

## PREFACE

### Disenchantment

The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the “disenchantment of the world.”<sup>1</sup> (Max Weber, *SV*, 155)

*F*ates spinning weaving in our times through all times. Many fates many threads many times. Many reasons many intellects many passions many truths. Many expressings askings tellings. Many spirits gods beauties arts. Shall we insist on one? Can we imagine many? Why above all and for whom? Many disenchantments many enchantments endless askings tellings expressings surprises arrivals interruptions. Images proliferating...

*What characterizes our fate our time? Death of the world death of the gods environmental catastrophe industrial depredation global disenchantment. Hope for ecology dream of ecosophy. If there be such . . .*

One can, in principle, master all things by calculation. This above all is what intellectualization means. (Weber, 139)

*What disenchantment means...*

*Accounting for all things...*

*Mastering by calculation. . .*

*Living by measure...*

What is not mastered by rationalization? What interrupts its rule? What remains for enchantment?

*Asking of all things...<sup>2</sup>*

*And telling...*

*Celebrate abundance and wonder. Sing the wonder and abundance of the earth. Cherish enchantment without sacrificing disenchantment...*

*Would you celebrate, will you sing dance chant with me? Ask tell with me? Enchantingly?...*

For many years, in many ways, I have been exploring what others describe as the disenchantment of the world and its re-enchantments.<sup>3</sup> I would now acknowledge this explicitly. Yet to name the goal *reenchantment* takes disenchantment for granted as the condition of modern life. On one side it responds to the modernization of the world by seeking to restore an enchantment disavowed in modernity. On another side it occupies an innocent space in which the earth was never disenchanted, in which modern reason imposed views on many who never accepted them, in which religion, theology, and the gods retain enchantment in their heart. All enchantment belongs to the gods and their chosen. On this view, the mind belongs to reason, disenchanted, the heart belongs to the divine, enchanted. On the former view, disenchantment is the defining condition of contemporary life in the midst of countless faiths. On this view modern religion is disenchanted, the gods are dead.

Neither of these images evokes the enchantments I ask for. One takes the earth as if it were magical without asking of the meaning of disenchantment. The other takes disenchantment for granted without asking after the pervasiveness of enchantment. It is as if they took the spheres of god and reason as given, no matter how different their work, and sought divine reenchantment on the one hand or disenchanted reason on the other. Complicating this dichotomy is another, that the modern public sphere is given over almost everywhere to reason, disenchanted, while coexisting everywhere with enchanted private spheres.

*What is modern modernity modernization? Who would not desire to be modern, perhaps without modernization industrialization rationalization? Without disenchantment filled with desire. Yearning for appearances simulacra virtualities as if perhaps they were enchanting...*

*Magic superstition wizardry illusion all contaminated. Perhaps. Unreal irreal appearances virtualities simulacra. As if reality were not them all as if enchantment might be cut away. With what knife? By which surgeon with what techniques? The incisions of disenchantment...*

*Once upon a time the world was enchanted but is now disenchanted...*

*The world was always disenchanted...*

*Once upon a time the world was enchanted and now is still enchanted...*

*The world was always enchanted...*

*The world was enchanted the world was disenchanted the world was neither enchanted nor disenchanted the world was both enchanted and disenchanted...*

*The world is neither enchanted... nor disenchanted... The world is both enchanted... And disenchanted...*

Let us suppose there is no choice here, nothing to settle, but endless askings and tellings concerning enchantment and disenchantment; endless images of disenchantment and enchantment; endless interruptions, and more; moreover, that enchantment offers endless askings while disenchantment presents endless others. I understand disenchantment to pose critical questions for modernization, rationalization, globalization, and technologization, and enchantment to pose endless askings for life and practice—and disenchantment. In particular, enchantment does not presuppose disenchantment's view of reason, even where it takes place in a world given over to that view. It is as if the natural world presented itself as if always in its mysteriousness, understanding economic, technical, and scientific rationality neither to eliminate nor to discount the mysteries. Nor on the other side do god and religion establish mysteries, but invoke them beyond themselves. An enchanted universe is mysterious because it is abundant in wonder, full of askings and tellings, multifarious, expressive, because it sings, bellows, chants, speaks in many tongues,<sup>4</sup> because its languages are unknown, because its images proliferate beyond themselves, because its ingredients exceed any accounts, mundane or divine, interrupting their rule.<sup>5</sup> Humanity and its disenchantments are among these enchantments. An enchanted universe is never innocent, betrays itself as disenchantment, offers itself in laughter to betrayal.

*Enchantment embraces the multifariousness of the world—the fairies dance christ is nailed to the cross. (Alfred North Whitehead, PR, 338)...*

*Enchantment embraces irreverence. Learn to laugh!...*

*Learn to laugh! Learn to betray! Learn to betray irreverence irreverently! Learn to enchant enchantingly!...*

*Learn a language halfway between gesture and thought. (Antonin Artaud, TC1, 242–3)...*<sup>6</sup>

*Learn to sing! Learn to hear!...*<sup>7</sup>

I would tell and sing in wonder and abundance of this betrayal as the caesura between disenchantment and enchantment.<sup>8</sup> I would imagine that it belongs to all ingredients of the earth including humanity and nature themselves, if there be such, if nature can be taken whole and if humanity can be taken apart. I

doubt it, and doubt that such a wholeness is compatible with enchantment. That is another story, still to come.<sup>9</sup> It pertains to local and global movements mobilized today under the heading of ecological practices. If nature and earth are inert, disenchanting, then ecological questions rest finally upon how they bear upon the conditions of human life. If earth and nature are enchanted, transformative and creative, then ecological askings bear upon creatures and things beyond humanity in unaccountable ways without finality. Ecology is enchanting, unaccountable beyond accounting, asking beyond questions, telling beyond knowing, relational beyond relations. The enchanted earth exceeds all accounts, proliferates its images beyond attachment and possession.

*Ways of living, of relating, of relationality. Ecological ecosophical multiple autopoietic ruptures of meaning. Enchanted and enchanting... Interrupting...*

The Earth is undergoing a period of intense techno-scientific transformations. If no remedy is found, the ecological disequilibrium this has generated will threaten the continuation of life on the planet's surface. Human modes of life, both individual and collective, are progressively deteriorating. The relationship between subjectivity and its exteriority—be it social, animal, vegetable or Cosmic—is compromised.

Only an ethico-political articulation—which I call *ecosophy*—between the three ecological registers (the environment, social relations and human subjectivity) would be likely to clarify these questions.

Henceforth the ways of living on this planet are in question. (Félix Guattari, *TE*, 27–8)

The refoundation of politics will have to pass through the aesthetic and analytical dimensions implied in the three ecologies. We cannot conceive of solutions to the poisoning of the atmosphere and to global warming due to the greenhouse effect, or to the problem of population control, without a mutation of mentality, without promoting a new art of living in society. We cannot conceive of international discipline without solving the problem of hunger and hyperinflation in the Third World. We cannot conceive of a collective recomposition of the socius without a new way of conceiving political and economic democracies that respect cultural differences. We cannot hope for an amelioration in the living conditions of the human species without a considerable effort to improve the feminine condition. The entire division of labour, its modes of valorisation and finalities need to be rethought. And to learn the intimate workings of

this production, these ruptures of meaning that are auto-foundational of existence—poetry today might have more to teach us than economic science, the human sciences and psychoanalysis combined. (C, 20–1)

*Enchanting ways of living are ecological aesthetic artistic poetic...*

*Enchanting stories interrupt our lives today...*

*The future is to come, is coming, coming and going, interrupting and proliferating. Interruption is proliferation...*

The questions we may ask today are how to think of enchantment under the conditions of contemporary reason, how to live an enchanting life, a life of wonder, asking, transformation, multiplicity, interruption, relationality, alterity. The mark of enchantment—but not its soul—is that it exceeds all accounts. Every ingredient, moment, thing, and creature of the earth exceeds every account, including every account of enchantment. This does not entail that accounts are useless, that knowledge is impossible. To the contrary, enchantment is the condition of the inspirations that make knowledge possible, that make truth accessible. Plato calls it *wonder*. I call it *asking*. In the midst of the disenchantments gathered under the heading of Platonism—I do not imagine it as Plato<sup>10</sup>—messages as if from the gods appear throughout the dialogues, filling the earth with wonder, augmenting its abundance, exposing its uncontainability.<sup>11</sup> Wonder is the condition of abundance whereby a disenchanted philosophy is possible. As Derrida says of responsibility and Heidegger says of truth. The impossibility of knowledge is the condition of its possibility, untruth the condition of truth. The wonder of things inspires us to seek to know them and to master them, to disenchant them. This sad and irresistible condition<sup>12</sup> is interrupted by enchantment, understood not to reenchanted what was disenchanted, but by the uncontainable tellings through which the enchantments of the earth are augmented and exposed. Enchantment is the exposition in images and language of the earth in wonder and abundance without which nothing can be known, including everything disenchanted.

*Exposition... as exposure expression ecology asking telling as aisthēsis mimēsis poiēsis catachrēsis technē as image aesthetics beauty art as unearthing revelation disclosure calling as giving interrupting in betrayal...*

*Interrupting... for asking... and telling...*

*Ask and you shall receive...*

*Seek as if you may find...*

*Give beyond gifts...*  
*Tell what you do not know...*  
*Perhaps...*

In English as well as other languages, *asking* performs diverse gestures. One evokes questioning, examining, inquiring, investigating, and presupposes, expects, insists on answers. A second evokes entreaty, solicitation, invocation, supplication, yearning, seeking, hospitality, welcome, and if it hopes for response, presupposes neither answers nor resolutions. The first drives toward control and violence, promotes forcible inquisition, and in the extreme elicits torture. The second answers of itself to the earth's deepest desires, and in the extreme offers itself as prayer. Similarly, *telling* suggests claiming, proving, demonstrating, establishing, explaining; yet also intimates revealing, sharing, presenting, exposing, expressing, opening, giving.

From the standpoint of command and response, these figures appear opposing. One exerts control, sometimes forcibly, and demands answers to the point of violence. The other expresses generosity and vulnerability, bequeaths control to others who are implored to assist and care. Yet in this juncture, if we ask of asking itself to assist us in living and being—all the way from before birth to death, and beyond; all the way from ethics to science, and back—the two join hands at the point of their departure. I mean that to insist on answers where there are none, or too many, is violence beyond questions. To plead and implore when we are asked to know is another violence, this time to reason. In other words, asking and telling on this doubled landscape, together with calling and giving and other expressive figures, reflect limitless possibilities for human beings and others, limitless askings for giving and telling, endless undos for every doing, limitless promises of curiosity.

In these ways *asking* and *telling* present a doubly doubled gesture, proliferating before us, multiple figures of intimacy and separation, revelation and betrayal. Each is double, and each doubles the other, and multiples again. Asking seeks answers, seeks where there are no answers, sometimes answers without seeking. On another register, asking opens itself and the world, welcomes asking and telling beyond seeking and having. Telling claims answers, even where there are no answers, tells the answer of what has no answer, responds to asking with telling. On another register, telling expresses itself beyond claims and answers, beyond asking, responds to limitless asking with limitless expressing,

endlessly asking of what may be inexpressible, if anything. Asking and telling together proliferate beyond any telling and any asking—moreover, each propagates beyond itself and the other.

The proximity of asking and telling is a separation that does not disconnect, a double that multiplies without division. In other words, the figure of their intimacy expresses—and unexpresses—what each might hope to say, to ask and tell, apart from the other—if that were possible. The point is that it is not possible, impossible beyond possibility. Asking is always telling: every asking is a telling, and every telling is an asking. That is, no claim, assertion, indication of truth can present itself without questions, without asking beyond itself, beyond questions, beyond answers, without expressing beyond expression. Conversely, every asking is a telling, expresses something unexpected, surprising, wondering.

Together, asking and telling express wonder and abundance, not in the abstract sense of an unknown, but in the concrete sense of what is known and claimed. To tell is to claim; to tell is to ask; to tell is to express; to tell is to beseech. And conversely, of asking. Asking and telling cannot be separated, cannot be identical, cannot be evaded, cannot be destroyed. Together they make up the world—that world of which we ask and tell, is it human? what of animals? what do stones tell? what do the stars ask of us? how are we to live? and the others, how are they?

In these ways we see that asking and telling exceed any account as *exposition*:<sup>13</sup> as expression, asking, calling, telling.<sup>14</sup>

*What you do not know, you may ask...*

*What you need, you should tell...*

*What you desire, go and ask...*

*What you hope, you may seek...*

*And so forth...*

*Asking in the generosity of calling, expressing, responding, betraying...*

If we could only imagine asking, or understand asking—and of course we are asking these of asking. Not a logic of questions, not a theory of asking, not even a language or poetry of asking and questioning—though there is goodness in all of them. Ask of and what and why of asking, and perhaps in that asking to find or hear or envisage or express something unknown, unknowable, beyond possession, given beyond having, telling beyond knowing. And in that way touch by asking upon what we may hope to know, how we may hope to live, what we may hope to give and receive—again, our deepest desires. By asking and telling. Not



from asking—receiving what we ask, receiving because we ask; not from telling—claiming what we need—but imagining human being as promised by asking in the generosity of expressing and responding, in wonder and abundance. Betrayed as human and beyond.

We live in a time in which Enlightenment reason appears to many to be under grave attack, from those who have never admired it to those who employ it to undermine itself. Some say that human beings are fundamentally not rational, those who disagree with us are deeply irrational, political and economic forces show that human beings act and believe from desire and feeling, not reason. Some say we should be saved by reason—those who are rational shall rule. Some say we cannot be saved by reason—reason itself is irrational, imposes itself on the world in the name of some human authority. Some say that reason claims an authority it cannot possess.

How is it that humankind throws up, generation after generation, a cadre of thinkers slightly further from God than Ramanujan, but capable nevertheless, after the designated twelve years of schooling and six of tertiary education, of making a contribution to the decoding of the great book of nature via the physical and mathematical disciplines? If the being of man is really at one with the being of God, should it not be cause for suspicion that human beings take eighteen years, a neat and manageable portion of a human lifetime, to qualify to become decoders of God's master script, rather than five minutes, say, or five hundred years? Might it not be that the phenomenon we are examining here is, rather than the flowering of a faculty that allows access to the secrets of the universe, the specialism of a rather narrow self-regenerating intellectual tradition whose forte is reasoning, in the same way that the forte of chess players is playing chess, which for its own motives it tries to install at the centre of the universe? (J. M. Coetzee, *EC*, 69)

None of these suggestions can be told without asking. Certainly there will be no answers without asking—where there are answers—and no doing without undoing. Perhaps it is worth imagining that asking and telling, with or without answers, is the reason—and unreason—I mean the life we may be seeking. To ask, and to ask of asking; to call, and to call of calling; to tell, and to tell of telling; to know that every asking, calling, telling divides, and divides again; betrays and betrays again. These might be science, or philosophy, more likely they may be poetry, or art, or love. In any case, the asking goes beyond itself.



The project I am undertaking here is asking and telling.<sup>15</sup> And I am asking it of others. Asking after asking, asking of and about asking, asking by telling. And yet, not too quickly—or ever—expecting to answer, to say what asking is, to define asking, to explain telling. The point of asking, as against questioning or problem solving, is that we may ask and not answer, not because we do not have the answer, not because there is no answer, not because not answering is lacking, but because asking and telling is the thing itself, that which goes beyond itself. This going beyond, this generosity, is what I hope to seek, asking and telling as thought and life and being going beyond themselves, undoing themselves, multiplying and dividing. Asking and telling multiply, proliferate other askings and tellings. Questioning and answering call for resolution and settling in place. Asking in daily life, in intimacy and community, encompasses science, philosophy, performance, poetry, and religion, yet perhaps not in their own terms, in the ways they have come to answer to the asking, but as expressing, responding, giving, telling, enchanting. The asking I would ask goes back to the beginning of recorded thought, to the asking and not the answers, not in a historical sense of what is past, but in the historical sense of what is now and to come.

There is, then, a project of asking, asking of and after asking, present as limitless desire and endless generosity, betrayed as telling, exposition and expression. Yet it does not begin with asking itself. And it may not end with asking itself. Instead I mean to explore the landscape of asking, its topography and flora and fauna if you will. The telling beyond, undoing beyond doing.

Nevertheless, the gist of asking, its life and promise, and of telling, is that, rooted in the soil of the human world, human experiences, languages, and cultures, it overflows beyond any boundaries. Overflowing is the mark of asking and telling; teeming is their manifestation.

Some day there may be an answer to asking, what it is to ask, what it might be to tell. Yet why should there be, why expect to have the answer to asking where asking is beyond answers?

Some day there may be an answer to humanity, what it is to be human; an answer to being, what it is to be, human or otherwise, living or nonliving. Yet why should there be, why expect to have the answer where asking of them is beyond answers?

*Asking is expressing, imagining, giving, performing, telling, enchanting, undoing, unsettling, desiring, proliferating, calling, surprising, etc. etc....*

*Asking is exposition... as exposure expression ecology asking calling performing... as aisthēsis mimēsis poiēsis catachrēsis technē... as image aesthetics beauty art... as unearthing revelation disclosure telling... as giving interrupting betraying...*

*Asking is expressing and responding beyond questions and answers, beyond knowing and unknowing, beyond doing and undoing, beyond being and nonbeing, where beyond is always more and other in the wonder and abundance of enchantments...*

Here, then, are some of the prospects, one after the other. And of course, in the nature of asking, nothing can be taken for granted. Here is where asking with telling promises to take us, linked terms surpassing every limit and themselves:

*asking as giving, giving as enchanting;...*

*asking as performing, performing as undoing;...*

*asking as desiring, desiring as proliferating;...*

*asking as expressing, expressing as imagining, imagining as telling;...*

*asking as promising, promising as surprising;...*

*asking as undoing, undoing as queering, queering as betraying;...*

*as calling, invoking, responding, saying, knowing;...*

*as coming, becoming, going, staying;...*

*as giving, having; possessing, dispossessing;...*

*in wonder, abundance, profusion, proliferation;...*

*in flourishing, compassion, cherishment, sacrifice, plenishment;...*

*in enchanting, wandering, traveling, resisting;...*

*in mystery, surprise, unsettling, unknowing, conjuring; not to mention;...*

*human asking (what does it mean that human beings ask and tell?);...*

*beyond human asking (how do other creatures ask and tell?);...*

*asking asking;...*

*telling telling;...*

and finally, if only to mark a certain asking familiar to us as a university:

*asking and telling as disciplining...*

A world of asking for giving and telling, celebrating and betraying enchantment and unsettling.<sup>16</sup>

*Returning from this second interruption...*

These expositions themselves exceed every account. So from the first we glimpse the paradoxical forms in which enchantment appears enchanted. The enchantment of the earth gives to us the possibility of its disenchantment. Enchantment exceeds every ac-

count, including the account I hope to give. In this enchanting discourse, we encounter three recurrent themes. The excessiveness of enchantment is its prevailing condition; it appears as given, in giving, interrupting having; and it appears in expression, through exposition, in asking and telling. The enchantments, the inspirations that exceed all accounts, are the ways in which the things of the earth are given to us, as gifts, in asking, by telling, in performing and giving, impossible to hold or grasp, images proliferating in wonder and abundance. Giving and generosity are among the recurrent thematic expositions of enchantment and its excesses, as are expressing, performing, asking, and telling. Generosity and giving are among the ways in which we may speak of how things exceed every account—as giving exceeds possession, as expressing exceeds knowing, as asking exceeds responding, as becoming interrupts being, as ecology exceeds relationality. As if...

*Generously the earth in wonder and abundance offers its enchantments to us to the gods offers us to the gods offers the gods to us and more than the gods as the sacred spiritual pagan divine secular ecological ingredients of our time endless images in proliferation...*

It follows that the task of exposition in which the earth and its ingredients are expressed is itself ecological beyond accounting. The task is endless, every offering is called into question in the ways in which it becomes disenchanting, every image multiplies and proliferates. Disenchantment here is not uniquely a function of the modern world but of its reflections upon enchantment. To know, to understand, is not as such to disenchant, but to bring enchanted things into our possession, where they may be disenchanting. I mean that they do not cease to be enchanted though they may appear so. Among the terms—I will not say *concepts*—that are required to express enchantment are those that express its relations with disenchantment. The term *betrayal*, an enchanting word, expresses that relation as violation and revelation.<sup>17</sup> Enchanted things are betrayed by disenchantment; disenchanting things betray the enchantments at their heart, reveal them, interrupt them, transgress them. This complex relation entails that enchantment and disenchantment are not oppositional in a binary relation—nor for that matter synthetic, reciprocal, or dialectical—but inhabit the transgressive relation described by betrayal. It entails as well that no binary relations—perhaps of reason—can express enchantment and its relations to disenchantment. Nor can any nonbinary relations, relations absolutely without rupture. Enchantment is the rupture in the world that on the

one side opens it up to asking and giving, on the other betrays it. Enchantment interrupts every account including every account of its impossibility. Here enchantment is not a way of being, and disenchantment is not its betrayal into being. Each betrays the other, frames it and reframes it.

*Betrayal betrays the order of things. In interruption. The disenchantment of the earth betrays every ingredient in the perhaps and as if of telling and asking that marks their generosity affirms the ruptures disruptions caesuras of their identities betrays them defiles them reveals them frames them. Betrayal betrays itself...*

For these reasons I have engaged in the endless task of articulating something enigmatic and elusive through different ways and avenues and terms of art. No account of enchantment can settle its nature and being, no account of the earth and its ingredients. Many accounts have been given, many more are to come, including the most technical and scientific reports, in which betrayal and enchantment are present obliquely, and many other expositions, many ecologies,<sup>18</sup> in which enchantment and betrayal are foregrounded. All must succeed, and all must fail. Moreover, success and failure are not oppositional and binary, but are enchanting beyond any disenchantments, asking beyond any answers.<sup>19</sup>

For these reasons again, my writings of the past decades, my life work so to speak, form an ongoing encounter with enchantment, by means of diverse interruptions. In the reworking of that project here I will retrace those gifts to present them in an enchanted light. I begin with disenchantment as weber made it explicit in "Science as a Vocation," the work in which he discusses it extensively. I begin with such a disenchantment so as to extend its reach back and forward in time. I mean to ask whether science can be a vocation without enchantment.<sup>20</sup> I take for granted that it is impossible for philosophy, the arts, and life itself to be what they are without enchantment, without endless asking, though it is possible—indeed irresistible—to disenchant them.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, reflective human life—I mean ethics, politics, arts, religions, and sciences—affirms the enchantments of the earth even as they have become disenchantments. The death of the gods is one of the defining events of the modern world. That is why I speak repeatedly of the secular enchantment of the earth, of how secularization betrays enchantment in ways beyond the reach of religion or theology.

*Secularization enchants the world in abundance... Wonder proliferates in exposition... Reason interrupts the rule of the gods... Asking disrupts the rule of truth...*

*Returning from this first interruption...*

"Science as a Vocation" is addressed to graduate students in the modern academy. It avows to advise them on the conditions they must meet to become successful scientists and the conditions they will face and under which they will live. Weber describes such conditions as *external* and *internal*, and among the latter includes the disenchantment of the world, by which he

means that principally there are no mysterious incalculable forces that come into play, but rather that one can, in principle, master all things by calculation. This means that the world is disenchanted. One need no longer have recourse to magical means in order to master or implore the spirits, as did the savage, for whom such mysterious powers existed. Technical means and calculations perform the service. This above all is what intellectualization means. (139)

One might summarize this far too briefly as that enchantment is belief in spirits<sup>22</sup> invested with mysterious powers, and that disenchantment is mastery over all things by technical means and calculation. Disenchantment removes the magic from things, making them knowable and calculable. Enchantment in this way is beyond calculation.

*No incalculable forces in principle as if principles were not disenchanted from the first. As if enchantments knew principles did not betray them...*

Following a line of thought from Friedrich Nietzsche through Martin Heidegger and Theodor Adorno into Michel Foucault, one might emphasize that mastery takes precedence here. Enchantment and disenchantment are conceived by Weber as forms of domination, competing for control. Imploring, pleading, and praying are other masterful ways of obtaining goods from recalcitrant gods or events. One might imagine that science and religion compete for authority and mastery in the contemporary world. Such a view leaves state authority aside, an authority I regard as neither scientific and technical nor religious even in states dominated by clergy. The contemporary state is disenchanted, but by no means because it accounts for everything. To the contrary, it is because government originates its own forms of mastery and its own techniques of control.<sup>23</sup>

One might suppose that modern reason and its disenchantment both follow from insistence on mastery, and that another view of reason, perhaps an enchanted one, might be possible if we turned from mastery to generosity, from knowing to asking and telling, and from possession to dispossession. One might suppose that reason as such is disenchanted in its insistence on control. We no longer strive for control through magical means because reason is the greater master.<sup>24</sup> The critique of technical rationality must acknowledge the masterful force of reason. I suggest that reason itself is enchanted, even when it is calculation and mastery, and that these too are enchanted. In an enchanted world we do not know where exclusion and mastery will take us. Every journey exceeds expectations. Including the journeys of disenchantment.

*We journey together and apart filled with violence injustice destruction cruelty mastery domination as if perhaps journeying must be. Filled with joy love celebration wonder abundance ecstasy rapture responsibility generosity, affirming journey's enchantments. Being's journey yours and mine is abundant wonderful cruel exposition's wonder and abundance...*

It may be productive in the context of a disenchanted world to address the mastery associated with religion and the divine as well as with academic disciplines and sciences. It may be productive to view the debate between disenchantment and enchantment as one of authority.<sup>25</sup> Who controls and who possesses authority? I would think of enchantment as unsettling all forms of mastery and authority, divine authority and priestly mastery as well as academic authority and scientific mastery. I would imagine the wonder and abundance of the earth as exceeding all mastery and authority, even as these are irresistible, as they always return. Here the language of generosity reappears: enchantment is given from the earth to give, in giving, ecological beyond possession; mastery is received from the earth to have. Here the earth is given in abundance and wonder while the spirits and gods are held up by institutional religions and their elites as something to hold onto.

*Gods spirits disciplines sciences rend us rip open the fabric of the world to its wonders and abundances, grip us grasp us coerce us persuade us make all of us theirs. Enchantments become masteries become our masters become disenchantments. We succumb we war we struggle are broken in their grip are comforted in their grasp are awakened we sleep the long sleep...*

It is time to evoke a different relation to the spirits whose presence marks the enchantment of the earth, at least as human beings encounter it.

*Another interruption...*

Someone, you or me, comes forward and says: *I would like to learn to live finally (enfin).*

*To learn to live:* a strange watchword. Who would learn? From whom? To teach to live, but to whom? Will we ever know? Will we ever know how to live and first of all what “to learn to live” means? And why “finally”?

But to learn to live, to learn it *from oneself and by oneself*, all alone, to teach *oneself* to live, is that not impossible for a living being?

And yet nothing is more necessary than this wisdom. It is ethics itself, to learn to live—alone, from oneself, by oneself.

If it—learning to live—remains to be done, it can happen only between life and death. Neither in life nor in death *alone*. It can only *maintain itself* with some ghost, can only *talk with or about* some ghost (*s’entretenir de quelque fantôme*). So it would be necessary to learn spirits. Even and especially if this, which is neither substance, nor essence, nor existence, *is never present as such*. To live otherwise, and better. No, not better, but more justly. But *with them*. No *being-with* the other, no *socius* without this *with* that makes *being-with* in general more enigmatic than ever for us. And this being-with specters would also be, not only but also, a *politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations. (Derrida, *SM*, xvii–xviii)

Could one *address oneself in general* if already some ghost did not come back? If he loves justice at least, the “scholar” of the future, the “intellectual” of tomorrow should learn it and from the ghost. He should learn to live by learning not how to make conversation with the ghost but how to talk with him, with her, not to let them speak or how to give them back speech, even if it is in oneself, in the other, in the other in oneself: they are always *there*, specters, even if they do not exist, even if they are no longer, even if they are not yet.

*Thou art a scholar, speak to it, Horatio. (176)*

These ghosts or spirits, if they enchant us, are to be neither mastered nor implored, but spoken with and to. And never finally. There are always ghosts, and more, the earth is enchanted, spirits come back, interrupt our comfort.

*To learn to live ecologically enchantedly relationally with spirits with ghosts with...*



*In the modalities of as if and perhaps as if many ghosts perhaps as if they return as if we might speak with them as if they might speak perhaps to us perhaps for us. Never finally. As if and perhaps as asking...*

Derrida calls our attention to these ghosts as uniquely present in the academy. The enchantments of the earth present tasks to the modern intellectual, if there be such, tasks of un mastery and dispossession perhaps, as if that were possible.

*Dead spirits returning with the gods. Dead gods the gods are dead the gods return perhaps the spirits too. Gods and spirits and the return are infinite eternal questionable beyond accounting as if to be accounted for in another return another accounting. Ecstatically the gods return us to ourselves to themselves beyond accounting beyond possession to speak with address comfort ask with the ghosts who restlessly reappear. There is no rest the world proliferates at rest...*

Before venturing a closer reading of weber's understanding of disenchantment, I would recall the audience of his speech<sup>26</sup> to explore the possibility that disenchantment does not pertain to humanity in general, that it is not human beings as such or ordinary europeans and americans, but academics and especially scientists who are disenchant ed. The question is whether disenchantment pertains to contemporary life as such, to ordinary people who believe in different kinds of things, many regarded by academics as superstitions, or whether it pertains to academics as such, to those who have chosen science as a vocation, for whom calculation represents the form of their knowledge but not all the ways in which they relate to the earth. Not finally.

I will content myself here with asking this question. I am not in a position to answer it nor must I do so to approach enchantment as I hope to. The question is less whether contemporary life has been taken over by technical means and calculation in all walks and ways, and more whether the academy, including philosophy, has made itself disenchant ed in order that it may be scientific, resisting interruption of reason's rule.<sup>27</sup> In other words, the question is again of the divide between the university and the world, the ivory tower and life, in the form of the commitments of secular rationality to guarding its authority tightly in the form of disenchantment. *We who know the earth best know it as disenchant ed.* Such a claim is directed against those who believe in magic and superstition, in strange and incredible things, by those whose knowledge confers authority upon them. That such knowledge confers little authority in the world at large—in state, church, military, or corporation—is a minor issue. The scientist

would possess authority in the academy. The schools must be ruled by disenchantment.

In this way I will keep the academy in mind in my celebration of enchantment. I believe the earth to be a magical, enchanted place for many people in their daily lives, whether in their churches or in the rituals and incantations that mark their social relations. I draw inspiration from Michel de Certeau's understanding of marginality.

Marginality is today no longer limited to minority groups, but is rather massive and pervasive; this cultural activity of the non-producers of culture, an activity that is unsigned, unreadable, and unsymbolized, remains the only one possible for all those who nevertheless buy and pay for the showy products through which a productivist economy articulates itself. Marginality is becoming universal. A marginal group has now become a silent majority.

This does not mean the group is homogeneous. The procedures allowing the re-use of products are linked together in a kind of obligatory language, and their functioning is related to social situations and power relationships. (Certeau, *PEL*, xvii)

Marginal behaviors are resistant to mainstream institutions of authority. That means they are superstitious, magical, enchanted. In Certeau's words, they are "everyday practices that produce without capitalizing, that is, without taking control over time" (xx). They interrupt the rule of time.

our society is characterized by a cancerous growth of vision, measuring everything by its ability to show or be shown and transmuting communication into a visual journey. It is a sort of *epic* of the eye and of the impulse to read.

In reality, the activity of reading has on the contrary all the characteristics of a silent production: the drift across the page, the metamorphosis of the text effected by the wandering eyes of the reader, the improvisation and expectation of meanings inferred from a few words, leaps over written spaces in an ephemeral space. Words become the outlet or product of silent histories. The readable transforms itself into the memorable. A different world (the reader's) slips into the author's place.

This mutation makes the text habitable, like a rented apartment. It transforms another person's property into a space borrowed for a moment by a transient. Renters make comparable changes in an apartment they furnish with their acts and memories; as do speakers, in the language into which they insert both the messages of their native tongue and, through their accent, through their own "turns of phrase," etc., their own history; as

do pedestrians, in the streets they fill with the forests of their desires and goals. In the same way the users of social codes turn them into metaphor and ellipses of their own quests. (xxi-xxii)

*Marginality expresses powerlessness illusion unreality as if powerful actual real always perhaps. People live as if perhaps among powers beyond possession beyond the rulers of culture. We are displaced, enchanted agents beyond the rulers of culture...*

Interrupting the organized spaces of everyday life, framed by technical means and calculation, readings and practices are transformed into metaphors and ellipses of alternative quests, magical and enchanted in their ways. These ways—crucial for enchantment—are social, collective, collaborative, shared. But they are shared outside the authorized institutions of disenchantment, including churches. They are shared as enchanted transformations.

*Returning from this interruption...*

Weber is explicit that the institutions that carry the weight and history of enchantment have become disenchanting, and the gods they worship have become disenchanting as well.

Today the routines of everyday life challenge religion. Many old gods ascend from their graves; they are disenchanting and hence take the form of impersonal forces. They strive to gain power over our lives and again they resume their eternal struggle with one another. What is hard for modern man, and especially for the younger generation, is to measure up to workaday existence. The ubiquitous chase for “experience” stems from this weakness; for it is weakness not to be able to countenance the stern seriousness of our fateful times. (149)

The fate of our times is characterized by rationalization and intellectualization and, above all, by the “disenchanting of the world.” Precisely the ultimate and most sublime values have retreated from public life either into the transcendental realm of mystic life or into the brotherliness of direct and personal human relations. It is not accidental that our greatest art is intimate and not monumental, nor is it accidental that today only within the smallest and intimate circles, in personal human situations, in pianissimo, that something is pulsating that corresponds to the prophetic pneuma, which in former times swept through the great communities like a firebrand, welding them together. If we attempt to force and to “invent” a monumental style in art, such miserable monstrosities are produced as the many monuments of the last twenty years. If one tries intellectually to construe new religions without a new and genuine prophecy, then, in an inner sense, something similar will result, but with still

worse effects. And academic prophecy, finally, will create only fanatical sects but never a genuine community. (155)

No room exists for enchantment in the academy, there religion produces fanaticism but not prophecy. Religion in the state does so as well. Enchantment comes when and where it chooses, and becomes fanaticism when secular disenchanted authorities claim its authority. Given the rest of the 20th century, weber's academic prophecy foretold many truths.

*The gods are dead. That is known to all religions and faiths known and felt in every faith no matter how deep. Always perhaps. Always as if a death not of religion but of enchantments and expressions...*

I have mentioned the link between disenchantment and the critique of reason. Those who have most prominently discussed disenchantment have interpreted calculation, technical rationality, mastery, and control as marks of a reason out of control.

*That other form of madness by which men in an act of sovereign reason confine their neighbors and communicate and recognize each other through the merciless language of non-madness. (Foucault, MC, ix-x)...*

I share the critique that would question the authority of modern reason, but I do not question its grandeur—let me call it *enchanted*.<sup>28</sup> Modern science and technology have contributed to terrible events—as have many religions. Science and technology claim to disenchant the world in the name of knowing everything, insist that everything is knowable by science and doable by technology. This inflated claim exceeds any possibility of credence. Why, then, would it not be enchanted, marking the mania weber describes?<sup>29</sup> The inflation of scientific knowledge can be accomplished only by magical means, and indeed, there is magic in the presentations of science and in the advertisements for new technologies. What they are is enchanted enough, what is claimed for them in the mimetic images that surround them is enchanting beyond enchantment. Enchantment is uncontrollable, together with mimesis and exposition. Uncontrollability includes fanaticism, domination, violation. There are no guarantees against evil spirits and violent demons.

*No assurances against evil spirits violent demons cruel ghosts oppressive gods mad scientists. The death of the gods is not the end of evil or its beginning...*

The critique of disenchanted reason and its defenders inhabit a line of thought from descartes to habermas. The defenders of reenchantment inhabit a line of thought largely restricted to reli-

gion and the arts. The possibility of reason's enchantment in the context of its disenchantment—an enchanted science, secularity, rationality—remains largely ignored.<sup>30</sup> Yet it is of immense importance for science and reason and for the struggle for mastery between church and academy. Each guards its authority against the other—two possessive forms of disenchantment. Against this guarding is an enchantment that glitters in art, the uncontainability of exposition and mimesis, the opening of the earth in language and exposition that inhabits every expression, every ingredient, with a wonder and abundance beyond attachment, enclosure, and possession. This is the enchantment of the earth—as world, as nature, ecological enchantments in and through humanity and culture. It knows no bounds even as it finds itself bounded on every side. Its enchantment requires the disenchantment of every world. This is another picture of the academy, filled with disenchanted disciplines whose limits are evident everywhere, in and out of the academy. This disenchantment neither struggles with enchantment nor is diminished by it. Instead, disenchantment fulfills enchantment in the context of a human academy. Disenchantment betrays enchantment.

*Disenchantment betrays enchantment fulfills enchantment enchants itself. Enchantment betrays disenchantment betrays itself interrupts itself disenchants itself...*

It is time to return again to weber, for I have passed over where he speaks of something that falls from the sky under the rule of enchantment: inspiration, creativity—indeed, intoxication, passion, enthusiasm, frenzy. The “inward calling for science” calls for all of these from its practitioners even as it presents itself and them as disenchanted.

*Inspiration creativity intoxication passion frenzy enthusiasm calling asking telling inhabit science express the wonder of science interrupt its disenchantments betray its enchantments. Science disenchants the world to betray enchantments hidden in an enchanted world...*

Nowadays in circles of youth there is a widespread notion that science has become a problem in calculation, fabricated in laboratories or statistical filing systems just as “in a factory,” a calculation involving only the cool intellect and not one’s “heart and soul.” First of all one must say that such comments lack all clarity about what goes on in a factory or in a laboratory.

On the other hand, and this also is often misconstrued, inspiration plays no less a role in science than it does in the realm of art. It is a childish notion to think that a mathematician attains any scientifically valuable results by sitting at his