

Process Perspectives



A Holistic-Relational Worldview For the Common Good

Volume 19 Number 1

ISSN 0360-618X

Summer 1995

CPS MANAGEMENT AND CULTURE WAR MEDIATION

John Quiring

A future for process *thought* is assured, at least wherever the histories of philosophy and theology are taught. This editorial, however, discusses the future of *the Center for Process Studies [CPS]*. Its mission is to facilitate interdisciplinary research that communicates, tests, and develops holistic-relational process philosophy and theology, including their policy implications for matters affecting the common good. I wish to suggest that CPS needs to be managed for growth. I also propose that emphasizing the mediational aspect of process thought might engage a new group of members. Developing a suggestion by David Ray Griffin [*CPS Newsletter* 18:3 (Spring 1995): 5], I recommend employment of process thought in a project of culture war mediation.

CPS Management

For over twenty years CPS has been supported by loyal members and generous donors. Our membership, consisting of students, faculty, clergy, and laity has been generated largely through *firsthand* exposure to process thinkers, the work of the Center, or the international process network. In recent years, however, each component of the CPS infrastructure and budget has undergone cutbacks: membership, journal subscription, overall donation, work/study funds for student staff, and campus support.

A considerably enlarged budget, therefore, is now needed if we are to maintain our current level of activity and ensure increased quality of service and growth in outreach. We are addressing that need by becoming more proficient in fund-raising, not only from grants and contributions, but through public relations and marketing.

CPS must now be managed as if it were a freestanding, nonprofit entity with a strong sense of its competition in the field of institute research—not only new paradigm, but

liberal and conservative as well. It needs to clarify and develop its niche in the small market for nonsectarian, nonpartisan, philosophical, theological, and interdisciplinary research and publication. We must now market our services and products far beyond the established process network. We are also receiving considerable encouragement to expand the scope of our traditional membership by seeking to popularize the themes of process thought and to show the difference it makes in daily life. While the Process & Faith program has sought to increase the accessibility of process theology, CPS needs to increase the accessibility of its mediating positions across the full range of process research.

continued on page 2

INSIDE

Religions Meeting Religiously	4
To Potential Visiting Scholars	4
The Culture of Peace	5
Wittgenstein and Whitehead	6
Business Roundtable	8
Banks and Ecological Risks	9
Refusal and the Broken Heart	10
Membership Corner	11
Visiting Scholars	12
Letters to the Editor	14
CPS Calendar	16
CPS Member Papers	16

*Mediation of
The Culture War*

In addition to development of the conceptuality of process thought through analysis and comparison with philosophical and theological alternatives, CPS seeks to employ the process perspective to shed light on current affairs through the medium of interdisciplinary dialogues. Here Whitehead's trans-disciplinary worldview functions like a magnet, but is not itself the sole focus of attention. At both levels—worldview and policy—many process thinkers can be found within the middle ranges of spectra of logically possible and historically developed views on issues. I believe this positions CPS to participate creatively in attempts to facilitate mediation of the culture wars, if we are willing to make the effort.

The culture war is composed of battles between polarized subcultures of conservatives and progressives, religionists and secularists, theists and atheists, fundamentalists and modernists, populists and elites. Breakdown of communication across these divides results in contemptuous exchanges of stereotypes. My suggestion is that the culture war needs mediators and that CPS facilitation of dialogues between representatives of all factions would provide opportunities to demonstrate the capacity of process thought to be a candidate for, or component in, a new public philosophy and public theology. These public culture vehicles would offer a worldview comprehensive enough to mediate ideologically polarized factions by evidencing the compatibility of diverse truth and value claims on both sides.

The mediating stance of process thought has been impressed on me through my work as CPS librarian and bibliographer. A portrait of what I mean by process mediation can be indicated with a sketch of mediating positions held by at least some thinkers in the process movement. This is intended to suggest a *range* of mediating positions. Pages of bibliography would obviously be required to verify this, as well as group deliberation to revise it. Process thought is not tied to all of these positions and labels.

In terms of Western intellectual history, process thinkers developed **constructive postmodernism** by combining elements of premodern wisdom with modern science. In process metaphysics a **many-becoming-one** or **unity-in-diversity holism** mediates dualism and monism; **“Creativity”** integrates the dualism of spiritualism and materialism. In philosophy of science, **scientific realism** mediates naive realism and antirealism. Science-and-Religion scholarship generates the process view of **integration** or **fusion**, as opposed to conflict and compartmentalization, and **theistic evolutionism** or **naturalistic theism**, as opposed to supernaturalist creationism and atheist naturalism. On the God-world relation, Process **pan-en-theism** mediates dualistic theism and pantheism. In philosophy of religion, process **neoclassical theism** mediates classical theism and Western atheism, though it draws parallels between process “Creativity” and Buddhist non-theistic “Emptiness”. In epistemology, **perspectivist intersubjectivism** mediates value-free objectivism and subjectivism; while **non-foundationalist inter-relatedness** points to an alternative to foundationalism and relativism.

Suggestions of mediating positions in process thought continue. In religious epistemology, process theology integrates **experience, reason, scripture** and **tradition**, privileging none. On the plurality of religions, the process-developed view of **mutual transformation** is an alternative to exclusivism or inclusivism on the one hand, and perennialist pluralism on the other. In soteriology, **personal and social transformation** defuses the personal salvation/social gospel dualism. In ethics, **wisdom-as-moderation** avoids the generic liberal danger of excess and the generic conservative danger of deficiency. A policy of **general criteria for balancing the interests of all parties** mediates objectivist legalism and subjectivist relativism. In gender studies, **ecofeminism-with-partnership** develops an alternative between patriarchal hierarchy and liberal rights-and-justice feminism, on the one side and, on the other, elite cultural feminism, and separatism. In ethnic studies, **social pluralism**, or “open nationalism,” mediate varieties of ethnocentrism and “melting-pot” homogenization. In political theory, **person-in-community communitarianism** integrates the extremes of libertarian individualism and authoritarian collectivism. In economic theory, decentralized **regional and national markets** are theorized as more likely to become participatory, just, and sustainable, than trans-national, world-market, free-trade capitalism or centrally-planned socialism. In environmental theory, **a balance of intrinsic and instrumental values** mediates anthropocentrism and biocentric egalitarianism. Our next step is to address the controversial area of

spirituality in the workplace. Further evidence, albeit negative, of the non-extremist intent of process thought derives from impressionistic criticisms on two compound flanks. But it also illustrates the difficulty in claiming to be moderate. Conceptions differ concerning the nature and size of the spectra upon which the extreme-moderate-extreme template is to be placed, partly because of the persistence of dismissive stereotypes of poles of experience and thought that need mediation and integration. Practically, the criticisms indicate the need to clarify a process agenda of **integrating competing disciplines and paradigms**—a source of continual misunderstanding for many. Historically, process thought focused on integration of the paradigms of science, religion, and philosophy. Recently, some process thinkers have also attempted to integrate the complex identity paradigm that generates analyses from the perspectives of race, class, and gender. Thus, process thought is not just philosophical, nor just theological, but multi- and trans-disciplinary thought generating a continually-refined, integrated, world-view with consequences for public policy and daily life.

On one side, some philosophers find process thought insufficiently epistemological and logically rigorous, “really just” theology, “full of fluff,” and perhaps passé. Some Humanists find it too religious, or too specifically Christian. Some want the metaphysics without God. Some academics are bewildered by its refusal to conform to disciplinary paradigms or

demonstrate loyalty to the advancement of professional guilds. Some Liberationists find it out of step with the latest tactics, not directly serving the marginalized, not multicultural enough, too homogenizing of difference.

On the other side, many people, of all backgrounds, find process writing too difficult, too abstract; “talk about misplaced concreteness!” someone wrote. Some Feminists find it too cerebral, disembodied. Some religious conservatives think process theology is too philosophical or metaphysical, too secularized or rationalistic, too radical, “unbiblical,” not relevant to ministry. Some say that in contrast to classical supernatural theism, the process concept of God is truncated, diminished. They are dissatisfied with process qualifications of divine power, knowledge, action, creativity, impassibility and immutability in contrast to the orthodox doctrines of omnipotence, omniscience, and creation *ex nihilo*. Some say the process God is too immanent, not transcendently other enough. In mistaking process panentheism for pantheism, some dismiss it as New Age, or say that panentheism is “just pantheism for people with Ph.D.s.” Some see process interpretations of Jesus, Bible, immortality, ethics, and evil as watered down or weak.

This vignette of process moderation is not advanced as a new orthodoxy. In fact there are *many alternatives* within process thought. I offer it, rather, as “language” for diplomatic proposals in the culture wars, and as an oasis for explorers weary of adversarial posturing in the desert of argumentation. I do not see the mediating positions as constituting a fixed balance or a dead center, because social reality is conflictual and allows only dynamic and temporary integrations. Will the mediating positions soon become mainstream opinion? I do not anticipate their hegemony any time soon, for the hardened bunkers of secularism and the fundamentalisms of Left and Right will likely prevent many from hearing reports of a cease fire. Intellectual Balkanization may run as deep as geographic.

I conclude with questions: Is mediation desirable or possible? Does process thought have the capacity to mediate? Does CPS? We invite critical dialogue on all CPS activities. We know we cannot please everyone, though some of us may wish we could. We seek not confession of a new creed, but critical interaction for the sake of *creative transformation*, not only of the institutions of our society and the world, but of process philosophies and theologies, and CPS as well. ■

Process Perspectives, THE NEWSLETTER OF THE CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES, is published three times per year by the CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES.

A subscription to **Process Perspectives** is included with Center Membership, as is a subscription to *Process Studies*, the quarterly devoted primarily to Whiteheadian thought. Membership rates are on a sliding scale. Membership categories are \$35-65, \$80, \$150, \$300, \$600, and \$1200 (plus \$7 postage for members outside of the U.S.). Newsletter subscriptions are available for \$10 per year. More information on membership is available from the Center @ (909) 621-5330. Or you can write to CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES, 1325 N. College Avenue, Claremont, California 91711.

Co-Directors:

John B. Cobb, Jr. / David Ray Griffin / Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore / Marjorie Suchocki

Assistant Director: John Quiring

Editor: Olav Bryant Smith

Our co-directors at the Center for Process Studies:

David Griffin, Marjorie Suchocki, Mary Elizabeth Moore and John Cobb

Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore Seminar

Religions Meeting Religiously

by June Watkins

Is it possible for religions to meet religiously? This question was posed by Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore on March 2, 1995 in Claremont, CA. Although the possibility may sound absurd, according to Dr. Moore, it is absolutely necessary in a world where religious communities are fighting against each other all across the world. The task may be difficult but it is necessary and important so that all can live together in relative peace. Dr. Moore's paper was built on the dream that religious communities might meet together with the depths of their religious passions, the fullness of their religious commitments, and the openness of their religious questions. These three terms: passions, commitments, and questions were organizing principles for the paper.

In the first section, Dr. Moore gave an overview of the current religious clashes around the world, such as Pakistan, Bosnia-Serbia, and Ireland. Are these conflicts religiously oriented? Absolutely, says Moore, religion intensifies conflict. Religious differences distance people from one another. In terms of passion, violence occurs in the name of religion. Religious beliefs are cited as justification for violence.

We might first look at the difficulties religious communities have in sharing worship. Worship and sacred texts are at the very center of religious life. Some communities have become angry at mixing different religious scripture or ritual into their own. Moore believes that we must move beyond mere tolerance of other beliefs.

In terms of commitment, clashes of ethical commitments occur frequently between different faith communities. Groups may have altogether different ethical commitments, or they may have the same ethical commit-

ments but because of other differences they aren't able to work together effectively. Take the cases of abortion and ecological crisis, for example. It may seem obvious that interfaith discussion could take place on these two issues, but concerns of the ethical issues are often subsumed under religious concerns. Another way religions clash is dealing with their unresolved faith questions. This problem is exacerbated by the inequities of power among these religious communities. When one religious community has dominant power, the other religious communities define themselves over against the dominant one. Additionally, a dominant faith community has more influence over the political and economic decisions.

Dr. Moore then laid out some practical proposals. Religious communities can meet religiously but they need to speak out of their personal spiritual journeys. ■

A Word to Potential

Visiting Scholars

As the new Visiting Scholars Coordinator, I would like to introduce myself to you, and pass on some information that will help us serve you when you come to visit the Center for Process Studies (CPS). My name is Martha Jean Mugg Bailey, but you can call me Martha. I am here to assist you as you arrange to come to CPS for a day or a year. I want to help make your visit comfortable and profitable, by helping with local arrangements and by orienting you to Claremont and CPS.

Most Visiting Scholars need assistance in finding local housing for their stay in Claremont. We do our best to find housing that is suitable, but there

continued on page 13

Professor Kathleen Dugan (UC San Diego) and Raimundo Panikkar

Raimundo Panikkar Seminar

Religion and The Culture of Peace

by Sheela Pawar

On March 20, 1995, Raimundo Panikkar, recipient of three doctoral degrees (Chemical Engineering, Philosophy, and Religion), author of *The Hidden Christ of Hinduism*, and deliverer of the 1989 Gifford Lectures, presented a seminar at the Center for Process Studies. That seminar was entitled, "The Contribution of Religions to the Culture of Peace." Panikkar described the dislocation of religion resulting in a loss of humanity's spiritual stamina and prescribed a course of treatment including the proper relocation of religion through metanoia. An interesting symptom of this spiritual malaise is UNESCO's shelving of its project, the "Declaration on the Role of Religion in the Promotion of a Culture of Peace" for more than twenty years. Religion was not considered a serious subject. This attitude has recently changed and UNESCO is beginning to recognize religion as an important part of human life and a serious source of action. Pannikar is currently involved in formulating this "Declaration" with UNESCO. The following report is based upon Dr. Panikkar's presentation:

History

The last 6000 years of human history have advanced a culture of war. In this time, we encoded the culture of war into rules - embedding them into our culture. Today 40 million soldiers exist in the world; 70 times more money is spent on each soldier than on each student. War is a cultural, not a natural phenomenon; it is not in line with the evolutionary nature of humankind. The human species has forgone its natural weapon -- the tongue -- for more violent means. The power of words as barriers to violence has deteriorated. An increase in war has corresponded to a decrease in rhetoric and the breakdown of relations and dialogue has increasingly led to war.

Humanity has descended to a subhuman level.

The role of religion lies at the root of these problems. In its present state, however, religion can be of little aid as it has misdirected and abused the religious impulse of humanity. Religions are now "lofty doctrines" which preach passivity. They avoid the existential factor of human life and thus neglect their true purpose. Religions have abused humanity, participating in slavery and torture. They have sanctioned the most heinous crimes throughout history, contributing very little to the culture of peace. Since they claim absoluteness, they cannot tolerate each other. All religions are equally guilty of these offenses.

Diagnosis

The culture of war and its offspring, Western techno-scientific culture, have infected the world causing spiritual malaise, particularly in the West. No longer able to consider everything as an end in itself, the world suffers from a loss of spiritual stamina. We are now incapable of the type of action necessary to improve our world situation -- poverty, ecological danger, etc. We are imprisoned within our obsession with techno-scientific culture. Absolutization of the "ends" of technology has left us blind to the inhumanity of our means.

Treatment

Though religion is needed to heal our malaise, the historical record proves religion a bitter cure, more harmful than helpful. Therefore, the first step toward a cure for this spiritual malaise is the conversion and repentance of religion itself. We must give religion its proper place in order

continued on page 12

George R. Lucas, Jr. and Professor D.Z. Phillips

George Lucas Seminar

Wittgenstein, Whitehead and the Protest Against the Enlightenment

by *Olav Bryant Smith*

When we heard that George Lucas, an Assistant Director in the Division of Research Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities, was scheduled to come to the A.P.A. West meeting in the spring, we invited him to speak at the Center about his paper concerning "Wittgenstein and Whitehead: The Critique of Enlightenment and the Question Concerning Metaphysics." The paper was originally written for the 17th Annual International Wittgenstein Congress, held during the summer of 1994 near Vienna, Austria. We were honored by Dr. Lucas's acceptance of our invitation. D.Z. Phillips, Danforth Professor of Philosophy of Religion at the Claremont Graduate School, and John B. Cobb, Jr., one of the Center's directors, agreed to give responses. Professor Phillips quipped at the event that "There was a somewhat demonic suggestion that I would reply to the section on Whitehead and Dr. Cobb reply to the section on Wittgenstein, but fortunately that turned out to be a rumour."

Lucas wanted to make clear that he had not spontaneously set out to compare Wittgenstein and Whitehead. As someone responsible for granting in philosophy at N.E.H., he admitted that comparisons of philosophers are usually only mildly interesting at best. But the theme of the International Wittgenstein Congress had been "Wittgenstein and The Tradition of 20th Century British Philosophy." A recent Lucas book entitled *The Rehabilitation of Whitehead* [SUNY Press, 1989] had led to the invitation to speak about Wittgenstein and Whitehead.

Rather than focusing on the differences between Wittgenstein and White-

head, Lucas chose to draw out what they had in common, which is, no doubt, nearly impossible in the eyes of some. Lucas makes a strong case for seeing these two thinkers as part of a general movement at Cambridge toward a distrust of the Enlightenment's confidence in reason. In making his case, Lucas picks up on a theme, first talked about by Von Wright, pointing to two separate traditions at Cambridge. One tradition is thoroughly "modern" in its tendencies to stress *exactness* in conceptuality, reducing wholes to atomic parts, using mathematical models to describe the physical world, and logic "to adjudicate philosophical disputes." This movement, which Lucas claims can be traced through Russell to Leibniz, also places great confidence in specialists and experts.

Against this view is a tradition which arguably can be traced through Hume to Gassendi and Vico. The tradition of Gassendi and Hume has "relied on history, textual evidence, experiment and modeling," has expressed a "fear of the hegemony of mathematical method in sciences," and "the misleading promise of precision at the expense of engagement of the actual." Those who have embraced this tradition have spoken of the limitations of mathematical-logical reasoning. And there has been a "deep-seated distrust of specialists." Von Wright has made the case that Wittgenstein belongs to this latter tradition at Cambridge, and Lucas makes the case that the later Whitehead, of the speculative years, as well as G.E. Moore and, "to some extent," Frank Ramsey, also belong to this tradition opposed to

continued on page 7

Enlightenment overemphasis of the value of logical precision.

Lucas also used the occasion to ask the question whether Whitehead's "metaphysics" transcends the boundaries of philosophy that Wittgenstein saw as necessary. Lucas has concluded that Whitehead's activities fall under the description of *heuristic conceptual modeling* that Wittgenstein approved of and often used. Lucas had first made this argument about the hermeneutical nature of Whitehead's metaphysics in 1983, but it met with resistance. He used the opportunity of this paper to revisit the issue. He makes a distinction between the *literal* use of metaphysical hypotheses and their *heuristic* use. Following Hertz and Boltzmann, Lucas argues that scientific theory is meant as a model used to help reveal the nature of things, but without being intended as a "snapshot" of reality. As opposed to the "snapshot" model of reality, *Vorstellung* in German, there is a model, *Darstellung*, used "to tease out aspects of the real and get you ever closer to what the real might be." Lucas believes that the use of this kind of hermeneutical model is well within the western philosophical tradition, pointing even to Plato, who in the *Timaeus* wrote that what was being presented was "a likely story." In the *Sophist*, Plato writes that the way to attain the level of the Ideas is by way of *hypotheses*, which should be taken as far as they can be, and then used as *springs* to propel us to ever higher levels. Lucas compares this to the analogy of Wittgenstein's ladder, to be dropped as soon as you've gotten to the higher level. And Lucas argues that Whitehead's model is to be taken as

"a likely story," not meant as a "snapshot" of reality.

D.Z. Phillips and John Cobb were both critical of Lucas's theme of "modeling."

Phillips began by questioning the tendency to emphasize the notion of philosophy as *therapy*. He said that Wittgenstein had come to hate the use others made of this idea, because it suggested that philosophy was akin to psychoanalysis, as in John Wisdom, but that this suggested a *personal* dimension to philosophy that is exaggerated. "While we must struggle *personally* with our problems," said Phillips, "the problems are not *personal*, like psychological problems. Problems are *confused* ways of thinking, to which *anyone* is prone. They're not personal. They *tempt* us all."

Turning to Von Wright's analysis, Phillips had no quarrels with Von Wright if read as Lucas suggested that we should. However, he believes that Von Wright sometimes wrongly suggests that Wittgenstein is outside of *any* philosophical tradition. Wittgenstein once commented to Joad that his questions were the same as Plato's. Phillips says that Wittgenstein, like Plato, was concerned with the question "What is it for words to say something, that is, to have contact with reality? And that question runs right through the history of philosophy." The Enlightenment project was optimistic regarding the laying of a foundation which would guarantee a kind of certainty about the relationship of language to reality. That foundation was based either on Reason or Experience. But "scepticism succeeds in driving a wedge between how we *think* our discourse and reality." This question

of the relationship between our words and reality is a struggle with scepticism. Pointing to the example set by Plato and the Sophists, Phillips asks: "Are we really saying something, or are words merely weapons by which we seek to dissuade each other?"

Phillips does not believe that the notion of "fallible models" can succeed against this power of scepticism. It gives away the game before it begins. He said that Wittgenstein would argue that science *does* show you something. But it does so *not* as a model, but in the sense of *ordinary realism*, as opposed to *metaphysical realism*. Against the Enlightenment view, we can find an *ordinary certainty*.

"He was terrified of Shakespeare," Phillips remarked. "He said 'I can't find the man's *style*. I can find a *style* in Göthe, but Shakespeare says to me: *there's the world, LOOK at it!* You can't find him anywhere.' Now *I* think that Wittgenstein tried to be a kind of Shakespearean philosopher: 'I show you the city with no main road.'" Whereas the Enlightenment sought to give the world a *foundation*, "Wittgenstein says: 'the world doesn't need it. Look at it in its variety.... Instead of saying that the world needed foundations, he said 'wonder at the fact that it *doesn't!* And that that is a wonderful fact that is both precarious and in *that* sense fallible; fallible in being precarious; but there to be appreciated."

Cobb, while appreciating Lucas's paper in the main, questioned calling Whitehead's project "modeling" in any sense. He preferred Lucas's use of the term *hypotheses*, while pointing out that Whitehead's own terms

continued on page 13

June Watkins and Stephen Hinkle

John Renesch and Luann Linquist

CPS Business New Paradigm Roundtable

by John Quiring

On April 28 The Center for Process Studies hosted an all-day roundtable discussion of new paradigm ideas in business management theory. Twenty-four invited participants and seven auditors discussed papers written by special guest John Renesch and three CPS representatives. Renesch, formerly of the World Business Academy, is Managing Director of Stirling & Stone, Editor/Publisher of *The New Leaders* business newsletter, and Editor of *New Traditions in Business* and *Leadership in a New Era*.

The paradigm shift from hierarchy to systems thinking and holism, suggests Renesch, is not just a matter for academics but an actual grassroots transformation of consciousness. One issue Renesch brought to CPS was that of spirituality in the workplace. The Workplace Values Survey, conducted by Renesch's newsletter, suggested a growth of spiritual practice at work and increased interest in spiritual meaning. His paper "Spirit & Work: Can Philosophy and Business Live Together?" discussed continued resistance to spirituality evidenced by management guru Tom Peters' remark that "when the talk turns to the spiritual side of leadership in business, I mostly want to run." To account for this contradiction to his survey, Renesch responds by differentiating between 'religion' as group-oriented ritual and dogma, while 'spirituality' is a more personal quest for community, openness, trust, caring, responsibility, and harmony with one's environment.

John Cobb's paper "Can Whitehead Make a Contribution to Management Theory?" characterized the new paradigm as the shift from viewing reality as par-

ticle- or wave-like individual *objects* to experience-like communal *events*. Smaller firms can fit into this view of things--managed as communities participating in the wider human community which in turn nests in the cosmic community. Cobb warns, however, that in our times--when finance and business are the dominant institutions--larger firms are still acting more like the competitive individuals of economic theory, seeking short-term advantage rather than long-range common good.

Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore's paper "Institutional Leadership and Social Transformation" suggested that survival in the transitional decades through which we are now living require institutions to be purposive, communal, conversational, passionate, and prophetic.

John Quiring's paper was entitled "Balancing Stakeholder Claims: Applied Process Thought and the Old/New Paradigm Dualism in Business." Stakeholder theory seeks to extend enterprise responsibility beyond stockholders to all internal and external groups or entities influenced or impacted by an enterprise, and Process thought wishes to encourage this development.

Beyond clarification of New Paradigm issues, the main goal of the roundtable was to get feedback on whether CPS has a unique contribution to make in this developing area of management theory. The three working groups answered this question with a "definite yes!" Two projects are indicated: further development of CPS's interpretation of the New Paradigm in management theory, and development of a *marketable* management workshop focusing on New Paradigm Perspectives and Spirituality in the Workplace. ■

*Georg Michalik Seminar***Banks and Ecological Risks***by John Quiring***George Michalik and Niels Hansen****Stephen Hinkle, John Quiring, and John Cobb**

"Banks and Ecological Risks" was the topic of a Center Seminar by Georg Michalik on April 27, 1995. Michalik, a graduate student at the University of Mannheim and Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, was a CPS Visiting Scholar from March through April. He is applying his field of organizational psychology to business management theory, with a focus on the ecological audits banks increasingly need to run on corporations to minimize lending risks. Michalik sees ecological risk management as a function of the sustainable development stage of the environmental revolution. It is the response of the corporate and international communities to the first stage of environmentalism which emphasized limits to growth.

Perhaps five percent of lost loans, said Michalik, are due to businesses running afoul of nature and environmental regulations, at least in the European context. To calculate risks, banks employ a "hazard totem pole" that ranks possible hazards from high probability and low-cost prevention (at the top) to low probability and high-cost of prevention (at the bottom). As you move from top to bottom, hazard risks become increasingly financially acceptable--in the present context. Ecological factors include the

natural risks, burdens of degraded land, conservation laws, and changes in value. Social factors include risks of credit-worthiness, mortgage risks, loss of image, and shift of business fields.

A breakthrough for sustainability, says Michalik, is the development, deployment, and expansion of the *stakeholder* concept of enterprise relations. Instead of seeing responsibility to stockholders as the only or primary responsibility of managers, responsibility is expanded to include a wide range of entities contributing to and impacted by the actions of the firm. Initially modeling information interfaces between components of the social sphere of production and service, the stakeholder idea is now being expanded to include the ecological sphere. The stakeholder concept parallels the process notion of community-of-communities developed by Herman Daly and John Cobb in *For the Common Good*.

The payoff for businesses with ecological consciousness and astute employment of public incentives is gaining competitive advantage over other firms by greater reduction of losses from degradation of resources and environment. Loan directing by banks give them special leverage in impacting sustainability. A remaining challenge lies in the dominance of the old paradigm that sees the socio-economic sphere as the primary environment and the ecological sphere as the secondary environment. The new paradigm sees nature as primary with the human as derivative. By encouraging expansion of the stakeholder concept, process thought may have a role in facilitating negotiations over this major perceptual difference. ■

Susan Nelson Seminar

“For Shame, for Shame, the Shame of It All”: Postures of Refusal and the Broken Heart

by Sheela Pawar

Susan Nelson, Assistant Professor of Theology, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and author of **Beyond Servanthood: Christianity and the Liberation of Women** (1989), is interested in redefining the concept of sin. Nelson participated in the Presbyterian Church's restatement of sin, which acknowledges two types: pride/rebellion and “hiding.” This is the first time that “hiding” has been doctrinally stated as sin. Nelson has been interested in hiding as an aspect of sin for many years, asking, “Is Sin an appropriate name for the experience of alienation?” She explores the nature of shame and the process of internalizing shame that leads to hiding.

Nelson notes that the usual way that philosophers and theologians discuss sin is bipolar. The human condition is characterized by two types of sin: pride and sensuality. However, it is the sin of “hiding” that is of interest to Susan Nelson. Her preoccupation stems from feminist thought, especially the work of Carol Gilligan, who notes that woman is socially constructed to “hide.”

Nelson also studies human relationality as an aspect of sin. She envisions a matrix of relationships in the midst of which the tension between finitude and freedom arise. Nelson explores the work of theologian Ed Farley, who sees the human condition as three spheres: the agent, or person; the social; and the interhuman. Farley believes that philosophers have neglected the interhuman sphere, which is formative of our relationality, our face-to-face relationships. Unfortunately, Farley still locates sin in the human agent. Refusing our vulnerability (the basic structure of our existence), we assume a posture of insistence in which we use relationships to suit our own purpose. In this manner, all the dimensions of humanity are distorted and we are corrupted. In contrast, Nelson asks, what if one is insecure because one is a victim, not an agent?

Nelson defines sin as: a refusal to be who we are; (leading to) postures of refusal, where the defense mechanisms involved become routinized; (and expressed in) violation, or (consent to) acts of violence. However, even this definition portrays alienation/hiding as an act of the agent. Nelson notes that for women hiding comes more from being refused, or “broken hearted,” than from refusal. Patriarchy refuses our very being. Such ruptures of relationality are a precondition for sin. We are born extremely dependent and need to have face to face relationships. We internalize our relationships and build ourselves in response to them. Broken relationships lead to broken hearts and alienation.

Nelson asks, why did Adam and Eve hide themselves? Why didn't they just confess? They hide because something terrible about themselves has been revealed. They are ashamed. The Genesis story points out that shame and guilt reflect different human experiences. Guilty feelings arise

from something you have done or have not done. Shame is feeling bad about yourself because of who you are. Guilt can be atoned for but shame cannot.

Shame is knowing oneself as unworthy, deficient, as needing to be hidden from view. Shame breaks our interpersonal bridges. Humans are deeply relational and have a desire to be cared for. Borrowing an image from the poet Marge Piercy, Nelson states, “Human beings are bridge builders, and shame is the result of broken bridges.” We build bridges within ourselves, forming our identities. We learn to treat ourselves as others treat us. Being human, Nelson insists, includes the knowledge that some broken bridges may be mended and some may not. Broken bridges are a part of the regular human situation. We cannot always be there when we want or need to be. Shame is part of the human situation, and thus is not the problem whose solution we must seek. Rather, what happens to shame should concern us: the possibility of reconciliation. When bridges are broken and mended, we feel hope. Since many of our shaming relationships are forgotten and buried within our psyches, therapy to recover from alienation includes returning to the historical location of our shame. We must learn that we feel ashamed for a reason, a particular broken relationship.

Nelson asks if our defense mechanisms are sinful, as well as being indicative of a deeper problem. She notes two sources of sin: refusal and being refused. She explains that shame both happens to people and people participate in it through alienating themselves and others. She suggests that the traditional understand-

ing of sin equated with alienation/shame is inadequate. We should understand sin as dissecting an axis of alienation and broken heartedness.

Respondent Marjorie Suchocki questioned Nelson about the definition of sin: How can we be other than what we are? Isn't our refusal who we are? What does it mean to say "we refuse to be who we are?" Nelson replied that this refusal is a refusal to admit to the ontology of our existence, the human condition. It is to refuse to admit that we are connected, that we are free, finite, and relational creatures. ■

Membership Corner

by Jeff Sanders

In the recent past, you have seen a great deal of change in **membership prices** and categories. Several years ago, we sought to meet the needs of our members through introducing a pricing structure that was more sensitive to the needs of those who could not afford our base \$50-a-year membership. This reduced our income considerably, which has placed an enormous financial strain on the *Center*. In order to alleviate the strain, it is now necessary to increase our membership rates. Our participating membership rates will begin at \$35 a year for incomes of \$0-\$19,000 and go up from there. This increase has been long in coming, and we hope that we will not need to increase our rates again in the near future.

A second change is also in progress. As of April 1995, the *Center for Process Studies* and the *Process and Faith* program will **no longer offer joint memberships**. The logistics of maintaining a joint membership program with two separate staffs is too costly and offers little to our members. Because member renewal schedules are radically different for each program, separate enrollments are advisable.

If you were a joint member, your membership has been changed to participating membership in each program and you now will be billed separately for each program. The information that you receive will not change.

We have received many questions concerning membership benefits and renewals, so we would like to explain our renewal process in detail. **Your membership** in the *Center* entitles you to 4 issues of the journal, 3 issues of the newsletter, 12 free papers (4 advertised in each newsletter), bibliographic services, help in research, the latest information on process-related scholarship, access to our library, and participation in our visiting scholar program. *Nevertheless, the way we track expirations is through the journal.* When a member has received 4 issues of the journal we count that person's membership as having expired. Normally (in an ideal world) you would receive 4 issues of the journal each *calendar* year.

The journal, *Process Studies*, has been plagued by chronic lateness. What does this mean? First, it means that you have not been receiving all of your journals in a single *calendar* year. Will you receive those journals? Yes, no matter how long it takes to get a volume of the journal out. This also means that you are entitled to all of your other rights and privileges as a member until you receive your fourth issue! You receive extra newsletters, you are entitled to extra papers, longer access to the library, and contin-

ued access to our bibliographic services.

What are we doing about the lateness of the journal? We tried several things in the past, but they did not help much. Recently, however, we have taken some steps that we believe will solve the problem. We have taken over the typesetting of the journal so that we can control the turn-around time. Further, we have taken a more active role in "encouraging" the printer to be diligent in getting our publication printed and shipped to us in a timely manner.

Please understand that when you receive a **renewal notice** you should have received all issues of the journal up to and including the expiration printed on your renewal form. However, it may be well behind the calendar date. For example, the last journal to be mailed was volume 22 number 4, which is dated Winter 1993. This issue was mailed in June of 1995. In the unlikely event that there is any discrepancy with your membership, please let us know and we will do everything we can to clear it up immediately--including sending you any issues that you may have missed.

As we work toward "catching-up" the publication of the journal, you will begin to receive *more than* 4 issues of the journal in a calendar year. You will then be receiving *more than one renewal notice per calendar year*. Please be sure to check your expiration against the last issue of the journal that you received and notify us if there is a problem. We hope that all who are members in the *Center* think of their investment in membership as much more than an investment in their "member benefits."

continued on page 14

Visiting Scholars

by Olav Bryant Smith

This past semester has been a very busy time at the Center for Process Studies, especially in terms of our visiting scholars, who continue to keep the Center fresh with new perspectives. We have had five visitors from Europe, which reflects a growing interest in process studies there, and two from old friends in the United States.

John Hammond, Professor Emeritus at Portland State University, visited for five days in April, researching "ways of conceiving persons in process thought." He gave a talk on "Whitehead's Aestheticism," but unfortunately our report on that seminar is delayed until the next issue of this newsletter.

Niels Viggo Hansen, a Danish philosophy Ph.D. student with a background in physics, is working on a project entitled "Concepts of time, change and development in recent philosophy and natural science." He was able to meet with John Cobb, Rob Valenza, and Granville Henry here in Claremont, and with David Griffin in England en route back to Denmark. Hansen reflected on the growing interest in Europe in process studies that is especially coming by way of French thinkers such as Isabelle Stengers, Michel Serres, and Bruno Latour.

Roland Faber, Assistant Professor of Theology at the Institute for Dogmatics and Dogmatics History/University of Vienna in Austria, and a member of the Austrian Society for Philosophy of Religion, arrived in May for a one year stay. He is working on a project called "God, Creativity and 'The Ultimate'." His work is about the "notion of God" in Whitehead and he is interested in producing articles on Whitehead and Aquinas based on his research.

George Michalik, whose degree was in Psychology from the University of Mannheim in Germany, and who works for the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich as the Chair of Environmental Sciences/Natural and Social Science Interface. He was working on the topic of "sustainable development," and offered his expertise to us both on ecology and the economy, and on banking/loan management and sustainability. His visit happily coincided with our Business Conference, which he attended, and George gave a presentation of his own that is covered in this issue of the newsletter.

Beate Weinz, a student of Theology, could only take a short look at the Center and Claremont in June. She is currently pursuing a Master's degree in Germany, but is looking into the possibility of returning to Claremont sometime after that.

Susan Nelson, Assistant Professor of Theology at the Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, whose presentation here entitled "For Shame, For Shame, The Shame of it All: Postures of Refusal And The Broken Heart" is covered in this newsletter, visited for two weeks in June.

Ferrie R. Veen, a Lecturer on organizational theory and management at the Business School Hoge School West-Brabant at Breda, in the Netherlands, visited from mid-July to early August. He requested and received a series of condensed tutorials on process thought, and his visit culminated with his writing a draft-paper on an application of process thought to organizational theory. He learned of Whitehead through the work of Van der Veken in Belgium, and is quite interested in the potential impact of a non-deterministic, non-mechanical, interrelational paradigm on organizational theory.

We are saddened by a report that Michel Weber, who spent the last two years with us as a visiting scholar at the Center, was seriously injured in an automobile accident during a trip across the United States. Michel was heading to the eastern part of the U.S., visiting a number of people on the way before his scheduled return to Belgium. We understand that Michel is recovering in Belgium at this time. Before his return home, Michel was hospitalized with a back injury from the accident. ■

Panikkar Seminar

(continued from page 5)

for it to function as the natural source and regulator of spirit. A second step toward spiritual health involves answering two complex problems: knowing what is true and knowing the mystery. The cultural milieu is our source of this information. We must learn to link ourselves with human communities, with our true selves and with Nature and the Divine.

Only religion's mutation to another level can overcome the failure of religions. This mutation must occur in all three aspects of religion: religiousness, the inherent dimension of the human person where one recognizes he or she is not self sufficient but needs something; religiosity, the sense of community or belonging that one feels as a member of a particular group; and religionism, a belief system, such as Buddhism or Christianity. Mutation must take the form of "metanoia."

Various translations of metanoia are employed: penance, repentance, change of mentality, transcendence beyond the mental/rational. Each translation gives a shade of meaning of the necessary treatment. Religions need repentance for their abuses: slavery, torture, etc. Thus, they must ask forgiveness. They also need repentance/forgiveness for their uses: the reduction of religion to morality, the superficiality of religious books and sermons, etc. Religions have succumbed to religious consumerism and have become banal.

Change of mind/mentality is also a part of metanoia. This change must include:

A. Dispelling our misunderstandings about, our caricatures of, other religions. Religion is polysemic. It does

continued on page 13

not translate from culture to culture. Therefore, this step requires human sympathy, intellectual curiosity and effort.

B. Understanding the Other. To achieve this, we must ask others for their self-understanding. This requires dialogue.

C. Changing the very idea of "religion" so as not to overemphasize doctrine and the supernatural. Religions have neglected the secular; but the secular does not oppose the sacred; the profane opposes the sacred. The secular is the vital span; it is the vital source of religious spirit. Justice, hunger, peace - these are religious problems, as well as legal, and economic.

D. Transcending the mental. Human nature implies a political aspect and must lead to action. This requires "relativization of the means and deabsolutization of the ends." Panikkar employs a twelfth century concept of three eyes: the senses, the intellect, and faith. Faith, the third eye, sees the third dimension of reality — the depth of the world. The three eyes are dependent and interconnected aspects of human nature. Pure thinking leads to ideas while contemplation leads to action. In this way, religion can become a way to peace. Peace means participation in the harmony of the rhythm of the Universe.

We must understand the "other" not as a competitor. To eliminate the enemy is to wound the victor. Violence is a violation of the dignity of a being. Each of us is a microcosm of the entire reality. Talking about human rights in the abstract is very easy, but to act to thwart injustice is a great challenge. The place of religion is unavoidable

for peace.

Prognosis

When religion finds its proper place, it can function as an instrument for peace and mend our spiritual decay. UNESCO's renewed interest in its project "Declaration on the Role of Religion in the Promotion of a Culture of Peace" is a promising development. This 23-point declaration is still in need of amendment. The Culture of Peace implies: a new theology, a new anthropology, and a new epistemology. The Culture of Peace means the cultivation of peace so that peace flourishes and blooms. Little help/hope exists for the world if we do not give religion its rightful place.

For more information regarding UNESCO's "Declaration on the Role of Religion in the Promotion of a Culture of Peace" please write to:

Centre UNESCO de Catalunya
Mallorca, 285
Barcelona 08037
SPAIN ■

Lucas Seminar

(continued from page 7)

were *hypotheses* and *theories*. Every proposition is a theory, and the body of propositions that go to make up Whitehead's philosophy of organism is a system of propositions, or a theory of theories. Cobb said that "*Models* are almost inevitably, in Whiteheadian terms, in *presentational immediacy*."

Cobb agreed that there is a certain aspect of Whitehead's work that is *heuristic*, but argued that this is not an "exhaustive" description of his speculative philosophy. Speculative philosophy is both a theory and something more, Cobb said. "A theory is partly heuristic," he said, "but also

proposes certain forms of action, which then may be able to lead to a test." Speculative philosophy is always in a process of refining its hypothesis to be more adequate to the data of experience. It is true, he said, that the theory offers a kind of lens through which the world is evaluated, and in fact, this is a major task of the Center for Process Studies, but this is not exhaustive of the role of Whitehead's speculative philosophy.

This discussion was very well received by a large and appreciative audience. ■

To Potential Visitors

(continued from page 4)

are some ways you can help us succeed. Much of our housing is with local residents, and we need at least two months advance notice of your needs in order to be able to locate housing.

When you know that you are coming to CPS, and that you would like our help in finding housing, please write or call me at CPS. Some of the information I need is: dates of stay; number of persons/number of beds you will need; your housing budget; willingness to share a bath, kitchen, entrance; distance you will walk to get to CPS or if you will have a car; do you smoke?; are pets okay?; and any other special needs. I will ask you these questions personally, but this list may help you begin to plan your trip.

I will answer any questions you have about the area, as well as I can. We look forward to having many of you come and visit us in the future. ■

CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES
1325 NORTH COLLEGE AVE.
CLAREMONT, CA 91711

*Membership Corner**(continued from page 11)*

It is an investment in the future of the *Center for Process Studies* and, we hope, an investment in the future of process thought.

Finally, please help us to maintain accurate records. It is very difficult for us to find you following a move if you do not give us a forwarding address. **Please notify us of your new address if you move.** ■

Jeff Sanders
Membership Manager

Spring Booksigning Event

Karen Baker-Fletcher and William Beardslee

John B. Cobb, Jr.

Letters to the Editor

Our new *Letters to the Editor* section was very well received by the membership. As stated in the previous issue, it is very important to us that you, as Center members, feel a part of the Center and its development. This forum provides an important means for you to voice your opinions. As Dr. John Quiring suggests in his lead editorial of this issue, we do not want the Center to be an entity isolated from your concerns, but consider it our role to help facilitate dialogue.

—Olav Bryant Smith, Editor

To the Editor:

There was a strong undertone of pessimism and frustration running through “The Future of Process Thought” [*Newsletter of the Center For Process Studies*, 18:2 (Fall 1994)] that struck me as being warranted in only a small part. John Cobb speaks of Whiteheadians as being “marginalized in all the academic disciplines in which they work,” questions whether “we have had our chance and failed,” and calls it “very likely” that “reforming the dominant life of the Western mind (is) a grandiose pipedream.” I appreciate the depth of feeling behind this line of self-interrogation, but also believe that gaining acceptance from what John Cobb calls the “university culture” in the current “intellectual climate” is (or should be) a non-goal, since this culture has become too prone to following intellectual fashions rather than encouraging independent and iconoclastic thought. To achieve a lasting influence, one must attract the giants of intellect, not the midgets. Very often these are outsiders or iconoclasts.

So a better goal would be to seek out dialogue with some of the truly original thinkers in the arts (for instance, an Umberto Eco) and sciences (for instance, an Ilya Prigogine) and let the fashion-followers worry about themselves. When John points out the seeming inability of the deconstructionists to offer “positive proposals,” he is alluding to their devolution into trendy verbal cleverness and self-reference when vigorous intellectual engagement beyond the academic world would have been more a sign of health and integrity of their ideas. The critical contribution of communications theory to the development of postmodernism is hardly in doubt, but to begin and end with linguistic and psychological theories, as deconstructionism has, without taking into account developments in systems thinking and information theory, does not bode well for the future viability of this branch of postmodern thought. Changing the Western mindset is likely to be a work of many generations, and building toward this goal requires that we demonstrate the ability to grow and leave an abiding intellectual legacy rather than devolve into mere self-satisfied fashion.

The Christian “sectarianism” of many Whiteheadian investigators also need not be a barrier to the application of Whitehead’s ideas to other forms of religion. Again, it may be

fruitful to look beyond the mainstream (academic and religious) for participants in a broader dialogue. For example, contemporary pagans have a largely immanence-based spirituality that meshes well with Whitehead's conception of deity, and leading pagan thinkers such as Starhawk and Margot Adler could provide some original insights into ways in which non-Christian religions could apply Whitehead's thought in a formal way. The example of Jung, whose original development of psychomythography as a vital intellectual discipline contributes significantly to contemporary paganism, is one which should encourage Whiteheadian scholars. Jungian thought also had to spend its time in the wilderness of academic disfavor, much as one might say Whitehead's thought has, but the perseverance of able Jungian-oriented scholars such as Eliade and Campbell has now made psychomythography a touchstone of comparative religious thought in our present cultural environment. It is important, as John Cobb points out, to maintain the independence of studies in the works of highly original thinkers, such as Whitehead, such as Jung, such as Kierkegaard, rather than diluting them in "diverse contexts," because the total message, the voice and soul of such thinkers, deserves to be kept alive for the future generations that may come to understand it more clearly.

So my recommendation is that when the program is original and ambitious (even grandiose!), seek out others who also demonstrate originality and ambition to engage in dialogue, perhaps all the more vigorously when such others do not fit into the mainstream of popular fashions in academic or cultural thinking, when they are outsiders. The community of Whiteheadian scholars will make its best contribution by adding a strong individual voice to discussions among other challengers of the "correct" and "accepted" *status quo* in the intellectual and academic worlds.

Paul Connelly

To the Editor,

As a Center member and reader of the Newsletter I was happy to see the two articles (John B. Cobb Jr., Autumn 1994 and David Ray Griffin, Spring 1995) regarding "The Future of Process Thought." Thank you for sharing. I was even more pleased to learn that the question whether to pursue the continuation of Whiteheadian thought as a distinct element was being answered in the affirmative.

Thanks also for printing full three Letters to the Editor (Newsletter, Spring 1995) which provided additional views on that same question.

My own opinion, as a non-scholar very much interested in process thought in general and A.N. Whitehead in particular, is that we today need Whitehead more than ever. A holistic/relational worldview is crucial in this time of increasing disorder and fragmentation. "Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice"

(AE, Mentor: p.26).

Regarding future emphases on Whiteheadian thought I could like to see comparatively more emphasis (relative to theology and to the analysis and interpretation of this or that aspect) on the APPLICATION of Whitehead's basic ideas to the problems and issues of those Whiteheadian basics in order to make meaningful applications.

Please continue your very important work towards greater visibility and greater influence of process thought and Whiteheadian ideas. Thanks also for your plan for an international conference on "The Future of Process Thought" celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Center.

Sincerely,
Norman C. Truxton

To the Editor:

David Griffin's article, *The Future of Process Thought*, inspired me to respond. I have been an enthusiast of Process Thought/Theology for over fifteen years now. The paradigm Process Thought/Theology offers lured me into several endeavors. One was originating a UU Process Theology Network almost ten years ago and beginning a private practice of psychotherapy where I continue to be conscious of embodying Process Thought/Theology in my work with clients.

The paradigm offered by Process Thought/Theology is inclusive, offering a dynamic process behind dualisms. I agree that the vision is a timely one. My perception is that in the last two years in our western culture, the rate of change has accelerated and people are hungry for philosophies that answer some of the big questions such as issues around diversity.

David, I appreciate your point about perception. Understanding and appreciating diversities in perception is tremendously helpful. I saw a client the other day who has come in to see me off and on over the past six years for various watershed times in her life. She said the most valuable understanding she has gained from our work is the understanding that her unique perception is just as important as the perception her husband holds at any moment in time. Even though we had talked about the idea early in our work together, she acknowledged that now she truly felt the new awareness. How we perceive a situation is also influenced by the paradigm or lens through which we view the world. The notions are fundamental and timely.

Let me know about what your plans are for a conference that bridges the sacred and the secular-- another movement beyond dualisms--yeah!! Moving beyond "misplaced concreteness" and into possibilities for open dialogue are exciting and aiming for 1997-98 sounds appropriate.

In dialogue and always in process,
Barbara Keiller, M.S.,MFCC
San Diego, California

CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES CALENDAR

Most events sponsored by the Center for Process Studies are held at the Davis Community Center in the Butler Building, on The School of Theology at Claremont's campus. If you plan to attend, we encourage you to call for more information at (909) 621-5330.

November 9, 1995

4-6pm

Gila Hirsch Art Exhibit and Talk

November 19, 1995

9-11pm

CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES Reception

at the American Academy of Religion and
Society of Bible Literature's
1995 Annual Meeting
at the Philadelphia Marriot (Rms. 302 and 303)

CPS MEMBER PAPERS

Upon request, the following papers are available free of charge to center members (\$3 each for non-members). We were unable to email papers after the last issue due to technical problems, but believe those problems now to be resolved. Therefore, if you have email, and would like to receive member papers via email, please send requests to: <process@cgs.edu>.

Raimundo Panikkar

Religions and the Culture of Peace

George R. Lucas, Jr.

Wittgenstein and Whitehead

Susan L. Nelson

*Soul-Loss and Sin:
A Dance of Alienation*

Leslie A. Muray

Transformative Model of Pluralism

Credits: Thanks go to John Quiring, who again took all of the photographs for this issue. Also, special thanks to Jeff Sanders for invaluable technical support. We welcome comments and suggestions from members of the Center. -- Ed.

THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES

1325 NORTH COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CA 91711

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. Postage
PAID
CLAREMONT, CA.
PERMIT No. 176

FORWARD AND ADDRESS CORRECTION

