



## Announcements

THE JAPANESE SOCIETY FOR PROCESS STUDIES was founded on December 8, 1979, in Tokyo. Dr. Yamazaki was elected chairman, and Dr. Matsunobu, vice-chairman. Dr. Yamamoto, whose Japanese translation of *Process and Reality* has just appeared, gave a lecture on "Whitehead's and Nishida's Philosophies."

A WHITEHEAD SYMPOSIUM will be held in Bonn, Germany, in August, 1981. For information, write to: Whitehead Symposium, Westfaellische Wilhelms-Universitaet, Seminar fuer Philosophische Grundfragen der Theologie, Johnanisstrasse 8-10 T. 2638, 4400 Muenster, W. Germany.

THE FORMATION OF WHITEHEAD'S METAPHYSICS is the title of an advanced graduate seminar to be offered by Lewis S. Ford at Old Dominion University (Norfolk, Virginia 23508), July 14-August 6, 1980. Tuition is \$155 (\$90 for Virginia residents), but those with Ph.D.'s are invited to participate without charge. This will be a workshop based on a compositional analysis of *Process and Reality*; the aim is to reconstruct the stages of Whitehead's philosophizing between 1926 and 1928. For preliminary results, see PS 8/3. For further information, contact Lewis S. Ford.

PROCESS THEOLOGY AT COLLEGEVILLE: David Griffin will offer a course on "Evil, Enjoyment, and Ethics," June 13-July 3, 1980. Norman Pittenger will offer a course on process theology, July 7-25. Piet Schoonenberg will teach a course during the entire six-week period. For further information, write to Bernard Lee, S.M., St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321.

PROCESS THEOLOGY AND EVIL: THE HOLOCAUST EXPERIENCE will be the topic of a Jewish-Christian conference held at the School of Theology at Claremont June 3-5, 1980. Participation is by invitation, but auditors are welcome. For further information, write to Lori Krafte or David Griffin at the Center for Process Studies.

THE THOUGHT OF CHARLES HARTSHORNE is the title of a conference to be held at the University of Chicago in the fall of 1981, co-sponsored by the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Meadville Theological School, and the Center for Process Studies. Participation will be by invitation, but auditors will be welcome. To make suggestions about participants, write to David Griffin or Lori

(Continued on page 282)

# PROCESS STUDIES



VOLUME 9 / NUMBERS 1-2

SPRING-SUMMER / 1979

SEE NOTICE INSIDE FRONT COVER

# PROCESS STUDIES

(ISSN 0360-6503)  
(USPS 002-870)



EDITOR  
**LEWIS S. FORD**  
Old Dominion University

MANAGING EDITOR  
**ROBERT W. HUTTON**  
School of Theology at Claremont

REVIEW EDITOR  
**GEORGE R. LUCAS, JR.**  
Randolph-Macon College

DIRECTOR  
Center for Process Studies  
**JOHN B. COBB, JR.**  
School of Theology at Claremont

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
Center for Process Studies  
**DAVID RAY GRIFFIN**  
School of Theology at Claremont

Process philosophy may be defined as applying primarily, though not exclusively, to the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead and his intellectual associates, most notably Charles Hartshorne. With this as the focus, PROCESS STUDIES seeks to explore process thought more broadly as it appears in related philosophies and theologies and to apply the Whiteheadian conceptuality to other fields, such as aesthetics, mathematics, physics, biology, cosmology, history of religions, social science, and literary criticism.

PROCESS STUDIES is published quarterly by Process Studies in association with the Center for Process Studies at the School of Theology at Claremont, 1325 N. College Ave., Claremont, CA 91711. Second class postage paid at Claremont, CA, and additional office.

MANUSCRIPTS should be sent to Lewis S. Ford, Department of Philosophy, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23508. Reviews, books for review, and abstracts should be sent to George R. Lucas, Jr., Department of Philosophy, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, VA 23005. Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced, including references and notes, which should be placed at the end of the article and prepared according to Process Studies style as described on the inside back cover. It is our policy to avoid sexist language insofar as practicable. Authors of recent dissertations are urged to submit to the Review Editor a one-page double-spaced abstract, with full bibliographical information, at any time for the annual compilation of dissertation abstracts.

SUBSCRIPTION orders, changes of address, and business correspondence should be addressed to Process Studies, 1325 N. College Ave., Claremont, CA 91711.

#### ADVISORY BOARD

IAN BARBOUR *Carleton College*  
ARABINDA BASU *Banaras Hindu Univ., India*  
L. C. BIRCH *University of Sydney, Australia*  
JEAN-MARIE BREUVART *Ecole d'Éducateurs, France*  
DELWIN BROWN *Arizona State University*  
MILIC CAPEK *Boston University*  
WILLIAM CHRISTIAN *Yale University*  
JORGE ENJUTO BERNAL *Univ. of Puerto Rico*  
LEONARD J. ESLICK *St. Louis University*  
JAMES W. FELT, S.J. *University of Santa Clara*  
A. H. JOHNSON *University of Western Ontario*  
GEORGE L. KLINE *Bryn Mawr College*  
ERVIN LASZLO *SUNY at Genesee*  
NATHANIEL LAWRENCE *Williams College*  
IVOR LECLERC *Emory University*

A. LICHTIGFELD *Univ. of Witwatersrand, South Africa*  
BERNARD LOOMER *Graduate Theol. Union, Berkeley*  
VICTOR LOWE *Johns Hopkins University*  
CHARLES MALIK *American Univ. of Beirut, Lebanon*  
BERNARD MELAND *University of Chicago*  
SCHUBERT OGDEN *Perkins Theological Seminary*  
DAVID PAILIN *University of Manchester, England*  
ROBERT PALTER *University of Texas*  
ALIX PARMENTIER *Fribourg, Switzerland*  
EDWARD POLS *Bowdoin College*  
GENE REEVES *Wilberforce University*  
PAUL SCHMIDT *University of New Mexico*  
DONALD SHERBURNE *Vanderbilt University*  
JAN VAN DER VEKEN *Univ. of Louvain, Belgium*  
REINER WIEHL *Heidelberg, Germany*

INDIVIDUALS	
One Year	\$10
Two Years	19
Three Years	27
INSTITUTIONS	
One Year	\$13
Two Years	25
Three Years	36
Single Copy, \$4	

There is no additional charge for subscriptions delivered outside the United States; however, checks or money orders must be in U.S. dollars and must be written on an American bank.

**NOTICE:** Volumes 9 and 10 contain two issues each, dated Spring-Summer and Fall-Winter (of 1979 and 1980, respectively), allowing PS to reach current cover dating at the end of volume 10. Subscribers will still receive the number of issues for which they have paid—four issues for each volume originally ordered.

## Process Thought in Contemporary Europe

*Editor's Note:* The following communications were presented during the European Weekend on Process Philosophy held November 10-12, 1978, at the Catholic University of Louvain on the occasion of the bestowal of an honorary degree upon Charles Hartshorne.

### GREAT BRITAIN (Dr. W. N. Pittenger, King's College, Cambridge CB2 1ST, England)

Alfred North Whitehead was an Englishman who for many years was a member of the Faculty of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge. Although doubtless he was concerned, even then, with philosophical questions, he did not develop his metaphysical system until he arrived at Harvard. All of his major metaphysical works were written there. All of them were published in Britain by the Cambridge University Press. Probably they were read by some people, but it is certainly true that in his native land Whitehead never received the recognition which was his due. Nor has the work of Charles Hartshorne been given the attention which it deserves, although recently, he is now at last being read and discussed.

But process *theology*, as distinct from the more general process conceptuality, has often been regarded in Britain as a peculiarly American phenomenon. Whitehead and Hartshorne may have been placed among philosophers who carried on, with improvements, the kind of metaphysical thinking represented earlier in the century by such men as S. Alexander, C. Lloyd-Morgan, and Jan Smuts; yet any serious attempt to use the process philosophy for theological purposes is fairly recent in the United Kingdom.

I recall the surprise shown when I arrived in Cambridge from New York, fifteen years ago, and was invited to give a lecture in which I presented and defended process theology. Many of those who attended said that they had never even heard of that theological approach. No longer can this be said. The publication of books such as Schubert Ogden's *The Reality of God* and John Cobb's *A Christian Natural Theology* has helped in this respect. And in some of our universities, notably in Manchester where David Pailin is a senior lecturer, a remarkable

satisfactory interpretation of experience without being as narrow as the Kantian scheme, nor does it have the same transcendental significance. The last chapter of *Process and Reality* took me back again to still another style, the last and admirable pages of Hegel's *Encyclopedia*. There was therefore a certain analogy with my former model and an invitation to go further.

To go further meant leaving the transcendental viewpoint and reexamining the problem of God, while returning to pre-Kantian modes of thought. This problem, along with the one of the relations between time and the eternal objects, seemed to me the most important. The publication of A. Parmentier's thesis as well as D. Brown's study "God and Process" became the basis of my reflection.

In short, the research about God became a research on philosophical discourse and its right to "say" God. Within this perspective *Process and Reality* and equally *Modes of Thought* became the focus of passionate interest, not so much as to know *what* was said, but rather to know *how* it was said.

All Whiteheadian philosophy seems to rest upon the postulate that internal relations exist among the eternal objects, by which each defines itself and that these internal relations are governed by a certain coherence in the universe within which we find ourselves.

Per contra, the eternal objects remain indeterminate in their relation to actual occasions, toward which they entertain only external relations. If God is the foundation of the determination of "things," he is not, therefore, the foundation of that which is determined (SMW 231, 257). The fundamental belief of Whitehead is that even if we are not able to determine in advance what will be we can, nonetheless, in principle circumscribe the progression toward the good in what has been because the real according to the Hegelian formula is rational.

Precisely, it is the notion of "Wirklichkeit" which could cause problems for Whitehead: what is the tie between the social historical rapport, within which this "reality" is defined, according to Hegel, and the linguistic codes which govern this social rapport? Is not the discourse learned in a sociological and historically determined milieu, within which aspiration for a change develops and desire exists? Are there not other domains, such as art and religion, within which its transcendent relation to discourse is manifested?

Whitehead's answer conforms to his vision of a possible analysis of all prior facts: "The dim recesses of experience present immense difficulties for analysis. . . . We have recourse to memory, to the testimony of others including their memories, to language in the form of the analysis of words and phrases—that is to say, to etymology and syntax. We should also consider the institutions of mankind in the light of an embodiment of their stable experience" (FR 77). The only point which could create difficulties is that of "analysis." Are the social institutions of which Whitehead speaks solely made to be analyzed by the philosopher? Or, stated another way, is not the philosopher of light, for better or worse, inevitably bound up with the philosopher of night—to whom the obscure aspirations can never fully be justified?

Perhaps I have yielded to the demons of French philosophy, at once Cartesian and critical. Their influence may be so pervasive that it becomes impossible to escape entirely the Hegelian influence and the importance of collective history in the development of consciousness and the unfolding of each individual existence. More fundamentally, however, the Whiteheadian heritage, as with all the great philosophers, seems to me ambivalent.

Even though we find in Whitehead a constant concern for clarification throughout his work, we find equally an openness to the irrational with perhaps the indication that philosophy will no longer be a rational discourse but poetry (see especially RM and the last chapter of PR). Here, it seems to me, we find all the difference in the world between the chapter on God in *Science and the Modern World* and the invocation of a God whose Consequent Nature is "the judgment of a tenderness which loses nothing that can be saved" (PR 525). Whitehead assures that he alludes only to an image. But isn't it true these images express, even better than concepts, all the meaning and the tragedy of existence?

#### GERMANY (Dr. M. Welker, Gartenstr. 14, 7401 Nehren/Tübingen, West Germany)

Since the late 40's there has been some effort expended on introducing process thought to the German academic world. The teaching activity of Charles Hartshorne in Frankfurt after the war and translations of Whitehead's works which appeared in Switzerland have awakened the first intensive interest in process thought. This is shown especially by several dissertations on Whitehead from the 50's and early 60's. But it is not until the second half of the 60's that questions appear in German publications where process thought is essential if one is to answer these questions.

Process thought was adopted in order to redefine basic concepts that are found both in the field of classical metaphysics and modern science. Process thought should prevent the situation from arising where such fundamental concepts as "substance," "time," or "force" slip between those two areas and so remain relatively undefined. It is, however, easy to explain why it has been received with hesitancy.

After the German academic world had for years been intensely occupied with itself, with ways of coming to terms with its own tradition, it turned in part to a source of new impulses, initially the discussions regarding analytical philosophy. Further attention was paid to process thought only with the increasing realization that communication between the arts and sciences was not only desirable and interesting but indeed necessary.

In the 70's Eberhard Bubser translated *Adventures of Ideas* (1971) and *The Function of Reason* (1974). In an extensive introduction to the translation of *Adventures of Ideas*, Reiner Wiehl shows that Whitehead's philosophy offers new forms of representation which are in many respects superior to those traditional ones, even though they can be

related to them. This "Introduction to the Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead" is the most important text that has ever been written in Germany by an authority on process thought. In this way a larger readership has, for the first time, been presented with the fact that process thought not only develops answers to certain single questions but also provides new forms of thought and matrices which enable one to comprehend and improve upon several supposed fundamentals of the continental traditions. The dogmatism that we can perceive single objects, the unquestioning presupposition of correlations, the lack of concern for examples, and a string of other practices in European thought now prove to be customs that must be reexamined. Yet process thought in Germany is still experiencing the same difficulties as Whitehead's Gifford Lectures: its importance is recognized but the problems with its reception are great. Furthermore misleading opinions, supported by several popular publications, are being formed, such as the proposition that process thought only wishes to show that everything is in motion and in flux. The general reaction to such caricatures is a groan rather than the urge to think, a groan that we have already heard this from Heraclitus and Hegel.

While process thought in Germany has now gained intensity, primarily through the work of Reiner Wiehl, it must not renounce a concern with a broader impact. This has been taken care of by American process theology. Wolfhart Pannenberg, Jürgen Moltmann, and Gerhard Sauter have established contact with process thought in American theology and have not only drawn attention to it in their publications but have also introduced several ideas and theses from process theology into the German discussion. Dietrich Ritschl, who taught for many years in the USA, recently held seminars on Whitehead and Hartshorne. For some time now the Research Institute of the Evangelische Studiengemeinschaft in Heidelberg has been studying Whitehead and American process theology with the intention of finding the foundations for a discussion between theologians and scientists. In December, 1978, the Studiengemeinschaft sponsored a conference with John Cobb in the Evangelical Academy in Arnoldshain, thus making the dialogue about process thought accessible to a larger public.

Also more primary and secondary literature on Whitehead in Germany has become available. The University library at Tübingen is at the moment engaged in acquiring the majority of those publications in book form to be found in the 1977 bibliography. It also intends to collect those of Whitehead's important early essays that are not at the Center for Process Studies in Claremont and to produce a xeroxed anthology. In this way the Tübingen University library will be, after Claremont and Leuven, an address to which all those can apply who wish to get to the bottom of the "secrets of process thought" as it is still described in Germany today. The will to intensify this research is increasing among specialists. More and more they are asking themselves that question that governs the development of Whitehead's theory: "How does exact thought apply to the fragmentary, vague *continua* of experience? I am not saying that it does not apply: quite the contrary. But I want to know

how it applies. The solution I am asking for is not a phrase, however brilliant, but a solid branch of science, constructed with slow patience, showing in detail how the correspondence is effected."

**ROME (Prof. Dr. W. P. Welten, S.J., Hobbemakade 51, 1071 XL Amsterdam, Nederland)**

A course on Whitehead given at the Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, during the first semester of the academic year 1978-79, has given me the opportunity for some observations and reflections.

Most of Whitehead's philosophical books have been translated into Italian, but in the Roman bookshops I visited I found only a few of them and no process books in English at all.

At the Gregorian University, there have been three doctoral dissertations on process philosophy in the years 1952-66. They were written under the direction of three different professors. This shows a kind of oscillating interest, no continuous tradition. Among the present-day professors of philosophy and theology, there is a feeling that Whitehead's philosophy *might become important*, but there is certainly not a general conviction that process thought *is* already important.

My course, "An Introduction to Whitehead's Metaphysics," was offered as an optional course for second-cycle students of philosophy and of theology, students having completed at least two years of philosophical studies. Actually the theologians formed the large majority of my listeners. This fact corresponds with the situation at the Gregorian University, where the Department of Theology plays the leading part, by its number of students and by the very nature of that university. To me, however, this dominating presence of theologians among students of Whitehead seemed rather unsatisfactory. In order to explain this, I would like to present briefly a few ideas concerning process thought and theology.

I suggest that theologians may choose between two different attitudes.

(1) They may concentrate on the concept of God and then try to express the Biblical revelation about God and their personal religious experience in a coherent system of rational thought. They will then find a great help in *Process and Reality* and in the works of Hartshorne. There is no doubt that this work ought to be done—and Woodbridge's Whitehead bibliography shows that it is done abundantly: Whitehead scholars have concentrated their attention on the concept of God much more than Whitehead himself ever did. Apparently, theologians were in urgent need of new conceptual structures, and they found them in process philosophy.

(2) There is, however, another possibility. Theologians may also consider in the first place the needs of the millions of people who do not believe at all or whose faith calls for a different religious language than what is usually offered. I think that in that case they will try to approach these people through the dominant modes of thought of our time, that is, through philosophical currents that are now generally