle, in the form of Cyborg’s trans- or posthumanism, and correlatively geoengineering.

For want of place, I shall restrict this argument to the following three quotations (for more details, BERQUE 2010, 2014 a) :

a) *Declaration, XIII<sup>th</sup> c. B.C., of God’s absolute substance* (BIBLE, Exodus, 3, 13-14) :

“Then Moses said to God, ‘Behold, I am going to the sons of Israel, and I will say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you.’ Now they may say to me, ‘What is His name?’ What shall I say to them?’ God said to Moses, ‘I am who I am’ (אֲנִי־אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר־אֶהְיֶה *ehyeh asher ehieh* → ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν [I am the Being] → *sum qui sum*); and He said, ‘Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, “I am” has sent me to you.’”

b) *Declaration, XVII<sup>th</sup> c. A.D., of the cogito’s non-placeness* (DESCARTES 2008: 36-37; my translation) :

“Then I looked carefully into what I was. I saw that while I could pretend that I had no body and that there was no world and no place for me to be in, I still

couldn’t pretend that I didn’t exist. (...) This taught me that I was a substance whose whole essence or nature is simply to think, and which, in order to be, doesn’t need any place (*qui, pour être, n’a besoin d’aucun lieu*), nor depends on any material thing.”

c) *Declaration, XX<sup>th</sup> c. A.D., of Cyborg’s deterrestation* (GRAY ed. 1995: 47)<sup>1</sup> :

“I thought it would be good to have a new concept, a concept of persons who can free themselves from the constraints of the environment to the extent that they wished. And I coined this word cyborg. [...] The main idea was to liberate man [...] to give him the bodily freedom to exist in other parts of the universe without the constraints that having evolved on earth made him subject to.”

#### § 2. What is mesology ?

The French word “*mésologie*” (mesology) – from the Greek *meson*, “middle, mean”, and *logos*, “discourse, science” – was created by physician Charles Robin (1821-1885), who presented it at the inaugural session of the Société de biologie on June 7th, 1848, as a science of milieux (environments) (CANGUILHEM 1968 : 71). The first edition of the Petit Larousse, in 1906, defined it as “Part of biology which deals with the relations of environments and organisms” (*Partie de la biologie qui traite des rapports des milieux et des organismes*).

Robin was a direct disciple of Auguste Comte. He understood mesology as a positive science, the field of which was extremely large, since it corresponded to that with which deal, to-day, ecology, physiology, anthropology and sociology; too vast a field indeed for a single positive science; which explains why mesology, after having prospered together with determinism in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, faded away until it disappeared from dictionaries in the XX<sup>th</sup> century.

The main reason for this decline was the blossoming of ecology, which was born later – it is in 1866 that Haeckel introduced in German *Ökologie*, which penetrated in French as *écologie* in 1874 –, but the field of which was better defined. A correlative reason was

that since the word *mesology* did not exist in English, the progresses of the new science in the Anglosphere were accomplished as *ecology*, and consequently were known in French also as *écologie*, not as *mésologie*.

Now, while mesology vanished from the academia in France, it was reborn in Germany, but in a new light and with a new name, in the works of the Baltic-German naturalist Jakob von Uexküll (1864-1944), one of the founders of ethology, and the precursor of biosemiotics.

The new light brought forth by Uexküll may be qualified as an instance of hermeneutical phenomenology. It consisted in considering living beings (in practice, mainly animals) no more as *Maschinen* (machines), but as *Maschinisten* (drivers, operators of a machine), that is, no more as objects but as subjects; subjects who interpreted the environmental datum in a way specific to their respective species, thus conferring these data a particular signification, and behaving according to that signification (*Bedeutung*). This meant that the scientist, instead of studying a mechanism of stimulus-answer, as did behaviourism, had to penetrate that signification in order to define it from the inside, that is, from the point of view of the concerned subjects.

Thereby, Uexküll introduced a founding distinction between environment (*Umgebung*) and milieu (*Umwelt*). Environment is a raw and universal datum, considered *in abstracto* by the look from nowhere of modern science, and accordingly valid in principle as such for any living being; whereas milieu is a concrete and singular reality, valid only from the point of view of the being concerned, and dynamically coupled with the constitution of that being.

This amounted to establishing mesology as a science of milieux (*Umweltlehre*), whereas ecology is the science of environment. Moreover, *Umweltlehre* is intimately coupled with a study of signification (*Bedeutungslehre*, later called *biosemiotics*), whereas ecology is not<sup>2</sup>.

In 1934, Uexküll gathered up his views in a small book, finely illustrated by his colleague Georg Kriszat, *Streifzüge durch die Umwelten von Tieren und Menschen* (*Raids into the milieux of animals and humans*) (UEXKÜLL 1965).

At about the same time, in 1935, philosopher Watsuji

<sup>1</sup> Gray is here quoting Manfred Clynes, who invented the word Cyborg in 1960

<sup>2</sup> To-day, biosemiotics (*Biosemiotika* in German) has become a part of ethology, not of ecology (*Ökologie* in German).

Tetsurô<sup>3</sup> (1889-1960) published *Fûdo*. This word *fûdo* 風土, “wind-earth”, means milieu in the sense of *Umwelt*. The subtitle was *Ningengakuteki kôatsu* 人間学的考察, “a study of human betweenness” (WATSUJI 1979). The matter is indeed about human milieux, not milieux in general as in Uexküll. Correlatively, Watsuji established a human mesology, *fûdoron* 風土論 or *fûdogaku* 風土学. Whether he had heard of Uexküll’s *Umweltlehre* during his stay in Germany (1927-1928), or rediscovered its homologue on his own side as a practitioner of hermeneutical phenomenology, Watsuji’s mesology was founded on the same principles; namely, that a milieu supposes the subjecthood (*shutaisei* 主体性) of the concerned people, and, correlatively, that milieu (*fûdo*) is not the natural environment (*shizen kankyô* 自然環境).

Uexküll and Watsuji are the two founding fathers of contemporary mesology, which I advocate in their wake. Yet in my mind, rather than a discipline, which in a word would amount to a phenomenological ecology, mesology should be considered as a general perspective, outdating modern classic dualism, which, as it is known, relies on an abstract and radical distinction between what pertains to the subject and what pertains to the object. For mesology, reality, that of concrete milieux, is neither properly objective, nor properly subjective, but *trajective* (BERQUE 1986, 2014 b, 2018 etc.). This concerns the natural sciences as well as the humanities.

Compared with the MCWP, this is of course a shift of ontological order, but also of logical order. As we shall see, mesology’s *meso-logics*, overcoming the abstract dualities of dualism (subject/object, nature/culture, assertion/negation, subject/predicate, etc.), overcomes also the law of excluded middle, and pertains to the tetralemma: beyond assertion (A is A) and negation (A is not non-A), it acknowledges bination (neither A nor non-A) and biassertion (both A and non-A). Pertaining to both ontology and logics, the new perspective which mesology brings forth is *onto-logical*.

The general meaning of mesology is that such a paradigm shift is necessary in a time when the abstraction of modern dualism, together with the law of excluded middle and their various attributes (mechanicism, reductionism, analytism, individualism, quantitativism,

capitalism, industrialism...), have come to the point of not only triggering off what is nowadays called the Sixth Extinction of life on Earth, but, moreover, of breaking up the social bond and playing havoc with the landscape; in other words, of entailing a loss of cosmicity which may well be fatal for Humankind. This means that, contrary to that decosmization, in order to ensure sustainability, we have to recosmize, reconcretize, re-Earthbind human existence; and this is precisely the aim of mesology (BERQUE 2014 a, 2014 b; AUGENDRE *et al.* 2018).

### § 3. From imprint-matrix to seeing as

The word “milieu”, at least in French<sup>4</sup>, has the twin and apparently contradictory meanings of both a centre or focus and what surrounds this focus. It may be the *centre* of a target or the *middle* of a road as well as the *environment* of a fish, i.e. the water *around* it, the *midst* of which is the fish itself. This poses clearly a logical problem: how can the midst be also the surroundings, A be also non-A? How can it mean both one thing and its contrary?

One may notice, first, that when talking about the environment (“milieu”) of a fish, one considers here a set of objects – the fish and the other elements of the environment –, placed under the look from nowhere of scientific measure; and, second, that when talking about the fish as the midst (“milieu”) of its ambient world, we have here a subject – the fish – for which any other thing is defined in relation with its own existence. Both cases are compossible and neither one is truer than the other one, but they are contradictory.

Such is the question: how can we overcome this contradiction? How can the milieu of a fish be both objective and subjective? How can the inside be at the same time the outside, and vice versa?

The ancestor of this ambivalent notion of milieu (in the mesological sense of *Umwelt* and *fûdo*) is probably the *chôra* χώρα in Plato’s *Timaeus* (BERQUE 2000, and especially 2012). The most general and concrete meaning which this word might have in the Greek city-state, that is for the citizens of a *polis* πόλις, was the nurturing countryside, of which, everyday, beyond the walls of the *astu* ἄστυ (the town proper), they could see the hills,

covered with wheat fields, vineyards and olive groves. From there, daily, came for them these earthly foods which enabled them to live. In such a world, no *astu* without its *chôra*!

Now, *astu* – the urban centre of the *polis* – is a word, the Indo-European root of which, *WES*, means “sojourn, stay”. This root is also found in the Sanskrit *vasat* (he stays) or *vastu* (place). In German, it gave *Wesen* (being, nature, essence), *war* and *gewesen* (temporal forms of *sein*, to be); in English, *was* and *were* (temporal forms of *to be*). The *astu*, in short, and inasmuch as the matter concerned a Hellene as Plato, was by essence the abode of Being in the sensible world (one would say in Castilian *la estancia del ser*, and in post-Heideggerian *der Aufenthalt von Sein in Seiendheit*); nevertheless, that abode of Being could’nt concretely exist without this nurturing milieu: the *chôra* which surrounded the *astu*.

This context probably inspired Plato’s words in the *Timaeus*. Now, as far as the *chôra* is concerned, the least one can say is that these words are unclear, and even contradictory; a contradiction which the text of the *Timaeus* precisely does not overcome, and which will seal the fate of the *chôra* for the centuries to come in European thought. In a word, until Heidegger’s *Dasein*, European thought will foreclose it – forgetting, in sum, the question “why does Being (*Sein*) need a place and a milieu?” – and content itself with the clear definition which Aristotle, on the contrary, has given about the notion of *topos* τόπος in book IV of his *Physics* – namely a place dissociable from the being (*Seiende*) it contains (since it is not mobile, while this being is), whereas the *chôra* is not dissociable from it.

Now, if in the *Timaeus* this foreclosure is still not accomplished, since Plato precisely questions about the *chôra*, his ontology, the principle of which is the self-identity of “true Being” (*ontôs on*, i.e. the *eidôs* or *idea*), excludes any logical capture of that notion of *chôra*, since it mysteriously escapes this principle of identity. It escapes it so thoroughly that Plato fails to define it, contenting himself with metaphors; which metaphors, moreover, are contradictory. He compares here the *chôra* with a mother (*mêtêr*, 50 d 2) or a nurse (*tithênê*, 52 d 4), that is in sum with a matrix, but

elsewhere to that which is the contrary of a matrix, namely an imprint (*ekmageion*, 50 c 1). The *chôra* is both an imprint *and* a matrix toward that which Plato calls *genesis* γένεσις (origin, source, beginning, nativity, generation, production, creation), that is the process of becoming of beings in the sensible world (*kosmos aisthêtos*); beings who, in Plato’s ontocosmology, are not true Being, but only its reflection as images.

Thus both an imprint *and* a matrix, one thing and its contrary, the *chôra* has literally no identity. One cannot figure it. Plato acknowledges that this is “difficult to believe” (*mogis piston*, 52 b 2), and that “when seeing it, we dream” (*oneiropoloumen blepontes*, 52 b 3), but he insists that it exists: in the array (the *kosmos* κόσμος) of Being, there is indeed, from the beginning and at the same time, true Being, its projection as beings, and the milieu where this projection is concretely accomplished, namely the *chôra*. The text says (52 d 2) : ὄν τε καὶ χώραν καὶ γένεσιν εἶναι, τρία τριχῆ, καὶ πρὶν οὐρανὸν γενέσθαι, “there is Being, and milieu, and being, all three triply, and which are born before the sky” (that is before the arranging of *kosmos*, which in the *Timaeus* is identified with *ouranos*).

In terms of Aristotelian *topos*, on the other hand, such a problem of imprint/matrix does not arise. In the *Physics* (IV), the *topos* is like an “immobile vase” (*aggeion ametakinêton*, 212 a 15), which makes that the thing which occupies it, and which for its part is mobile, can change its place while keeping its own identity, obviously distinct from that of the *topos*. This principle is of course linked with Aristotelian logic, which is a logic of the identity of the subject (*hupokeimenon* ὑποκείμενον), in other words a logic of the identity of substance (*ousia* οὐσία). As a matter of fact, in the European way of thinking, following Aristotle, “substance & accidents in metaphysics correspond to subject and predicate in logic” (*The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed.: 1287). Now, the *chôra*, on its part, manifestly does not pertain either to that logic nor to that ontology, since it can be one thing and the contrary. In Aristotelian logic, correlatively, a place cannot be another place. It is where it is, that’s all there is to it. For sure, one can go from a place to another one, but that will precisely be

<sup>3</sup> In the present text, East Asian names are given in their normal order: family name first.

<sup>4</sup> In English, the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (2007 edition) defines « milieu » (in roman fonts, i.e. as an English word), plural -ieus, -ieux, as “1. An environment; (esp. social) surroundings. 2. A group of people with a shared (cultural) outlook; a social class or set. In France: (a group or organization belonging to) the criminal underworld”.

another place.

Nourished by such a logic, that is to say my surprise when I discovered that in landscape matters, in East Asia, a place can be another place, or at least be seen as another place. This is what is called in Japanese *mitate* 見立て, literally “instituting visually”, in other words “seeing as”. It consists in seeing such or such landscape as if it were another one, famous in the arts and letters (NAKAMURA 1982, BERQUE 1986). In that way, throughout East Asia, starting from China, could be found the “eight views” (八景, cn *bajing*, jp *hakkei*) of the Xiao and Xiang rivers, which are tributaries of lake Dongting in Hunan. The Chinese tradition, since the Northern Song (960-1127), had instituted in these parts eight local scenes into models of landscape: “autumn moon on lake Dongting”, “night rain on the Xiao and Xiang”, “evening bell at the monastery in the mist”, “fishing village at sunset”, “wild geese descending on a sand bank”, “sails returning from a distant shore”, “mountain village after the storm”, “snow on the river at dusk”. Following China, similar scenes were discovered in the neighbouring countries, and were multiplied. In Japan, the most famous of these “eight views”, imitated from those of the Xiao and Xiang (*Shô-Shô hakkei* 瀟湘八景), were those of lake Biwa, near Ōmi (*Ōmi hakkei* 近江八景). Some other ones are less famous, like those of Kanazawa (now a district of Yokohama) (BAKER 2010). One must add the multiple allusions to these views which can be found in various gardens, more or less accessible to the public.



Evening bell at the monastery in the mist  
by Chen Fu (1259-1309). Source : Baidu.

What then could be the link between a place or view A, near lake Dongting in China, and a place or view non-A, near lake Biwa in Japan? Let us here outline a connection with logic and ontology. In this issue are at play two different substances, two different logical

subjects (S1 and S2, lakes Dongting and Biwa), which, eight times, are perceived as a same or analogous view (autumn moon on lake Dongting, etc.). In other words, the identity of predicate P (“be as a view of lake Dongting”) subsumes (engulfs) the non-identity of subjects S1 and S2.

If you are a geographer, such a thing is impossible. As a modern scientist, you are moved by that logic of the identity of the subject which we have inherited from Aristotle, and which has underlain modern classical science. This logic does not allow to confuse either the *ousia* or the *topos* of lake Dongting with those of lake Biwa. The matter is different, and the scene is elsewhere. Then, what founds the *mitate*, in which a same place can be another place, and another thing be the same thing? Probably the fact that we are in a same cultural field – the area of influence of the Chinese literary culture –, but still?

#### § 4. From possibilism to the logic of “as”

As a geographer, I have been in my youth nurtured on the thought of Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845-1918), father of the French school of geography. This school, which reigned in France until the sixties, was characterized by that which historian Lucien Febvre called *possibilism* (FEBVRE 1922), a now obsolete term which Roger Brunet could mock as follows:

“‘tenet’ attributed by Lucien Febvre to Vidal de la Blache, who however never expressed it. The matter is about a simple empirical attitude which consists in supposing that ‘Nature’ offers a certain range of ‘possibilities’, among which ‘Man’ ‘chooses’, it is unclear how; derived from : *pouvoir* [can]. It only remains to try to describe the momentary ‘impossible’, which depends closely on the technical state, resources and means. (...) Many geographers, afterwards, were satisfied with that empty label, which they thought might attribute them a sort of philosophical label”. (BRUNET 1992 : 358; my translation)

Seen from that angle, this indeed is not leading far away. Of the same generation as Brunet, Yves Lacoste

for his part conceived of that possibilism much less ferociously :

“Tenet attributed to Vidal de la Blache by opposition to the deterministic theses according to which the conditions of the natural environment, notably climatic data, would determine human activities. Vidal estimated that a same natural environment offers various possibilities to humans. One should rather say that human groups, given their tools, can take advantage in different ways from a same natural environment”. (LACOSTE 2003: 310-311; my translation)

Replaced in its historical context, possibilism was indeed much more than an “empty label”; it meant a refutation of the determinism which, at the time, dominated the German and Anglo-Saxon schools, no less. It showed that, would environmental conditions be similar, human societies can develop completely different *genres de vie* (lifestyles). No determination, then, but the contingency of history.

True, the said possibilism did not go so far as to challenge the very notion of milieu, a term which at the time was used in the sense in which we now talk of environment. It is in that sense that, as we have seen, the founder of mesology, Robin understood it. Yet, in its new sense of *Umweltlehre* and *fûdoron*, what mesology showed was exactly the same fact as possibilism did at about the same time; namely, that in a same environment, different species or cultures will have different milieux. The logic is the same, except that mesology brings the question much farther. Uexküll, in particular, goes as far as posing, and proving experimentally, that an object in itself does not exist for an animal; it exists for it only according to a certain “tone” (*Ton*), resulting from an operation which Uexküll names “tonation” (*Tönung*). This tonation makes that a same object will exist differently according to the species concerned. For instance, a same tuft of grass will exist as food for a cow, as an obstacle for an ant, as a shelter for a beetle, as drink for a cicada larvae, etc.; that is to say respectively on an *Esston*, a *Hinderniston*, a

*Schutzton*, a *Trinkton*, etc.

That “exist as” disrupted the substantialism which, until then, had ruled Western ontology and logic. Heidegger made no mistake, when he dedicated half his seminar of 1929-1930 to Uexküll – a seminar which, after his death, was published under the title *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik (The fundamental concepts of metaphysics)* (HEIDEGGER: 1983). For sure, thanks to a subtle shift, the matter here is about *Grundstimmung* (basic mood) rather than about *Ton* and *Tönung*. Yet, the idea remains the same, except that Heidegger precises the topic onto-logically. For instance, Uexküll’s demonstration according to which

“All the richness of the world surrounding the tick (*die Zecke umgebende Welt*) shrinks (*schnurrt zusammen*) and transforms itself into a poor image (*ein ärmliches Gebilde*), composed with only three sensible signs<sup>5</sup> (*Merkmalen*) and three agible signs<sup>6</sup> (*Wirkmalen*) : it is its milieu (*ihre Umwelt*). The pooriness (*Ärmlichkeit*) of the milieu, however, conditions the certainty of the activity, and certainty is more important than richness” (UEXKÜLL 1965: 29, my translation)

unfurls in Heidegger into the famous thesis according to which the stone is “worldless” (*weltlos*), the animal “worldpoor” (*weltarm*), and the human “world-making” (*weltbildend*) (HEIDEGGER 1983: § 42).

One shall not fail to notice that, in Uexküll, speaking of the “poorness” of the tick’s world is contradictory, since it is only if compared with the *Umgebung* (i.e. the *Umwelt* of our science) that this world may be deemed to be poor and reduced to a simple image. From the tick’s point of view, on the other hand, its *Umwelt* is just as complete and real as Plato, in the last few lines of the *Timaeus*, judged the *kosmos* to be from his human point of view (that is, as a human *Umwelt*): ὁ κόσμος οὕτω (...) μέγιστος καὶ ἄριστος κάλλιστός τε καὶ τελεώτατος γέγονεν (“Thus the world was born ... very big, good, beautiful and perfect”). Heidegger for his part, from a definitely anthropocentric (and more precisely logocentric) point of view, saw “worldpoorness as

<sup>5</sup> Or perceptual marks.  
<sup>6</sup> Or operational cue carriers.

world-deprivation" (*Entbehren von Welt*) (HEIDEGGER 1983 : § 46).

Where Heidegger innovates is, as said above, in considering that question from both a logic and an ontologic point of view. When commenting the enunciative proposition in Aristotle, he shows that the Stagirite, when speaking of *sunthesis* σύνθεσις,

" (...) means in fact what we call the structure of 'as' (*als-Struktur*). It is what he means, without really advancing expressly into the dimension of that problem. The *structure of 'as'*, the *in advance unifying perception* (*vorgängige einheitbildende Vernehmen*) of something as something (*etwas als etwas*), is the condition of possibility of the *truth* or the *falseness* of λόγος" (HEIDEGGER 1983: 456; Heidegger's italics, my translation).

This « in advance unifying perception », constitutive of a world (*Welt*), Heidegger assimilates it to the predication of "a as b", which makes that "a is b". It is the "structural moment of manifestness" (*Strukturmoment der Offenbarkeit*), by dint of which the things appear as something. It is the "as" of the being as such (*das Seiende als solches*), in sum the *qua* of the *ens qua ens*, the *hē ousiōtēs* of the *on hē on ousiōtēs* (HEIDEGGER 1983 : § 69).

However, Heidegger did not elaborate much farther this logic and this ontology of the "as". On the other hand, that is precisely what mesology has aimed at.

##### § 5. Capsizing the logic of the subject into that of the predicate will not suffice

According to Heidegger, as we just have seen, Aristotle did not venture into the problematic of "as". The opposite would have been surprising from the father of the logic of the identity of the subject, *alias* logic of the identity of substance, since a logic of the "as" is precisely not a logic of substance. When, in the logic of *mitate*, lake Biwa is looked at as lake Dongting, that can evidently not be a logic of substance. The substance of lake Biwa is not that of lake Dongting. The subject – that which the matter is about – is not the same. Then, what kind of logic is it?

We must here come back to some more geography. Geographers, indeed, would be the first to certify that lake Dongting (*Dongting hu* 洞庭湖) is not lake Biwa (*Biwa ko* 琵琶湖). Correlatively, Hiroshige cannot have heard, near lake Biwa in the evening mist, the same bell sound as Chen Fu round about lake Dongting, six centuries before. Then, if lake Biwa can *exist as* lake Dongting, that is certainly not geography.



Utagawa Hiroshige (1797-1858) *Evening bell at Mii monastery*.  
Source : Kokkai Toshokan.

Yet that was indeed as a geographer, and in an encyclopedia of geography, that I could one day write the following :

"Wouldn't the distinctive feature of geography be that it poses the question of that 'as' (*en tant que*), in which the physical and the social hold only in relation to each other? And in which the land, through resources, constraints, risks and amenities, the value of which is always relative (lived, perceived, conceived), is only the milieu in which human space unfurls, that environment which appears as a landscape, and which, in a feedback, humans develop in the sense of the representations they have of it. (...) basically, only a matter of different points of view on a same object". (BERQUE 1992: 367-368; my translation)

At the time, over a quarter of a century ago, I had read nothing of Uexküll nor of Heidegger. My questioning was purely geographical, and seen from to-day, purely in the wake of possibilism. If, however, I had come to talk of *en tant que* (as), it was because in the seventies, while preparing my thesis on the colonization of

Hokkaidō (BERQUE 1977, 1980), I had discovered that the reality of one and the same island might be very different depending on whether you were a Japanese peasant or an American agronomist. More specially, it was because, a few years later, I had discovered the custom of *mitate* in the history of landscape in Japan, in its perceptive array as well as in its material array; that is, in sum, in the reality of the Japanese milieu. And thence, I had come to understand that the reality of any human milieu is a matter of ambivalent *prises* (or affordances, in the vocabulary of GIBSON 1979) between nature and society; namely, that for human beings, the physical data of the environment *exist as* four main categories or predicates: resources, constraints, risks and amenities. The reality of these predicates is historical, and depends both on nature and society. For instance (let it be said to simplify), petroleum in itself is *not* a resource. It *exists as* a resource only inasmuch you have invented the combustion engine and petrochemistry. For the Inuit, who nevertheless had had it under their feet for millenia, the oil of Alaska simply did not exist. Then came oil companies, and the reality of the Alaskan milieu changed.

This problematic once established (BERQUE 1986, 1990), there remained to take head-on the question of "as" in its relation with reality. What does "exist as" mean? Back to the very term "category", which I was using about the issue of the said affordances, when I started to work – still as a geographer, since Vidal de la Blache had defined my discipline as a "science of places" (*science des lieux*) (ROBIC 1980) – on the "logic of place" (*basho no ronri* 場所の論理) of Nishida Kitarō (1870-1945), I discovered at the same time that Nishida, for saying the same thing, used as well the expression "logic of the predicate" (*jutsugo no ronri* 述語の論理) (NISHIDA 1927, 1945). In fact, rather than "place", a common translation of the term *basho* 場所 since it is its ordinary meaning, the Nishidian *basho* would more adequately be rendered with "field" or, better, "predicative field".

Almost at the same time, I discovered that Aristotle used *katēgoria* κατηγορία in the sense in which we now talk of "predicate": that is, what is said about a logical

subject, or a quality attributed to a certain substance. To say for example that "petroleum (S: subject: substance) is a resource (P: predicate: quality)" is an onto-logical equivalent of the geographical reality of oilfields as resources, and of the mesological reality "petroleum (S) exists as a resource (P)". In other words: in a certain predicative field – in a certain milieu –, petroleum is a resource, but, though it is still physically there in the environment, it is not a resource in all milieux and not at all times in human history (e.g. not for the Inuit until oil companies came on stage).

The said predicative field is also called by Nishida "historical world" (*rekishi sekai* 歴史世界), or straight out "predicate world" (*jutsugo sekai* 述語世界). That could well have met the Uexküllian *Ton*, and consequently Heidegger's *Welt*, by showing that a same logic is at work in the three cases: that of "as", i.e. *als* in German and *soku* 即 in Japanese. Such a meeting would have allowed to build a genuine logic of milieux – a *meso-logic* –, but, unhappily, it did not happen. Instead of searching for a middle course between Aristotelian logic, i.e. that of the identity of the subject (hereafter *IgS*) and his own logic of the predicate (hereafter *IgP*), Nishida only capsized *IgS* into its enantiomer, the absolutization of *IgP*, by assimilating P to absolute nothingness (*zettai mu* 絶対無), that is the pole opposite to that of substance (BERQUE ed. 2000, 2002). Now, absolutizing P is, *ipso facto*, absolutizing one's own world; in other words, lapsing into ethnocentrism and nationalism. Neither Nishida himself nor his followers, even to-day, realized that; but it is indeed what such a philosophy entails.

One can also show, in another direction, that this philosophy takes place, in more than one respect, in the wake of Buddhist thought. I will come back to this later; let us confine ourselves here to notice that Nishida's philosophical system tends to absolutize worldliness as absolute nothingness, *zettai mu* 絶対無.

This absolutization of the world, in Nishida, expresses itself notably by reducing systematically the Other to the Same. This is textually what means the formula which reigns supreme on his system: *zettai mujunteki jiko dôitsu* 絶対矛盾的自己同一, "absolutely contradictory self identity". Commenting such an oxymoron would

require pages, but what does it entail, really? That all the differences between beings are resolved in the self-identity of the world. Correlatively, in Nishidian phraseology, there are plenty of formulas – the preceding one to begin with – which allow to say any thing and its contrary; for instance, “worldwar must be worldwar for negating worldwar (*sekai sensô wo hitei suru tame no [...] sekai sensô*), for eternal peace (*eien no heiwa no tame*)” (NISHIDA 1945: 439). The last of the last, what else? One can also easily find in Nishida the idea that, if alterity is resolved in identity, the latter supposes the former, etc.; which allows to quibble indefinitely over the place of the Same and the Other in that philosophy.

Confronting these mirror games, what must not be forgotten is the absolute closure of this worldliness on itself. As a matter of fact, Nishida often uses the formula *sekai no jiko gentei* 世界の自己限定, « self-determination of the world ». This goes along with an absolute constructivism, in which, if every thing also determines itself, it ultimately comes down to the circularity of a world endowed with the will to create itself through the “absolutely contradictory self identity from what is created to what is creating” (*tsukurareta mono kara tsukuru mono e to mujunteki jiko dôitsuteki ni*) (NISHIDA 1945: 391): “Every thing determines itself baselessly (*mukiteiteki ni jiko jishin wo gentei suru*), that is, it holds its own self (*jiko jishin wo motsu*) from its very self-determination” (Id.: 390). “The historical world forms itself (*jiko jishin wo keisei suru*) self-formatively (*jikokeiseiteki ni*), as willing-active Being (*ishi sayôteki u toshite*) (Id.: 391).

In the scientific domain, one can easily find here what, for instance, inspired Imanishi Kinji’s idea that in evolution, contrary to Darwin’s theory (in which the evolution of the species is the mechanical result of the selection of individual organisms), it is the species which, as such, determines the course of its own evolution (IMANISHI 1980). Yet more generally, and ontologically, if the world is endowed with will and acts on its own, it is simply because it subsumes, as the nothingness of a predicative field, individual beings, and accordingly invests itself with the properties which

characterize individuals. It shall not be necessary to underline what this implies politically: the radical impossibility that Antigone ever opposes Creon, since Creon is... absolute nothingness!

As I have argued elsewhere (BERQUE 1998), Nishida’s philosophy holds in itself that at which expressly aimed the militarism of his time: to nihilate the responsibility of the citizen, by engulfing it in what Heidegger calls “the They” (*das Man*), and about which he writes “the They (...) each time takes away from the Dasein his responsibility”, since the They is “that about which we must say : it was nobody (*das, von dem wir sagen müssen, keiner war es*)” (HEIDEGGER 1993: 127). Just as that cunning Ulysses to Polyphemus: *Oudeis* οὐδείς (Nobody)!

Nishida adds p. 408 : “The world (...), that does not mean a world opposed to our self. It is nothing else than that which tends to express its absolute placehood (*zettai no bashoteki u wo arawasô to suru*), and this is why one can say that it is the absolute (*zettaisha* 絶対者)”, and p. 457: “That it comprises indefinitely this self-negation (*jiko hitei* 自己否定) is precisely the reason why the world exists just by itself (*sore jishin ni yotte ari*), moves by itself, and why one can consider it as absolute existence (*zettaiteki jitsuzai* 絶対的實在)”.

From the point of view of mesology, that does not stand up, since, for standing up, you need a ground on which to stand onto-logically (i.e. a *hupokeimenon*) as well as ecologically (i.e. an *Umgebung*). In a word, you need planet Earth, that *primum datum* which the various concrete milieux of the living species, including ours, have evolved from; whereas for Nishida’s absolute constructivism – a radical forerunner of the *French theory* –, the world has no ground : it is baseless (*mukitei* 無基底) (*op. cit., passim*).

## § 6. Overcoming the MCWP with the meso-logic of mesology

While we owe to Nishida the idea that the world is a predicative field (P) – for mesology, it is indeed the combination of all the “as” according to which we have a hold on things as something –, on the other hand, we cannot follow him in his absolutization of the predicate.

A world, whichever it is, cannot arise if not from an *Umgebung*, that is from the Earth, which is its *hupokeimenon* – its necessary base: S. Yet, this universal base does not exist – it does not *ek-sist* (stand out) from the gangue of its self-identity – if it is not drawn outside by a certain world (P) which, by predicating it, will assume it, *realize* it as something (*als etwas*, would say Heidegger). Hence the mesological idea that *reality is the assumption of S as P*, which I sum up with the formula  $r = S/P$  (reality is S as P) (BERQUE 2003).

What is here essential, and which characterizes the meso-logic of mesology, is that concretely, there cannot be S without P, nor P without S. Modern classic science, the dualism of which absolutizes the substance of the object (i.e. S: that which the matter is about) does exactly the opposite of what did Nishida, who absolutized P. In both cases, it is a profession of faith, since empirically, there is never S without P, nor the reverse. Without a certain predicate, S would remain forever closed up in mere virtuality, that of its self identity. This is what physics has discovered and proved experimentally in the XX<sup>th</sup> century, which led precociously Heisenberg to acknowledging that

“If one may speak of the image of nature according to the exact sciences of our time, one should understand here, rather than the image of nature, the image of our relationship with nature. (...) It is first and foremost the network of the relations between man and nature which that science is aiming at. (...) Science, ceasing to be the spectator of nature, recognizes itself as part of the reciprocal actions between nature and man. The scientific method, which chooses, explains, orders, admits the limits which are imposed on it by the fact that the use of the method transforms the object, and that, consequently, the method cannot anymore separate itself from its object”. (HEISENBERG 1962: 33-34)

This relational view was born, as we know, from the numerous paradoxes of quantum physics, such as the intrication of different states, non-separability or non-locality. We have here several analogies with the

problematic of milieux. That a same particle can, according to the experimental device, exist for us as a wave or as a corpuscle, or that two particles can behave as a same particle in two different places, such facts do not tally with the Aristotelian substance and topicity (placeness) proper to modern classic science. On the other hand, they are strangely consonant with such mesological notions as *mediance* (*fûdosei* 風土性) – defined by Watsuji as “the structural moment of human existence” (*ningen sonzai no kôzô keiki* 人間存在の構造契機 (WATSUJI 1979: 3) – i.e. the dynamic coupling of Being and its milieu –, *choresy* – the unfurling of a same predicative field, therefore extending a milieu over the environment –, *conrescence* – the growing-together of Being and its milieu –, etc. (BERQUE 2000, 2018 etc.) which characterize the empirical grasp of reality.

What then, for mesology, is the said “empirical grasp” ? It is the *trajection* of S as P, in other words the *realization* of S (the transformation of the virtuality of S into a reality S/P) through the senses, action (which concern all the living), thought (which concerns only superior animals) and language<sup>7</sup> (this is proper to the sole human). This is what concretely produces the reality (S/P) of milieux (S/P), those of the living in general as well as those of the human in particular. Now, this trajection is a process – historical or, at another time scale, evolutionary–, where indefinitely, through generations, new predicates P’, P”, P''' etc. overpredicate reality S/P into (S/P)/P’, ((S/P)/P’)/P”, (((S/P)/P’)/P’)/P''' etc., thus placing indefinitely S/P in position of S’ relatively to P’, then of S” relatively to P”, and so on. This is what I call a *trajective chain* (*chaîne trajective*, BERQUE 2014, *passim*). Now, taking into account the homology of the two couples subject/predicate in logic and substance/accident in metaphysics, this is to say that the predicate P, which is unsubstantial for Aristotle as well as for Nishida, will progressively be substantialized. This conversion of unsubstance into substance is traditionally called a hypostasis. A trajective chain is, then, the history of such a hypostasis, the evolution of a substantialization.

This is for instance what shows the history of human settlements. Hypostasis, in that case, was not only

<sup>7</sup> As defined by double articulation, not only the transmission of signs as in biosemiotics.

metaphysical, but eminently sensible and material. Starting from the myth of the Golden Age and its Chinese equivalent (*Datong*大同, the Great Identity), that is, from mere words (P), and through successive stages – mandarinal hermiticism and the invention of “landscape” in China, hence the realization of landscape gardens, hence of suburban villas inspired by the fabrics of such gardens, hence of modern suburbs, hence of urban sprawl, hence of our present way of life: diffuse urbanization, the ecological footprint of which is unsustainable –, it has entailed, three thousand years later, a telluric effect: global warming, a substantial S if any! (BERQUE 2010)

In that way, in the history of milieux, world P is indefinitely hypostatized into ground S, which indefinitely makes it the base (*hupokeimenon*) of further worlds P', P'', P''' and so on, and correlatively of new milieux S/P, S'/P', S''/P'' etc. Far from the self identity of substance, which is an abstraction, concrete reality is trajective; therefore, it is indefinitely a genesis of beings, a becoming of Being – precisely that which Plato, when trying to conceive of the *chôra*, called *genesis* γένεσις.

When he tried to overcome substantialism – that of Aristotle and Plato as well as that of Christianity –, why didn't Nishida think of a meso-logic, i.e. a logic of trajection and trajectivity (S/P) rather than of a logic of the predicate (lgP)? Because his inspiration fundamentally came from Buddhism (especially from Zen, which he practised), which precisely, as a religion, absolutizes its own predicates – in this case under the name of “ultimate truth” (Sanskrit *paramārtha*, translated in Chinese as *shengyi*勝義, pronounced *shôgi* in Japanese).

No wonder, this in fact is also what Christianity did when posing that the Word (which is intrinsically predicative, since it says something P about something S) is God (absolute subject : substance : S), paradigmatically so in the beginning of Saint John's Gospel : 1. In the beginning was the Word (Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος) ; 2. and the Word was with God [this is the canonical translation, but the Greek καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν can also be read : and the Word P was about God S]; 3. and the Word was God (καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος), i.e. P was S.

What we can see here, in a sublime shortcut, is the essence of what happens in trajective chains, where there is – but progressively, historically and evolutionarily – a hypostasis of P into S, and where, unless through the mystic leap of religious faith, one cannot ever return to the initial genuine S. We find that same hypostasis of the predicate in the Koran, said to be God's Word itself. Etc. It is the logic of myth, which is a hypostasis of unsubstance (P) into substance (S). This is indeed what Roland Barthes showed in his *Mythologies* when defining myth as the effect of a “semiological chain” in which a former sign (the signifier S<sup>a</sup> as the signified S<sup>é</sup>, = S as P) becomes in its turn the signifier (S<sup>a</sup> = S') of a further signified (S<sup>é</sup> = P', i.e. S'/P') (BARTHES 1957). To be sure, Barthes did not use exactly the same formulas as the above trajective chains, but the underlying logic is the same: that of a hypostasis.

Yet there is an essential difference between Christianity and Buddhism, in that the latter is precisely antipodal to substantialism. On the contrary, it poses that all is relation, and elaborates this relativity with a great conceptual luxury, from which Nishida, had he not been obsessed with the idea of capsizing Aristotle's lgS into its enantiomer lgP, might have taken a more meso-logical party. Whereas he only speaks of absolute nothingness and baselessness, Buddhism for its part also speaks of “propping” (sk *nīśraya*, cn *yizhi* 依止, jp *aji* or *eshi*), namely that the relations, while being unsubstantial, support each other. The *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra* (one of the founding classics of Mahayana Buddhism) writes for example : “It is because they have no proper nature that (all the *dharma*) arise / The anterior props the posterior (*Wu ziti gu cheng, qian wei hou yizhi* 無自體故成、前為後依止)” (GIRARD 2008: vol. I, p. 212).

There is much in common between the said “propping” and the trajective chains of mesology, a reason for which I came to speak of “trajective propping” (*calage trajectif*). In the trajective linkage of a mesological chain, each posterior predicate tends to hypostatize an anterior S/P, thus establishing a new link in the chain, on which it can prop itself as on a ground (*hupokeimenon*). This can exactly be represented by the

formula *qian wei hou yizhi* 前為後依止. Yet there is an essential difference, namely that Buddhism does not consider this as a hypostasis at all : the *dharma* arise because of their very unsubstance, and while propping each other, remain unsubstantial. For mesology, such an absolutization of unsubstance is a mystic leap, typical of a religion. From a Buddhist point of view, considering *nīśraya* as a hypostasis, were it relative and progressive, would be nothing else than a heresy; but this is precisely the stance of mesology.

Another concept of Buddhism seems to have much in common with mesology : *paryāya*, which has been rendered with *catégoriel* (categorical) (CORNU 2001: 799). Xuanzang (600-664) translated it with “different door”, *yimen* 異門 (jp *imon*) (YAMAUCHI 1974 : 315). The idea is that there are different accesses to a same thing, none of which can be deemed to be else than a mundane truth – ultimate truth being precisely that there is no proper nature of the thing. These “different doors” seem to be homologous with the “as” of mesology, and particularly with Uexküllian “tones” (*Töne*), which are never the object in itself, but somehow a certain access to the object, respectively proper to each different species. It is the same in human milieux: for instance, that which for a certain culture can exist as a delicacy (S/P), can also be considered as uneatable (S/P') by another culture, independently from what the object is in itself (S). Here then, predicate P corresponds to Xuanzang's *yimen*.

These various relations combine themselves into what Buddhism named *prajñapti* in Sanskrit, and *paññatti* in Pāli. This term is ordinarily rendered with “conceptualization” or “designation”, but I prefer to render it with “array” (*agencement*), having in mind, on the one hand, what evokes its Chinese translation *shise* 施設 (jp *sesetsu*), and on the other hand Heidegger's *Gestell* and Foucault's *dispositif* (AGAMBEN 2006). In mesological terms, it is the choresy (extension of a predicative field; from the Greek χόρησις, action of going forward) of a certain milieu (S/P). About such array, Yamauchi writes the following (*op. cit.* : 323-324, my translation):

“As Hinayana Buddhism, in general, holds that all exists<sup>8</sup>, and grasps the diverse beings not as void (*kū* 空) but as there-is (*u* 有), the thought of array, for that reason, was more than additive. It is probably for that reason that it detailed to the utmost the concept of ‘*sesetsu*施設-array’, which one may trace back to Foyin (Buddhagosa)'s *The error of human array*<sup>9</sup>. The term which *sesetsu*施設-array translated, *paññatti*, seems grossly synonymous with the *prajñapti* of Mahayana Buddhism, but whereas the latter is very abstruse, the former was conceived as an explicit doctrine, which expresses clearly its link with the thought of the *Abhidharma*. According to the research made by Mr Sasaki (Sasaki Genjun, *Research on the thought of the Abidharma*), the various acceptations of *paññatti* are the following. Most generally, it means ‘law contained in a certain limit’ (*paricchinna dhamma*), which expresses that ‘absoluty offers aspects limited by categorized significations’. This is to say that the general meaning of *sesetsu*施設-array is that absolute things, through self-determination, present various concrete aspects. Just in the same way as, for example, in a bedroom, bed and chair are not laid out no matter how, but disposed in order, first conceived then laid out, and only so all is ready. *Patthāpeti* is to install, but *paññatti* signifies, more upstream, ‘let know’, ‘reveal’. Above all, as an ‘array which lets exist’<sup>10</sup>, it meant first reveal, announce Being itself<sup>11</sup>. In order to reveal, to let people know what a thing is, what Being is, you need some equipment<sup>12</sup>. It is the first condition for letting Being be manifestly there<sup>13</sup>”.

This “array which lets exist” must be compared with what has been said above under the name of trajection. Trajection indeed is that which lets exist (*ek-sist*, stand out) S as P, i.e. S/P, a reality which is not S in itself (the Real, that ideal goal of physics), and therefore can be held as that which physicist and philosopher Bernard d'Espagnat called “veiled real” (*réel voilé*) (D'ESPAGNAT 1979, 1994, 2002). Mesology also, when speaking of the trajectiveness of things, means that they

<sup>8</sup> *Ubu*有部, abbreviation of *Setzu issai u bu* 說一切有部 : Sarvāstivādin (A.B.).

<sup>9</sup> *Jin sesetsuron kai*, cn *Ren shishelun gua* 人施設論註, pl *Puggalapaññattipali* (AB).

<sup>10</sup> *Sonzai seru sesetsu* 存在せる施設.

<sup>11</sup> *Sonzai sono mono wo kajiji shi, kokuji suru* 存在そのものを開示し、告示する.

<sup>12</sup> *Setsubi* 設備.

<sup>13</sup> *Sore wa sonzai wo shite gen ni soko ni aru mono tarashimeru dai ichi no jōken de aru* それは存在をして現にそこにあるものたらしめる第一の条件である.

are a veiled real, which never can be the object in itself. On the other hand, for considering like Buddhism that, in certain conditions, ultimate truth can be attained, one needs a mystic leap – that which is proper to religion, and which mesology refuses to do. For mesology indeed, attaining the absolute (S) would *ipso facto* be trajecting it into S/P.

To be sure, Buddhism does not deal with S in the same meaning as Europe understood it (the subject : substance), but considers on the contrary the vacuity (*sūnyatā*) and thusness or tality (*tathatā*) of things, which one could in sum understand as the “as” of “S as P”, but without S. This could be represented with the following formula: /P. The “as” indeed is neither S nor P, but what relates them and therefore is neither substance (S) nor unsubstance (P).

Now, this “neither...nor” is a binegation, which corresponds here to an impossibility in Aristotelian logic, since it infringes the law of excluded middle by posing : neither A, nor non-A (i.e. neither substance nor unsubstance). The trajectiveness of concrete reality infringes effectively the law of excluded middle, which, on the other hand, has reigned over Western classic rationalism at least since the *Timaeus* excluded, as unthinkable, the “third and other gender” (*triton allo genos* τρίτον ἄλλο γένος, 48 e 3) of *chōra*, which is neither absolute Being nor relative being. And the fact is that the law of excluded middle still reigns over Western thought, making for example that quantum physics has still not been rationally integrated into the rest of physics.

Following Yamauchi, I shall consider binegation as the third (not the fourth) lemma of the tetralemma, the fourth lemma being then biassertion (both A and non-A). It is indeed essential to put biassertion in fourth and last position, since, instead of closing everything on nihilism, on the contrary it opens up all the possibilities of singular milieux (S/P) on the ground of a universal environment (S). That was the essence of Vidal’s possibilism as well as of Uexküll’s *Umweltlehre*, as seen above. Yet, both the third and the fourth lemma instantiate the same “third and other gender” of milieu, that is a meso-logic which overcomes trajectively both dualism and the law of excluded middle.

Effectively, from the meso-logical point of view of mesology, understanding concrete reality requires precisely the ternarity of the “third and other gender” excluded not only by the dualism of the MCWP, but also by the mystical absolutization of unsubstance P as well as by the scientific absolutization of substance S. Being S as P, reality is necessarily on the move (in trajection) midway between S and P, because this, concretely, always necessitates a third term I, the interpreter of S as P, be it human or non-human or even, as in quantum physics, a purely material experimental device. Concrete reality is neither S nor P, it is the ternarity of S-I-P, i.e. S as P for I. By the same token, reality is neither purely objective, nor purely subjective, but always trajective.

\*  
\* \*

To conclude, why the deuce should we need such an onto-logic? Just because absolutizing S or P is to foreclose the existence of any interpreting I, which as far as we humans are concerned, is first and foremost a human being, whose mediance necessarily depends on a certain milieu, which in its turn necessarily comprises other living beings and their respective milieux<sup>14</sup>. Now, onto-logically, the MCWP, with its dualism and its exclusion of the middle, precisely forecloses the existence of the third term I, which concretely makes trajection (*ek-sistence*) possible. This foreclosure, following the principle of Mount Horeb, first and foremost abstracts our existence from its structural moment (our mediance), an abstraction which in fact, far from absolutizing it, virtually amounts to annihilating our very Being, deprived of its nurturing *chōra*. Concretely, this means that, by dint of abstracting our existence from our milieu, we may well, sooner or later, delete ourselves from the surface of the Earth, swept away by the Sixth Extinction which the MCWP has triggered off. This is precisely the onto-logical reason we have for overcoming the MCWP with the meso-logic of mesology.

Palaiseau, 5 July 2018.

## REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, Giorgio (2006) *Che cos'è un dispositivo? (What is an array ?)*. Rome : Nottetempo.
- ARISTOTE (1996) *Physique, I-IV*. Paris : Les Belles Lettres.
- AUGENDRE, Marie, LLORED, Jean-Pierre, NUSSAUME, Yann (ed., 2018) *La Mésologie, un autre paradigme pour l'anthropocène ? (Mesology, another paradigm for the Anthropocene ?)*. Paris : Hermann.
- BAKER Jennifer (2010) *The Eight Views : from its origin in the Xiao and Xiang rivers to Hiroshige*. College of Arts at the University of Canterbury.
- BAILLY, Antoine, FERRAS, Robert, PUMAIN, Denise (eds, 1992), *Encyclopédie de géographie (Encyclopedia of geography)*. Paris : Economica.
- BARTHES, Roland (1957) *Mythologies*. Paris : Seuil.
- BERQUE, Augustin (1977) *Les Grandes terres de Hokkaidō. Étude de géographie culturelle (The wide land of Hokkaidō. A study in cultural geography)*. Paris IV University.
- Id. (1980) *La Rizière et la banquise. Colonisation et changement culturel à Hokkaidō (Ricefield and icefield. Colonization and cultural change in Hokkaidō)*. Paris : Publications orientalistes de France.
- Id. (1986) *Le Sauvage et l'artifice. Les Japonais devant la nature (The Savage and the artificial. The Japanese and Nature)*. Paris : Gallimard.
- Id. (1990, 2000) *Médiance. De milieux en paysages (Mediance. From milieu to landscape)*. Paris : Belin & RECLUS
- Id. (1992) Espace, milieu, paysage, environnement (Space, milieu, landscape, environment), p. 352-369 in BAILLY & al.
- Id. (1998) Tôkyô, ou le champ du prédicat (Tokyo, or the field of the predicate), *Techniques, territoires et sociétés*, 35, oct. 1998, 99-106.
- Id. (2000) *Écoumène. Introduction à l'étude des milieux humains (Ecumene. Introduction to the study of human milieux)*. Paris : Belin.
- Id. (ed., 2000) *Logique du lieu et dépassement de la modernité (Logic of place and the overcoming of modernity)*. Bruxelles : Ousia, 2 vol.

- Id. (2002) La logique du lieu dépasse-t-elle la modernité ? (*Does the logic of place overcome modernity?*), p. 41-52, and Du prédicat sans base : entre *mundus* et *baburu*, la modernité (On the baseless predicate : between *mundus* and *baburu*, modernity), p. 53-62 in Livia MONNET (ed.) *Approches critiques de la pensée japonaise au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle (Critical approaches of Japanese thought in the XX<sup>th</sup> century)*. Montreal : Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Id. (2003) Shizen to iu bunka (Culture as nature), p. 7-23 in KIHEI Eisaku (ed.) *Shizen to iu bunka no shatei (The range of culture as nature)*. Kyôto: Kyôto Daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyûka.
- Id. (2010) *Histoire de l'habitat idéal, de l'Orient vers l'Occident (History of the ideal abode, from East to West)*. Paris: Le Félin.
- Id. (2012) “La *chōra* chez Platon” (*Chōra* in Plato), p. 13-27 in Thierry PAQUOT and Chris YOUNÈS (eds.) *Espace et lieu dans la pensée occidentale (Space and place in Western thought)*. Paris : La Découverte.
- Id. (2013) *Thinking through landscape*. Abingdon : Routledge.
- Id. (2014 a) *Poétique de la Terre. Histoire naturelle et histoire humaine, essai de mésologie (Poiesis of the Earth. Natural history and human history, an essay in mesology)*. Paris : Belin.
- Id. (2014 b) *La Mésologie, pourquoi et pour quoi faire ? (Mesology, why and what for ?)*. Nanterre La Défense : Presses universitaires de Paris Ouest.
- Id. (2018) *Glossaire de mésologie (A Glossary of mesology)*. Bastia : éditions Éoliennes.
- BRUNET, Roger et al. (1992) *Les mots de la géographie. Dictionnaire critique (The words of geography. A critical dictionary)*. Montpellier/Paris : RECLUS/La Documentation française.
- CANGUILHEM, Georges (1968) *Études d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences concernant les vivants et la vie (Studies in the history and philosophy of sciences relating to the living and to life)*. Paris : Vrin.
- CORNU, Philippe (2001) *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme (Encyclopedic dictionary of Buddhism)*. Paris : Seuil.
- DESCARTES, René (2008) (1637) *Discours de la*

<sup>14</sup> In the case of quantum physics, being a material device, the interpreter (I) for sure is not a living being, but it exists only inasmuch as it is conceived, made and read by a human being I'. This amounts to a trajective chain; and even at the ontological level of

the device itself, the fact is that in physics, what for instance is called “von Neumann chain” (D'ESPAGNAT 2002: 128 sqq) is also quite analogous with a trajective chain.

- méthode. Méditations métaphysiques (Discourse on the method. Metaphysical meditations)*. Paris : Flammarion.
- D'ESPAGNAT, Bernard *À la recherche du réel. Le regard d'un physicien (In search of the real. A physicist's look)*. Paris : Dunod.
  - Id. (1994) *Le réel voilé : analyse des concepts quantiques (Veiled real. An analysis of quantum concepts)*. Paris : Fayard.
  - Id. (2002) *Traité de physique et de philosophie (Treatise of physics and philosophy)*. Paris : Fayard.
  - FEBVRE, Lucien (1922) *La Terre et l'évolution humaine. Introduction géographique à l'histoire (The Earth and human evolution. A geographical introduction to history)*. Paris: Albin Michel.
  - GIBSON, James J. (1979) *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
  - GIRARD, Frédéric (2008) *Vocabulaire du bouddhisme japonais (Vocabulary of Japanese Buddhism)*. Geneva : Droz, 2 vol.
  - GRAY, Chris Hable (ed., 1995) *The Cyborg Handbook*. New York and London: Routledge.
  - HEIDEGGER, Martin (1983) *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik (The fundamental concepts of metaphysics)*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
  - Id. (1993) (1927) *Sein und Zeit (Being and time)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
  - HEISENBERG, Werner (1962) (1955) *La nature dans la physique contemporaine (Nature in contemporary physics)*. Paris : Gallimard.
  - IMANISHI, Kinji (1980) *Shutaisei no shinkaron (Subjecthood in evolution)*. Tokyo: Chûô Kôron.
  - LACOSTE, Yves (2003) *De la géopolitique aux paysages. Dictionnaire de la géographie (From geopolitics to landscapes. Dictionary of geography)*. Paris : Armand Colin.
  - LAVELLE, Pierre (1994) Nishida, l'École de Kyôto et l'ultranationalisme (Nishida, the Kyôto school and ultranationalism), *Revue philosophique de Louvain*, XCXII, 4.
  - NAKAMURA, Yoshio (1982) *Fûkeigaku nyûmon (Introduction to landscape studies)*. Tokyo: Chûkô shinsho.
  - NISHIDA, Kitarô (1927) *Basho (Lieu, 1927)*, pp. 208-289 in vol. IV of *Nishida Kitarô zenshû (Complete works of Nishida Kitarô)*. Tokyo, Iwanami, 1966.
  - Id. (1945) *Bashoteki ronri to shûkyôteki sekaikan (Logic of place and religious worldview)*, pp. 37-463 in vol. XI of *Nishida Kitarô zenshû (Complete works of Nishida Kitarô)*. Tokyo, Iwanami, 1966.
  - PLATON (1985) *Timée, Critias*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
  - ROBIC, Marie-Claire (1980) Sur un lieu commun de la géographie : "la géographie est la science des lieux et non celle des hommes" (On a common place of geography : "geography is the science of places, not that of men"), p. 114-119 in : *Géopoint 80 : Axiomes ou principes en géographie*. Avignon : Groupe Dupont.
  - UEXKÜLL, Jakob von (1965) (1934) *Streifzüge durch die Umwelten von Tieren und Menschen. Bedeutungslehre (Raids into the milieux of animals and humans. The study of sinification)*. Hamburg : Rowohlt.
  - WATSUJI, Tetsurô (1979) (1935) *Fûdo. Ningengakuteki kôsetsu (Milieux. A study of human betweenness)*. Tokyo : Iwanami.
  - YAMAUCHI, Tokuryû (1974) *Rogosu to renma (Logos and lemma)*. Tokyo: Iwanami.