

Running head: ECOSOPHIC IMMANENCE

Title: Through a Lacanian lens: Ecosophic immanence, somatic corpora, and naturalization

Paul-Andre Betito MSW RSW

ORCID: 0000-0003-0597-9177

admin@entelocius.com

paulandreb@tutanota.com

ENTEL  CIUS
RHIZOMATIC TRANSCENDENCE

Abstract

This paper firstly argues that Romanticism and Naturalism diverge immanent territorial margins, and that their radials, longitudes, and predilections constitute an inscription of unitary discursive topography and hence, a mutual preclusion of rational extraterritoriality. Second, natural order predicated on a fundamental assumption of self-other complexions is posited as the archetypal locus for territorialisation, and Batesonian 'ecosophy' or ecological philosophy is stipulated to conform semiotic semblances from this internequine unconscious with the accession of newly emergent adaptation, namely, the dyslexic extenuation of somaticized action and somatic corpora, which are of physiologic and Freudian genealogy and become immured to Lacanian chains of signification. Third, these hyperextensive viscera are positioned as Parts-in-Wholes constituting protopathic Deleuzian and Guattarian plateaus, and they are inured disjunctively and dissimulated unevenly, a fact which sharpens axiomatic planes and causes pejorations and distortions of symbolic order. Lastly, an atlas for semiotic naturalization is surmised for further exploration.

Keywords: Lacan; Bateson; Deleuze; Guattari; Romanticism; Naturalism; psychosomatics

The departure from Romanticism (e.g., Rousseau, Locke, Hobbes, etc.) was seemed to have been prefigured by its insoluble veneration, incautious appeal, and emancipatory largesse, the inherent fissiparity of “an original identification with all other creatures” (Lévi-Strauss, 1961, p. 101) and its bold embrace of a paradisial, revolutionary will and engulfing, supersessive, hyper-prevalent flow within Man; and its concurrence with Naturalism (e.g., Darwin, Quine, etc.) having produced phenotypic stock between blithe, ingenuous causal aestheticism and latterly, disembodied circumspection and the “birth of the intellect” (Lévi-Strauss, 1961, p. 100), has lain fallow until only rather recently, in the latter half of the twentieth century, when ‘eco-philosophy’ (henceforth ‘ecosophy’) drew a “flow” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977; 1987) between manifold or set-theoretic acculturation and parametric invigoration, and later, sophisticated scrutiny of semblable natural objects.

Ecosophy is the biotopic resolution mounted between self and soma given newly perpetual leak (i.e., cementation) and binding from the earth. Namely, Romanticism has induced schiz-matically (i.e., its ceded and blatant overtures) to Naturalism, and Naturalism then has given to a kind of shock resulting from transgression of the space between impression and stipulation, trace and measure, and this repletion has sown and proved harbinger to a particularly paralytic mediation between immanence or dispositive temporality (i.e., the stochastic centroid) and, on the other hand, Deleuzian and Guattarian plateaus (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977; 1987), whose frenetic resonance stabilizations contextualize and harbour the soma at diametric, and thus cybernetically meaningful, lengths.

To say, romantics seek *capsis*, or the engulfment and erumpence of the will to devour social liveries and attest unified immanence; naturalists the preservationist, injunctive, and irrespective promulgation of will; and their divisive manipulations on this subject have induced vicarious redefinition and re-transmittance of, not namely will or volition, but “brief commitment to an adaptation” (Bateson, 1972, p. 242) or, according to Bertalanffy, an

immanent state of action; and further they have coerced the preservation of the latter in terms primarily of somatoform inculcations, which are to philosophic account our most proximal or myopic flows and, thus, a dependence or defensive inurement. Importantly, these are decoded disjunctively, in haste—and, hence, erroneously—insofar as they are subjected to the entanglement and manipulation and internecine and perpetual transformation of natural ecosophic territorialisation.ⁱ That is, the corpus or body proper of volition, namely i) motor composure; ii) structural internalization and abstraction; iii) mechanization or processual sequentialization; and iv) serial commitment or progressive tractation, has been gradually hollowed or consummately depersonalized to incorporate Romantic allusion (impressive, alterable, fecund) with Naturalistic systematism and rational objectivism, and this voluble transformation has effected a scrutable and, more necessarily, ordered natural situation of somatic speciation.

The present argument leaves from an assumption that the transition from Romantic idealism to Naturalistic logical materialism and object-relation has been territorialized, namely conformed and, to use a Deleuzian and Guattarian analogy, digested. Second, our theoretic discrepancy from nature, having in effect perpetuated physical or configurational dualism—having, so to speak, eloped the map—and entrenched an antisense vexation, i.e., a circuitous slough or pejorative brain-freeze in which the perspectivist manipulation of matter is inappropriately sharpened against its fledged, profligate reflection, and it has shaped an ineluctable revitalization and transposition of organic for somatic tensions and completion. Analytic nature has become schiz-modal, i.e., territorially fatuous and spurious, and the cleft or distribution separating Romantic indulgence for the natural world from its Naturalistic depredation has been rapidly supplanted and enswathed with a quixotic, small-world stereotypy populated with *somatic corpora*, meaning the copious rhythms, acuties,

extrapolations, and parcellations of the body predominating from Freudian genealogy and immured to Lacanian discursive semiosis.

This paper endeavours to reveal how somatic plateaus are dissembled, substituted, and abruptly or stubbornly naturalized, and in the process to offer an alternative paradigm of naturalization whereby the somatic corpora figuring these plateaus are adequately surmised, distressed, subordinated (re-territorialized), and transmitted to lodge their autopoietic complaints for further philosophic influence and investigation. However, firstly a basic clarification is expectable. If it is assumed that “flows” (i.e., from Deleuze and Guattari) are linearized, contiguous, and fluidly or hieroglyphically depictive, and that an ethos (i.e., from Bateson) is statically indicative, as well as refulgent or coactive, it makes intuitive sense in the present, albeit Batesonian context to prefer flows and, perhaps counterintuitively, to dispose of ethos; for values are surely distended and protracted, i.e., commensurate with relative and temporalized volatilities or subjectivistic errancies, rather than being singularly protrusive and embellished or engrained and cleaved to existing structure. Additionally, the flow is fervid, indiscriminate, whereas the analytic membrane is porous and visceral, providing an expected commensurability or theoretic Batesonian complementarity to somatic indigence; and conversely, the ethoic error is naturalistic, inasmuch as its imputation of causality is, in a definite way, blinded to its topographical condition, leaving it like a certain catalyst to dysfunctional (or blind) somatic conjunctions, yet an unlikely mediator of, or transactive container for, the primitive disavowal or ecosophic desensibilization affecting contemporary analytic decomposition.

Ecosophy is arguably the decomposition of the somatic aisle, its tortuosity, but prior to this critical deconstruction it is valuable to the sake of philosophical (i.e., rhetorical-territorial) lucidity to clarify an additional argument. Somatic corpora (the Parts-in-Whole) are scattered around the self-otherⁱⁱ axis, which is an equally geometricized and ecological

axiom providing natural (or recurrent and artefactual) and evolutionary mainspring and order to the substantive locus of somatic attraction (or vector displacement or purveyal). It does not, in fact, subserve social functions to the exclusion of universal pretence, for the separation itself is characteristic of, namely corporatic to or somatically adjured from, symbolic order. In other words, somatic corpora are palpably and, directly for their contingent requital, needlessly significatory, and to this purpose the self-other distinction presumes, activates, and supportates the Lacanian Signifier-signified ratio; whereas this adopts its direction and pattern of signification from language or discourse, i.e., its inert material or analogical connaturality, self-other is described to marginal completion in terms of movement and topological fields. Hence, the evocation from movement or motor configuration to static transection and florid dissection characteristic of linguistic signification is a Little Ordinal—an indistinguishable byte or vacuous consequence—in the signifying chain, nearly identical with its praxis. Moreover, the level of discretion that is partitioned between these functional outlets is imaginary or dimensional—merely instrumental.

The solipsistic geometry inhering to the self-other field is a mechanical caveat that, relative to the placation of territorial argument, is soddenly disoriented and indisposed; in larger effort, it is definitive and ordinate, i.e., a doctrination of accounts, but in cultural, namely ecosophic prevalence, it is a mechanical incongruity—an axis or plane of asymmetry—skiving, shirking, scanting, or reallocating the onus and interlocution of systems and semiotic structures. It is the leading edge (so to say) or bifurcation upon and from which the territory prevaricates and displaces its charge, and if patterning exists, the self-other distinction is its pneumatic imprinter or the “machinic assemblage” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977; 1987) responsible for its latence or ubiquity. It is for this reason cultural theory is immersive and simulationist, for inasmuch as it categorically develops and traduces institutional interaction it also derives immanent locution or motor regulation of Batesonian

difference always from polyvalent alterity or self-other diachronism. Hence the self-other cybernetic whorl—for it is neither truly, in its elusive mimesis and vertiginous regress, entirely differential nor remotely planar—is the apical source of interpretation and disgorgement of cultural symbolic order, and thus also the Procrustean tangibilization of the soma.

The soma is exorbitant, rancorous, and callow, holding true given a rudimentary provision: that the form is regenerative. Normally mortification (a preservationist self-other structure) prevents this shape from obtaining colour, but under ecosophic pretense somatic distribution suffers distracted motricity, a type of primitive autoscopy (Lacan, 1901, p. 85) whereof sensoria are constrained and quantitatively immanent, forcibly irascible, and the soma is thus prevented and rendered orthogonal to the “BwO” or Body without Organs (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977; 1987), meaning that the autocracies and proximities of the organs are instead transfused incoherently and, having lost its biostatic sublimity, action at this immutable nucleus is exasperated, stultified, and disproportionate, resulting in specific emergent downstream disjunctions cleaved, yet, to somatic plinth. In theoretical terms the axiom, the penultimate precedent, can be said to be unacquainted (i.e., bilateral) or unembroiled with its arguments; and then the syllogism is herpetetic or completely short or abortive; the preposition is disfigured or fatally lamellar; and the theory is decentered or removed from cerebellar equilibrium, in which contribution is multiaxial and completion becomes apparent in and from itself. Generally, there is the disintegration of speculative territory and its specious supplantation with vast overexposure of somatic level (i.e., interchangeability or organicity that is mistakenly spontaneous), in addition to submergence of unconscious somatic (or common, or false or misleading) mythos: the duplicitous preference or preconscious dormancy of the organ, the specialness or quality of the limb, the stirring allusion of the face, etc.

The somatic derision of ecosophic territory is funereal, for the inherently Hobbesian somatic trajectory (i.e., its delusional or psychotic programming) is mistakenly imputed to epistemological cause. It is to be oxidizing in time with the air and tensing in circumstance with the clouds; volition is, within this same analogical avowal, a moribund stipulation, decrepit, having been adjusted, tensored, and fixated to the natural depilatory and cyclical parameters of the soma. The dispositive bracket of the soma allocates brevity, a frame of reference efferent (at great disdain) to its coda, and with its maw it decodes the wounds or arrests (rather than the composition or emergence) of the somatic branch. This does not regard vast somatic expression—its roiled, wrought, unentrenched, and bloodless mutiny—any less than specific or parcellated somatic expression: for, also the legs are made to carry transitory indulgence of the part or the whole; the arms, to disperse rhetorical carriage impulsively; the mandible and the maxilla surmised, to truncate or disparage paradigmatic linguistic predominances and uses; and so forth. Hence the self-other lens or partition is deformed and manipulated at lengths to requite its peremptory stream, exacerbating its convex schizz whose geodesic aligns firstly to (cybernetic) context and secondly, to—ultimately—abandon, a supplicatory or ingratiating alternative to its wilderness.

In addition, the “symbolic subduction” (Lacan, 1901, p. 87) of the ecosophic territory is mounted (i.e., collective and copious) and fruitful, progenitive, for in the former sense the soma has lost integumental context, its precise and decorous (or veiled) *mater*, requiring nought but space to distend and glorify its analogic priming, and in the latter sense the soma is axial and stereotyped, the redoubled emphasis of an unlikely or chance vestige rather than desultory or inexorable resource of the territory. Fundamentally its priming or subtension is strident, proving a transversal bedevilment, and unsurprisingly it makes presumptive cause that is in-itself, rather than languid, paroxysmic. In turn this promotes slavish microscopy (i.e., primitive autoscopy of the somatic allocation), an exaggeration or hysterical abstraction

of its selfsame minutiae (not to mention an apposite mirroring of the apical territorial conformation), giving rise to somatic dilution or effluvia: the false or deceptive notion of, in the psychoanalytic stance, anal, oral, phallic, and genital persuasions viscerated or glorified through corporal distortions, as opposed to transduced into functional and topographic symbolic organization.

For present purpose *plateau* is taken firstly in the Batesonian sense, as a “hierarchy of discontinuities” (Bateson, 1999, p. 252) that is, however, dissociated from learning or severed (thus proving its point or sharpness), and secondly in the Deleuzian and Guattarian sense, as a categorical instigation or disjunction of territorialisation or its failure of larger equality. The step from somatic pleroma to somatic plateau is a hypostasis, a Batesonian circuit-level; hence the somatic plateau ingratiates prediction of the gestalt. It is a “differentiated point” (“nucleus of change”; Bateson, 1979, p. 46), and it is a neoplasm of vast dissuasive potential, formed from (not of) or visible like sporadic homological alternations taken out of depth, revealing or epitomizing pathology in the same way madness is able to consume meaning. Thus, the somatic plateau is an unconscious territory of the soma, where it has gone further than to misidentify or misrecognize its lapses. And those somatic plateaus which are reobtained from ecosophic depredation (i.e., having minds, owing inveterate decomposition and recomposition) are primarily separable into (I) perceptual streams, (II) pathway ventriloquisms, (III) liminal constructions, and (IV) rotatory prevalences, having in common they are Batesonian amalgams (i.e., concordant shapes or affinal ciphers): presently the addition is the morphogenetic dissemination of shape, i.e., the cogent quasi-aggregate of contours, traces, etchings, and engravings.

(I) Perceptual streams are the meridians and longitudes giving ability to deny coincidence in the brain, i.e., to prove denotative immanence, and inasmuch they have both prejudicial apposition and lavish (i.e., falsely copious) qualities they are, in the mirror, the

foremost protean artefact of analytic symbolism. Their corpora are primarily visual and auditory, for these respective perceptual fields abide denotative consistency or essentially, resorptive potential, and irruptive signifying orders. They are internally mirrored and mutually diametricized, allowing for illusory or fantasy complementarity of their fulgurations, which are in actuality locally undetermined, meaning simplistic (albeit extenuated) and, rather, unwoven—not abutted—at the edges of their concurrent knots of displacement and (in terms of environmental alterity) their hyperactivity. Perceptual streams are ecologically prefabricated with minor oblique enunciations which cannot be harnessed evenly at the crux of discontented (malformed) territories, suggesting dirigible truncation that condescends or delimits signification. However, they also posit false logical classes; they detract the territory without composing or inhabiting it, and this is sensible to assume provided the base for denial of coincidence (perhaps thus being also a similar hedge for repression) stems from its monstrous overindulgence of same. Inasmuch as perceptual streams procure consonance and inflection, the misplacement or dissimulation of ethological pretence, they can be attributed in humans whose evolutionary multifarious ascension has struck apical (high-resolution) cost, to the concentric and collected similarities of the face, to the proveniential allocation of tangential profile (including the ears), and a rationale can be surmised that, if the inundation of face or facie is the demonstrable property of the perceptual stream, the multi-terminous syncopation of perceptual stream is the mirrored timeliness of an in-equal-parts immanent and inexorable fashion to carry the face, and the ecosophic territory is directly competitive with this vector allusion.

(II) The actual (as opposed to comparative) breadth of somatic conniption (i.e., Trace-of-Being)—the latter which is suggested to seek to exculpate its biologic redress through localization of progressive channels of communication (whose consecutive assurances can abide any number of, but largely physical micrological properties)—portends generous

assumption of its limits, yet, proving in addition a mirror to the fatalistic or moribund trajectory (derangement and mastication) of the ecosophic territory, the highly dubious recomposition of a sinking (receding) range. Arguably, this is an etiology of the BwO as much a leading or demonstrable somatic habitude (levelled or transactive) under expended or conflagratory suggestion; for the somatic revolution (subterfuge) is compelled to greater and greater exigency under loss of durance, i.e., under threat from incommensurate oblivion and renewal of wilderness (i.e., the loss of tapered and equilibrated logic or perspective), and the greater its gain of exigency, the sharper the misadjustment (reflection) of coordinates, offering to symbiotic abstraction significant (i.e., signified) disjunction. Thus, provided that self-other refraction makes assumption to traduce disjunction, the subsequent introduction of mediated ventriloquism, i.e., of performative and deformative pathways, is less a directional accomplishment than a confrontation between somatic vortices and their contributed distortions of the somatic plane, which has been deterritorialized to accommodate impression (an exogenous or, in this case, involuntarily displaced memorization) of the Trace-of-Being.

ENTELOCIOUS
RHIZOMATIC TRANSCENDENCE

In different ways somatic corpora are confrontational, and never the more so than within sight of their largest collective or inveterate disjunction. Excretive functions compose with speech narrow discrepancy and imprecation; implicated muscles mutually struggle for edge-celerity and load of tensility; and metabolism is translocated and spontaneously caused and audited, with glucose having or assuming preponderance in apparent relative complacency with the somatic field—to wit, cells of the digestive tract impaling or circumscribing their semblable rivals, neurons. Together the confrontations and disfigurements produced by somatic corpora result in orthogonal stratifications— fundamentally the extent of the stagger of the step or gait—and in this way, with the ecosophic territory occurring in direct tangent with the ideographic transfiguration between soma and the process of territorialisation, a destructive (intransigent) topographic volution occurs, forcing crude

exteriorizations or epigenetic conversion symptoms to suffice the erroneous or misidentified plane (i.e., the plane having become external to somatic corporatization), and thereby also serving a false mirror to motor or actionary commitment.

(III) Somatic corpora are symptotically proven, past Hebbian wiring and firing, like their comparative and categorical conjunctures result from vestigial unconscious foreground, which had to have been jettisoned from a primordial mainspring linking symbolic order with structural inflection, instating, and necessity—i.e., with geometric field, to augur and subtend as-provable cumulation and logical familiarization (i.e., excession) relative to the plane of seemingness. This property takes extensive measure of philosophical dispute, for liminal interspersions are subject to an evaluative propensity to its cast—to the discordant conflation of its trajections attracting at an equal interpretation, requiring transduction and seduction (the material manifold), whose complemented physical emergence is also comparative to the culminant malleability of settled philosophical territory: their properties can only fold as closely as ecosophic countenance (i.e., uniquely their proximity is also uniquely their reticence), proving in addition the indispensability of somatic corpora to terminable and shared (i.e., attributable) discourse. Yet, in addition to this facet, somatic joints demonstrate the arguable nucleus of liminal constructivity, for they are transcendent of the corporal plane—visible against axis—and aimlessly contingent in this eminent regard. That somatic corpora are veridical in this way is attributable to their inhabitance and population as a rule of engulfment: they are immanent insofar as they are entwined, and they are entwined insofar as they are superlative to drive or instinct, that is, intrinsically focal (i.e., machinic) and dissuasive. Curiously, bilateral reflections or genetical pairs of symbolically indifferent (i.e., monotonous or repletional) somatic corpora are indistinguishable from their proximities, in that their interspersions—their secession and retention turning dependent axes—results in a natural logical locus occurring irrespective of conflated paradigms of matter. This ponderous

division is identical to a true-to-form or inherited organic mirror, and the mechanism at play is as likely retributive, having equivalent physical and unconscious aspersion devoid of topography, as for mere allocation, avoidant.

The most suggestible and traversable of the corpora, namely those of Freudian genealogical provenance, are long-since eminent and injunctive, meaning they have been evolved to forthcome semiotic intention. Conversely, whereas Lacan gave only passing relation to the property of apical scanting or abruption, i.e., of the singular and ultimately mitotic progression and teleology of the apogee within symbolical orders—i.e., of the eventual specious irruption and declension of the apogee—clearly somatic corpora, apart from developmental interjection and temporal cybernetic, owe their existence to such a relational projection, in which their satiation or indelible ordination is excoriated sharply to afford continual maximization. Hence most somatic corpora are liminal (following identical lines), having but their chutes or eternal plummets in common, and their signification is lasted from liminal or linear functional integration (territoriality and, contrariwise, nomological disjunction); contrary to impression, the specular fragmentation of somatic corpora alone is not a subsumable manner of territorialisation. More trivially, the condensation of somatic corpora effects an ecology such that the whole is peculiar and relative to codominance, cooccurrence, and co-terminance, to allusive rather than injunctive or tomographical specialization, proving that allostases have less than liminal construction or superficial coordinates in common, that homeostasis is a moot frustration of vertiginous territorialisation, and that self-other insistence within this contextual reference is a kind of spare perjury.

(IV) At inspection the parallelism, oblativ parsimony, and zygotic transfigurations of somatic corpora recede gradual avouching of confabulatory or interpositional separation, meaning insignificant pluriformity, situating an earthen bound (i.e., an inflexible propriety or

vital monotonic custom) for discursive flow, i.e., for equivalent codification. Speech emerges thusly like the affectation or appurtenance of closed system interiorizations, and it is this interior densification that procreates firstly a qualitative or sequential reduction of temporal opportunism, and secondly redundancy (or natural law). The former can also be likened as a rotatory prevalence, stifled and nucleic, inasmuch the ambulation or ironic courtesy is the evocation, and the evocation is what cannot disgorge or be disgorged. Here we are also taken with secretory glands and keratinizations whose orientations are constructive, and with the genetic spool, in which the impetus is reflexivity (and the ceiling is autological), or the bloodstream, in which the distribution of pressure in terms of thin and indulgent generation punctuated at capillary beds can be said to majorly sustain causal somatic artifice or its means *and*, as opposed to *of*, production. Additionally, the production of pathways of somatic pain are noted primarily for, as Bateson (1972) would emphasize, a beginning and an end, similarly with stochastic reflex causeways.

The interiority of somatic corpora (which are ever dispelled and bleak) is a "topological phenomenon whose distribution in nature is as sporadic as the dispositions of pure exteriority that condition it" (Lacan, 1901, p. 352), however it is virtually conditional, and is for this reason additionally kinesthetic or adequate to ecosophic diminution. It is a property which is biased from view, which is the exact requital of its complete or amounted providence, and it finds its closest allusion for its lack of concavity (reflecting the disjuncted membrane) in the gravities or severities of the soma, whatsoever strengthens its putative measure: the syncopations, infarctions, untimely metastases or programs, phagocytic exertions, tenesmatic or nystagmatic malaprops, imperative or punctuative contractilities, synthetic deconditions, etc. Each of these somatic corporatizations is held at greater and lesser material extent relative to the parallel of self-other definition, but not to its plane or window; the emphasis occurs that is egregious or emaciated, meaning that in terms of natural

order it is not the seed or the blade, but rather the opening—whatsoever is tempestuous or windful.

Yet, for its compositional fruition (i.e., for being barred), the voluptuousness of this feasible demarcation is extraterritorial, trudging the minima and maxima of a layered and inconsummate field, as a result of having its ostensible slate blurred in excess of range (i.e., beyond manipulable partition). In these corporatic mechanisms the whole of ecosophic vitalism is held to the light, though its territories are merged insensately. Unsurprisingly then, the rotatory prevalence embarks voluntary and involuntary structure implicitly—as far as formalism—and produces involuntary treacle, the half-hearted disparagement and hiatus of alleged (performed as opposed to actual) occupance. The territory is deprived sadistically: i.e., the *pied* of syllepsis occurs atop the insuperable terrain, where it is confined, such as when the specific functional transduction of the organ is supposed to reach conscious experience; and, just as the pinch or reflexion of accessory soma is wont to occur, the precursor to this material cause is spurred to temporarily (temporally) abandon locus to emerge identically, and is thus an accordance of false profundity or somatic hyperbaton. The plateau cedes to lesser plateau until, it can be said, it is caught.

Naturalization

The goal of the naturalization of somatic corpora in terms of ecosophic immanence is to obtain a clean Lacanian image (i.e., an intended and undistorted psycho-structural disposition) of the process of territorialisation. It is unreasonable to suppose this could occur without a retributive and vituperative circuit in which corpora are poorly lucid, because the sustenance of their causation is the position of maelstrom or semiotic decomposition; moreover, the primitive Oedipal mantle circumscribes an essential egoization which somatic corpora must abide, given that they are at various advantage or disadvantage with the levers

or mechanisms of the ego, which are supernumerary in excess of tangible or dubious somatic-corporatic manipulation and, for this reason, in defiant or complicit egress from completion. Somatic corpora are at an unusual representation in this regard, given that whereas semiotic immanence is directly conveyed from discursive value, the raucous appurtenance of somatic corpora flouts this essentiality, making a misaligned or disordered or nonfocal normalization of their exclusionary or deprivational paucity—fundamentally their centrality or sense of accession—an egregious understatement of Lacanian root. The tribal Bacchanalia or Dionysian blindness affecting somatic-corporatic supposition is a contingent transposition of the Lacanian expectation of predicative (i.e., mirrored) product, especially if somatic corpora are within earshot of or in lockstep with the nucleus of change; and invariably this is their length, that is to mean, an abnormal or non-Euclidean bias or prediction of projection, an affine participation that both disperses irruptive margin of error and secures equipositional grounding for both discursive and behavioural activation, ensuring there is a generous basis or corporatization for discrepant signifierness. However, it is primarily the praxis that is lopsided or turbulent, for the form or datum is a static transmittance, and the promulgation, a secular insinuation of a field of interactivity, and eventually the purposivity of somatic corpora is caused in terms of their forthright landing or violence, what ever lauds the extenuation of chains of desire supposing their permanence and hyperbarity with ego. The first-order naturalization of somatic corpora is thus the preservation of specific activity, or a redundant or basal cybernetic illness, whereas a cybernetic health is the realization not of specificity, but of response, which is—in and of itself—a reacted or unquestioned somatic tautology. Additionally, the holism that is exceptional to somatic corpora is intransigent with adumbration and enumeration, given that soma is the instigator of process or formalism, yet its calculations are moot, inasmuch as these cannot exceed a sum that is successively and exhaustively prevalent and indefatigably disposed to transcend its claim of conjunction. At

this point it is a helpful escapism of deformation with Žižek (1991) on Lacan, who wrote that "reality itself is nothing but an embodiment of a certain blockage in the process of symbolization", as well that there is occurrent "Lacanian foreclosure of a certain key signifier" with reality as a symptom; we can comfortably establish that this reality is, in fact, an embodiment of body, of the soma, which is also the blockage apparent, and in this metaphorical trigger we discover "the whole pack of Rousseauian prophets—regenerators, vegetarians, fresh-air freaks, sunbath apostles, and so forth" (Mann, 1924, p. 456): i.e., the distribution of a corporeal reality that is symbolically—paroxysmally, dissolutely, parochially—intent on the soma.

The naturalization of somatic corpora is fundamentally their expatiation, and the incalculable immanence of Freudian hieroglyphic or mytho-logic is a territorial drive of egoistic effacement or recession in which the least detail is the largest iconographic virtualization. Firstly, somatic corpora are said to disavow and renounce the Ego—or to overthrow that which is the lassitude or spiritualization of form—and their simultaneously gradual and total accretion and systematization is a deconstructive endemization of an imperative of natural order, within which there is an assumption—whether divine or rational—of the responsibility of interruption (or the equilibration of Deleuzian and Guattarian "flow" and "conjunction" in their sempiternal space), equivalent to "nature's pathological "tic" or deformation" (Žižek, 1991, p. 133) or the truthiness and burden of familiarization. The process of somatic naturalization conversely requires defamiliarization, a manner of polarization, occurring in the way of deformity, an extrapolation beyond measure, that is to the ego too large for Lacanian foreclosure, which is to say it is protrusive or nodular in order to prove apart. The larger corpus of somatic corpora is dispirited or freed of imperative except for anatomic and logico-modulatory, amounting to being caused to resort its skeptical or redoubled kernel elsewhere. Thus there is the Oral, which is the resultant of

complication and Lacanian foreclosure (i.e., interruption); the Anal which is the conjuration of an impossible symbolization and ordering for somatic rotatory prevalence; the Genital which is at a readiness vis-à-vis natural order (i.e., preformation); the Phallic which is redoubted with its selfsame slavish genitorship as part of an equally genitalized but, in its case, distracted readiness vis-à-vis natural order, being that it is an increasing experience or totemization of formation, a truncation of matters of symbolization. There is here also an opportunity to emancipate the proportion of Freudian genealogy as far as its constitutive connections with an equalization of territorial activity. However, it is important firstly to adjust the facile assumption of a physical dominion, i.e., a territory, divergent from a concessive administration of symbolic interactivity, i.e., territorialisation. The territory is an indelible tangibility and orchestration of territorialisation, and thus like an absolute or irreparable sophistication or complexification of the desistance or enlightening of territorial praxis, a pinion or placeholder onto or into which signification, and its primitive extension of the object, stabilizes its form and creates an expression for self-other dyadic componentiality. For evolution of the sphere of mirroring and identification does not occur atop, but from and within a nucleus of proportionate condensation—again in reflection of somatic berth—consisting of retracted and effected modes, or the first and last places of somatotomy respectively. In the search of Romantic devaluation and Naturalistic decoction, the self-other abruption is also a dissociation, an exasperation of corporality, tried disastrously at the acropolis of false or filiform spatio-temporalizations (for having failed to do with a continuous matrix of matter, i.e., for being territorialized rather than metrical). This explains in great detail the extent that territorialisation is regulated by the death-drive: the death-drive is knowable as an imminent (i.e., impugned) and incumbent (i.e., exculpated)—evasive, transversal—captivity, tantamount to the shape of the form, and so on.

The territory emulates display, allowing for denied confocality or an impenetrable distribution of staple values (whose transitory identities attest or stand material negation), but the immanence of the ecosophic territory is such that, at least at a visible standard of solipsistic inflection (i.e., with contiguous and jointed focality; the stagnant waters harbouring Narcissus), it can hardly contract to provide its securitization or mirth, i.e., at an overarching mechanization the capitulation or cessation of movement. Tokenized perceptions are poorly able to enunciate structures or structural validation, and as such consciousness, whether Romantic, Naturalistic, or their encoded interpolation, is given to be reducible to its adaptations without abandoning or shunning language, forcing an incongruous assimilation of incorporate or abandoned method. This is seen particularly in the deprivation and zombification of experimental context, wherein exists an eternalized contextual elision qua effect, as well as in the scotoma afflicting various levels of revelation of discourse—i.e., the point is left quintessentially darkened.

The semblance of somatic corpora vis-à-vis the ecosophic territory is roiled and despotically abrogated such that a febrile imprint is conveyed, i.e., allocated to sedimentation, like a diapason, meaning cleansed and moot. At base of this falsity—this rigorous, i.e., essentialized, climax of the Real—is a profound or topical anesthetization of somatic plaint, inundating the causal circuit with incidental, not visual, conflict, and stiffening rotations or protocols of cybernetic acclimation and emergency measure (see Bateson, 1979) in response to environment that is stinged or reproached of somatic glorification. Somatic corpora are not granitic and stable, but mouldering, and their discontinuous excision and perforation of ecosophic territory is an activation and deactivation, a preferment of assurance of its surrounding tissues and extensively, its organs, rather than a sustenance and just preservation of relation. From the side of Romanticism, the soma is jarred, i.e., injured, or unduly speciated, repleting surgical tenors that concede cellular, i.e., proliferative or abortive

pathologization, encouraging vapid planting and transplanting or injection or catheterization. This is much like an accordance of invective or aggressive libidinality under assumption of territorial prolixity—of self-other distraction—whereas ecological speech represses distance, drudging in this case portentous exacerbation. And for an ongoing capability of Naturalism, somatic distance ought to be cleaved to its remittal such that there is a reduction of concentric depth or tautolization, which is equivalent to the return of ecological sufficiency or clonal or vital branch profusion. Within these mechanizations the ecosophic territory develops sagittal and transversal velocities which eventually subjectivize resorption and absorption, whose actions are distributively immanent (in somatic terms) to territorial (i.e., focally or contextually indistinguishable) action, and comparative to frequentist measures such as multiple coextensive or syncretic monitoring or regularization vis-à-vis metabolic competition (i.e., trace memory and marring or landscape oppression or hermetic densification).

Ideally, the soma ought to be anatomized (i.e., scientifically sufficed and quantized) and normalized to judge and endemize its pervasion. The lowest-order naturalization possible of somatic corpora is an individuation of semblance, a paltry cure of their subjectival indiscrimination adjudicating the brevity of lacunae to the assemblages of caprices and vice versa, such that verisimilitude and planar organization can interchangeably abide plethoras of Batesonian context without premature or tractated dissociation of the inalienable significations of each somatic corpus in turn. Of somatic corpora, organs provide the least reminiscentⁱⁱⁱ plateau: apart from being diminished from experience, lending divulgence and reproach to the introjection of their forms, they are in strong relation to the psychoses (Freud, 1899, C1SC3), suggesting an extent (i.e., an irresponsive tautology or scanting) of misconfiguration, and, proportionally, the realization of dimensionalized inner product relative to discourse, leading to a highly ingratiated or inestimable significatory modulus

(rather than a material). Conversely, (I) the perceptual stream can be distilled to dis-encounter its polemic, numericized to diverge its endless coupling with effect, and squandered to disjunct and relieve its often mistaken senses of direction; (II) the pathway can be recombined to enervate control and prioritize its commonality; (III) the liminal construction can be travailed at a more competent height and, in *Anti-Oedipal* parlance, decomposed, to venerate its weak extraction; and (IV) the rotatory prevalence can be enamoured or fixed (i.e., supportated) with extraneous stimuli, namely clones or virtual prosthetics, and can be abridged (i.e., disjuncted needfully) and formulated such that its nascent fixtures of effect are autonomously accorded, corroborated, and ensured. The rotatory prevalence is the strongest idealization of Romantic territorialisation, for it is the closest to, as Mann (1924) put it in *The Magic Mountain*, make light of matter as a “disreputable degeneration of the immaterial” (p. 361), and in this way it is a further mentalization of the Deleuzian and Guattarian comedic frankness and insistence of reference to the anal-elastic exercise, to the manipulation and conformity of space as the most impressionable conjunction of a long-winded presence of mind, of a consciousness both in jest and sport.

Finally, it can be stated that Freud's ascription of a "return to the inanimate" to every living body, in addition to being a preservation of the fact of discourse (Lacan, 1901, p. 680), is the inverse or falsification of somatic recomposition. For the totalization of soma occurs with the object—not the object with the soma—in that the body's signifierness is indistinguishable from or incalculable to—but thus absolutely engrained or duplicitous with—interoceptive territorialisation, to mean it is "inscribed in a discourse": in fact the ignorance of the subject is dependent upon levels of articulation, a factor which in Lacan's development is relegated prematurely, meaning that articulation is wrongly disposed of experiential praxis and, judging from its dialectical priming, also its salvo of territorialisation, and so these strata are separated schiz-matically (i.e., spastically devolved)—experience is

derealized because it is dredged and overdetermined within (or enclosed and suborned to) the deuterio-finitude, i.e., the prescience and preclusion, of the soma.



References

Bateson, G. (1972; 2000). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. University of Chicago Press.

Bateson, G. (1979; 1982). *Mind and nature: A necessary unity*. Bantam Books.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1977; 2009). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*.

Penguin Classics; Illustrated Edition. (Original work published 1977, Viking

Penguin).

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *Anti-Oedipus: A thousand plateaus*. University of

Minnesota Press.

Freud, S. (1899). *The interpretation of dreams*. In The Standard Edition of the Complete

Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. London: Hogarth Press.

Lacan, J. (1901—; 2006). *Écrits* (B. Fink, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company, Ltd. (Original

publication 1901—, Les Éditions de Minuit).

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1962; 1991). *Totemism* (R. Needham, Trans.). The Merlin Press Ltd.

(Original work published 1962, Presses Universitaires de France).

Mann, T. (1924; 1996). *The Magic Mountain* (J. E. Woods, Trans.). Vintage.

Žižek, S. (1991). *Looking Awry: An introduction to Jacques Lacan through popular culture*.


The MIT Press.

ⁱ Here the assumption is that Romanticism and Naturalism differentiate a shared but ultimately indelible and insoluble ecosophic landscape, or that the remoteness of nature and culture and affect and intellect according to Rousseau (Lévi-Strauss, 1961, p. 100) is not necessarily false, but spatially or territorially misleading.

ⁱⁱ In terms of ecosophic correspondence, the psychoanalytic Other is a frequent and rather unfortunate amnesia, as figuratively it is not often referred to by what does not logically precede it (i.e., the tribal interacts the “socius”—and this case of refractive or imperative discrepancy is, unlike its compositional discursive habitudes, infrangible and, thus, improbably dismissed). Instead, the ecosophic unconscious is simply improvised, and lacking its categorical mainspring the self-other distinction—its prominent juxtaposition at ends with its pervaded and naturalized ontology—is left in the proverbial dark, casting a deep and

focally counterfeit (i.e., obstreperous) shadow, a visibility also perhaps giving coincidental explication for the departure of Jung from Freudian discipline.

ⁱⁱⁱ The organs are in large evidence somatic dream-compositions because they are inseparable yet without space (the BwO): “Dream-compositions, by their very nature, are insusceptible of being remembered, and they are forgotten because as a rule *they fall to pieces the very next moment*” (Freud, 1899, C1SD).

ENTEL  CIUS
RHIZOMATIC TRANSCENDENCE