

Process Perspectives



A Holistic-Relational Worldview For the Common Good

Volume 19 Number 2

ISSN 0360-618X

Fall 1995

CONVERSATION AT THE CENTER FOR PROCESS STUDIES

Mary Elizabeth Moore

Imagine yourself sitting around a table with a few of your favorite friends, filling the space with conversation and drinking a beverage of your choice. I am sitting with you in that circle of conversation as I write this brief essay. What I share here is the questing and hoping that is bubbling inside me (along with the beverage of my choice) as I ponder the future of process studies. The lightheartedness of this image is, at once, its seriousness. The Center for Process Studies has been a center for conversation, and this essay is aimed to explore the nature of the conversation that lures us into the future.

QUESTING CONVERSATION

At its roots, the conversation emanating from any center of process thought needs to be a questing conversation. On the surface, this seems to be an easy and obvious challenge since the very heart of process theory has been a questing after new answers for old questions and new questions for old answers. This is a difficult challenge to face, however, because the questing continues inside me even as I write. The task is made even more difficult by the thoughtful essays of John Cobb, David Griffin, and John Quiring in recent issues of *Process Perspectives*.

I have been deeply formed by process thought, so much so that it is for me a common sense way of

thinking. Frequently I find myself thinking a new thought, only to realize in retrospect that the idea fits a process view of reality. How much of this is due to the study of process philosophy and theology, I cannot say because deep inside I think that I have been a process theologian all of my life. The very first course that I took in process thought was an experience of dawn breaking--the dawning of a day where I discovered that other people in the world think many of the same thoughts that I do.

To complicate the situation still further, I have changed my mind on a hundred (or a thousand) questions in the past 20 years, but those changes have been influenced not only by process thinkers, but very much also

by feminist, womanist, mujerista, and liberation theologians. Further, the changes have been influenced by my own experiences of the devastations and joys of life, by encounters with biblical and historical texts, and by encounters with social and economic realities embodied in world events and in people all around me who are struggling to survive and thrive. In short, I have found process thought to be compelling since I first encountered it, but I have never felt that it was the one and only formative framework for me.

In light of this experience, the possibilities in process thought have compelled me to explore deeply into the web of questions and propositions that are pondered by process thinkers,

continued on page 2

INSIDE

Higher Education Conference	6
Spirituality in the Workplace	8
Servant-Leadership	10
Gift of Books	10
East-West	
Process Studies Project	11
Youth Ministry and	
Postmodern Times	11
The Liar Paradox	12
Membership Corner	14
Letters to the Editor	15
CPS Calendar	16
CPS Member Papers	16

and to engage critical issues from the center of that web. On the other hand, I have never been an evangelist for process thought. I have no motivation to snare others in this web of meaning that carries so much meaning for me. This is an ironic place to be because process thought is still enough on the margins of philosophy and theology that to engage it fully is still suspect. One who engages process thought is often assumed to be an evangelist.

My first awareness of this assumption was in a Conference on Education and Social Transformation co-sponsored several years ago by the Center of Process Studies. I had presented a paper at the conference in which I drew upon some Whiteheadian ideas in describing the dynamics of change and the relationship between individuals and communities. This was the only paper in the Conference that touched explicitly on process thought, and the discussions prior to my paper had, therefore, been devoid of process language or analysis. For this reason, I was not prepared for the response that followed my paper near the end of the meeting. In the midst of a very stimulating discussion of the ideas in my paper, someone asked me to explain a particular idea in process thought. I did so, and noted that this particular idea could also be found in some other world views and, also, in many liberation theological perspectives. In the discussion that followed my response, one participant said that he could not understand why process philosophy or theology was so important. He, being Roman Catholic, added, "I gave up allegiance to the Pope some time ago, and I do not need another pope demanding my allegiance." I was shocked that what I had said evoked such a strong response, especially since this person also operated out of an explicit worldview about which he had communicated at length in this conference and in his earlier writings.

As I reflected on this response, and on my colleague's suspicion that I was making process theology into a pope, I could not find any insistence on my part that a Whiteheadian cosmology was more valuable or authoritative than any other. I began a reflection that I have not made public until this moment, and the heart of my reflection is to wonder *why process philosophy and theology are so threatening for some and so much a monument to the past for others*. Of course, some obvious answers can be given, especially regarding the propensity in process theory to question commonly accepted views of the world, and to reformulate language, often using technical constructs to do so. I suspect, however, that the resistance goes even deeper. Certainly, the colleague who responded to me in the Conference has not avoided technical language in his own research and writing, and he has often involved himself in questioning the status quo.

Why does such fear appear? I think that beyond the questions and language of process thought is a deconstructive movement that continues to unearth long-held assumptions, refuses to validate commonly held ideologies (whether conservative or Marxist), and insists on the changing nature of knowledge and of reality itself. I have used the language of deconstruction rather than construction despite the fact that David Griffin makes a compelling argument for constructive postmodernism. At its best, postmodern thought raises questions with established patterns of thinking

in the modern world, questioning the assumption that reason is more important to human wellbeing than imagination and emotion, and the assumption that scientific theories are literal descriptions of reality rather than social constructions.

In a very different vein, the fear of process theory may also be a fear of its totalizing tendencies, or what my colleague was reading in me or others as a claim to the comprehensiveness and power of a pope. At its best, postmodern thought does stir more than critique; it also stirs imagination regarding new ways of thinking and acting in the world. But postmodern critics are obligated to raise questions, even with themselves and even with emerging views that have considerable heuristic value. Deconstruction opens the door for reconstruction, and it stirs imagination regarding alternative ideas and worldviews, but it cannot quickly move into answers without undercutting the radical movement into questioning. Perhaps, this suggests a warning to process theorists for whom the constructive movement is so compelling.

In light of these ideas, *why do some philosophers and theologians regard process thought as a monument to the past?* Perhaps this is possible in part because process theorists do engage often in constructive postmodernism, seeking to identify alternative world views that bring together pre-modern consciousness with postmodern inquisition and imagination. Such a move is filled with risk, especially the risk of using reason and technical language to provide an alternative to the overly rational and overly

technical modernist views of the world.

Perhaps the very argument that process theory can answer questions raised by postmodernism is on shaky ground insofar as process thought is a cosmology that emerged in a particular time and place. Much of the public critique of modernity has emerged after the death of Alfred North Whitehead, and after the most active years of Charles Hartshorne's writing. Many in the succeeding generation of process thinkers are world class scholars, and they have engaged in wide questing and profound depths of thought. They have, however, continued to draw wisdom from the traditions of Whitehead and Hartshorne, both in critiquing earlier philosophical traditions and in constructing alternatives. Perhaps a certain reserve is needed when drawing upon a cosmology born in the modern era to critique the very same modern era.

Just as many critics of process thought are suspicious of its radical questioning, others look askance at the process propensity to provide alternatives. I myself am not drawn so much to the answers of process thought as to the movement to explore below the surface, going ever deeper into questions. As in process thought, the postmodern move toward deconstruction is important if we are to explore questions in depth. The gift of postmodern reformulations is not to answer questions, however. The gift is to encourage people to look honestly into their taken-for-granted views of reality, to analyze and dismantle these views, and

when the time comes, to reconstruct them again. The move to reconstruction cannot be rushed if we are to engage in radical deconstruction, and radical deconstruction is an urgent call in our time when the dominant philosophical answers have failed and have reinforced very oppressive systems of thought.

Given these ideas, the suspicion of process thought should not be unexpected, especially when process theorists turn to constructive postmodernism, or when process theory is offered as a metaphysical system that provides more answers than questions, or when it becomes disengaged from the question-posing realities of pain and violence and cosmic destruction. Having acknowledged that reality, however, I propose that process theorists have been admirably timid in posing constructive alternatives to modernist thought, and admirably active in engaging with persons holding very diverse views. The search for alternative worldviews and ethical frameworks is one that process theorists have engaged with many companions along the journey. Process theorists have also been unusually fruitful in unearthing the questions of postmodernism, as well as in diagnosing the major social, economic and ecological realities that plague our time.

For all of these movements within process thought, the cosmological system can hardly be seen as static or passe. It is a living, breathing system, and one that is quite promising in what it has to offer the future movements of deconstruction and reconstruction. Having said this, the question that is more important is what lies ahead. *What is the future of process theory, process ethics, and process world views?* The answer to this question is not one that can be given glibly because all of the critiques raised above are real dangers. How can our questing conversations be signs of hope and sparks for generative conversations to come?

GENERATIVE CONVERSATION

The questing that I have engaged thus far is a questing into issues that do not have answers. The very openness of the questions leaves us with more than vulnerability and rawness, however. While the questing conversation leaves many nerve endings exposed, it serves to open possibilities beyond imagination-possibilities for thinking and acting that contribute to the wellbeing of the planet. Perhaps that, after all, is the vocation of the Center of Process Studies.

continued on page 4

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

Thus, I conclude with musings regarding *the vocation of the Center as a center for generative conversation*. Indeed this has been foundational since the beginning of the Center, but it has not been named as such, and that is my primary purpose here. What is important to communicate in the remainder of this essay is the *importance of generative conversation in the future work of process theorists: conversation that engages people, ideas, and actions for the sake of supporting life*.

At least three emphases commend themselves as approaches to future conversations, and they carry a weight of urgency in light of the discussion above. The approaches may be described as ways of engaging: engaging with the passions of others, engaging in praxis, and engaging in sustained exploration of issues and ideas. These ways of engaging are forms of conversation, or crossing with others. They are ways of being with others so as to foster mutual respect and learning--mutual transformation. They are ways of being in action so as to discern wisdom revealed in the immediate experience of the world. They are ways of sustaining a quest that is finally never-ending.

ENGAGING WITH THE PASSIONS OF OTHERS

One way that the Center of Process Studies has functioned from its inception is to engage the passions of people with broad-ranging ideas and commitments. We have sponsored major conferences with people working from different contexts and points of view; conferences on wide-ranging topics (ecology, economics, theological

issues, education, evolution, interreligious relationships, business, and so on); seminars with visiting scholars; the *Process Studies Journal*; and countless conversations with people near and far.

I wonder where we might enhance our engagement with people in their deepest passions, seeking not only to discover converging ideas, but also exploring the rawness and wonder of our responses to the world. Certainly reading the letters to the editor in *Process Perspectives*, I discern that people do carry much passion regarding the world's process and relationality. How might the collegium of process thinkers who are engaged in the newsletter, journal, seminars and conferences engage even more passionately with one another and, also, with people whose passions coincide or conflict with theirs?

I can only write briefly to this question here, but surely we can identify questions of great import around which we can engage in significant dialogue. That will likely include socio-political analysis, attending to issues of immigration, health care, welfare, education, and public language (including issues of bilingual communication). It will surely include economic analysis, continuing the conversations begun by John Cobb, Herman Daly and others. Further, it will need to include ecological analysis, attending to animals, plants, soil and sky, and doing so with people whose views of the earth and stewardship are radically different from one another. And it will continue to include philosophical and theological analysis regarding questions of the origins of the universe, the divine

mystery, the dynamics of difference and unity, the nature of knowledge and authority, and directions for ethical action.

In naming these concerns, I am not naming a radically new direction. I simply suggest more intentionality in bringing people together with radically different views and experiences. Several years ago, a C.P.S.-sponsored conference had an unexpected ideological conflict arise between Paulo Soleri (architect of Arcosanti in Arizona and intellectual follower of Teilhard de Chardin) and E. F. Schumacher (author of *Small Is Beautiful*) regarding their very different understandings of human futures with the earth. The two men had been invited to a conference on ecology because their ideas about earth-care seemed to coincide. The ideas, in fact, were quite different, as were their proposals for action. The result was one of the most interesting and generative conversations that I have ever heard. Similar passions were evoked in the more recent Pacific Rim Conference (co-sponsored with Morikawa) and the Creation Conference (co-sponsored with the Native American NUMNAC). Perhaps, we need to be more intentional about planning for such passionate conversations.

Passionate conversations have sometimes emerged in the past by serendipitous accident. The question now is how can we be more intentional in creating these opportunities. We can surely do this best if we attend to diversity in our planning, especially attending to diversity in conference styles and diversity among participants in ethnicity, culture, intellectual traditions, contexts of work, and

ideas. And we can do this best if we invite people to share from their deepest passions.

ENGAGING IN PRAXIS

What has been said about engaging with the passions of others leads naturally into the importance of engaging in praxis. Much past attention has been given to the importance of process thought for action in the world, and much generative work has already emerged, especially regarding economics, ecological integrity, peacemaking, psychotherapy, education, and interreligious relationships. Thus far, the engagement has centered primarily in theoretical reflection on theoretical systems. What is needed in the future is more engagement in praxis reflection, focusing on particular actions in the world and reflecting on those actions for the sake of discerning the wisdom that is revealed in them as well as the issues and problems.

If we were to engage more fully in reflecting on action for the sake of future action, we might find ourselves participating in field trips as part of conferences, inviting praxis reflections in our publications and seminars, and meeting with people who are immersed in practical concerns of peacemaking or immigration. This kind of suggestion is often made in our conferences on education and psychotherapy, and the time is ripe for bringing such suggestions to the center of our planning and reflecting for the future. Perhaps a beginning point would be to plan seminars and conferences in a form fitting to each particular subject. For example, a conference on higher education would include reflection on educational case studies

(as the recent one did), and a conference on spirituality would include meditation time and the invitation to participate in spiritual disciplines as appropriate for the participants. These ideas are only the tip of a very large iceberg.

ENGAGING IN SUSTAINED EXPLORATION

What has been said thus far is oriented to building a future--engaging with people in their passions and engaging in praxis. The first proposal is to collaborate with others by identifying passions and pursuing points of convergence and difference; the second is to reflect on action for the sake of action. One last word is needed, and that has to do with sustained exploration of issues and ideas. With a concern for *sustained* exploration, we return to the earlier discussion of deconstruction and reconstruction.

In truth, the movements of deconstructing and reconstructing are probably inherent in human patterns of thought. They could even be paralleled with Jean Piaget's descriptions of the dynamics of human knowing, especially in his later work; however, that is a discussion for another day. What is most important to communicate here is the value of sustained exploration in which ideas are explored from every angle and with many partners in conversation and in many different moments in time to the end that the exploration is deepened, challenged, reshaped, and opened playfully to imaginative thinking. This may be deconstruction at its best. In discussing biblical criticism, Edwin Good makes a helpful distinction between deconstruction and destruction:

I find that deconstruction has to do far less with smashing things with sledgehammers than with slipping playfully out from under the walls and fences that the search for Truth has erected around us. The deconstructionist searches for the text's multiple possibilities, its fascinating and liberating inconsistencies, its simultaneous contraries--the ways the mind and the text play their mutual games. (Good, 1990, 181)

The purpose of such deconstruction is to open our eyes to what we do not know without filling it prematurely with reassurance and answers. The very act of deconstructing is rich with "multiple possibilities." This is the value of sustained exploration, and it shows forth when Marjorie Suchocki spends years of her life exploring the meaning of sin and evil, or when David Griffin spends more than a decade exploring psychic experiences. To such sustained exploration, we need to commit ourselves again and again.

This vision of sustained exploration turns us back to the image of sitting around a table, deep in conversation and sipping on our favorite beverages. If the Center of Process Studies could continue to support such conversations, and to include an ever more diverse community of conversation and a stronger focus on conversation for action, we could find ourselves exploring in a very particular way---a way in which we circle, critique, play, dance, and dream in hope that our conversations, finally, will sustain life. ■

Good, Edwin M. 1990. *In Turns of Tempest: A Reading of Job*. Stanford: Stanford University.

Thomas Berry and Mary Clark

Washington, D.C.—Conference III Higher Education for a Just and Sustainable Future

by John Quiring

The third in a series of conferences on higher education initiatives for sustainability and social justice was held on September 14-17 at the National 4-H Headquarters in Chevy Chase, MD.

The event was hosted by the Washington-based Center for Respect of Life and Environment and co-sponsored by the Center for Process Studies and the University of La Verne. The conference went a long way toward being a model of diversity--disciplinary, professional, organizational, gender, ethnic, cultural, and age.

This consultation assembled scholars, education administrators, and policy makers to consider the educational component in the interrelated problems of over-population, over-consumption, social injustice, and environmental degradation. The conference focused on initiatives to encourage academia to model sustainability and justice in curricula and practices. Presentations covered the transforming of educational philosophy, curricula and campus operations, the “greening” of the disciplines, and case studies of institutions responding to the challenge. The wide array of presentations, only some of which are mentioned in this report, forged educational networks extending from rural to urban cultures, and linking

leadership groups in education, government, business, philanthropy, agriculture, and religion.

Biologist Mary Clark discussed the global challenge. She focused on recent criticisms of the inadequacy of economic growth indicators as measures of social health. Gross Domestic Product, for example, interprets *remedial* expenditures (law enforcement, pollution clean-up, etc.) as factors of economic *growth* rather than as signs of social disorder. In her opening remarks, conference facilitator Mary Evelyn Tucker of Bucknell University used the term ‘inter-being’ to characterize a view of social harmony in balance with the natural world that might moderate the rationalist alienation from “place” that drives much technological culture.

John Cobb of the Center for Process Studies suggested that an investigation into the assumptions underlying academic disciplines is needed if the university is to be encouraged to serve aims other than those of the world market economy. Rutgers philosopher Bruce Wilshire discussed the difficulty philosophers have in breaking out of the self-enclosed assumptions of Descartes that contributed to the modern way of thinking. Wilshire asked, “What if the technocratic mindset is *itself* the problem?” John Gingrich described University of La Verne faculty meetings where Department representatives are required to give presentations on their disciplines and their founding assumptions.

Ecologist Thomas Berry’s sketch of “the universe story” sought to draw attention to *primary experience*—“what the trees, wind and stars say,” from which a sense of

awe and the sacred derive--as the primary "university." He also suggested that a deep hidden rage against the human condition--on *nature's* terms--has led many to seek to remake the world, driving civilizations to scales beyond the range of sustainability. University of Minnesota physicist Roger Jones cautioned that the *science* to which the universe *story* appeals is interpreted by many as indicating, rather, a meaningless, alienating, intimidating, frightening place.

Joe Holland of Miami's St. Thomas University discussed the view that First-World-type bourgeois, industrial bureaucracies will collapse and be supplanted by Third-World-type village-based communities, with strong leadership from female-headed micro-enterprises, and utilizing computers and satellite dishes, but not cars. Education theorist Chet Bowers of Portland State University cautioned against the high-tech optimism in Holland's radical vision. He suggested that intelligence involves cultural, ecological, and cross-generational communication. This can be observed in "bio-conservative" primal cultures. But the globalization of our anti-tradition, high-technology-dependent culture, which presumes an individualistic, sender-receiver model of intelligence as data-exchange, is likely to be a threat to the indigenous cultures championed by Holland.

Jean and Larry Edwards discussed the Earth Literacy Program of Genesis Farm in Blairstown, NJ. It teaches Thomas Berry's universe story and promotes community-supported agriculture. A satellite of St. Thomas University, it provides students and farmers with a bridge

between rural and urban cultures. Former Hendrix College Dean, Gary Valen, described his project of localizing produce sources for that Arkansas campus's food service, and the current attempts the Meadowcreek Center, also in Arkansas, to combine its mission of environmental education with community-building in a depressed, rural setting.

Ines Talamantez of the University of California at Santa Barbara referred to the wisdom of Native American Elders as highly relevant to contemporary concerns about sustainable living. She said, "You want to get back to living simply in harmony with with Earth? My people have never stopped living this way."

Dieter Hessel discussed the Project on Ecology, Justice and Faith which fosters environmental education in theology institutions. He noted that care for earth and care for people is not an either/or matter in Hebrew tradition. In Christian scripture, however, an anthropocentric strand of Greek thought overlays a Hebrew spirituality. Hessel was concerned to generate dialogue between developers of ecotheology and liberation theology.

Mary Elizabeth Mullino Moore introduced the document "Toward a More Just and Sustainable S. T. C.," a faculty-adopted program at the School of Theology at Claremont. Elizabeth Ferrero discussed her outdoor classroom at St. Thomas University, one of seven eco-justice "lead institutions." Job Ebenezer of the Evangelical Lutheran Church explained photos of urban gardens in Chicago, and straw-bail-construction as a possibility for an increasing

number who are finding mainstream housing unaffordable. Libby Falk Jones described Berea College programs that model simple lifestyle and equality between genders and races. Miriam Weinstein discussed the eco-justice and gender categories in her *Making a Difference College Guide*.

David Orr discussed Environmental Studies at Oberlin College which is at the forefront of attempts to model campus sustainability at the levels of architecture, curriculum redesign, campus operations, and food service. The "Green University Strategic Plan" of George Washington University was described by Mark Starik of the Business Management Department. The Plan employs the "stakeholder" concept to link interest groups inside and outside the institution. But Tony Cortese of Boston-based Second Nature cautioned enthusiasm by agreeing with the assessment of author Paul Hawken that even the best of today's ecologically and socially responsible firms do not yet model true sustainability (See *Utne Reader* Sept./Oct. 1993).

Cynthia Robinson of Tufts University introduced the program of the Secretariat of University Presidents for a Sustainable Future. It links ecological literacy programs on campuses in forty countries. Mark Lucey, of Connecticut College, and Ben Strauss, of the Nathan Cummings Foundation, illustrated their recent work in coordination of student efforts to push for campus environmental responsibility.

Russell Edgerton, President of the American Association of Higher

continued on page 14

June Watkins and Stephen Hinkle

John Quiring and June Watkins Seminar *Spirituality in the Workplace*

by Tess Cowen

On September 12, 1995, the Center for Process Studies sponsored a seminar entitled "Spirituality in the Workplace" at the School of Theology at Claremont featuring June Watkins and John Quiring as presenters. In their talks, Watkins and Quiring both posited the theory that the crisis in the workplace may well be one of the most critical issues facing society today, and discussed both the changes in business practices which have engendered this situation and the subsequent impact those changes have had on the lives of individuals.

Drawing on her years of experience in the advertising industry, Watkins opened the seminar by addressing the issue of the changing workplace as it affects individuals. Watkins believes the crisis in the workplace is manifesting itself at this particular time because we are currently living through a great economic upheaval caused by the transition from an industrially based economy to an information/scientific economy. Arguing that there is a high

personal price to be paid for this "progress," Watkins cited statistics which correlated a dramatic increase in suicides, homicides, deaths from cirrhosis of the liver, state mental hospital admissions, and spousal abuse incidents with one percent increase in unemployment sustained over a period of six years. To Watkins, however, the statistics only hint at the scope of human tragedies, for statistics cannot quantify the loss of one's self-esteem or the psychological impact on a family when both parents are forced to work, sometimes in jobs below their abilities, just to put food on the table.

Watkins credits the above situation to the tendency of large companies to enter into fields traditionally organized by small, local companies. The blow to the local economy caused by the closing of a business is exacerbated as the "ripple effect" comes into play, for large corporations tend to shunt their money to large regional centers rather than deposit it in a local bank. Moreover, the decisions made by these large companies are based on profits earned nationally or, in some cases, internationally. The shortcoming of a community's dependence on a large company for both services and jobs can be seen in the results of a study done by Philip Shapira which showed that 43,844 workers were laid off between 1977 and 1981 because 45 companies operating in California were moved either out of state or overseas.

Recalling a time in history when individuals manufactured items by hand and had control of the production of an item from the beginning to the end, Watkins maintains that it was not uncommon

for an individual's very identity to be linked with his or her work. The manufacturing age separated individuals from the results of their work and their families. Marx characterized this as "alienated labor." The inception of the information age has exacerbated that alienation. Responsibility is now so diffused throughout a large organization that any connection to a final product is virtually lost.

Watkins' solution to the above problem is to suggest that businesses take Liberation Theology as their model and institute a non-competitive working environment. Of course this would mean exchanging the hierarchically based managerial style commonly practiced today for an inverted organizational chart which places the customer at the top of the chart and the officers and stockholders at the bottom of the chart. In an inverted hierarchical paradigm, the task of managers would be to do their jobs to the best of their ability. Watkins believes this shift in power relationships is the key to healing many of the problems in the workplace.

In his paper, Quiring employs the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead to address the problems in the workplace from a philosophical/theological perspective. Maintaining that job insecurity has proved to be a major force in the instigation of the recent spirituality-in-the-workplace discussion, Quiring suggested that process thought's emphasis on creativity, unity-in-diversity, interrelatedness, becoming person-in-community and mutual transformation make it well suited to frame and

integrate the polarized concepts of workplace, nature and spirituality.

The concept of spirituality in the workplace has had both its supporters and its detractors. Quiring described the methods of two practitioners in the areas of spirituality in the workplace: Richard Smith of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership and Martin Rutte of Livelihood, Inc. Smith's psychological approach involves serious listening and then the raising of questions about personal and company aims that penetrate to the level of deep inner motivation. Rutte's approach is to tell his personal story in such a disarming way as to invite discussion

...the resistance to the current spirituality in the workplace discussion comes from both the libertarian and conservative camps. Libertarians stress the privacy element of spiritual matters and maintain they should be kept separated from the ethos and pace of the workplace. Conservatives, on the other hand, emphasize traditional religion and express suspicion of New Age spiritual eclecticism.

of spiritual issues. Interestingly, Quiring points out that the resistance to the current spirituality in the workplace discussion comes from both the libertarian and conservative camps. Libertarians stress the privacy element of spiritual matters and maintain they should be kept separated from the ethos and pace of the workplace. Conservatives, on the other hand, emphasize traditional religion and express suspicion of New Age spiritual eclecticism.

The above, Quiring maintains, are not the only issues to be addressed when integrating a spirituality in the

workplace. The problem of spiritual pluralism and the spirituality/religion dualism must also be faced. Spiritual pluralism means that spiritual expression and application differ, not only by tradition and denomination but also by gender, race, class and ideology. While validating the non-clerical and nonsectarian nature of the spirituality-in-the-workplace movement, Quiring seeks to link it to spirituality, interpreted as the experiential dimension of religions which also have mythical, ritual, doctrinal, ethical, and institutional dimensions.

Acknowledging that the task will be difficult, Quiring maintains that the dualism generated by loss of the experiential dimension of religion and forgetfulness of the immanent dimension of ultimate reality can lead to a perception of ethics as incomprehensible moralism and legalism rather than action in harmony with creation and empowered by Creator or Creativity. Ultimately, secularism can lead to a life without ultimate meaning or guidance. Furthermore, a loss of the dimension of divine immanence can desanctify creation, rendering Earth and the human body susceptible to misuse.

Quiring ended his talk by offering some wording that might be employed in organizational policies or mission statements to facilitate discussion of spiritual and ethical perspectives on current workplace issues, he reminded the audience that these same materials will probably be relevant when painful adjustments necessitated by further downsizing are to be made. ■

Foresight emerges as one lives “by a sort of rhythm that encourages a high level of intuitive insight about the whole gamut of events....” The leader is at once...historical, contemporary analyst, and prophet”

Stephen Hinkle, Richard Smith, and Jill Roth

Richard Smith Seminar

Servant-Leadership

by John Quiring

On September 30 the Center for Process Studies sponsored morning and afternoon dialogues with Richard Smith of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership, Indianapolis, Indiana. The Greenleaf Center consults with organizations seeking ways of increasing collaborative efforts in management.

The point is to liberate employee talents, energy, and creativity otherwise oppressed by rigid job descriptions, personal identities, and relationship hang-ups.

The Greenleaf service-style of organizational change involves the search for contradictions between affirmed aims, values, and beliefs, on the one hand, and organizational structures that block their realization. Richard Smith's psychological approach to organizational change begins with intensive listening. He then asks a variety of questions that probe the “deep currents” of individual and group motivation. The precise nature of the depth dimension is left intentionally open, to prevent conflict at the level of worldview pluralism. It might be psyche and it might be soul or spirit. Smith suggested that CPS can complement the Greenleaf approach by helping frame questions about the nature of the depth dimension.

Several parallels between process thought and Greenleaf management theory can be suggested. Richard Smith notes that the Greenleaf way “seeks

to lead from serving, to persuade more than coerce” and employs “an internal model rather than an external model.” Robert Greenleaf's concept of “foresight” as the central ethic of leadership rests on a notion of time as “the moving concept in which past, present moment, and future are one organic unity.” Foresight emerges as one lives “by a sort of rhythm that encourages a high level of intuitive insight about the whole gamut of events....” The leader is at once...historical, contemporary analyst, and prophet” [“The Servant as Leader,” p. 17].

Organizations that have been influenced by the Greenleaf style are divisions of AT&T, a global oil company, and a large pharmaceutical firm; Mead Paper Co. and Schneider

continued on page 15

Move Occasions Gift of Books

The Center for Process Studies wishes to thank William A. Beardslee, Director of the Process & Faith Program, for donating to our library 40 basic books of process theology and philosophy and a set of the *Process Studies* journal. The gift was occasioned by the move of the Process & Faith office into the vacated office of Dr. David Ray Griffin, CPS Executive Co-Director, after he moved to an office in the School of Theology Academic Building. The P&F move enabled CPS to have a separate room to house its continually-expanding article file cabinets and dissertation shelves.

Members and other readers of *Process Perspectives* are encouraged to **remember the CPS library when you make your next move.** The CPS library is especially appreciative of gifts of books in the Whiteheadian tradition to serve as replacement copies. Many of our basic process texts disappear without a trace and many are by now out of print. ■

East-West Process Studies Project

by Toki Nobuhara

We held the 17th Annual Meeting of Japan Society for Whitehead Process Studies at Keiwa quite successfully September 8-9. Forty-eight members came. Professor Murakami's public lecture on "Natural Sciences and Christianity" was the climax of the entire conference. We had thirty or so citizens in the audience in addition to the official participants and attendees.

We had ten programs:

(1) "Workshop" at Niigata Welfare Pension Hall near Nugata Station JR, September 8, 2-5pm. On "the Dialogue between Whitehead and the philosophies of Nishida and Tanabe," Yutaka Tanaka, presiding; Eiko Kawamura (Osaka Prefectural University), Ryusei Takeda, and myself, presenting papers.

(2) "Noboru Yoneda (Chuo University), "The Concept of Nature in *Modes of Thought*."

(3) Makato Ozaki (Sanyo Gakuen College), "Whitehead's Beauty and Hajime Tanabe's Critique of 'Kan' or View-idea;" Toshihide Yoneda (Bukkyo University), presiding.

(4) Ichiro Hirata (Kansai Foreign Languages University), "Whitehead and Classics."

(5) Sueo Oshima (Reitaku University), "On the Similitude of Conceptual Structure between Barth and Whitehead," Haruo Murata (Momoyama Gakuin University), presiding.

(6) Seisaku Yamamoto (Kansai Foreign Language University), "On Whitehead and Contemporary Philosophies;" Tetsuro Sato (Niigata University), presiding.

(7) Nobuyuki Kubota (Gakushuin Women's Junior College), "Higher Education---It's Present Status and Its Task."

(8) Keiji Matsunobu, "The University in Nishida and Whitehead."

(9) Hiroshi Endo (Waseda University), "Whitehead As Viewed from the Perspective of Santayana;" Yoshihiro Arakawa (Teuri University).

(10) Yoichiro Murakami, "Natural Sciences and Christianity;" Seisaku Yamamoto, presiding.

Presentations (2)-(10) were delivered at Keiwa on September 9. At the reception in a nearby ceremony hall, there were three speeches:

(1) Hiromasa Mase (Keio University), "Report on My Academic Stay in Europe."

(2) Koji Yamamoto (Nagaoka Institute of Technology), "On Process Thought."

(3) Hidetoshi Toyofuku (Niigata Industrial University), "On the Late Torataro Shimomura Sensei." ■

Youth Ministry and Postmodern Times: The P&F Seminar

On October 21, the Process and Faith Program sponsored a seminar on youth ministry and the nature of faith in postmodern times. Former Process & Faith staff member, Dwayne Dawson discussed the Children & Families Ministries program he developed at All Saints Church, Pasadena. Dawson's challenge was to introduce a Children and Families program within the context of a very successful congregation widely known for its peace and justice ministries. *Young families*, however, weren't attending. Peace and justice, it seems, were widely viewed as *adult* issues, though youth poverty, homicide, and lack of health insurance are on the increase. By framing the current youth crisis as a peace and justice issue that could be addressed by a sanctuary-type movement, the program got the support of the top leadership and developed quickly. The emphasis at church is to facilitate *experiences* of connection and spirituality, not just teach about it. Some programs are integrated with the community groups, co-sponsored, for example, with City Hall and the Children's Defense Fund. These include tutoring, night basketball, nonviolence training, and coordination of the agencies investigating child abuse.

Process & Faith Director William A. Beardslee's presentation offered an interpretation of audience responses to Dawson's work. Life is viewed by many as increasingly

continued on page 14

Will Beardslee and Sang Yil Kim

Sang Yil Kim Seminar

The Liar Paradox

by *Olav Bryant Smith*

On Tuesday, October 24, 1995, Professor Sang Yil Kim of Han Shin University in Korea presented a paper entitled “The Liar Paradox and Process Thought.” The presentation was given at the Claremont Graduate School History Department. There was a small but appreciative audience, and Professor Kim, a graduate of the Claremont Graduate School, seemed quite at home presenting the main lines of his current work in this area. The response was by Martha Bailey, a lecturer at Victor Valley College and doctoral student in the Philosophy of Religion and Theology at the Claremont Graduate School.

The Liar Paradox as classically expressed, presents the dilemma of assigning a truth value to the sentence “I am lying.” If this sentence is true, then it must be false, since, if true, the speaker making the assertion is a liar. This paradox has also famously taken the form of a Cretan asserting that “All Cretans are liars.”

Professor Kim sees this Liar Paradox as prototypical of paradox in general, and uses the term “Liar Paradox” in a somewhat broader way than many of us are used to. In his paper, he writes that “the dictum of the liar paradox is THE CLASS DOES NOT CONTAIN ITSELF AS A MEMBER (self-reference) or THE CLASS DOES NOT CONTAIN THE CLASS

ITSELF AS A CLASS (self-annihilation): a class is not the class-itself or a class is both the class and a member. This is paradoxical.” At first glance, this strikes me more as the form of Russell’s paradox, which came in response to Frege, but Professor Kim believes Russell’s paradox to be but one form of the general Liar Paradox. He continues by presenting his dual-thesis that “ultimately the concept of [the Korean word] *Han* . . . represents this dictum. I insist that Hartshorne’s philosophy also implies this, that is, the dictum can be applied to the doctrine of God as follows: God, while (in one respect) being independent of the world, also (in another respect) includes the world. This is called *panentheism*.”

The Liar Paradox is, for Professor Kim, “a bridge” between Korean *Han* philosophy and process philosophy. The word “Han” in Korean can represent either whole or part, the one, or the many. He argues that the Liar Paradox provides the concept of “creativity,” in the process sense of the Category of the Ultimate with “a logical basis.” To those of us educated in the West, the notion of a paradox providing a “basis” of *anything* seems itself paradoxical, but Professor Kim is speaking from a ground which embraces the paradoxical relation in its fulness as the nature of reality: neither side of the paradox can be dismissed; both must be accepted. Professor Kim argues that the Western world, with few exceptions, has attempted to “overcome” the paradox, while Oriental philosophy has long accepted paradox as foundational to any realistic worldview.

While Hartshorne overcame what we might call the “problem” of the Liar Paradox through its acceptance as part of his process philosophy (to be found especially in his concepts of *divine relativity*, *panentheism*, and *the ontological argument*), Professor Kim argues that he did so from the standpoint of, and informed by, Russell’s theory of logical types. Kim’s paper suggests that later developments in logic, particularly those of Herzberger and Gupta, are actually more congenial to a process acceptance of paradox.

This issue of how to deal with the Liar Paradox is not merely an interesting side-note to the history of philosophy, according to Professor Kim. It is, for him, the *central* issue of the history of philosophy. Kim sees philosophical thought as primarily divided between two principle paradigms: the one is based on a *hierarchical-consistent* logic in the tradition of Aristotle’s Law of the Excluded Middle; the other is based on a *circular logic* that embraces inconsistencies. He discusses the *paradigm shifts* of the twentieth century as *all* revolving around coming to grips with this paradox. He does not believe that there is a single paradigm shift in the twentieth century that does not find itself involved in rethinking the world from the perspective of this paradox.

After a discussion of the hierarchical systems of Russell’s theory of logical types and Tarski’s T-convention, Professor Kim discusses the work of Herzberger, who showed that “the truth values of paradoxical sentences are systematically unstable in their semantic evaluation, so that, as Herzberger puts it, *the truth value* of

those sentences “cannot be pinned down, because... each valuation for a paradoxical statement sooner or later *yields* the opposite valuation.” The only inconsistency in paradoxical statements therefore is one that applies from valuations at one level of understanding to another. The work of Herzberger, Gupta and Belnap describe *anaive semantics* in which, Professor Kim says, “language can contain paradoxical sentences and have a systematic and coherent semantic structure at the same time.” Gupta notes the similarity between the concept of truth and circular definitions. He concludes that the “T-scheme,” in Professor Kim’s words, “is a partial definition of truth that the concept of truth is circular, and that its meaning is given by a revision rule with hypothetical supposition.” Kim argues that, “the circular-inconsistent views represented by Chihara, Herzberger, and Gupta come close to the process concept of reality. According to the circular-inconsistency view, *non-normality* [a term used by Ernst Nagel and James R. Newman to denote the paradoxical class-member relationship] is not a pathological but a creative dynamic. Because the hierarchical-consistency view sees *non-normality* as pathological, many scholars including Russell, tried to eradicate this paradox instead of accepting it.

Professor Kim places Hartshorne’s theological work in the context of one amongst many paradigm shifts in the twentieth century: “What do the terms *monopolar* and *dipolar* mean in the liar paradox? I think that the words originate from the two terms, class and members, in the liar paradox. If one applies the term class to the

doctrine of God, s/he will become a theist, while if one applies the term members to it, s/he will become a pantheist. Because the two terms were polarized in the Western tradition, classical theism and pantheism run parallel without any meeting point. The main reason why they are disassociated from each other is due to the adoption of Aristotle’s logic only, at the price of abandoning the liar paradox. Beginning with this century, however, Western scientists and mathematicians have started to incorporate the paradox into their disciplines. Hartshorne’s adoption of the paradox should be seen in the same way.” Professor Kim makes a case for Hartshorne’s familiarity with the problem, through both Whitehead and Carnap, and claims “He applied the liar paradox to his doctrine of God, resulting in panentheism, as he did to relativity resulting in surrelativity.”

Amongst the points challenged by Martha Bailey, in her response to Professor Kim, she convincingly argued against the notion that paradox has uniformly been ruled heretical in the Western theological tradition, pointing most especially to the doctrine of the Trinity as a primary example of the place of paradox in that tradition. Still, Professor Kim’s point stands, in that Western rationality has tended to reject propositions outside of the Aristotelian framework, to the extent that martyrs have died over the issue. Kim views this turn in twentieth century Western thought as being perhaps the most significant contributor to the possibility of dialogue between East and West. ■

Membership Corner

by Jeff Sanders

Thank you to everyone for their patience over the last two months. The *Center for Process Studies* has gone through several physical changes and is in the middle of some moderate structural changes. After years of being cramped in our office with all of our library materials and office materials attempting to occupy the same *space/time* (so to speak) we have **expanded** beyond our walls to occupy the office adjacent to ours. This has required a lot of physical reorganization of furniture, file cabinets, desks, books, tapes, and other materials. We are all still trying to get used to the new arrangement and I believe there are still a few files that we are trying to lay our hands on, but it is well worth the effort. We now have a larger workspace, an additional computer, and perhaps in the near future--*sanity!*

The *Center for Process Studies* annual report has been completed and is now available to all members by request. The annual report outlines accomplishments of the past fiscal year, financial statements and proposed projects for 1995-1996. If you would like a copy of the annual report, please send your request addressed to me at the *Center*.

Two more issues of the journal have been typeset and are going through final proofs. Issues 23:1 and 23:2, calendar 1994, should be sent to the printer very soon. Issue 23:1 is a general issue, featuring articles by Helmut Maasen of Kardinal von Galen Gymnasium Kevelaer in Frankfurt, Joseph A. Bracken of Xavier University in Cincinnati, OH, John B. Cobb, Jr. of Claremont Graduate School, and Granville C. Henry and Robert Valenza of Claremont McKenna College. Issue 23:2 is a special issue on process thought and Buddhism, featuring articles by John B. Cobb, Jr. of Claremont Graduate School, Takeda Ryusei of Ryukoku University in Kyoto, Japan, John S. Yokota of Chikusi Jagokuen University in Japan, and Granville C. Henry and Robert Valenza from Claremont McKenna College in Claremont, California.

In February of 1996 a newly formed advisory council will convene for the first time in Claremont. The purpose of this advisory council is to help guide the *Center for Process Studies*, its publications, library, conferences and other activities into the future. The council will consist of process scholars from various disciplines in an effort to aid our interdisciplinary vision and add diversity of foresight to our planning. If you would like make suggestions to this council, please send your suggestions to the *Center for Process Studies*, ATTN: Advisory Council no later than January 15th, 1996. ■

Higher Education Conference

(continued from page 7)

Education, said that education for sustainability can function as a counterweight to the otherwise-dominant, advertising-based industrial concept of civilization to which students are now being socialized. Edgerton invited conferees to be involved at the next annual meeting of the AAHE, in addition to the contributions several have generated for its publication series.

Conference participants marveled at the diversity of eco-justice education projects represented and at the richness of information exchanged. **If you would like further information** on any of these programs, please contact John Quiring at the Center for Process Studies. ■

Youth Ministry

(continued from page 11)

complicated and precarious. Youth, especially, sense the disconnectedness of things and reach out to peer groups in the absence of adult supervision. Beardslee interpreted the disconnectedness of our times as a postmodern, subjectivist reaction to the objectivism of modernity. Modernity claimed that disinterested knowledge was possible and desirable. Postmodernism holds that while everyone is "an interested party," our articulations are not solely constructions of our own interests, but arise out of histories of attempts to say how things are, based on what we all have taken in from many perspectives. There was a time when a college education attempted to integrate what the disciplinary perspectives discovered. But now many feel integration is impossible or even undesirable. Process thought, however, seeks to offer integrated views that are also sensitive to diversities of perspective.

If you aren't familiar with *Creative Transformation*, the Process & Faith magazine, please write to Process & Faith at the Center for Process Studies for a sample copy. ■

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

Letters to the Editor

Our new *Letters to the Editor* section has been very well received by the membership. 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. --Olav Bryant Smith, Editor

[The following was written to Dr. John Quiring, Assistant Director of the Center for Process Studies, who wrote the lead editorial for our last issue. We believed that it would be of interest to our readers, and with Professor Middleton's permission, we are pleased to print it in our letters to the editor section—Ed.]

Dear John,

Just a note to congratulate you on your very fine editorial (Process Perspectives, Summer 1995). It was well-written, measured, and full of insight. Might I add, though, that you omitted my own "mediating position"--process thought and *literature!* Indeed, one of the more interesting features of a recent book devoted to religion and literature includes the assertion that the human "self" is an imaginative, heuristic concept. In his *Breaking the Fall: Religious Readings of Contemporary Fiction*, Robert Detweiler proposes that the assumption of a solid selfhood, enduring the same across time, is a piece of fiction. He repudiates substantialist metaphysics, abandons a belief in the static "self" and, in its place, embraces the image of an empty center that is occupied by a succession and interplay of selves" (1989:6).

For Detweiler, we are people "on the move," open to an unknown future, and through language our many "selves" are able to "cohere and co-operate" as we follow the call of human possibilities (1989:7). This relational theory of self, a notion remarkably similar to views implicit in constructive postmodern theology, may help us as we approach fiction. In reading a novel, Detweiler claims that the reader very often identifies with actors in a narrative, momentarily forgetting "self," in order to take delight in the "selves" of the plot's characters. Reading a novel is an iconoclastic exercise, for it undermines all secure sense of an enduring, discrete self. This is because the novel is the kind of literature that by nature promotes the action of multiple selves" (1989:11). As a result, one of the novel's many functions is to be a catalyst for personal and social transformation for, "reading fiction can serve as a probe by offering the self other versions of what it might be" (1989:11). Reading, then, is a comparative activity for when "I" read a novel, "I" leave "myself" to examine other "selves," but "I" return to "myself" with new possibilities both for thought and for action. The breakdown of the model of the enduring self in process philosophy has its parallel in literary criticism as well! This is something I'd like to explore in the future!

Regards,
Darren J.N. Middleton
Religious Studies Department
Rhodes College

Thanks

by Jeff Sanders

On behalf of the co-directors and staff of the *Center for Process Studies*, I would like to let our membership know about a couple of large donations that the Center has recently received. In the spring of 1995 the *Center for Process Studies* applied for and received a matching grant from a foundation which wishes to remain anonymous. The grant is for general operating budget and requires matching donations to meet the obligations of the grant proposal. The matching ratio is 1:1.

In response to this grant, Dr. John Buchanan, a member of the *Center* and long-time supporter, made a contribution to match funds from the foundation, and Dr. John Cobb made a pledge of matching funds for the grant obligation.

These donations are much appreciated in this difficult time of transition at the *Center* and have made possible our continued operation for this year and provide promise for the future.

The staff and co-directors of CPS are continuing their search for funding and appreciate all donations from our friends and membership.

Servant-Leadership

(continued from page 11)

Engineering; the Center for Creative Leadership and a University of Tennessee leadership institute; Daughters of Charity and Sisters of St. Joseph health care systems; the Bottum Family of Companies (Ann Arbor, MI); Trinity Services for the developmentally disabled (Joliet IL); Prescott, Meridian, and Alverno colleges, the University of Michigan housing program, several secondary school systems, the US Inspector General--Dept. of Education, and a PBS station. T. D. Industries, influenced by the Greenleaf idea, is a model of the employee stock ownership plan. ■

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.

Thursday, February 22, 1995 4-6pm

David Ray Griffin :

**Overcoming the Conflicts between
Science and Religion:
How Whitehead Helps**

March: Details To Be Announced

Marjorie Suchocki

Thursday, April 18, 1995 4:15-6:15

John B. Cobb, Jr.

**Higher Education
For The Common Good**

CPS MEMBER PAPERS

Upon request, the following papers are available free of charge to center members (\$3 each for non-members). If you have email, and would like to receive member papers via email, please send requests to: <process@cgs.edu>.

Sang Yil Kim
*The Liar Paradox
and Process Thought*

Mary Elizabeth Moore
Religions Meeting Religiously

Leslie A. Muray
A Democratic Faith in a Democratic God

John Quiring
*Workplace, Nature/Spirit, and Paradigm Polarization:
A Process Perspective*

Credits: Thanks go to John Quiring, who again took all of the photographs for this issue. 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

