

## PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Nature-Life Fusion Through Deleuzian-Guattarian Posthumanism

AUTHORS: Özgür Bozan

PAGES: 1-28

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/4605179>



NATURE-LIFE FUSION THROUGH DELEUZIAN-  
GUATTARIAN POSTHUMANISM\*

DELEUZECÜ-GUATTARICI POSTHÜMANİZM  
ARACILIĞIYLA DOĞA-YAŞAM ETKİLEŞİMİ

Özgür BOZAN\*

ABSTRACT

This article aims to analyze a theoretical reconceptualization of the materiality of nature. To this end, this study raises two political problems of nature, specifically as a concept. The first problem is the modern concept of nature, which depicts its materiality as a mechanical concept, resulting in the domination of nature. On the other hand, the second problem is the postmodern concept of nature, which presents its materiality as a function of discourse. In this respect, there is no nature; it is political. This article presents an antidote derived from a critical posthumanist perspective based on the works of Deleuze and Guattari, *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. In this context, I advocate a new materiality of nature that constitutes an ethics of immanence and sees nature as a process of life production from the posthumanist approach. Nature is a plane where all life emerges, representing a dynamic production process.

---

\* This article has been derived from Özgür BOZAN's ongoing PhD dissertation at Istanbul Technical University, Department of Political Studies, Political and Social Thought PhD Program. Ethics committee approval was not required for this article.

\* Ph.D. Candidate, Istanbul Technical Univ., Department of Political Studies, Political and Social Thought PhD Program & Research Assistant at Şırnak Univ., bozan18@itu.edu.tr, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7145-5059>

\* Makale Geliş Tarihi / Article Received: 19.09.2024  
Makale Kabul Tarihi / Article Accepted: 20.11.2024

**Keywords:** The Concept of Nature, Materiality, Posthumanism, Deleuze and Guattari, The Ethics of Immanence.

## ÖZ

Bu makale, doğanın materyalliğine ilişkin teorik bir yeniden kavramsallaştırmayı analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, bu çalışma özellikle bir kavram olarak doğanın iki politik sorununu gündeme getirmektedir. İlk sorun, doğanın materyalliğini mekanik bir kavram olarak tasvir eden ve doğanın tahakküm altına alınmasıyla sonuçlanan modern doğa kavramıdır. İkinci sorun ise, doğanın materyalliğini söylemin bir işlevi olarak sunan postmodern doğa kavramıdır. Bu açıdan doğa diye bir şey yoktur; doğa politiktir. Bu makale, Deleuze ve Guattari'nin *Kapitalizm ve Şizofreni* adlı eserlerine dayanan eleştirel bir posthümanist perspektiften türetilen bir panzehir sunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, posthümanist yaklaşımdan hareketle doğayı bir yaşam üretim süreci olarak gören bir içkinlik etiği oluşturan yeni bir doğa materyalliğini savunuyorum. Doğa, tüm yaşamın ortaya çıktığı, dinamik bir üretim sürecini temsil eden bir düzlemdir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Doğa Kavramı, Materyaliti, Posthumanizm, Deleuze and Guattari, İçkinlik Etiği.

## INTRODUCTION

In the latter part of the 20th century, particularly from the 1960s onward, nature was frequently portrayed as a root cause of various political problems. During this period, not only were environmental issues at the forefront of some political problems, but environmental movements also emerged as significant developments. Concurrently, the concept of nature began to undergo radical critique within social and political theory. In this period, man as separate from nature is seen “as the root cause of the problems we currently face such as racial oppression and violence, wild capitalism born of neoliberalism, environmental destruction and mass extinctions” (Daigle and McDonald, 2022: 2).

This portrayal led to ethical scrutiny of political and social practices and raised ontological and epistemological concerns about human beings' self-perceptions. Despite this, the push for change primarily pertains to managerial

adjustments. It does not seek to bring about an epistemological and ontological shift in the modern understanding of nature.<sup>1</sup> It represents a demand to maintain capitalist production and consumption patterns and the liberal economic framework rather than a call for structural transformation.

However, how we perceive nature and interact with it plays an essential role in the persistence and origin of these non-structural changes. Therefore, it has become necessary to revisit the concept of nature. This concept's political and philosophical implications can have repercussions in our everyday lives. Understanding the existence of political problems related to nature and how to address them involves rethinking how we perceive nature conceptually, particularly its material aspects.

We deal with it conceptually because “new concepts must relate to our problems, to our history, and above all, to our becomings” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 27). In this respect,

The concept is obviously knowledge – but knowledge of itself, and what it knows is the pure event, which must not be confused with the state of affairs in which it is embodied. The task of philosophy when it creates concepts, entities, is always to extract an event from things and beings, to set up the new event from things and beings, always to give them a new event: space, time, matter, thought, the possible as events. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 33)

This article aims to analyze a theoretical reconceptualization of nature's materiality. To this end, this article raises two political problems of nature, specifically as a concept. On the one hand, the first problem is the modern concept of nature, which depicts its materiality as a mechanical concept. On the other hand, the second problem is the postmodern concept of nature, which presents its materiality as a function of discourse: there is no nature; it is political.

This article presents an antidote to these two political problems of nature. This antidote is derived from a critical posthumanist perspective based on the works of Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (I)*, and *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (II)*. I advocate a new materiality of nature that constitutes an ethics of immanence that sees nature as a process of life production in the posthumanist approach.<sup>2</sup> In their works, I argue that within

---

<sup>1</sup> For this managerial approach to political problems, see Dobson (2007) and De Lucia (2020).

<sup>2</sup> At this stage, humans are decentralized and exist within nature, as in Deleuze and Guattari (1983: 4). Thus, the distinction between humans and nature no longer exists. This article has ensured that critical posthumanism, while overcoming man's transcendental ethics, essentially refers to the concept of nature itself. The concept of nature (and the concept of life) allows for an immanent ethical understanding of the human entity.

the plane of immanence or consistency<sup>3</sup>, nature is a plane for a process of continual production where life generates new connections and becomings throughout multiplicities in an infinite loop and where they constantly interact and develop. Thus, I discuss that nature is a plane where all life emerges, representing a dynamic process of life production.

Deleuze and Guattari contribute to a broader understanding of the concept of nature and the concept of life, in which both can interact and become inextricable from each other. Although Deleuze and Guattari use the concepts of life and nature, they do not directly argue that nature is a process of life production. Instead, they do it in a convoluted way. In their work, the concepts of life and nature consist of two cross-cutting lines. The point at which they intersect, which I call the "*nature-life fusion*"<sup>4</sup>, is precisely where Deleuze and Guattari make us encounter nature as a process of life production. It is possible that confusion can occur here. It is that nature here seems to be life itself. Still, I claim that in Deleuze and Guattari, life is non-organic and self-organized, making matter live in a material dynamic. Simultaneously, nature exists on this same plane as an abstract machine or machines (machine ontology) where immanent life productions emerge. Nature "is a plane upon which everything is laid out, and which is like the intersection of all forms, the machine of all functions; its dimensions, however, increase with those of the multiplicities of individualities it cuts across" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 254).

## 1. THE POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF NATURE: MODERN AND POSTMODERN

The modern concept of nature presents a challenge by reducing nature to a mechanistic reality. In contrast, the postmodern concept of nature views its materiality solely as a construct of discourse or denies its existence altogether. The former facilitates the domination process of nature, while the latter undermines ethical principles associated with nature, leaving no middle ground for ethical considerations. I will briefly touch on both political problems in this section.

### Problem I: The Materiality of Nature as a Mechanical Concept

The COVID-19 pandemic, one of the most important events of modern times and whose effects are still felt today in social and political spheres, has made us rethink humanity's relationship with the concept of nature. The pandemic has brought along fundamental discursive ambiguities in our understanding of nature.

---

<sup>3</sup> The plane of immanence is also called a plane of consistency. It means that nature, in some sense, "is coded and inscribed in multiple ways producing a certain alignment of bodies" (Halsey, 2005: 40).

<sup>4</sup> The word fusion must be taken in the same sense as the word intersection. Nature and life have an immanent standpoint as the intersection of the two lines.

Along with this understanding, it “evoke[s] questions about the historical embeddedness but also the present self-understanding of humans related to what is called “nature”” (Engert and Schürkmann, 2021: 3). The most essential ambiguity is the concept of nature, which is treated as an external understanding. Throughout this pandemic, nature has unmistakably demonstrated its authority, embodying a powerful narrative of retribution (see Hornborg, 2021). With this discourse, it is seen that the so-called nature is composed of nonhuman beings<sup>5</sup>. This pandemic has revealed the enormous power and influence of nonhuman beings.

Throughout history, the concept of nature has significantly influenced political discourse. It has been utilized to understand human existence and society at large. In Western thought, the concept of nature has always been central, undergoing conceptual shifts from ancient to modern times (Williams, 1980; Ducarme and Couvet, 2020). The perception of humans' relationship with nature evolved over this period. Initially considered an integral part of nature, humans later became viewed as separate from it.

The formation of the modern state, the impact of the Judeo-Christian heritage, the scientific revolution of the 17th century, and the emergence of early capitalism have all contributed to shaping the modern perspective on nature as something to be governed and ruled by humans (Pattberg, 2007). Within the political realm, modernity further highlights the continuous dominance of humans over nature, normalizing it as a tool to serve human interests. Nonhuman entities are excluded from political life and are instead passively utilized. The advancement of instrumental rationality and representational thinking has coincided with this process (Adorno and Horkheimer, 1997; Leiss, 1994; Plumwood, 1993).

Among the most important pioneers were modern thinkers such as Rene Descartes (2006; 2008) and Francis Bacon (see Gaukroger (2004) and Malssen (2015)), whose political and scientific implications led the modern understanding to conceptualize nature as a passive object external to humanity and a mechanical subject to be dominated by it. In this way, this intellectual inference shapes our thought processes about ourselves and others, embedding in our view of the world the myth of man as the master or possessor of nature. This presents a distinct portrayal of the metaphysical viewpoint of contemporary society, prioritizing humans over nonhuman entities. However, a downside of this perspective is that

---

<sup>5</sup> In this context, the COVID-19 pandemic is not assessed regarding inherent positive or negative impact as nonhuman beings. The focus is on portraying nonhuman entities as external to the modern concept of nature. This demonstration highlights that nonhuman entities or the concept of nature, in a contemporary context, encompass anything external to human entities, including things other than human beings, such as viruses.

it excludes nonhuman entities from the sphere of political existence.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, the separation process here leads humans to be transcendental and nature as a mechanical entity depicted by the physical and external life, including all nonhuman life, which is passive and inert. The examination shows that the fundamental distinction between humans and nonhumans originates mainly from human-centered metaphysical understanding.

On the one hand, the idea creates a contradiction that sets up a dualistic view between nature and humanity. As Soper (1995: 15) indicates, nature “is opposed to culture, history, to convention, to what is artificially worked or produced, in short, to everything which is defining of the order of humanity.” Although the fundamental problem of the modern concept of nature is that it presupposes mechanistic materialism, the principle of domination to which it leads us must be considered as the result of this problem. This modern dualistic plane presents the separation of human life from other life forms (Lemm, 2010: 75). Nonhuman entities, thus, are excluded from the ethical sphere.

On the other hand, the modern concept of nature's second tendency shows anthropocentrism. This means giving priority to human interests and preferences over nonhuman life. In the historical process, the concept of Anthropocene refers to human activity in terms of the domination of nature, which “points to human responsibility for the catastrophic state of the earth, which in turn – if we want to avoid reifying humanity into an abstract global agent – points to a certain form of social organization” (Favier, 2023: 1). The dominant idea in many current studies is the anthropocentric approach to claiming domination over nature (Lewis and Maslin, 2015), highlighting a significant environmental crisis in our everyday existence.

The contemporary idea of nature holds significant sway over every facet of existence, impacting both human and non-human entities. According to Krause, our current way of life heavily relies on the relentless exploitation of the earth, influencing what we consume, how we work, what we acquire and dispose of, where we reside and travel, and even how we are laid to rest (Krause, 2016: 1).

The core challenge stems from the instrumental view of nature, which recognizes nature's material presence but reduces it to a purely mechanical one. So, the first problem is the materiality of nature as a mechanical concept, which

---

<sup>6</sup> The representation of nonhuman beings as part of nature is specific to the metaphysical viewpoint of modernity because nature is embedded in mechanical structure and acknowledged as passive, non-dynamic, or non-alive due to the understanding of matter itself. This conceptualization is also embedded in essentialism. To follow the concept of essentialism in more detail, see Ellis (2014) and Koslicki and Raven (2024).

leads to the processes of domination of nature through dualistic and anthropocentric implications.

## **Problem II: The Materiality of Nature as a Function of Discourse**

Throughout scientific literature, there is a prevailing understanding of nature's domination. However, certain scholars are endeavoring to challenge or suppress this view. This is precisely what postmodern thought does. So then, how does the postmodern thought depict the concept of nature? The answer might be that there is no “nature”<sup>7</sup> except one that is politically and culturally constructed. While the contemporary notion of nature is often associated with dualist and anthropocentric viewpoints, many scholars contend that political and social influences fundamentally mold both modern and pre-modern understandings of nature, highlighting the interconnectedness of these ideas (Biro, 2005; Dingler, 2005; Gare, 1995; Meyer, 2001; Smith, 2008; Soper, 1995).

Some scholars emphasize the significant influence of human history on the concept of nature, arguing that human nature is inseparable from human activities (Phelan, 1992; Williams, 1980). This means that societal ideas also shape our perceptions of nature (Williams, 1980). These scholars believe that the foundational and essentialist characteristics of the term "nature" lack significance because its usage is inherently politicized and historically influenced. Therefore, they aim to challenge the essentialist and rigid nature of the political understanding of concepts such as justice, gender, and even nature itself in order to denaturalize them.

Dingler (2005) provides an explanation for why the contemporary understanding of nature is not considered a political category:

Once humans interact with nature, pre-given matter enters the sphere of the symbolic and is interpreted and conceptualized. Hence, the Cartesian account is based on a dualism of pre-given nature and the symbolic order. According to this account, since nature already exist before it is symbolized, nature is independent of relations of power. Hence, the essence of nature and its representation in the human sphere through knowledge is not distorted through the impact of power. As politics are inseparably related to power relations and nature is free of power, according to the Cartesian position nature is consequentially not a political category. (Dingler, 2005: 210).

---

<sup>7</sup> The word “*nature*” in quotation marks in literature is a symbol of the postmodern movement. Since nature is a political and social category, it is absurd to say it exists. For this attitude about demanding quotation marks in postmodern literature, see Papastephane (1999) and Richards (2015).



However, in the Foucauldian sense, nature is embedded in processes of power that guide conduct and normalize it at the level of individuals (through bodies) and populations, privileging the anthropocentric insight throughout modernity (Foucault 1998, 2003, 2007, 2008).

Lemke (2010) grasps this Foucauldian concept and portrays the materiality of nature as linked to discourse, which consistently corresponds with governmental practice. He asserts that:

Paradoxically, the liberal recourse to nature makes it possible to leave nature behind, or more precisely to leave behind a certain concept of nature that conceives of it as eternal, holy or unchangeable. For liberals, nature is not an autonomous domain in which intervention is forbidden as a matter of principle, or impossible. Nature is not a material substratum to which governmental practices are applied, but rather their permanent correlate... Liberal concept of autonomy and freedom are closely connected to biological notions of self-regulation and self-preservation, which prevailed over the hitherto dominant mechanistic paradigm of understanding bodies. (Lemke, 2010: 430).

Postmodern thought has always tried to get rid of essentialism. When they deal with the concept of nature, they want to understand it best as a political and cultural discourse. Especially recently, with this understanding, most thinkers in ecocritical thought prefer to use the concept of environment instead of the concept of nature. Ecocritical thought “wants to evaluate texts and ideas using “the environment” as secure and transcendent measuring rod – the very “nature” that the texts in question are said to “construct” in the first place!” (Herzogenrath, 2009: 2).

According to Judith Butler (1993), matter is an engagement with discourse and representation. Butler puts “matter into discourse representation, ultimately fails to escape the exclusionary logic of belatedness, according to which materiality is *always already* a function of discourse” (Herzogenrath, 2009: 2-3). Butler puts it this way:

It must be possible to concede and affirm an array of “materialities” that pertain to the body, that which is signified by the domains of biology, anatomy, physiology, hormonal and chemical composition, illness, age, weight, metabolism, life and death. None of this can be denied. But the undeniability of these ‘materialities’ in no way implies what it means to affirm them, indeed, what interpretive matrices condition enable and limit that necessary affirmation. That each of those categories have a history and a historicity, that each of them is constituted through the boundary lines that distinguish them and, hence, by what they exclude, that relations of discourse and power produce

hierarchies and overlappings among them and challenge those boundaries, implies that these are *both* persistent and contested regions. (Butler, 1993: 66-67).

Thus, the body is no longer material but is like an empty surface filled with discourse, without any biological signs of dynamism or agency (Tillman, 2015: 31). From this perspective, the body is abiological because of its materiality, which is embedded in the discourse process. Karen Barad states this lack of materiality in the postmodern theory and states that:

Language has been granted too much power. The linguistic turn, the semiotic turn, the interpretative turn, the cultural turn: it seems that at every turn lately every “thing”—even materiality—is turned into a matter of language or some other form of cultural representation. The ubiquitous puns on “matter” do not, alas, mark a rethinking of the key concepts (materiality and signification) and the relationship between them. Rather, they seem to be symptomatic of the extent to which matters of “fact” (so to speak) have been replaced with matters of signification (no scare quotes here). Language matters. Discourse matters. Culture matters. There is an important sense in which the only thing that doesn’t seem to matter anymore is matter. (Barad, 2007: 132).

Herzogenrath (2009: 3) argues that instead of seeing materiality as political and cultural (as how postmodern thought sees it), “a new perspective that allows for the incorporation of the workings of the “repressed” of representation (namely of the “real,” of “nature,” of “matter”) is needed.”

In this sense, what we need is “a theoretical rapprochement with material realism” (Coole and Frost, 2010: 6). Because they refuse the use of “nature” and “materialism” and do not want to reconceptualize them. There is a discernible tendency of antinaturalistic implications in postmodern thought, particularly in its inclination to bypass ethical considerations when addressing our contemporary societal challenges.

So, the second problem with nature is its materiality as a function of discourse, which indicates that there is no nature but only its political or cultural (in a linguistic way) construction and does not leave room for ethical consideration.

Then, what can be said in response to these two problems of nature? How can the mechanical structure of the modern concept of nature be prevented? How can the relationship between nature and the earth or life, whose metaphysical position has been taken away from it, be established in a non-mechanical way? Beyond all this, how can the materiality of nature be thought of differently? Or how can one reclaim the materiality of nature without these two problems?

One can say that posthumanist thought has ontologically some theoretical frameworks that can answer these kinds of questions. This paper aims to understand which or whom the posthumanist approach can pose a challenge or shift to these two materiality problems of nature. I would say it is the posthumanist perspective embraced by Deleuze and Guattari.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. DELEUZIAN-GUATTARIAN POSTHUMANIST EFFORT

When we call posthumanism, the first thing that comes to mind is to reject all the derivations made about what humans are in the traditional (particularly modern and postmodern) sense and to bring it back to the stage as a new entity. All efforts are ultimately to discover a new human. For this, Deleuze and Guattari (1994) call for a new earth and a new human. They state that:

We lack creation. *We lack resistance to the present.* The creation of concepts in itself calls for a future form, for a new earth and people that do not yet exist. Europeanization does not constitute a becoming but merely the history of capitalism, which prevents the becoming of subjected peoples. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 108).

Europeanization should be understood as an attempt to construct an organization that the modern world or man always wants to build along with capitalism. Deleuze and Guattari use this expression as a condition that prevents the emergence of a new human and a new earth. It is framed by the conviction that this structure, which develops around the principle of transcendence, “will save us” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 47). This outlook led to an anthropomorphic approach to the entire life. The humanist mindset, combined with the maturation of Western thinking and the desire to fulfill the demands of the Enlightenment, led to the principle of transcendence being felt in all aspects of life.

The most crucial aspect here is the concept of domination, which has aggressively gained a place in the modern world. In other words, recognizing humans as a transcendent entity has brought all these problems along with it. Therefore, as we understand that this has been the cause of the dire consequences today, it has also made us realize that it has an effect as an ethical consequence of failure (Daigle and McDonald, 2022: 2).

In terms of *Anti-Oedipus* where Deleuze and Guattari (1983) relate the concept of Oedipus to capitalism, it can be said that they provide that the human being who approaches nature with an understanding of domination emerges through the established prohibitions by the logic of social repression within a

---

<sup>8</sup> In their writings, Deleuze and Guattari may not explicitly employ the term “posthumanism,” yet they effectively grant us entry to this conceptual framework.

history (or the historical logic of capitalist structure). Although in terms of psychoanalysis, the logic of prohibition has an essential place in the familial structure of the oedipal personality, Deleuze and Guattari argue that this structure has historically emerged in the logic of capitalism, which traps the desire<sup>9</sup> to create a false image in the unconscious. This is a process of repression that blocks the productive effect of individuals. They state that:

For what really takes place is that the law prohibits something that is perfectly fictitious in the order of desire or of the “instincts,” so as to persuade its subjects that they had the intention corresponding to this fiction. This is indeed the only way the law has of getting a grip on intention, of making the unconscious guilty. In short, we are not witness here to a system of two terms where we could conclude from the formal prohibition what is really prohibited. Instead we have before us a system of three terms, where this conclusion becomes completely illegitimate. Distinctions must be made: the repressing representation which performs the repression; the repressed representative, on which the repression actually comes to bear; the displaced represented, which gives a falsified apparent image that is meant to trap desire. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 114-115).

It is a history of the unconscious beyond the human and of desire determined by capitalist social organization. Through this historical logic, man negates himself from nature or from everything else.

But how can this enquiry of Deleuze and Guattari on man be overcome? If the human is a transcendental entity formed within the historical logic of capitalism, how can human entities be redeemed from this process? I say “redeemed” because the human being has unconsciously caused dire consequences and at the same time has realized the existence of these dire consequences as anthropocentrism and dualism. So how can human beings be redeemed from this situation in which they are trapped? According to Colebrook (2015), with reference to Deleuze and Guattari, to be human requires the act until it does not have a destructive effect and becomes within nature, which refers to a posthuman who realizes the ethics of immanence:

The oedipal, subjective and human imperative becomes this: act in such a way as to do all you can to redeem what might have been if only the human had not been so destructive, so inhuman. To be human, to be a subject, is to be at once constitutively separated from a world one imagines as present and natural, *and* to embrace a structure of imagining that one might – finally – overcome the human stain and find one’s proper post-human

---

<sup>9</sup> Please see the meaning of the concept of desire and the concept of oedipal structure in the next section.

being. When Deleuze and Guattari diagnose the relation between capitalism and Oedipus, they are not mourning a world that has been subjected to differentiation and calculation, but criticizing the notion that calculation and capital are the sovereign differentiating systems that master a Nature that has no distance or difference itself.

Only by positing a paradise lost does one become a human subject, or one who wishes that he might become post-human and find Nature again. The Deleuzian challenge would be to think of a world without Nature, without the non-human milieu of life, growth and innocence that is mourned when one becomes a subject cut from the fullness of the Real...Rather than see 'man' and structure of exchange and difference as that which violates an otherwise wondrous, lost and transcendent nature, we might move to an innocent immanence in which there has always been nothing other than difference and distance – never a pure absolute or in itself. (Colebrook, 2015: 224).

The core dynamic that Colebrook (2015) tries to indicate to us is how relational and inclusive the ethics of immanence is in Deleuze and Guattari. The profound relationship between nature and man is that immanent ethics recognizes the position of man within nature. Thus, man reemerges in the conditions of a posthuman situation, by relocating himself to a decentered space (but within nature). The concept of nature, as an indispensable element of the posthumanist approach, regenerates the human being.

If the human is the key that posthumanism challenges and seeks to relocate, the concept of nature is the keyhole in this respect. In Deleuze and Guattari, along with nature, the concept of immanent life is also the keyhole integrated into this approach because according to Deleuze, “[p]ure immanence is A LIFE, and nothing else. It is not immanence to life, but the immanence which is in nothing is itself a life. A life is the immanence of immanence, absolute immanence: it is sheer power, utter beatitude” (Deleuze, 1997: 4). In this case, our keyhole appears as the nature-life fusion in Deleuze and Guattari. The human, who functions as a key, must open the door of the nature-life fusion in order to become posthuman.

If immanence is life and nature also is immanent, on what basis do they have the property of immanence? The answer is vital immanence or materialism. The materialist perspective, ascribed to Spinoza and Leibniz by Deleuze, is rooted in the definition of nature through an immanent vital force. This concept is evident in the works of Bergson and Nietzsche in their exploration of life. Deleuze and Guattari's departure from modern materialists like Bacon and Descartes is greatly influenced by these philosophers. The bipolar interpretation of vitalism paves the way for Deleuze and Guattari to delve into posthumanism through the immanent vital force. According to Gamble et al. (2019), this represents a new form of

materialism that is separate and distinct from traditional, modern materialist perspectives. They state that:

Deleuze first turned to Spinoza and Leibniz because, in contrast to other modern materialists, Spinoza and Leibniz thought that all of nature was defined *primarily* by an immanent vital power or force. For Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, and Newton, for example, vital force was something distinct from mind or matter and thus remained extrinsic to them, often in the form of God or deistic natural laws. In Spinoza and Leibniz, however, force was immanent to matter, because matter is nothing other than an expression of *force itself*. (Gamble et al., 2019: 119)

Deleuze and Guattari reject the idea of human transcendence as a norm. They argue that this norm is based on a fundamentally mechanical understanding of nature and life. In vital materialism, nature and life are viewed as immanent rather than transcendent. According to Colebrook (2010), vitalism offers two interpretations of life: passive and active. The passive interpretation criticizes the notion that life is essentially external or transcendent and instead takes an approach that is quite posthumanism to the ethics of immanence.

This distinction is already recognized in Deleuze and Guattari (1994: 213) in two possible interpretations: “that of an Idea that acts, but is not – that acts therefore only from the point of view of an external cerebral knowledge (from Kant to Claude Bernard); or that of a force that is but does not act – that is therefore a pure internal Awareness (from Leibniz to Ruyer).” What is immanence here is a pure internal awareness. There is no externality to act or move, but only “a pure contemplation without knowledge” (1994: 213). This is the vitalism that is immanent to matter (nature and life).

In the ethics of immanence, human beings and all non-human beings with whom they see themselves as transcendent (often rationally) are no longer hierarchical and are now within nature as a process of production (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 5). Posthumanism unequivocally acknowledges the vital process of nature and life, embedding it in the ethics of immanence. Thus, in Deleuze and Guattari, we encounter an ontology of immanence that offers a new material perspective, which is “not dependent upon a foundational or transcendent power such as God, fate, evolution, life-force, Gaia, mechanisms, systems or structures” (Fox and Alldred, 2018: 2). Furthermore, the idea of immanence<sup>10</sup> is involved in what I see as the nature-life fusion, and they ground this interaction by approaching nature and life from a vitalist perspective. Their works as the ethics of immanence “have been an inspirational force that gives life to posthumanism in many forms” (Daigle and McDonald, 2022: 2). Posthumanism expresses the

---

<sup>10</sup> Deleuze and Guattari ground the concept itself in the philosophical perspectives of Spinoza, Nietzsche, and Bergson.

inseparability of all (human and nonhuman life) as the process of nature within this ethics of immanence. Nature-life fusion is to express this posthumanist situation. With this claim, nature as a process of life production challenges two materiality problems of nature in modern and postmodern perspectives.

Moreover, some studies<sup>11</sup> prefer to analyze this situation through the power of some kind of continuum to overcome dualism. Conceptual frameworks such as naturecultures continuum are presented (Haraway, 2003). Also, some of these kinds of ontological endeavors have been associated with alternative agencies or powers such as "Zoe" (Braidotti, 2013), "Hyperobjects" (Morton, 2013), or "Gaia" (Latour, 2017). Within these frameworks, posthumanists want to emphasize something challengeable to modern and postmodern thought to clarify some ontological approaches as alternatives in response to the relationship between nature and man.

The objective of this article is not to argue that these concepts are misapplied. Instead, it is to find a way to integrate the concept of nature if we talk about anthropocentrism and dualism, which have some adverse consequences. In such perspectives, the concept of nature is often lost or overshadowed by the concept of life. However, in Deleuze and Guattari, nature as a process of production confronts and fuses with life. They intersect on the plane of immanence and represent multiplicity in a single meaning. This can be a continuum process but still, this process takes place immanently on the plane of nature-life fusion, because there is no process that arises outside the production process. The plane of consistency of nature contains everything, and all forms of life here intersect in an infinite loop in terms of producing a new, becoming. Within this framework, a vitalist materialism centered on immanence serves to reevaluate nature and life. In this materialist perspective, "there is the attempt to recognize the positivity of nature and penetrate its depths and to grant the human being the thinking capacities necessary to penetrate these depths" (Ansell-Pearson 2017: 96).

### 3. A PATH TO NATURE-LIFE FUSION: NATURE AS A PROCESS OF LIFE PRODUCTION

Deleuze and Guattari, at the beginning of their famous book *Anti-Oedipus* (1983), present the nature-life fusion through a person with schizophrenia (in a psychoanalytic concept) called Lenz, who is Georg Büchner's literary character.<sup>12</sup> Here, Deleuze and Guattari first reject the distinction between man and nature:

<sup>11</sup> They are mostly influenced by Deleuze and Guattari.

<sup>12</sup> Together with Lenz, the authors try to explain the functioning of the schizophrenic process with many more examples. In this respect, Buchanan states: "It is obvious from the opening pages of *Anti-Oedipus* that literature is very important to Deleuze and Guattari – the literary references

...we make no distinction between man and nature: the human essence of nature and the natural essence of man become one within nature in the form of production... Not man as the king of creation, but rather as the being who is in intimate contact with the profound life of all forms or all types of beings, who is responsible for even the stars and animal life, and who ceaselessly plugs an organ-machine into an energy-machine, a tree into his body, a breast into his mouth, the sun into his asshole: the eternal custodian of the machines of the universe...man and nature are not like two opposite term confronting each other – not even in the sense of bipolar opposites within a relationship of causation, ideation, or expression (cause and effect, subject and object, etc.); rather, they are one and the same essential reality, the producer-product. Production as process overtakes all idealistic categories and constitutes a cycle whose relationship to desire is that of an immanent principle. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 4-5).

The most essential characteristic of not making a distinction between man and nature lies in “the profound life of all” existing entities, in which man as a schizo experiences nature as a process of production. According to Deleuze and Guattari, this secret is hidden in “desiring-production.” In this conceptualization, desire refers both to the eco-social realm of production and the realm of desire in the unconscious (Protevi, 2012: 249). They aim to show that at the core of the unconscious<sup>13</sup>, there is “an immanent plane of nature” because “the schizo as *Homo natura*”<sup>14</sup> (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 5) experiences nature as a process of production.

---

always outnumber the clinical references when it comes to exemplifying what schizophrenia is like: for every Schreber there is an Artaud (who probably was schizophrenic himself, but nonetheless wrote literature rather than memoirs of his neurotic illness) and a Beckett; for every Wolf-Man there is a Nerval (who also was probably a schizophrenic, or at least a manic depressive) and a Büchner, and so on. These works by Artaud, Beckett, Büchner and Nerval (and we could add Michaux, Moritz, Proust and Rimbaud, to list only some of the most frequently cited) do not represent schizophrenia; they don't offer us representations of schizophrenia; they are, in Deleuze and Guattari's vernacular, schizophrenia 'in person'. It is not the author that is schizophrenic in other words, although that may also be the case, but the work itself” (Buchanan, 2008: 33). This is schizophrenia as a process because one of Deleuze and Guattari's main aims is to distinguish between the concept of schizophrenia as an illness and schizophrenia as a process (Buchanan, 2008: 40).

<sup>13</sup> Deleuze and Guattari oppose psychoanalysis's concept of the unconscious. They object to the reduction of the unconscious to the personal imaginary formed by the Freudian parental triangle (Voss, 2023: 156).

<sup>14</sup> *Homo natura* is treated here by Deleuze and Guattari with a Nietzschean approach. For a detailed reading of this approach as a Nietzschean concept, see Lemm (2020). Lemm takes the concept of *homo natura* as a positioning against the Kantian stream of vision. Lemm argues that: “For Kant, the human being was the lawgiver for nature. Thus, his question asks about the pragmatic conditions for a rational natural being to raise itself above nature in complete freedom. By contrast, throughout his writing career Nietzsche insists on the continuity between nature and the human being, and on the impossibility of attaining a transcendental standpoint outside of nature” (Lemm, 2020: 1).



However, the treatment or constitution of the human as a conscious (or rational) entity (in modern thought) “must be seen neither as the triumph of nature nor the embodiment of freedom, but the site of a capture and diminution of life” (Roffe and Stark, 2015: 8). In this state, then, man is imprisoned in an oedipal state<sup>15</sup> (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983).

The fact that nature is a process of production involves an affirmative perspective in its relationship with life. This affirmative perspective is most evident in the schizo. Deleuze and Guattari present the schizophrenic process (which is a positive life process) as a desiring-production. They state that “[i]t is our very own “malady,” modern man's sickness” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 130) in terms of capitalist production, but the schizophrenic is the malady who points to the existence of a new world in terms of immanent process. For the later understanding, the schizo discovers desire<sup>16</sup> as a movement of metaphysical production at the edge or end of social production, not within it (1983: 130-131). This affirmation is therefore hidden in the schizo's journey through the earth despite “his journey is strangely stationary, in place” (1983: 131). The schizo, in this respect, “does not speak of another world, he is not from another world: even when he is displacing himself in space, his is a journey in intensity, around the desiring-machine that is erected here and remains here” (1983: 131). He carries desire with him and reproduces it in a new world (1983: 131). Desire is, therefore, realized in the unconscious.

With this, the schizophrenic process holds revolutionary potential within the unconscious realm. Deleuze and Guattari here have a posthumanist tendency as follows: “The schizo is not revolutionary, but the schizophrenic process – in terms of which the schizo is merely the interruption, or the continuation in the void – is the potential for revolution” (1983: 341). This revolutionary movement in the schizophrenic process brings a new conceptual understanding as a breath of fresh air to the nature-life fusion. Deleuze and Guattari's entire endeavor becomes legitimized by their uncovering of what they call the schizophrenic process.<sup>17</sup> Schizophrenia as a process is a “harrowing, emotionally overwhelming experience, which brings the schizo as close as possible to matter, to a burning, living center of matter” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 19). This is a “vital

<sup>15</sup> Oedipal state is a Freudian formula called “daddy-mommy-me” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 23), where schizophrenia is believed to form the basic dynamic of the disease.

<sup>16</sup> In traditional thought (from Plato to Kant) desire is considered as the lack of an object or the lack of a real object (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 25). In this understanding, which is based on the essence of lack, psychoanalytic studies take desire as a production process, as the production process of the fantasized object because the lack of the real object represents “an extrinsic natural or social production, whereas desire intrinsically produces an imaginary object that functions as a double of reality, as though there were a “dreamed-of object behind every real object,” or a mental production behind all real productions” (1983: 25-26).

<sup>17</sup> Schizophrenia as a process differs from schizophrenia as an illness resulting from the Freudian oedipal complex. The schizophrenic is now essentially a witness to what is real.

progression” of the schizophrenic process (1983: 20) because it is “the material processes of the unconscious” (Buchanan, 2008: 40), which “attains a nonfigurative and nonsymbolic unconscious, a pure abstract figural dimension (“abstract” in the sense of abstract painting), flows-schizzes or real-desire, apprehended below the minimum conditions of identity” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 351). The schizo, in this respect, manifests the real in itself. Deleuze and Guattari provide the example of Lenz as a part of this process and claim that there is no meaning anymore to spelling words in a dualistic sense:

A schizophrenic out for a walk is a better model than a neurotic lying on the analyst’s couch. A breath of fresh air, a relationship with the outside world...While taking a stroll outdoors, ... he is in the mountains, amid falling snowflakes, with other gods or without any gods at all, without a family, without a father or a mother, with nature...Lenz has projected himself back to a time before the man-nature dichotomy, before all the co-ordinates based on this fundamental dichotomy have been laid down. He does not live nature as nature, but as a process of production. There is no such thing as either man or nature now, only a process that produces the one within the other and couples the machines together. Producing-machines, desiring-machines everywhere, schizophrenic machines, all of species life: the self and the non-self, outside and inside, no longer have any meaning whatsoever. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 5).

Lenz’s contemplative interaction with nature underscores the significance of finding meaning in his surroundings as a pivotal aspect of the schizophrenic experience. Lenz’s profound connection to nature offers valuable insights into his interpretation of the schizophrenic process. Lenz does not see “rocks, metals, water and plants *per se* that signals the underlying presence of schizophrenia” (Buchanan, 2008: 41). The real meaning resides not in the objects themselves, but in his unique perspective. In effect, Lenz does not perceive nature as a subject; instead, “Lenz perceives in the natural elements a profound presence of Life, not just a strange and terrible beauty” (2008: 41). Lenz’s perspective encompasses a recognition not only of the immanent vitality within natural elements but also an awareness of a broader, more comprehensive external realm, and this awareness motivates his desire for inclusion within this expansive sphere, to be “the All” (2008: 41) or, in Deleuzian-Guattarian perspective, to be life itself. Therefore, life itself is based on a process of its production as nature. When the schizophrenic sees the presence of life in the natural elements, it is a sign that nature is a process of life production.

When the schizo is with nature, he places himself beyond or even before modern and postmodern materialist conceptions. Instead, he enters a new becoming in an immanent but still material realm. In this framework, desiring-production makes a critical reference to the transcendent superiority of man.

Deleuze and Guattari here draw a non-anthropocentric framework, thus trying to overcome the dualistic perspective. Protevi (2012: 249) states that “Desiring-production is not anthropocentric; it is the very heart of the world; all natural processes, even those well beyond the human, are processes of machinic desiring-production.”

According to Deleuze and Guattari, this state of mind of Lenz is due to the fact that he is surrounded by machines. As a process of life production, even though nature contains the concepts produced, it does not attribute meaning to them but treats them as machines. Because “[e]verything is a machine” (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 2), but it is not a machine in the mechanical sense. On the contrary, what Deleuze and Guattari mean by nature “is neither mechanistic and purely physical nor the manifestation of some ineffable life principle but “machinic,” that is, contingently self-engineered and self-engineering” (Tynan, 2014: 49). Nature as machinic is a desiring-production or production process in an immanent sense. Deleuze and Guattari state that:

Desiring-machines are binary machines, obeying a binary law or set of rules governing associations: one machine is always coupled with another. The productive synthesis, the production of production, is inherently connective in nature: ‘and...’ ‘and then...’ This is because there is always a flow-producing machine, and another machine connected to it that interrupts or draws off part of this flow (the breast=the mouth). (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 5).

Therefore, they are desiring-machines that humans and nonhumans connect with each other. In terms of the concept of nature, precisely the Epicurean sense, these connections have the significance of the idea of multiplicity or assemblage. According to Deleuze (1990), in Epicurean sense,

Nature is not attributive, but rather conjunctive: it expresses itself through “and” and not through “is.” This *and* that – alternations and entwinings, resemblances and differences, attractions and distractions, nuance and abruptness. Nature...is made of plenitude and void, beings and nonbeings, with each one of the two posing itself as unlimited while limiting the other... Nature is indeed a sum, but not a whole. (Deleuze, 1990: 267).

So, nature can be related to a process of life production because everything has its life-production process. This leads us to an antidote showing that nature is immanent. It leads to a materialist approach that can generate and create itself for “*to be life*.” This has more of a Spinozian, Bergsonian, Lucretian, and Nietzschean legacy. Protevi (2012: 249) even touches on this legacy as follows: “Desiring-production is immanent, autonomous, self-constituting, and creative: it is the *natura naturans* of Spinoza or the will to power of Nietzsche.”

In *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), Deleuze and Guattari treat this nature-life fusion in many different but interconnected concepts such as "abstract machines" and "machinic assemblages" along with "multiplicities" and "becoming" and "lines of flight" instead of the word desire. However, "abstract machines" and "machinic assemblages" are the core of the concept of nature, as well as the concept of life. With this conceptual reference, the concept of nature points to the infinity of particles as assemblages and individuals and endeavors to show that they are in an infinity of interconnected relations. Here again, Deleuze and Guattari provide a concept of nature that leads itself to be a process of life production. After all, they write that:

...each individual is an infinite multiplicity, and the whole of Nature is a multiplicity of perfectly individuated multiplicities. The plane of consistency of Nature is like an immense Abstract Machine, abstract yet real and individual; its pieces are the various assemblages and individuals, each of which groups together an infinity of particles entering into an infinity of more or less interconnected relations. There is therefore a unity to the plane of nature, which applies equally to the inanimate and the animate, the artificial and the natural. This plane has nothing to do with a form or a figure, nor with a design or a function. Its unity has nothing to do with a ground buried deep within things, nor with an end or a project in the mind of God. Instead, it is a plane upon which everything is laid out, and which is like the intersection of all forms, the machine of all functions; its dimensions, however, increase with those of the multiplicities of individualities it cuts across. It is a fixed plane, upon which things are distinguished from one another only by speed and slowness. A plane of immanence or univocity opposed to analogy. The One is said with a single meaning of all the multiple. Being expresses in a single meaning all that differs. What we are talking about is not the unity of substance but the infinity of the modifications that are part of one another on this unique plane of life. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 254).

Deleuze and Guattari's approach makes us question how abstract machines exist. At this point, two important concepts come to the fore. One of these concepts is stratification, while on the other hand, we encounter the concept of destratification.<sup>18</sup> The process of stratification and destratification exist simultaneously. In particular, they play an important role in the constitution of nature as an abstract machine. For Deleuze and Guattari, "nature is singular yet bi-directional, the abstract machine of stratification and destratification. Nature operates both in, on, and between the strata, and also beyond them, on the plane of consistency. *Bi-polar nature*" (Protevi, 2001: 36). Stratification (coding) refers to

---

<sup>18</sup> This double meaning is not unique to the concept of nature. The idea of life itself also has this double sense. Life as stratification pertains to organisms, while life as destratification pertains to non-organic life (Protevi, 2012: 248).

a mechanical process of repetition organized hierarchically. On the other hand, destratification (decoding), representing immanence, relates to processes of experimentation and creativity. Nature manifests itself in this bivalent reality, simultaneously “constituting an “abstract machine” of stratification – a tendency to hierarchically ordered, mechanically repetitive systems – and destratification – a tendency to experimental, creative processes or “lines of flight”<sup>19</sup>” (Ansell-Pearson and Protevi, 2016: 43).

In this case, in the process of stratification, nature represents something like an organism, “a molar aggregate,” and “[t]he strata are judgments of God” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 40), while destratification represents creativity and dynamism as “life” which is also called non-organic<sup>20</sup> (Protevi, 2012: 250). Stratification produces a hierarchical body of homogeneous formations. Destratification, on the contrary, produces a non-hierarchical heterogeneous assemblage. This provides the function of a multiplicity of rhizomatic connections.<sup>21</sup>

However, just like the schizo does, Deleuze and Guattari see the full potential of nature within this destratification process as creative and productive or generative that produces the immanent life. Consequently, “nature is the construction and destruction of strata, freeing parts to form connections with heterogeneous others in consistencies or assemblages” (Protevi, 2012: 251).

Strata seem to block nature from being a process of life production, “[b]ut the abstract machine of nature is not just stratification producing organisms, but also destratification producing the plane of consistency” (Protevi, 2001: 39). In respect of this, one like the schizo, as mentioned above in the Anti-Oedipus,

---

<sup>19</sup> The concept of strata is ontologically seen as secondary to lines of flight, which disrupt to provide occasions for creative novelty (Ansell-Pearson and Protevi 2016: 42).

<sup>20</sup> Life is non-organic but includes all human and nonhuman entities regarding their understanding of vital matter or materiality.

<sup>21</sup> Rhizome is opposed to the tree-like structure which “endlessly develops the law of the One that becomes two, then of the two that become four... Binary logic is the spiritual reality of the root-tree” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 5). Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 6-7) describe rhizome as a multiple: “The multiple *must be made*, not by always adding a higher dimension, but rather in the simplest of ways, by dint of sobriety, with the number of dimensions one already has available – always  $n - 1$  (the only way the one belongs to the multiple: always subtracted). Subtract the unique from the multiplicity to be constituted; write at  $n - 1$  dimensions. A system of this kind could be called a rhizome. A rhizome as subterranean stem is absolutely different from roots and radicles. Bulbs and tubers are rhizomes. Plants with roots or radicles may be rhizomorphic in other respects altogether: the question is whether plant life in its specificity is not entirely rhizomatic. Even some animals are, in their pack form. Rats are rhizomes. Burrows are too, in all of their functions of shelter, supply, movement, evasion, and breakout. The rhizome itself assumes very diverse forms, from ramified surface extension in all directions to concretion into bulbs and tubers. When rats swarm over each other. The rhizome includes the best and the worst: potato and couchgrass, or the weed. Animal and plant, couchgrass is crabgrass. We get the distinct feeling that we will convince no one unless we enumerate certain approximate characteristics of the rhizome.” This is how nature works, not the way of a tree-like structure.

realizes the world in the window of the plane of consistency, even the organized and formed things as organisms (Sellars, 1999: 4). Thus, Deleuze and Guattari show us that affirmative life production finds itself in the plane of consistency of nature. For this, we need their explanation of the abstract machine to provide its relation to nature as immanent above. For Deleuze and Guattari,

...they are always singular and immanent. Contrary to the strata, and the assemblages considered under their other aspects, abstract machines know nothing of forms and substances. This is what makes them abstract, and also defines the concept of the machine in the strict sense. They surpass any kind of mechanics. They are opposed to the abstract in the ordinary sense. Abstract machines consist of *unformed matters and nonformal functions*...Of course, within the dimensions of the assemblage, the abstract machine, or machines, is effectuated in forms and substances, in varying states of freedom. But the abstract machine must first have composed itself, and have simultaneously composed a plane of consistency.” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 510-511).

As can be seen from this, in both works, Deleuze and Guattari convolutedly present nature as a process of life production, although they do not directly address it. For them, in nature, the production processes develop through an infinite synthesis of events, and these processes give rise to continuous energy flows on the earth. That is to say, these processes not only contribute to the occurrence of certain events but also give rise to their dynamic and fluid energy states. For them, “[n]ature is a moving force...always expending its energy, its outgrowth, engendering a plurality of results...” (Goh, 2008: 199).

Nature, therefore, manifests itself as a life production. Deleuze and Guattari see these processes as production and treat nature as a process of production (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 5). The most essential feature of this inference is that Deleuze and Guattari place the material status of nature within the theory of immanence. The dynamic and living structure of nature and its self-organizing characteristics arise from the fact that they find life (or matter) from a vitalist point of view in this way. Nature abandons its place in modern and postmodern thought through this perspective and offers a new ontological and materialistic perspective.

The process of life production brings nature into existence, and nature as a process of production is simultaneously generated by the existence of life processes. I do not think of life and nature as separate from each other. If both words are used conceptually, it must be recognized that nature gives rise to life production, and life production gives rise to nature. When one machine is connected to another machine, then nature and life are connected with each other. According to Deleuze and Guattari, this interconnectedness is like an infinite loop, and each machine has an infinite connection with every other machine. Wisniewska (2022) explains this connection:

They clearly describe an infinity of particles with an infinity of interconnected relations. There is a plane of consistency of nature, this plane consists of pieces, these pieces are in turn the various assemblages and individuals, and these group together particles entering an infinity of interconnected relations. (Wisniewska, 2022: 4).

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the domain of this interconnectedness is symbiosis (or heterogenous alliances), not filial relationships, since the filial relationship is non-productive and therefore does not bequeath any new becoming (Wisniewska, 2022: 7); hence, “the plane of nature is where these heterogenous alliances between human” (2022: 8) and nonhuman are generated. That's why all machines constitute multiplicity. Therefore, everything is in constant production. Even production is produced: the production of production because everything has a process of production (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983: 4). This is why nature and life can remain in a relationship within this logic of production, nature as a process of life production.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Regarding my claim, Deleuze and Guattari are posthumanists. The first reason is that they remove life from a situation in which it is lived by a subject and dissolve it in the nature-life fusion as immanent rather than transcendent. This understanding places the nature-life fusion in a center of *nonhumans or nonorganic*.<sup>22</sup> The second reason is that it disrupts the Cartesian structure specific to the distinction between man and nature within the framework of this understanding and thus places humans and nature within nature. Thus, it ends the existence of the human being as a transcendental and superior subject. It thus provides an antidote to the process of domination of nature that no longer exists or is no longer possible. Finally, it disqualifies all powers of representation by bringing the materiality of nature into existence within the ethics of immanence, thus distinguishing itself from both modern and postmodern thought.

Deleuze and Guattari use many interrelated concepts. But by doing so, they bring to politics an understanding of ethics that is different from a transcendental model of ethics in the traditional sense, rendering the previous ones meaningless. Also, they provide an antidote to the ethical deficiency of postmodern thought. In a material sense, this ethics can be called the ethics of immanence. Herzogenrath (2009) says that “[i]n this materialist tradition, natural sciences and politics are closely connected and related not to an ethics derived from any presupposed transcendent model of morality, but to an “ethics of immanence.”” Accordingly,

---

<sup>22</sup> What is meant here is unity within the multiplicity of all life, human and nonhuman. They differ from each other, but they are all single under the umbrella of immanence. Non-organic or nonhuman, I claim here, refers to life-nature fusion derived from nature as a process of life production.



Deleuze and Guattari, in adopting a posthumanist perspective, introduce the notion of nature as a generative process: dynamic, immanent, and productive, rather than passive and mechanistic.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. Theodor and Max Horkheimer (1997), *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (London: Verso) (Trans. John Cumming).

Ansell-Pearson, Keith (2017), “Deleuze and New Materialism: Naturalism, Norms, and Ethics”, Ellenzweig, Sarah and John H. Zammito (Eds.), *The New Politics of Materialism: History, Philosophy, Science* (London: Routledge): 88-108.

Ansell-Pearson, Keith and John Protevi (2016), “Naturalism in the Continental Tradition”, Clark, Kelly James (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Naturalism* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.): 34-48.

Barad, Karen (2007), *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (United Kingdom: Duke University Press).

Biro, Andrew (2005), *Denaturalizing Ecological Politics: Alienation from nature from Rousseau to the Frankfurt School and beyond* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Braidotti, Rosi (2013), *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Buchanan, Ian (2008), *Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus: A Reader's Guide* (London: Continuum).

Butler, Judith (1993), *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “sex”* (United Kingdom: Routledge).

Colebrook, Claire (2010), *Deleuze and the Meaning of Life* (United Kingdom: Continuum).

Colebrook, Claire (2015), “Who Comes after the Post-human?”, Roffe, Jon and Hannah Stark (Eds.), *Deleuze and the Non/Human* (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 217-234.

Coole, Diana and Samantha Frost (2010), “Introducing the New Materialisms”, Coole, Diana and Samantha Frost (Eds.), *New Materialism: Ontology, Agency, and Politics* (United Kingdom: Duke University Press): 1-43.



Daigle, Christine and Terrance H. McDonald (2022), "Introduction: Posthumanisms through Deleuze and Guattari", Daigle, Christine and Terrance H. McDonald (Eds.), *From Deleuze and Guattari to Posthumanism* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing): 1-20.

De Lucia, Vito (2020), "Rethinking the Encounter Between Law and Nature in the Anthropocene: From Biopolitical Sovereignty to Wonder", *Law and Critique*, 31 (3): 329-349.

Deleuze, Gilles (1990), *The Logic of Sense* (New York: Columbia University Press) (Trans. Mark Lester, Charles Stivale).

Deleuze, Gilles (1997), "Immanence: A Life...", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 14 (3): 3-7.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1983), *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press) (Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, Helen R. Lane).

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (London: University of Minnesota Press) (Trans. Brian Massumi).

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1994), *What is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press) (Trans. Hugh Tomlinson, Graham Burchell).

Descartes, René (2006), *A Discourse on the Method of Correctly Conducting One's Reason and Seeking Truth in the Science* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) (Trans. Ian Maclean).

Descartes, René (2008), *Meditations on First Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) (Trans. Michael Moriarty).

Dingler, Johannes (2005), "The discursive nature of nature: Towards a post-modern concept of nature", *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 7 (3): 209-225.

Dobson, Andrew (2007), *Green Political Thought* (London: Routledge).

Ducarme, Frédéric and Denis Couvet (2020), "What does 'nature' mean?", *Palgrave Communications*, 6 (1): 1-8.

Ellis, Brian (2014), *The Philosophy of Nature: A Guide to the New Essentialism* (London, Routledge).

Engert, Kornelia and Christiane Schürkmann (2021), "Introduction: Posthuman? Nature and Culture in Renegotiation", *Nature and Culture*, 16 (1): 1-10.

Favier, Killian (2023), "Materialism in the Anthropocene: A Critique of the 'Domination of Nature' in the Frankfurt School", *Emancipations: A Journal of Critical Social Analysis*, 2 (1): 1-34.

Foucault, Michel (1998), *The Will to Knowledge* (United Kingdom: Penguin Books) (Trans. Robert Hurley).

Foucault, Michel (2003), "Society Must Be Defended": *Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976* (United States: Picador) (Trans. David Macey).

Foucault, Michel (2007), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978* (United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan) (Trans. Graham Burchell).

Foucault, Michel (2008), *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979* (United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan) (Trans. Graham Burchell).

Fox, Nick J. and Pam Alldred (2018), "New Materialism", Atkinson, Paul A., Sara Delamont, M. A. Hardy, M. Williams (Eds.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Research Methods* (London: SAGE).

Gamble, Christopher N., Joshua S. Hanan and Thomas Nail (2019), "What is New Materialism?", *Angelaki*, 24 (6): 111-134.

Gare, Arran (1995), *Postmodernism and the Environmental Crisis* (London: Routledge).

Gaukroger, Stephen (2004), *Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Early-Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Goh, Irving (2008), "'Strange Ecology' in Deleuze/Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*", Herzogenrath, Bernd (Ed.), *An [Un]Likely Alliance: Thinking Environment[s] with Deleuze/Guattari* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing): 196-215.

Halsey, Mark (2005), "Ecology and machinic thought", *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 10 (3): 33-55.

Haraway, Donna (2003), *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press).

Herzogenrath, Bernd (2009), "Nature/Geophilosophy/Machinics/Ecosophy", Herzogenrath, Bernd (Ed.), *Deleuze/Guattari & Ecology* (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 1-22.

Hornborg, Alf (2021), "Beyond the image of COVID-19 as Nature's revenge: Understanding Globalized Capitalism through an Epidemiology of Money", *Sustainability*, 13 (9): 1-11

Krause, Sharon R. (2016), "Politics beyond Persons: Political Theory and the Non-human", *Political Theory*, 1-13.

Koslicki, Kathrin and Michael J. Raven (2024), *The Routledge Handbook of Essence in Philosophy* (New York: Routledge).

Latour, Bruno (2017), *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime* (Cambridge: Polity Press) (Trans. Catherine Porter).

Leiss, William (1994), *Domination of Nature* (London: McGill-Queen's University Press).

Lemke, Thomas (2010), "From state biology to the government of life: Historical dimensions and contemporary perspectives of 'biopolitics'", *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 10 (4): 421-438.

Lemm, Vanessa (2010), "Critical theory and affirmative biopolitics: Nietzsche and the domination of nature in Adorno/Horkheimer", *Journal of Power*, 3 (1): 75-95.

Lemm, Vanessa (2020), *Homo Natura: Nietzsche, Philosophical Anthropology and Biopolitics* (United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press).

Lewis, Simon L. and Mark A. Maslin (2015), "Defining the Anthropocene", *Nature*, 519 (7542): 171-180.

Malssen, Tom Van (2015), *The Political Philosophy of Francis Bacon: On the Unity of Knowledge* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Merchant, Carolyn (1990), *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper & Row).

Meyer, John M. (2001), *Political Nature: Environmentalism and the Interpretation of Western Thought* (Cambridge: MIT Press).

Morton, Timothy (2013), *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Papastephanou, Marianna (1999), "Prospects for thinking reconstruction postmetaphysically: Postmodernism minus the quote-marks", *Journal for Cultural Research*, 3 (3): 291-303.

Pattberg, Philipp (2007), "Conquest, Domination and Control: Europe's Mastery of Nature in Historic Perspective", *Journal of Political Ecology*, 14 (1): 1-9.

Phelan, Shane (1992), "Intimate distance: the dislocation of nature in modernity", *Western Political Quarterly*, 45 (2): 385-402.

Protevi, John (2001), "The organism as the judgement of God: Aristotle, Kant and Deleuze on nature (that is, on biology, theology and politics)", Bryden, Mary (Ed.), *Deleuze and Religion* (London: Routledge): 30-41.

Protevi, John (2012), "Deleuze and life", Smith, W. Daniel and Henry Somers-Hall (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 239-264.

Plumwood, Val (1993), *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (London: Routledge).

Richard, Sam L. (2015), "From Quotation, through Collage, to Parody: Postmodernism's Relationship with Its Past", *Perspectives of New Music*, 53 (1): 77-97.

Roffe, Jon and Hannah Stark (2015), "Introduction: Deleuze and the Non/Human", Roffe, Jon and Hannah Stark (Eds.), *Deleuze and the Non/Human* (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 1-16.

Sellars, John (1999), "The point of view of the cosmos: Deleuze, romanticism, Stoicism", *Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, 8: 1-24.

Smith, Neil (2008), *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space* (Athens: University of Georgia Press).

Soper, Kate (1995), *What is Nature? Culture, Politics and the Non-human* (Cambridge: Blackwell)

Tillman, Rachel (2015), "Toward a new materialism: Matter as dynamic", *Minding Nature*, 8 (1): 30-35.

Tynan, Aidan (2014), "Reading Anti-Oedipus: Literature, Schizophrenia, and Universal History", Ardoin, Paul, S. E. Gontarski, and Laci Mattison (Eds.), *Understanding Deleuze, Understanding Modernism* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing): 48-60.

Voss, Daniela (2023), "On Anti-Oedipus: Deleuze and Guattari's Spinozism", *La Deleuziana*, 1: 154-168.

Williams, Raymond (1980), *Problems in Materialism and Culture: Selected Essays* (United Kingdom: Verso).

Wisniowska, Magdalena (2022), “Calculating Selfishness: A Reading of Deleuze and Guattari’s Concept of the Plane of Nature”, *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, 18 (1): 1-26.