

**In Search of a Contemporary World View:
Contrasting Thomistic and Whiteheadian Approaches**
Vision Paper

Open Access

Tokiyuki Nobuhara*

Divine Ecozoics and Whitehead’s Adventure or Resurrection Metaphysics

DOI 10.1515/opth-2015-0031

Received August 30, 2015; accepted September 7, 2015

Abstract: My proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity seeks to find the ground of ecology of the world in the fact that God is loyal to the place / *Eco* of emptiness as it empties itself, thereby paradoxically manifesting God as the only one in the universe who can and does actually evoke loyalty / life (Gr., *Zoe*) in us creatures. Thus, it endeavors to give a theological rationale to Thomas Berry’s idea of the Ecozoic Era. The proposal of Divine Ecozoics challenges Sallie McFague’s idea of the world as “God’s body” by advocating that God has God’s own secret indwelling place before entertaining the world as God’s visible body. The present essay, however, is endowed with the Johannine-Whiteheadian idea of the Great Friend with which to critically qualify my general argument for Divine Ecozoics. The vision of the Great Friend transmutes the general view of the reality into its unity of appearance, or the co-resurrection of the Son and of us creatures.

Keywords: Divine Ecozoics, Adventure, Resurrection, Thomas Berry, Sallie McFague, Whitehead, Ryokan

Introduction

As I demonstrated in my previous two essays on Divine Ecozoics—Part I: “The Problem of the Two Ultimates and the Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity: In Dialogue with Thomas Berry and Sallie McFague”¹ and Part II: “Forty Theses on an Ecozoics of the Deity: Delivered at Oxford (July 30, 2013)—Vindicating the Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity: In Dialogue with Thomas Berry, Sallie McFague, Anselm, Aquinas, Whitehead, and Nishida While in Tandem with Jesus’ Theology and the New Cosmology”²—the idea of an “Divine Ecozoics” is the way in which I wanted to elucidate and articulate the relationship between God and ecology. Within this particular context, I took up two topics I have recently been most strongly concerned with, namely, the “problem of the two ultimates in interreligious dialogue” and ecology the crux of which has been termed “the Ecozoic Era” by Thomas Berry and gave a certain twist to them to deliver my thesis on the “Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity.”

In the present paper³ I would like to manifest that I have found the vision of the Great Friend who connects God and the world in John 15:15 and that this vision cultivates a new avenue from Divine Ecozoics toward Whitehead’s notion of Adventure or Resurrection Metaphysics. This is because I critically noticed

¹ See Faber and Slabodsky, *Conviviality*.

² See *Bulletin of Keiwa College*, No. 23, February 28, 2014, 149-172.

³ The paper was delivered at the 10th International Whitehead Conference: Seizing an Alternative: Toward an Ecological Civilization, at Pomona College, Claremont, U.S.A., June 4-7, 2015.

***Corresponding author:** Tokiyuki Nobuhara, Keiwa College, Japan, E-mail: tnbhara@cocoa.ocn.ne.jp

that my threefold vision of the theology of loyalty which is so essentially prerequisite for the formation of my idea of Divine Ecozoics was not really precise at one point. My theology of loyalty consists of three principles, namely, (1) God is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity; (2) Emptiness empties itself; and (3) God is the only one in the universe who can and does actually evoke loyalty in us creatures. The first principle in reference to the divine loyalty to Emptiness/Creativity was generally descriptive but was not really precise in the matter of Christology. In this connection, I paid crucial attention to two passages in the New Testament which, I found, are important not only religiously, but also metaphysically.

I do not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father (John 15:15).

Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect (Matt. 4:48).

In these passages it is noticeable that Jesus as the Great Friend is two-dimensionally directed: i.e., toward the Father and toward us his disciples at the same time. His personality lies in the fact that he hears from and sees the Father while at the same time calling upon his disciples to be loyal and perfect just as the Father is.

With this vision of the Great Friend in mind metaphysically as well as religiously, I think I can opt for a critical review of my Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity in Section I while at the same time launching myself on a new enterprise of thinking together with Whitehead as regards what he calls *Adventure* which I designate as *Resurrection Metaphysics* in Section II. Before embarking on a long journey dealing with Sections I and II, however, I need to write an overview of the Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity in order to give the reader a map for a preview of where we are going.

Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity - An Overview

The Term “Ecozoic”

“Ecozoic” is a neologism created by Thomas Berry⁴ for describing a geological epoch following the Cenozoic Era and it signifies something like “Eco or *Oikos*, standing in Greek for a house or a dwelling place, plus *Zoe* meaning life.” The reason for this neologism is that Berry as a geologist (meaning Earth-theologian) is deeply convinced that in view of the outrageous fact that our present modern industrial petroleum civilization has used almost 80 % of fossil fuels, especially of petroleum, for our fuel and energy during the last three centuries (especially between mid-19th century and mid-21st century), we need to transcend the present civilization in such a way that humans might be able to live in conformity with the entire life community of the Earth.

The Twist of the Problem of the Two Ultimates into Ecology

I said earlier that my proposal came out of my concern with the problem of the two ultimates as it is twisted into ecology or, rather more correctly, the Ecozoic Era. What I mean by the twist involved herein is the possibility of thinking in the following manner: namely, the relationship between God (as the religious ultimate) and Buddhist emptiness or the Whiteheadian creativity (as the metaphysical ultimate). They are both at the core of the problem of the two ultimates and would lead us to think that the way in which the former “is located within” the latter as the invisible place (what Kitaro Nishida calls the place of absolute *Nothingness*) might be grasped as the content (even the divine content or abyss) of such an ecology.

⁴ Thomas Berry started his academic career as a researcher of the history of Western thought by writing in 1951 a treatise entitled *The Historical Theory of Giambattista Vico*. As a Catholic thinker he was a successor to Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's evolutionary thought. He is renowned for his *Dream of the Earth* (1988) and *The Universe Story* (with Brian Swimme, 1994). He called himself a geologist because he thinks theologically through the Earth.

The Problem of the Two Ultimates Being “Ecologized”

In the above case, what is crucial is to think that God’s mode of being within the place of metaphysical ultimate (i.e., absolute *Nothingness*) defines our ecological thinking at its core. In other words, the problem of the two ultimates is now to be incorporated into ecology, thus being “ecologized,” as it were. Thus, it is possible for us to “substitute” the “problem of the two ultimates” for the framework of ecological thinking. Especially, as in my own case, when we designate ecology in terms of Thomas Berry’s rendering of “Ecozoic” (namely, in the sense of “*Oikos*=*Zoe* or the Dwelling Place giving rise to Life), this “substitution” might be regarded as persuasively appropriate.

Divine Ecozoics Preceding Ecology of the World in Ecological Theology

When it comes to substituting the “problem of the two ultimates” for Ecozoic thinking, there is, however, an important presupposition. That is the fact that I think it proper to consider the “ecology of the Deity” prior to the “ecology of the world.” We usually make it a rule to consider the ecology of the world under the heading of ecology. However, this would not be sufficiently proper when we think about ecology, at least theologically. We should rather think of the ecology of the Deity before considering the “ecology of the world”—and this as its presupposition. And specifically, when we have learned from Thomas Berry about the “Ecozoic” way of thinking as the deeper level of ecological thinking, we are led to a new science which I might designate “an Ecozoics of the Deity.” This is what my proposal is all about.

God as not Simply a “Pure Spirit”, but Located within God’s Proper Dwelling Place

Thinking of the ecology of God or the Ecozoics (i.e., *Oikos*/Life science) of the Deity implies that God’s proper Dwelling Place or *Oikos* is such that, while getting in touch with the world, God locates God’s unique place in God’s own inner depth-realm. In Jesus’ phraseology, we might have to attend to his statement to the Apostles that “Your Father is in the secret place” (Matt. 6: 6a). It is precisely because of this that Jesus then said to them: “Your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly” (Matt. 6: 6b). If this is the case, then we cannot think of God as simply a “pure spirit.”

The Human Self as a “Pure Spirit”—*res cogitans* at Descartes

At the beginning of the Modern Age René Descartes is said to have awakened to the human self in the form of “pure spirit” which he termed *res cogitans*. This self was perceived as a subject who exists apart from the body-world (or *res extensa*) and sees itself as object. The human subject for Descartes was one that needs nothing other than itself in order to exist—namely, a substance.⁵ Viewed in this way, God in God’s pure aseity might well be conceived as a bodyless or placeless “naked spirituality.” We might then think that God as a pure spirituality that can be housed in the world as God’s body, a proposal which opts for the idea of a theology of the body of God. My proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity denies such a theology of God’s body insofar as it lacks the vision of an Original Dwelling Place for God.

God’s Double Hidden Selfhood as Constituted by *Oikos*/*Zoe* or Eco-Zoic Dynamics

Hence, when we reflect upon theology as the Ecozoics of the Deity while incorporating into its core the newest achievements of ecology, we must recognize (1) that because God is Life (*Zoe*) being located (*ad intra*) within the Original Dwelling Place (*Oikos*), (2) God is also capable of manifesting this double Hidden Selfhood (constituted by the Place/Life or *Oikos*/*Zoe* dynamics) toward (*ad extra*) the world on the basis

⁵ While repudiating Descartes’ substance philosophy severely, Whitehead does not fail to acknowledge and praise that he attended to the subject’s enjoying conscious experiences as providing the primary data for philosophy. This is due to his new theory of the “reformed subjectivist principle.” (Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 159; hereafter cited as PR).

of God's inner ground. Since this inner divine ground is at the same time the ground of the world, thereby "making the world God's own body," Jesus' precept "Thy will be done on earth as well as in heaven" that appears in the third place in the Lord's Prayer is also inherent in our Ecozoic theology. The "Ecozoics (i.e., Place/Life science) of the Deity" thus becomes a new form of theology in our ecological age which Thomas Berry designates the Ecozoic Era.

Section I. A Critical Review of Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity

In what follows let me put forward an argument for my proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity that involves citing the original text and then critically appraising its validity. The original text of my proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity has five components: (1) The Problem of the Two Ultimates and the Emergence of Our Trust in the two Ultimates: Jodoshinshu and Christianity; (2) Learning from Cobb's Theory of "The Two Ultimates": A Proposal of Three Principles in my Theology of Loyalty Owing to the Elevation of "The Emergence of Trust"; (3) Thomas Berry on the Salvation of the Earth: His Vision of the Ecozoic Era; (4) The Ontological Integration of the Universe: Kitaro Nishida and Ryokan on the Thought of the "Turning Point"; and (5) A Critique of Sallie McFague's Theology of the "Body of God": I will develop a self-critical appraisal of each of the components—and this from the perspective of the "Great Friend" theology, as I mentioned earlier. By so doing, I think, I will be able to establish my vision of "Whitehead's Adventure or Resurrection Metaphysics in Tandem with Ryokan," in Section II. I firmly believe that an authentic "Great Friend" Christology introduces us into the realm of metaphysics appropriately, as Jesus prayerfully expressed it in the following manner:

Father, I desire that those also, whom you have given me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory, which you have given me because you loved me before the foundation of the world (John 17: 24).

Component I. The Problem of the Two Ultimates and the Emergence of Our Trust in the Ultimates: Jodoshinshu and Christianity

As is well known, in Jodoshinshu (Pure Land Buddhism) this issue of the emergence of trust is considered only in terms of "Amida's sincerity or loyalty." It doesn't lie in any sentient human faculty (including reason, the will, and sentiment or imagination) since all of them are heavily contaminated with wickedness and depravity. Originally, it only lies in the purity and truthfulness of Amida's causal religious practice in the person of Bodhisattva Hozo (Skt., *Dharmakara*). Consequently, we solely rely upon Amida's directing of virtue in order to produce in ourselves the desire to trust. At the core of the issue of the emergence of trust as it is embodied in "Amida's sincerity or loyalty" is Amida's Primal Vow, especially the 18th Vow which runs as follows:

If, after my obtaining Buddhahood, all beings in the ten quarters should not desire in sincerity and truthfulness to be born in my country, and if they should not be born by only thinking of me for ten times, except those who have committed the five grave offences and those who are abusive of the true Dharma, may I not attain the Highest Enlightenment.⁶

This willingness of *non-attainment* of the Highest Enlightenment by Amida for the sake of saving sentient beings is peculiar to Amida's sincerity or loyalty.⁷ It implies the salvific meaningfulness for us sentient beings of what Cobb in his essay on the two ultimates refers to as the standpoint of *Sambhogakaya* (Body of Bliss, or Amida) in relation to *Dharmata Dharmakaya* (Dharma-nature Dharma-body, or Emptiness), namely, the standpoint as it is qualified with wisdom and compassion.

⁶ Suzuki, *A Miscellany of the Shin Teaching of Buddhism*, 2-3.

⁷ See Nobuhara, "Sunyata," *Japanese Religions*, 15/4, July 1989, 50-66, esp. 61-63. See also Nobuhara, *A Theology of Loyalty*, 24-26, 162; hereafter cited as TL.

Inasmuch as Amida expresses his will of salvation for the sake of us sentient beings who are not enlightened, in saying, “May I not attain the Highest Enlightenment, if they should not be born by only thinking of me for ten times,” those in the Pure Land Buddhist Sect founded by Shinran in 13th Century have been perceiving “Amida’s sincerity or loyalty.”

A parallel case is found in those Christians who believe in the “righteousness of God by virtue of the faith of Jesus as the Christ (*dikaiosune de theou dia pisteos Iesou Xristou*)” (as found, for instance, in NRSV and NKJV); they, however, are mistaken in rendering it as: “the righteousness of God through faith *in* Jesus Christ.” The original intention of Paul was to say that the “righteousness of God” emerges in the very faith of Jesus as the Christ who believes, even if we don’t believe, in God.⁸ In this case, what Paul means by the “righteousness of God” is, primarily and fundamentally, a rightful mode of human existence appearing in the God-man Jesus who was sent by God; while, secondarily and derivatively, it signifies the righteousness by which God justifies us sinners (*iustitia qua nos iustus faciens*—Martin Luther) insofar as we entrust ourselves to Jesus the Christ and put on him (Rom. 13: 14) because God views us through him and reckons us as righteous although we are faithless and unrighteous in the presence of God. The righteousness of God in and through Jesus the Christ, in a nutshell, is forgiveness.

With this twofold structure of the righteousness of God in Jesus the Christ in mind, Karl Barth puts the motif of the obedience of the Son of God (der Gehorsam des Sohnes Gottes) at the center of his doctrine of reconciliation (i.e., the Incarnation) as developed in *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1. What is inherent in the notion of “obedience” for Barth is that there are in God “an above and a below, a *prius* and a *posteriorius*, a superiority and a subordination.”⁹ In fulfilling his obedience vis-à-vis the Father to the full, Jesus has lived up to the inner principle of the Incarnation, thus going through and beyond its outer principle, that of suffering.

Critique and Evaluation of Component I

My new theological perspective of Jesus as the Great Friend who sees and hears from the Father while calling his disciples “friends” rather than “servants” is attentive to the fact that God’s loyalty to Emptiness, which is the first principle of my theology of loyalty, has an inner structure in which the Son is obedient to the Father. This inner structure reminds us of Karl Barth’s doctrine of reconciliation that I mentioned above. In this sense, I must evaluate this part of my argument as rightful and important. However, my inclusion of Barth’s famous doctrine of *der Gehorsam des Sohnes Gottes* in the text of Component I was not meant to be a part of my theology of loyalty as a metaphysical theology. My new perception is to say that the Son’s obedience to the Father is an inner structure or a corollary of the theology of loyalty.

If viewed in that manner, the parallel case in Jodoshinshu of Amida’s sincerity or loyalty to Emptiness emptying itself may need a further clarification. Usually, in Buddhism Emptiness is referred to as “*Dharmata Dharma-kaya*” or Dharma-nature/Dharma-body. It might be the case that *Dharma-kaya* or Dharma-body is the personification/embodiment of *Dharmata* or Dharma-nature, as exemplified by *Mahavairocana* (Jpn., Dainichi-nyorai) in Shingon Buddhism which is inseparable from Emptiness per se and yet is “with” all things.

In the case of the New Testament description of the Father (e.g., in Matt. 5:48), we can perceive how He is perfect only through the perception and proclamation of the Son/the Great Friend. In this sense, the Son/the Great Friend is the Seer/the Proclaimer of the Father who calls forth our loyalty to the work of perfection. In seeing and proclaiming the Father, Jesus is at the same time the Son and the Great Friend: as the obedient Son of the Father he sees and hears from the Father while as the Great Friend he proclaims the Father in addressing his disciples “as his friends” (see John 15: 15). This twofold grasp of Jesus as the Son/the Great Friend will be connected to Whitehead’s idea of “the Great Companion—the Fellow-Sufferer who Understands” in reference to the metaphysical vision of the “Reciprocal Relation” (PR, 351) of the universe and God later on in Section II. At this stage of the paper, the linkage between my Divine Ecozoics and my

⁸ TL, 20-27, 36.

⁹ Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1, 200-201. I perceive that the Barthian notion of “obedience” must be considered as a Christological outcome of the entire loyalty of God to emptiness. Barth has no such understanding.

perception of Whitehead's Adventure or Resurrection metaphysics is pointed out through introducing the Great Friend theology in John 15:15. Now, let me talk about the theology of loyalty in relation to Component II in a deeper way.

Component II. Learning from Cobb's Theology of "The Two Ultimates": A Proposal Involving Three Principles in Theology of Loyalty Owing to the Elevation of "The Emergence of Trust"

As is clear from the above, that the theology of loyalty starts from the viewpoint of a fusion of Eastern and Western civilizations as they encounter each other around the issue of the "emergence of trust" by bringing together Shinran's Pure Land Buddhist notion of "Amida's sincerity or loyalty" and the Apostle Paul's idea of "faith of Jesus the Christ" lying at the core of his theology. However, if it is to be endowed with the authentic quality of a philosophical theology there has to be a leap in it. Here the leap must connote the elevation of Jesus' locus of obedience to the locus of the Deity's attitude as such.

It is at this juncture that I have learned much from Professor John Cobb's thesis of the "two ultimates." Cultivating this outstanding thesis in his celebrated 1982 book *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism*, Cobb promotes vigorously Buddhist-Christian dialogue based on Whitehead's distinction between God and Creativity. He holds that Creativity as the metaphysical ultimate is ultimate reality while regarding God as the religious ultimate, with the consequence that neither is superior to the other in the matter of ultimacy. When it comes to speaking of Buddhist-Christian dialogue per se, Cobb opts for the distinction between Buddhist Emptiness and the Christian God whom he designates as the Empty One.¹⁰ Cobb's proposal for this distinction is an eye-opener going straight into the core of Buddhist-Christian dialogue.

What would happen if I brought in my motif of a theology of loyalty mentioned above to Cobb's proposal for the distinction between God and Creativity/Emptiness? Naturally, I would regard it as very important that I have prized God's loyalty to Creativity. In my case, the idea of God's loyalty to Creativity is put forward as a philosophical-theological thesis on the basis of Whitehead's dictum to the effect that "the primordial nature of God is the acquirement by creativity of a primordial character."¹¹ My major concern here is to see how we can obtain the emergence of trust in this locus of theology in which we are related to God as the one who is related to Creativity in terms of Creativity's "acquirement of a primordial character." I interpret Whitehead's notion of "primordial characterization" as implying "God's loyalty to Creativity."

Combined with this is the fact that my studies of Josiah Royce's *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908) have led me to seek the sense in which we use the word "loyalty" in terms of the voluntary, self-expressive relationship between some particular individual self and the Universal. According to Royce, "Loyalty is the will to manifest, so far as is possible, the Eternal, that is, the conscious and superhuman unity of life, in the form of the acts of an individual Self."¹²

Yet, in my case, since what is at the center of my concern is the relationality between God and Creativity/Emptiness, Royce's philosophy of loyalty must be understood within the context of this theological relationality, thereby undergoing an elevation. What is at stake here is, in Whitehead's words, the "Apotheosis"¹³ of loyalty. And what is now transposed to the "individual Self" is God while the "Eternal" or the "conscious and superhuman unity of life" corresponds to Creativity. It is in this manner that Royce's philosophy of loyalty is to be elevated to the position that my theology of loyalty occupies. In my theology of loyalty God plays the role of the "individual Self" vis-à-vis Creativity or the "Eternal Unity." Hence, this theology is one whose ultimate agent is God, not any one of us theologians.

Thus far, I have disclosed a reflection on the first principle of my theology of loyalty, which I might

¹⁰ Cobb, *Beyond Dialogue*, 110-115.

¹¹ Whitehead, PR, 344.

¹² Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 357.

¹³ Cf. "Creation achieves the reconciliation of permanence and flux when it has reached its final term which is everlastingness—the Apotheosis of the World" (PR, 348).

thus designate: "God is loyal to Creativity or Emptiness." To this I must add a second principle from the side of Buddhist Emptiness and say, "Emptiness empties itself." Or, in Whiteheadian terms, "Creativity is characterless in such a thoroughgoing way that its characterlessness is not another character." Furthermore, a third principle is to be designated: "God is the only one in the universe who can and does actually evoke loyalty in us creatures."

In my theology of loyalty mentioned above, the ultimacy of God (which I might label the "evocative power") is actually to be looked upon as a different type of ultimacy than the ultimacy of ultimate reality which Creativity or Emptiness is. For in order that anyone might be able to call upon us, saying, "Be loyal!" that individual should have experienced his/her own loyalty; however, Creativity or Emptiness lacks such an experience of loyalty, with the consequence that it is not qualified to call forth our creaturely loyalty. The locus of God as the "One Who Calls"¹⁴ in the universe is unique. By contrast, the ultimacy of Creativity or Emptiness lies in its being "without a character of its own"¹⁵ or in its "non-bhava" (Jpn., *mujisho*) state of affairs.

Critique and Evaluation of Component II

It now turns out that the whole argument for my theology of loyalty in Component II with three principles (namely, (i) God is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity; (ii) Emptiness empties itself: and (iii) God is the only one in the universe who can and does actually evoke loyalty in us creatures) has to include my self-critical reference to the Great Friend theology in Component I, with the consequence that (iv) Jesus as the Great Friend is loyal to the Father who is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity, which is the fourth principle of my theology of loyalty. Noticeably enough, the principle of "loyalty to loyalty" which is at work in the Great Friend theology is reciprocally counterbalanced with his invitation to his disciples as his "friends" into the depth of Emptiness/Creativity to which God is loyal; in turn, Jesus as the Great Friend is loyal to God. We should not forget that his invitation to his "friends" (in order for them to "see his glory") originated from the place where he was with the Father before the foundation of the world (cf. John 17: 24; also John 1: 1b). For the disciples to accept his invitation joyfully is the opening of their whole existence in the presence of the opening of the kingdom of heaven. But this is the theme I would like to develop more fully in Section II.

Component III. Thomas Berry's Idea of the Ecozoic Era and Theology of Loyalty Giving Rise to the Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity: On the Salvation of the Earth

While learning from Vico's secular-historical theology and absorbing Chardin's cosmic Christology, Berry's theory of salvation of the Earth is unique in that it uncovers the critical situation for Earth-human civilization resulting from its "exploitation of petroleum" and yet it still turns into a theory of salvation of the Earth. It is precisely within this context that his idea of "the Ecozoic Era" comes up. Berry's words continue:

In evaluating our present situation I submit that we have already terminated the Cenozoic Era of the geo-biological systems of the planet. Sixty-five million years of life development are terminated. Extinction is taking place throughout the life systems on a scale unequaled since the terminal phase of the Mesozoic Era. A renewal of life in some creative context requires that a new biological period come into being, a period when humans would dwell upon the Earth in a mutually enhancing manner. This new mode of being of the planet I describe as the Ecozoic Era, the fourth in the succession of life eras thus far identified as the Paleozoic, the Mesozoic, and the Cenozoic. But when we propose that an Ecozoic Era is succeeding the Cenozoic, we must define the unique character of this emerging era.¹⁶

In defining the new geo-biological period as the Ecozoic Era Thomas Berry's shining genius and his geo-biological contribution coincide. Incorporating this coincidence into my own thinking, I challenge myself

¹⁴ See Cobb, *God and the World*, 42-66.

¹⁵ PR, 31.

¹⁶ Berry, "The Ecozoic Era," 3-4.

to redefine the task of philosophical theology in this new global age (which is the age of ecology or the Ecozoic Era) by submitting my proposal of an “Ecozoics of the Deity.” I am pretty much excited about the task before me.

Berry suggests the name “Ecozoic” as a better designation than “ecological.” For him, while eco-logos refers to an understanding of the interaction of things, Ecozoic is a more biological term that can be used to indicate the integral *functioning* of life systems in their mutually enhancing relation. In other words, what the Ecozoic means is the salvation of the entire Earth-human community. Then, in what sort of mode is the Earth-life community to be saved? Berry replies:

The Ecozoic Era can be brought into being only by the integral life community itself. If other periods have been designated by such names as “Reptilian” or “Mammalian,” the Ecozoic period must be identified as the Era of the Integral Life Community. For this to emerge there are special conditions required on the part of the human, for although this era cannot be an anthropocentric life span, it can come into being only under certain conditions that dominantly involve human understanding, choice, and action.¹⁷

According to Berry, there are six conditions of the integral life community as the mode of salvation as follows:

1. The first condition is to understand that the universe is a communion of subjects, not a collection of objects.
2. The second condition for entering the Ecozoic Era is a realization that the Earth exists, and can survive only in its integral functioning.
3. The third condition for entering the Ecozoic Era is a recognition that the Earth is a one-time endowment.
4. The fourth condition for entering the Ecozoic Era is a recognition that the Earth is primary and humans are derivative.
5. The fifth condition for the rise of the Ecozoic Era is to realize that there is a single Earth community.
6. The sixth condition is that we understand fully and respond effectively to our own human role in this new era.¹⁸

Of these I think the second condition manifesting the “integral functioning of Earth life” and the fourth condition indicating “the primary Earth and the derivative human” have to be ontologically unified. In my own view, ontologically speaking, there has to be in the universe that which enables the “second condition” to appear as its dynamics; and when it comes to speaking of the unification of the second and the fourth conditions, we have to be aware that the principle of order functioning between the dynamics of the universe and all things is to be found at the base of the “relationship between the Earth and humans.” In his earlier book *The Dream of the Earth* (1988) Berry describes beautifully the dynamics of the universe; and in his later work *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future* (1999) there is a reference to the fact that the universe is self-referent while all things in the universe are universe-referent. Let me thus quote his famous passage on the dynamics of the universe:

If the dynamics of the universe from the beginning shaped the course of the heavens, lighted the sun, and formed the Earth, if this same dynamism brought forth the continents and seas and atmosphere, if it awakened the variety of living things, and finally brought us into being and guided us safely through the turbulent centuries, there is reason to believe that this same guiding process is precisely what has awakened in us our present understanding of ourselves and our relation to this stupendous process. Sensitized to such guidance from the very structure and functioning of the universe, we can have confidence in the future that awaits the human venture.¹⁹

The importance of Berry’s view of the dynamism at work in the universe is not only contained in his description of what enables the evolution of the universe to appear. If it is, it is merely a theory of the evolution of the universe; and there is no need for me to dwell on the ontological integration of the dynamics

¹⁷ Ibid., 4.

¹⁸ See ibid., 4-8.

¹⁹ Berry, *The Dream of the Earth*, 137.

of the universe and the evolution of the universe. What I designate as the ontological integration of the dynamics and evolution denies initially a mere linear type evolution of the universe by retreating to its origin, ground or bottom. And it must advance therefrom toward the present, thus further looking forward to the future.

Critique and Evaluation of Component III

It is precisely in reference to what Berry calls “the dynamics of the universe” that I would like to put forward the proposal of the “Ecozoics of the Deity.” In Component I, I have observed that during the period of Buddhist-Christian dialogue beginning with mid-20th century up until now in the 21st century we have learned to keep together “Amida’s sincerity and loyalty” in Jodoshinshu and “faith of Jesus as the Christ” in Christianity as the pivotal moments of our trust in the religious ultimate(s). The first principle of my theology of loyalty appeared within this context: “God is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity, the metaphysical ultimate.” The loyalty evidenced by the religious ultimate (such as “Amida’s sincerity or loyalty” and “faith of Jesus as the Christ”) manifests the general truth of the universe, so we thought. Why don’t we then conceive of the universe in general with this same logic of loyalty in mind? Hence, my proposal of the “Ecozoics of the Deity” in reference to the universe. In this context, I am transmuting Berry’s idea of the “Ecozoic Era” into a creative enterprise of envisioning a new science “the Ecozoics (i.e., Eco-Life science) of the Deity” while, at the same time, putting the wisdom of the “Two Ultimates” inherent in Buddhist-Christian dialogue in the context of ecological theology, thus making it “ecologized,” as it were.

My new idea of the Great Friend theology is important in that it clarifies how the loyalty of the religious ultimate(s) to the metaphysical ultimate (Emptiness/Creativity) is reciprocally counterbalanced with the Great Friend’s intimate relationship to his disciples as his “friends” (see John 15: 15). Here I differ from the case of my teacher Katsumi Takizawa’s Pure The-anthropology in which his ultimate concern with the *Proto-factum* Immanuel is dissociated from his relationship with the historical Jesus because he does not want to be “in bondage” to Jesus.²⁰ He was critically convinced that his mentor Karl Barth conceived the *Proto-factum* as actually realized in and through its appearance in the person and history of Jesus of Nazareth.²¹

In my critique of Component II, I adopted the doctrine of “loyalty to loyalty” in referring to the case of the Great Friend’s relation to the Father who is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity. Now, I have arrived at the position where Berry’s vision of the “dynamics of the universe” has to be re-interpreted in terms of language of Divine Ecozoics in reference to the problem of the ontological integration of the universe. Here in this context, I think that the contributions of Kitaro Nishida and Ryokan are great.

Component IV. The Ontological Integration of the Universe: Kitaro Nishida and Ryokan on the Thought of the “Turning Point”

When it comes to speaking of this sort of ontological integration of the universe with its ground of dynamism (which consists in retreating to the ground and in advancing therefrom toward the future) I find Kitaro Nishida’s theory of recollection²² profoundly illuminating. Nishida writes:

Though [Bergson says that] 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 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 base and the present as its apex: this cone continuously advances toward 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.²³

²⁰ See Takizawa, *An Introduction to Pure The-Anthropology*, 272.

²¹ See Takizawa, *The Origin of Freedom*, 211-214.

²² Nishida’s Works, Vol. II

²³ Nishida, *Intuition and Reflection*, p. 132.

As is evident in the above passage, Nishida's reflection upon the ontological-integral depths of the dynamics of the universe is indicative of the turning point (or the hinge of the universe, as it were) of what Thomas Berry calls "the Ecozoic Era" and this enables my proposal of an "Ecozoics of the Deity" to come out. The turning point (or the hinge of the universe) was poetically praised by the Zen poet Ryokan in his brilliant *tanka*:

Waga noch wo
Tasuke tamae to
Tanomu mi wa
Moto no chikai no
Sugata narikeri

While beseeching thee
For Mercy after my death
Lo I find myself
Already embodying
The Original Vow now!²⁴

Ryokan's original intention in this *tanka* is to say something like this: "While getting sick in bed and feeling pain so much that I cannot but roll over and over again in bed with a prayer asking Amida for mercy upon me after my death, I am nevertheless aware of myself as embodying the Original Vow here-now!" Here at this juncture I would like to incorporate into this self-expression of Ryokan's in terms of "sugata narikeri" ("already embodying"), the entire vision of theology of loyalty. What happens, then? An event of the cosmic renewal happens, ontologically and integrally.

That is to say, the entirety of the future-intentionality inherent in the universe is to be enhanced by virtue of the Vow of the religious ultimate, Amida (which is the act of relinquishing the will to attain the Highest Enlightenment, if after [his] obtaining Buddhahood, all beings in the ten quarters shall not desire in sincerity and truthfulness to be born in [his] country) to culminate in loyalty—loyalty to the metaphysical ultimate, Emptiness or Dharmata Dharmakaya. It is precisely at that point that the universe all of a sudden transmutes itself into an integral self-systematization, encouraged and awakened by the Call of the religious ultimate, Amida, saying, "Be loyal!" Ryokan's *tanka*—finishing with the last two lines, namely, "already embodying / the Original Vow now!"—is an excellent poem which is more than enough to express artistically the "Ecozoics of the Deity."

Critique and Evaluation of Component IV

I am amazed at acknowledging anew that Ryokan's *tanka*, mentioned in the text of Component IV, is really in correspondence with the Great Friend theology in that it shares both the transcendent and the immanent character of the latter. While relying upon the mercy of Amida with regard to his imminent death, Ryokan finds himself embodying the Original Vow of Amida here-now—an astonishing self-realization! In his *tanka* Amida is invisible; but it is clear that what is described is the twofold reality of the Great Friend as at once transcendently self-reflective and immanently self-expressive in the Buddhist way.

In philosophical terms, Nishida expresses the same dynamics in the following manner: "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." *Regressus* or retreat on the part of absolute free will and *egressus* or proceeding forth of this world are paradoxically unified at the center of the universe, I might say. If so, Divine Ecozoics insofar as it contains both characteristics simultaneously is a paradoxical reality which is co-constituted by the Deity's loyalty to the Eco/Place/Ground of Emptiness and by the Deity's evocation of loyalty as Life in the world.

²⁴ Trans. T. Nobuhara. See Nobuhara, *Ryokan in a Global Age*, E35.

Component V. A Critique of Sallie McFague's Theology of the "Body of God"

In her celebrated volume *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology* Sallie McFague thinks of God in close relationship with the entire universe as the "body of God." Her attempt was influenced by the "Common Creation Story" as the reigning *Zeitgeist* in the aftermath of the scientific proofs of the Big Bang theory. It is an outstanding achievement in a new frontier of systematic theology, namely, ecological theology.²⁵

The Big Bang theory of the Russian physicist George Gamow was established as true when the astronomer Edwin Hubble made the discovery, observing the universe through the telescope at Mount Wilson in California in 1929, that the galaxies of the universe are moving away from us, which meant that the universe is expanding. It was also verified as true by two astronomers, Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson, working at the Bell Laboratories in Holmdel, New Jersey, when they identified the cosmic background radiation in 1964. These two incidents confirming the truthfulness of the Big Bang theory point to the big explosion that took place some 13.7 billion years ago, that gave rise to the coming into existence of our present universe. Thus we have come to have "the *prime fact* of the twentieth century, the most amazing scientific discovery of all time—the first one pointing beyond science altogether."²⁶

As a result, the "Common Creation Story" arose as a new gigantic ideology in the West in place of Socialism, while accepting the Big Bang truth as the unavoidable framework of the *Zeitgeist* of our times. By the term "common" we mean that not only believers in mono-theistic religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam but also humanists and even atheists commonly affirm this "theory of the creation of the universe." Here we can observe how a scientific discovery and the formation of a *Zeitgeist* are followed by a theological construction. In this sense, McFague's *The Body of God* is an obviously contemporary (in the sense of a post-Socialist) theological phenomenon.

The intention of McFague's concept of the "body of God" is clearly described in the following passage:

In this body model, God would not be transcendent over the universe in the sense of external to or apart from, but would be the source, power, and good—the spirit—that enlivens (and loves) the entire process and its material forms. The transcendence of God, then, is the preeminent or primary spirit of the universe. As we are inspirited bodies—living, loving, thinking bodies—so imagining God in our image (for how else *can* we model God?), we speak of her as *the* inspirited body of the entire universe, the animating, living spirit that produces, guides, and saves all that is.²⁷

Noteworthy here is the fact that McFague could not find the source of the universe as the "spirited body" in any other place than in the transcendence of God as the "preeminent, primary spirit of the universe." Nothing is more symptomatic than this fact regarding the idealistic or mono-spiritual nature of McFague's theology of the "body of God." In pursuing the source of the "ecology of the world," she was not able to find it anywhere other than in the "eco-less logos" of the Deity, that is, the transcendent spirit.

Conclusions

By contrast, we rather think that we can find the transcendent source of the inspirited bodies of the universe not directly in the "spirit" but in the "field" as this is peculiar to the realm of the Deity. What in Jesus' theology is called the "secret place" (Matt. 6:6a) is the Divine field. I take the Johannine Logos, "who was in the beginning" (John 1:1a) as the ground of the world, to mean at the same time the Divine field insofar as "the Logos was with God" (John 1:1b). In this way the togetherness of the Logos with God constitutes the inner relational depth of both the Logos and God. We might say that the Logos has two natures, one *ad extra* (which was "in the beginning of the world") and the other *ad intra* (which was "with God"). The latter nature is not personal but all-inclusive; and this nature of the Logos I might designate the "Divine field."

²⁵ See Cobb, *Is It Too Late?* whose first edition was published in 1972, thus cultivating the genre of ecological theology in the realm of systematic theology.

²⁶ Overbye, *Lonely Hearts*, 47: cited in Friedman, *The Hidden Face of God*, 224; italics Friedman's.

²⁷ McFague, *The Body of God*, 20.

This whole discussion of the Logos entails the all-inclusive Logos or the Divine field as the ultimate place whose Divine poles we call “Father” (God) and “Son” (the personal Logos).²⁸ Furthermore, when the Divine field or the ultimate place is viewed as at the same time the ground of the world,²⁹ it is to be called the “Place of absolute Nothingness,” as understood by Kitaro Nishida.

This state of affairs is commensurate with the truth as inherent in our theology of loyalty that we discussed at the outset of the present essay, namely, the dynamics that arises in the fact that the Deity, *qua* the religious ultimate, such as the Christian God or the Buddhist Amida, being loyally within the “Place of Emptiness or Dharmata Dharmakaya,” *qua* the metaphysical ultimate, is entitled to call forth loyalty in the bodies of the universe, saying, “You too should be loyal.” This state of affairs is at the core of my proposal in the present essay for an Ecozoics (i.e., Place/Life science) of the Deity, as has already been mentioned.

Critique and Evaluation of Component V

My conclusions show that it is due to the Divine loyalty to the Divine field of absolute Nothingness (which is the ultimate Relatedness) that the Deity is entitled to evoke loyalty in us creatures or the bodies of the universe. My new vision of the Great Friend theology, however, opts for critically clarifying that it is actually the one who sees and hears from the Deity as to how the Deity is loyal to the Divine field, who is entitled to evoke loyalty in us creatures (see Matt. 5:48). Divine Ecozoics works in actuality in and through the Great Friend. Then, we have to ask, saying, “Why so?” My answer is: Because the Great Friend is the Center of the Universe, as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin at one time manifested.

Section II. Whitehead's Adventure or Resurrection Metaphysics: Opening to Opening

Let me begin with a *tanka*:

Waga tsuma ya
Zetsugo emimashi
Fushigi ya mo
Fukaki hikumi no
Soko zo hishousu

Wonderfully
My wife smiles rich
while passing;
The bottom of the deep abyss
Is risen toward the Father.

The theme of Whitehead's Adventure of Ideas was combined with a Resurrection Metaphysics in my mind, when I saw my wife Nobuko smiling richly and wonderfully within the coffin after she died on March 11, 2014; Nobuko smiled continuously and even increasingly richly until the end of the wake on March 13 at our residence in Miyuki-cho, Shibata, Niigata. I immediately perceived Nobuko's smile while passing as coincidental with the presence of Jesus the Christ whom I call the Great Friend in this paper, as mentioned earlier.

²⁸ Cf. “The Logos was Divine” (John 1:1c).

²⁹ If the Divine field is limited to be within the realm of the Deity alone, it becomes a Being, a Concept, not an all-inclusive Reality. It must be at the same time the ground of the world. For this reason, a Being or a Concept of the intra-Trinitarian Place is to be negated in order to get in touch with the full Reality of Place, within (*ad intra*) and toward the world (*ad extra*), of the Deity. Hence, the Place of Absolute Nothingness. To depict this state of affairs, Shizuteru Ueda uses the expression “World/Emptiness” in his book *Shizuteru Ueda's Works*, p. 144. What Ueda means by the / (slash) here is God, which I confirmed in a personal conversation with him on September 9, 2010 at a conference in Kyoto. God belongs to Emptiness and to the World at the same time!

What I think is necessary in this section is to demonstrate that Whitehead's argument for an "Adventure in the Universe as One" (AI,³⁰ 295) is inclusive of a "Resurrection Metaphysics" as this arises when the narrative theology of the resurrection in John 21 is metaphysically reinterpreted and elevated. In this attempt, I will show that what I perceive as the Great Friend theology appearing in the Johannine Gospel (esp. John 15: 15) can lead us into the vision of the universe as centered around Him. I presume that Whitehead's *Adventure Metaphysics* allows for a metaphysical reinterpretation of the narrative theology inherent in John 21.

From the Narrative Theology of John 21 to a Metaphysics of the Resurrection

Just after daybreak, Jesus stood on the beach; but the disciples did not know that it was Jesus (John 21:4).

The narrative theology of John 21:4 is inclusive of the metaphysical truth that the risen One stood on the beach of "Life and Death" and "the Resurrection." The reader is expected to dig it out. Metaphysically speaking, the risen One and the beach are one and the same reality involving both the perishable world and immortality. In this sense, the phrase "Jesus stood on the beach" is not just a description of the landscape; it is expressive of the truth of what I might call "the Great Friend" theology of pointing to the transcendent Origin and the horizon of Life and Death at the same time. Metaphysically, this is the state of affairs which Whitehead designates: "We perish *and* are immortal" (PR, 351, 82). The "and" is precisely the expression of the fact which John 21:4 refers to as "Jesus stood on the beach." The "and" is the Center of the Universe consisting of the perishable and the immortal. However, the disciples did not know that it was Jesus, their familiar Great Friend. This is the foremost Christian case of what D. T. Suzuki expresses in these terms: "Indeed, ignorance is the negation of Enlightenment, and not the reverse." Enlightenment, namely, the Resurrection is just there before their eyes; but their ignorance denies that fact.

When they had finished breakfast, Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon son of John, do you love me more than these? ' He said to him, 'Yes, Lord; you know that I love you.' (John 21:15)

There are two ways of interpreting *agapas me pleon touton*:

(i) What is the meaning of *pleon touton*? It has been generally understood as meaning "more than your companions, the other apostles, love me"; and this makes good sense. Peter had claimed that his loyalty surpassed that of the rest (Mk. 14: 29; and cf. 13: 37). He had taken precedence over the others, in speech (6: 68) and act (18: 10), more than once. And the question of Jesus may mean, "Do you really love me more than the others do, as your forwardness in acting as their leader used to suggest?" But (a) if this be the meaning, the construction is elliptical and ambiguous. We should expect the personal pronoun *du* to be introduced before or after *agapas* to mark the emphasis; (b) comparisons of this kind, *sc.* expressions of love which this or that disciple displays or entertains, seem out of place on the lips of Jesus. To ask Peter if his love for his Master exceeds the love which, *e.g.*, the Beloved Disciple cherished for Him, would be a severe test; and the question would be one which Peter could never answer with confidence.

(ii) Does, then, *agapas me pleon touton* mean "Lovest thou me more than these things?" *sc.* the boat and the nets and the fishing, to which Peter had returned after the Passion and the Resurrection of his Master. This interpretation is, indeed, unattractive; but it may possibly be right, and it is free from some difficulties which beset the usual interpretation.³¹

I myself prefer the second interpretation simply because it basically corresponds to the *sequimini me* calling of the disciples by the Great Friend (Mk. 8:34-38). Love is love only because it relinquishes everything, the universe in its multiplicity, for the sake of the Great Friend: this motif of losing everything for His sake is the foundation of the Resurrection appearing in Jesus' ministry. By contrast, the first interpretation is indicative of adopting Humanism instead of Christianity, namely, the way in which one intends to practice a comparative way of loving Jesus as existing solely on Earth while, however, refusing to follow Him even

³⁰ Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*.

³¹ Bernard and McNeile, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 704-705.

to the crossing over the perishing line, death, with Him. Thus and only thus one is able to stand on the “Beach” with the Great Friend.

Jesus said to him, ‘Feed my lambs.’ A second time he said to him, ‘Simon son of John, do you love me?’ He said to him, ‘Yes, Lord; you know that I love you.’ Jesus said to him, ‘Tend my sheep.’ He said to him the third time, ‘Simon son of John, do you love me?’ Peter felt hurt because he said to him the third time, ‘Do you love me?’ And he said to him, ‘Lord, you know everything; you know that I love you.’ Jesus said to him, ‘Feed my sheep.’ (John 21:15-17)

Here occurs what I might call the *Re-missio Peccatorum* (meaning the remission of the sinners by way of re-sending them). If one truly loves the Great Friend, who is standing on the “Beach,” through crossing over the perishing line, death, with Him, then the Great Friend’s re-sending occurs in the immortal life of those who are resurrected with Him. Life immortal is an everlasting life of care for those who need universal assistance all over the universe—in heaven and on earth. It might be with respect to this vision that Whitehead said: “His true destiny as co-creator in the universe is his dignity and his grandeur.”³² On Earth the re-sending occurs as a process of Pentecostal events which is permeated by Paul’s confession: “I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me” (Gal. 2:20).

Whitehead’s Metaphysics of Adventure or Resurrection: In Three Stages

Prelude: The Great Friend Theology at Its Completion—With Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

In this paper I have been self-critically manifesting that my theology of loyalty needs a revision at one crucial point: namely, the first principle to the effect that “God is loyal to Emptiness/Creativity” needs a corollary to the effect that “the Son’s obedience to the Father can only be expressive of the inner dynamics of the evocation of loyalty in us creatures by the Deity.” This is because the Son sees and hears from the Father as regards how he is loyal to the Divine field or “the ultimate opening between the Logos and the Father” (see John 1:1b) in order to tell this story to his disciples as his “friends” (see Matt. 5: 48; John 15: 15). Here appears what I call the Great Friend theology. It is only in and through the Great Friend theology that Divine Ecozoics (Eco/Life science), in the sense in which God’s loyalty to the *Eco*/the Dwelling Place of Emptiness can and does paradoxically bring about God’s evocation of loyalty or Life (*Zoe*) in us creatures, can and does actually arrive at its completion.

This state of affairs is the mystery of metaphysics: metaphysics can go hand in hand with the Great Friend theology. It shows that the universe is centered and that the Great Friend is its center. This reminds us of what Pierre Teilhard de Chardin wrote on 7 April, 1955, three days before his death, in “Conclusion” to his *The Future of Man*.³³ He wrote:

Conclusion

NOTE BY FRENCH EDITOR. Three days before his death Pierre Teilhard de Chardin wrote the following, which constitutes his supreme testimony as a thinker and a priest.

LAST PAGE OF THE JOURNAL OF PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

Maundy Thursday. What I believe.

1 St. Paul—the three verses: *En pasi panta Theos.*

Christogenesis.

³² See Price, *Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead*, 366.

³³ Teilhard de Chardin, *The Future of Man*, p. 324.

2 Cosmos=Cosmogenesis—Biogenesis—Noogenesis—
3 *The Universe is centered*—Evolutively {Above
Ahead

Whitehead's Vision of the "Reciprocal Relation" in "The Great Companion—the Fellow-Sufferer Who Understands"

Whitehead's metaphysical vision culminates in his idea of "the reciprocal relation" of love in heaven and love in the world realizing itself in the conviction that "God is the great companion—the fellow-sufferer who understands" (PR, 351). He writes:

In the fourth phase, the creative action completes itself. For the perfected actuality passes back into the temporal world, and qualifies this world so that each temporal actuality includes it as an immediate fact of relevant experience. For the kingdom of heaven is with us today. The action of the fourth phase is the love of God for the world. It is the particular providence for particular occasions. What is done in the world is transformed into a reality in heaven, and the reality in heaven passes back into the world. By this reciprocal relation, the love in the world passes into the love in heaven, and floods back again into the world. In this sense, God is the great companion—the fellow-sufferer who understands. (PR, 351)

What I see in what Whitehead refers to as “the reciprocal relation” is a vision of metaphysics which is free from the bondage of the perishable world—the bondage such as is inherent in the Existentialist Philosophy of Heidegger in which *Sein's Geschichte* is authentically guaranteed only toward death. Sartre opts for the vision of the precedence of “existence” over “essence.” However, when one perishes there would be no way of keeping hold of existence. He doesn’t know that things are the other way round when it comes to speaking of one’s death. If the precedence of “essence” over “existence” is authentically provided in some way or another, one can say with Whitehead that “we perish *and* are immortal” (PR, 351). At that moment, I truly believe the following words of the Great Friend are authentically to the point: “Father, I desire that those also, whom you have given me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory, which you have given me because you loved me before the foundation of the world” (John 17: 24). Here it is said that the primordial glory of the Great Friend, namely, “the original opening between the Logos and the Father” (John 1:1b), awaits us in order to accept our response. By our response, I mean our response to the Divine Ecozoics, running through all universal history, culminating in the Deity’s evocation in and through the Great Friend: “Be loyal!” Our response takes the form of our resurrection with the Great Friend standing on the “Beach,” which means Opening to Opening in the universe, indeed!

Then, what about the case of heaven flooding back again into the world? I can only say that, given the years of the Church's Pentecostal experiences in which, as Paul confessed, Christ, not I, lives in me, the reciprocal relation is the thing that the Great Companion—the Fellow-Sufferer Who Understands—promotes. All the acts of "commerce" in its loftiest sense of the word might flourish in due course of world history as its analogy or correspondence in the world. We should not forget that in terms of an ecological theology what I call Divine Ecozoics—the Deity's loyalty to the "Primordial Opening between the Logos and the Father"

paradoxically transmuting itself into evocation of our creaturely loyalty in and through the Great Friend—is the way in which God and we creatures promote co-creatively the Great Work of “the Reciprocal Relation.”

Whitehead's Metaphysics of Adventure as the Resurrection of the Great Friend and Us in Union

There is one critical question that arises in my mind: What is Whitehead's basic intention when he speaks of an “Adventure in the Universe as One”? Let me quote the following two passages [A] and [B] first:

[A] This Adventure embraces all particular occasions but as an actual fact stands beyond any one of them. It is, as it were, the complement to Plato's Receptacle, its exact opposite, yet equally required for the unity of all things. In every way, it is contrary to the Receptacle. The Receptacle is bare of all forms: the Unity of Adventure includes the Eros which is the living urge towards all possibilities, claiming the goodness of their realization. (AI, 295)

[B] In this Supreme Adventure, the Reality which the Adventure transmutes into its Unity of Appearance, requires the real occasions of the advancing world each claiming its due share of attention. (AI, 295)

We know that Whitehead is critical of the Aristotelian idea of the “unmoved mover.” One of the basic reasons for this is that the “unmoved mover” is *outside* the universe.³⁴ If that is the case, then any idea of reality, including the Platonic Receptacle appearing in [A] and my teacher Katsumi Takizawa's notion of the *Proto-factum*, Immanuel as located outside the universe in order to impart change to other things without changing itself, is liable to Whitehead's critique in [B] of “the Reality.” Given the principle of the “reciprocal relation,” what is to be understood as the Center of the Universe is *not* the Reality but the Adventure which transmutes it into its Unity of Appearance, thereby “requiring the real occasions of the advancing world each claiming its due share of attention.” For this reason, the Great Friend is the center of the universe while adventurously beseeching the Father to glorify his own Primordial Glory (see John 17: 5). At the same time he invites his disciples to be with him, to see his Glory, which the Father has given him because he loved him before the foundation of the world (see John 17: 24)—namely, his own Resurrection and that of his “friends” in the Unity of Appearance. Our creaturely response/opening to the Original Opening between the Logos and the Father (see John 1:1b) is our event of the Resurrection which takes place on the “Beach” where the Great Friend stands (see John 21:4).

Concluding Remarks

What in my view is the most crucial point that distinguishes Section II “Whitehead's Adventure or Resurrection Metaphysics: Opening to Opening” from Section I “A Critical Review of My Proposal of an Ecozoics of the Deity,” is a wisdom that I have acquired quite recently. The paradox inherent in the Divine Ecozoics is that, although God is uniquely qualified to evoke loyalty in us worldly creatures (thus manifesting the Life (*Zoe*) of God with us) God is, nevertheless, limited in that our positive response is lacking. It is still open, however, although the Divine Opening is potentially inclusive of and is awaiting our own Opening to the Divine Opening; it just lacks a motivation for our Creaturely Opening from our side.

Section II is important in that it clarifies that what Whitehead manifests as the Adventure which transmutes the Reality into its Unity of Appearance (namely the Unity of the Divine Appearance in the form of the Son's Resurrection and of our own Appearance in the form of our resurrection) requires and even actually concurs with “the real occasions of the advancing world each claiming its due share of attention” (AI, 295). I believe Whitehead's idea of the Adventure manifests his metaphysical vision of the Resurrection,

³⁴ Cf.: “In Book VIII of the *Physics* Aristotle argues for the existence of a changeless source of change—an ‘unmoved mover’ as it is normally called. If there is to be any change in the universe, there must, he holds, be some original source which imparts change to other things without changing itself. The unmoved mover is outside the universe.” (Barnes, *Aristotle*, 64)

even the Co-Resurrection of the Son and of us creatures at the same time.³⁵

Furthermore, it occurs to me that the Co-Resurrection of the Son and of us has been inherent in advance in the Calling of the disciples as “friends” by Jesus: “I do not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father” (John 15: 15; NRSV). The Johannine idea of the Great Friend is metaphysically completed, as far as I can see, in Whitehead’s vision of “the great companion—the fellow-sufferer who understands” (PR, 351). In the Johannine and Whiteheadian vision of the Great Friend, the transcendent pole (i.e., my Father) is paradoxically unified with the immanent pole (i.e., the disciples) “as friends.”

In search of an ecological civilization so as to get rid of the impasse of an ecological tautology,³⁶ in the sense that we emphasize the importance of ecology for the sake of ecology of the world without going beyond and above it toward what I call “Divine Ecozoics” in this essay, I needed two ways, Sections I and II. By so doing I satisfied a manifestation of our praise of an ecological civilization which is Divine and natural at once. Only by being Divine and natural at once can an ecological civilization truly serve Peace.

References

Barnes, Jonathan, *Aristotle*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1 Peabody, MA Hendrickson, 2010.

Berry, Thomas, *The Dream of the Earth* San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988.

Berry, Thomas, “The Ecozoic Era,” CES/Foundational Essays/”The Ecozoic Era. 01-12-2003.

Berry, Thomas, *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1999.

Bernard, J. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, Vol. II*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, ed. Eberhard Bethge, *Widerstand und Ergebung: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen aus der Heft*. Chr. Kaiser Verlag Munchen, 1961.

Cobb, Jr., John B., *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Cobb, Jr., John B., *God and the World*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

Cobb, Jr., John B., *Is It Too Late? A Theology of Ecology*. Revised Edition. Denton, Texas: Environmental Ethics Books, 1995.

Friedman, Richard Elliot, *The Hidden Face of God*. Harper San Francisco, 1995.

Greene, Herman, ed., *The Ecozoic: A Tribute to Thomas Berry*. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Ecozoic Studies, 2009.

McFague, Sallie, *The Body of God: An Ecological Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Nishida, Kitaro, trans. Valdo H. Viglielmo, Yoshinori Takeuchi and Joseph S. O’ Leary, *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, “Reason and Intuition in Christian and Buddhist Philosophy: Anselm’s *Proslogion* II and IV Reinterpreted in Light of D. T. Suzuki’s Zen Thought,” *Bulletin of Keiwa College* 17 (February 28, 2008): 1-35.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, “Reflections on God Who Is ‘With’ All Creation: Phases of Mysticism in D. T. Suzuki’s Zen Thought and Whitehead’s Metaphysics,” *Process Studies*, 34. 2 (Fall-Winter 2005): 240-263.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, *Ryokan in a Cosmic Age: In Sync with Ecological Theologian Thomas Berry*. Niigata: Kokodo Shoten, 2013.

³⁵ It is important to notice metaphysically that, without envisioning the transmutation of the Reality into its Unity of Appearance, as Whitehead maintains, requiring the “real occasions of the advancing world each claiming its due share of attention”—and this even in such a way that I envisage as the “Co-Resurrection of the Son and of us creatures,” there would be no authentic rationale for an ecological recovery at its final core. The reason why Dietrich Bonhoeffer referred to the idea of “re-capitulatio” in the midst of the darkest days of his imprisonment during the Third Reich is, I believe, that he was able to see things in a really new metaphysico-Christological way such as is depicted in Eph. 1: 10. See Dietrich Bonhoeffer, ed. Eberhard Bethge, *Widerstand und Ergebung: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen aus der Heft* (Chr. Kaiser Verlag Munchen, 1961), p. 125. As far as Whitehead’s organic metaphysics is concerned, it might be the case that the idea of “re-capitulatio” can be acknowledged in relation to the “pragmatic” use of the actual entities, constituting their static lives, which “lies in the future.” Thus, “The creature perishes and is immortal” (PR, 82).

³⁶ What I call an “ecological tautology” is the standpoint from which one does not acknowledge any kind of Divine boundaries which might go hand in hand with what Will Steffen calls “Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet” in *Science*, Vol. 347, 13 February 2015, p. 736. The problem of an “ecological tautology” is a manifestation of our dealings with the Earth only within our alleged prerogatives over the Earth (including a possible nuclear attack on the Earth). A Divine Ecozoics, however, urges us to be loyal in our thought and action in accordance with Planetary and Divine boundaries.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, *Ryokan in a Cosmic Age Revisited: In Sync with a Whiteheadian Wind Theology*. Niigata: Kokodo Shoten, 2014.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, "Sunyata, Kenosis, and Jihō or Friendly Compassionate Love: Toward a Buddhist-Christian Theology of Loyalty," *Japanese Religions*, 15.4(July 1989): 50-66.

Nobuhara, Tokiyuki, *A Theology of Loyalty: Toward a Fusion of Civilizations, East and West*. Kyoto: Kohro Sha, 1997.

Overbye, Dennis, *Lonely Hearts of the Cosmos*. New York: Harper Collins, 1991.

Royce, Josiah, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.

Steffen, Will, "Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet," *Science*, Vol. 347, February 13, 2015, 736.

Suzuki, D. T. *A Miscellany of the Shin Teaching of Buddhism*. Kyoto: Shinshu Otaniha Shumusho, 1949, 16; cited in Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1985, 2-3.

Takizawa, Katsumi, *Buddhism and Christianity*. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1964.

Takizawa, Katsumi, *The Origin of Freedom: Immanuel*. Tokyo: Shinkyo Shuppansha, 1969.

Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *The Future of Man*. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

Ueda, Shizuteru, *Shizuteru Ueda's Works, II*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2002.

Whitehead, Alfred North, *Adventures of Ideas*. 1933. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Whitehead, Alfred North, *Process and Reality*. 1929. Corrected Edition, Ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. New York: The Free Press, 1978.