

Education in Hartshorne's Process Philosophy

PHAVISMINDA Journal
Volume 9 (May 2010):47-64.

Ferdinand M. Mangibin
Silliman University
Dumaguete City

Introduction

William Shakespeare saw this world as a stage on which all men act. But is there a purpose behind the wobbling drama? If there is, could it be education? Henry Ford appeared to have such an idea in mind when he said, "My only fortune is my experience." Compared this treasure, a billion dollars did not seem worth mentioning.

If the whole purpose of life is the education of man and beast and plant and the whole universe, then we are faced with a humbling fact: we do not know about it. We have no clear idea about the purpose of life; hence we do not know what sort of education ought to lead us toward it. There are individuals who believe they know, but mankind, his institutions, science, art, and literature do not know of such a purpose.

This lack of knowledge at once scales down the scope of education and extends its span across time. Obviously, we cannot even hope to reach any "perfect" or "complete" system of training in homes, schools, and colleges, and since even adults know but little about the final goal, we are all pupils from birth to the grave. Even if this realization may hurt our pride, it is a refreshing one and greatly helpful in making the best rather than the worst of the situation.

Whatever the child's ultimate aim and purpose may be, he has to live and function in the world we have made for him. He may change that world in his own good time only if he can master it first. We proceed proudly to teach him this mastery. There are pitfalls along the road. We may go too far or fall short. We may be too bold or too timid. The journey is long but the child is adaptable. He can take a lot of wrong education and still do pretty well. He has taken a whole of misinformation and spoiling, and maltreatment and beating from parents and teachers all through history. Yet, he is still going strong.

Granted that our educational system is based on an ultimate purpose of life which we, as a community, do not know; that the youngster is free to find his own bearings and develop according to his individual requirements; that school and universities concentrate on teaching him how to function in this

world so that he can make a living and have a background – have we succeeded in these aims? Have we found the right balance? Have we provided the best possible setting for the individual's triumphal march toward his unknown goal?

This study explores the relevance of Charles Hartshorne's philosophy in the aspects of education. It describes the process approach to education and seeks to understand issues related to the philosophy of religious education.

Towards a Process Model of the Human Person

Concept of Freedom

Hartshorne's concept of freedom¹ is found in several of his works. Basically, he provides a vision of reality as a "creative synthesis" in contrast to the mechanistic or merely phenomenalist views that have become prevalent in the West. Process philosophy affirms "freedom" or, to distinguish it from mere determinism and chance--what Hartshorne calls--"self-determination." Each actual occasion participates in determining just what it will be until it reaches its self-determination.² Hartshorne affirms freedom when he says that "there is always freedom, for there is always novelty."³ This suggests newness, uniqueness, spontaneity, and freshness for the actual occasion's moment of satisfaction; that is, it becomes.

Freedom provides a way of technically fleshing out God's influence (persuasion) on an actual entity (in this case human self-determination). It is the openness to the future as it is efficaciously influenced by the past in the present. It is the situatedness or the sheer givenness of the present or, in other words, the situatedness of the entity in its sheer givenness. Freedom is assumed given as the self becomes in the process. Man is not created from nothing to something in such a way that he receives free will from God. Free will is imbedded in the actual state of man's being in the world. Thus, freedom here is more of an existential ontological condition, and it is not the one that is commonly thought of.

The self has no freedom that moves with the self in process. It is not that we have freedom. Rather, we find ourselves in freedom. God has no power to distort this given condition. To enhance freedom, God is an object of lure and inspiration that guides the flow of process.

For process thought, freedom is always in the present state of concrescence, which means always "becoming concrete." As events which happen to each individual actual occasion, concrescences are "processes of their own momentary becoming." There is freedom in this becoming. Freedom is not a property but the condition of an actual entity. An actual entity is not itself first and then becomes by its freedom. Rather, it is from the start its own becoming through the freedom which is its very flow. The fact that it may reach



a state of satisfaction is therefore a free process and spontaneous. It flows as the actual occasion actually becomes.

Now, what if we are aware and conscious that there is a God watching, calling, alluring, and drawing us? Are we still free to act? Are we then merely subject to the divine power of God? Hartshorne maintains that although God is the most powerful He does not limit such a power to Himself to the point of taking the exclusive role that pertains only to certain agents. As opposed to classical theists, Viney's analysis of Hartshorne says,

The classical theists are invariably deterministic; more specifically, they are theological determinists – God is, as it were, 'omni-responsible' for all that occurs. The question of how creaturely freedom is possible if God determines all that occurs is difficult.⁴

Hartshorne opposes determinism which bluntly denies freedom and novelty or creativity. This suggests that creativity implies freedom and novelty. There is no such thing as a pre-determined event. A world where creativity is present removes the possibility of determinism. In fact, Hartshorne's solution to determinism is to "abandon the idea of theological determinism in favor of a metaphysics in which each individual has some capacity for self-creation. Although God contributes to the character of each individual, he is not wholly responsible for what an individual becomes."⁵ God always allows us to be creative and free in our own appropriate ways.⁶ He provides opportunities and possibilities for growth, novelty and creativity in the process of the actual occasion's coming to be.

Human Freedom

The human person is by nature free. This is the common contention of many even in the classical period.⁷ But are we really free? What do we mean by human freedom? In process philosophy, freedom involves power. Every actual entity in the world has certain power. Even a feather has the power not to fall immediately on the ground or the water in the river the power to flow. God cannot interfere with such power.

In the process relational perspective, freedom is always in terms of how one actual entity is related with another. In this case, it is always contextual. What does it mean by contextual? Freedom is the openness to the future as it is efficaciously influenced by the past and the present. It is the situatedness or sheer givenness of the present. It is, as said before, the situatedness of the entity in its sheer givenness. Freedom is in the process of the becoming of an actual entity.

The above concept of freedom, when applied to the case of a human person (actual entity), will always be within the context of his relationship to the following: the present, the process of concrescence, and God. With these three factors, human freedom can be understood.

The past has always something to do with the present. When a concrescing event⁸ perishes, it becomes a part of the past. The past is not dead, for it can be causally efficacious of the present. Indeed, the past sets the structure for the given. Hartshorne says,

In relation to one's own past, also, present experience must freely achieve its unique synthesis of influences. For the final units of actuality are not, as we have seen, things or persons but "experience-events," new total acts of response to events already actualized. The final "self" having "self-determination" is the present unity of experience.⁹

The past continuously influences the present. It is not something detached from the present. It sets the pattern for the becoming of the given as "now" (this moment, this event, this experience), in which the concrescence has subjective immediacy. When the present career terminates, the subjective immediacy is lost and is part of the past and lays an obligation for future concrescence. Once it has perished, the actual entity reaches satisfaction and only then can it be itself (a new self). The past then nourishes the present. How its intensity nourishes the present determines the amount of freedom that can be assumed by the concrescence where the actual entity reaches a state of decision. Lowe says,

Experiencing is an active process... A capacity for the spontaneous introduction of something not present in the environment is part of the structure of every experience. Otherwise the present would be only the sum of what is given it by the past, and any item, taken by itself, a mere re-enaction.¹⁰

The autonomous decision of the actual entity is the very dimension by which it can be itself and on that level it is free. If the actual entity is influenced too much by the past, then the degree of freedom is affected.

In relation to God, however, freedom can be implied by His giving of the initial aim. This depends on how the actual entity becomes. It is not that God

will give an aim that has no bridge by which a human person can fashion himself. Hartshorne further explains,

It follows that nothing and no power, even God, decides for us exactly how we are to put the data together into our experiential reactions to them. In influencing us, God himself could only be the supreme datum! Hence, freedom in some degree is inevitable, no matter by what rules, human or superhuman, we may be governed.¹¹

God does not jump and perform magic. The aim depends on who the actual entity is, in this case the human person. In this context, how much an actual entity can make of himself determines the freedom which is subject to the divine aim. "There is always a divine element in human decisions, and a human element in the divine decisions, but manifestly the human element is radically inferior and radically dependent."¹² What God wants is for the actual entity to achieve the beauty of his experience. The aim is not a deliberate action but a "lure." How an actual entity reads the "divine lure" constitutes the degree of his freedom. In this case, the "lure" is not only meant for those who have the capacity to read it. In the ethical perspective, God as an all-inclusive reality is available not only to those who have the capacity to become but also to all, and that is why God is considered by Whitehead as the "fellow sufferer who understands."¹³

Moreover, man's freedom cannot be deliberately sustained by God if we will maintain the idea of a direct participation coming from Him. It is not that there is an actual freedom coming from God and man's condition is treated as an empty shell or box. Hartshorne further says,

The assumption could be, and I think should be, that freedom is essential to man, if not to all beings, freedom from complete control even by a higher order of being, so that it is better that men be allowed to blunder into a certain amount of catastrophe than that they be deprived of all power over matters of importance, of all large scope and initiative.¹⁴

Freedom is already there as a condition because the self is an actual entity. The condition of relativity makes freedom possible. Freedom is the starting point. To say that man's freedom is "under" God's power might promote the misleading thought that God is always on top of man, and that the latter's power is only possible "if ever" God allows it. As Cobb expounds

Hartshorne, "God creates the conditions that provide the optimum balance of order and freedom. Within the limits set by God, creatures determine the details of what happens. Much that occurs takes place by chance interactions of diverse decision-making creature."¹⁵ This suggests man's freedom of choice and decision, here also understood as "the power of a man to judge and to engage in decision making, the power to determine the orientation of one's life and activities."¹⁶ Furthermore, it is suggested that

...freedom of the person is the profoundly positive....power of self-determination...of making and unmaking, or pursuing....individual choice....to live, expand and grow *according to the intrinsic desire or purpose*...undetermined by any extrinsic fiat or order or force that could summarily arrest the inner development.¹⁷

This again emphasizes man's choice or personal decision. He opts or decides without external force. As an actual occasion, he is given alternative options based on the persistence of the past and the lure of the divine. Because "if you say that God – and he alone creates the entire personality of a man, you seem to leave nothing for the man to create in himself, and then when we say, as it is good idiom to say, that a man 'makes' a decision or an effort, we do not know what we are talking about."¹⁸ Hartshorne views man's freedom as very essential as he decides for himself and is able to arrive at self-determination. Man is not merely an inquirer predicting, he is also an agent deciding, the future.

However, though human freedom is recognized and acknowledged by Hartshorne's process philosophy, man's freedom has its own limits inasmuch as it is a contextual one. Man's freedom is not absolute. "God can set *narrow* limits to our freedom."¹⁹ Man's freedom is limited by God, by what he has been in the past, by the condition of his body, by the wider context in which he acts, and the like. Hartshorne expresses this clearly,

God's power sets limits to the freedom of others.... [W]here there is freedom, however, sharply limited, conflict and evil must always be possible. What God can do, and because he is good does do, is to set the best or optimal limits of freedom....The definition of 'optimal limits' is that they are such that, were more freedom allowed, the risks would increase more than the

opportunities, and were less freedom allowed, the opportunities would decrease more than the risks.²⁰

God in this case suggests that he is the “ultimate limit” to man’s freedom (although God is not the only limiting factor). Setting the optimal limits means not going beyond what is offered to man.

On the other hand, the limitation of freedom is also subject to how the actual entity (man) has become. In this case, the past is a limiting factor. Hartshorne says that “the freedom of present creativity is not absolute, or in a vacuum. It accepts limits. But these limits are set by other acts of freedom, those that are known from memory or perception.”²¹ This suggests that the past of the actual entity also serves as a limiting factor. Man is in a constant state of becoming. With the “lure” coming from God he is free, while in the state of chaos there is a strict denial of freedom. The fact that each actual entity achieves a higher state of order explains why they are freer now compared to the past.

God-Man Relationship

There is also a clear relationship between God and man in Hartshorne’s process thought. In it the relationship is described as “internal dependence” or “mutual dependence,” never as an external one. A human person is dependent on God in terms of his self-constitution, and vice-versa. The more he makes of himself, the more he contributes to God’s self also. There is a mutual influence between God and man. Certainly no human can exist apart from God. And perhaps, God depends on creaturely experience for the content of the divine experience.

God-man is no ordinary relationship. One finds here an “immanent” or “internal” relationship.²² To be related is not to be contained in one particular space or locus and then to decide with whom to relate. Relation is achieved as the actual entity becomes and reaches satisfaction. To relate takes two forms: to have an effect on others and to be affected by others. To have an effect on others means that an actual entity is being itself and whatever it makes in terms of its self-constitution has an effect on other actualities. For example, an actual entity, say John, sees a lady. At that moment, she has no knowledge of John looking at her. Here, John is internally related to the lady, while she is externally related to John. Her effect on John is unintentional. Hence, the more she is herself, the more John becomes himself as he appreciates her presence. Nevertheless, John is still related to her, by her having an effect on him. The way John absorbs her enhancing effect represents also John’s state of being related to her. John may be transformed by such a process, which is internal, but there might be no transformation on her part, for it is external.

Hartshorne's emphasis on God-Man relationship brings a better human understanding of divine persuasive power and human freedom. It is, in short, through this relation that the possibility of God's persuasive power works in human freedom.

Man and the World

The human person is always changing. As a transcendent being, he can rise above what he is to what he is not. But the question concerning his nature leads to the question concerning the world.

The world is not simply a backdrop of the drama. The world and human person are parts of the drama, the drama of creation; they function according to their own specific roles. They interact with each other and are actively engaged. There is change but at the same time there is an unchanging core as the world changes.

The Human Person in Process

Hartshorne's process thought may lead us to a better understanding of the human person. Its principles and conditions along with the other concepts discussed above may bring us to an avenue where we can adopt an educational model in the process perspective.

Principle of Sociality and Relativity. Man is always social and related through prehension, which is the basic, universal form of experiencing and the most concrete mode of relationship by which the world hangs together as a cosmos.²³ "It (prehension) is the concrete facts of relatedness."²⁴ To experience is to prehend something. It involves the feeling or grasping of the physical and conceptual data of actual entities.²⁵ Prehension is thus more than just consciousness or observation of the phenomenon of another actual entity. In prehension, other actual entities are internalized and their prehension becomes part and parcel of the ongoing process. Prehension is not a conscious act except in higher forms of life.²⁶

The situation is that nothing could conceivably be known not to be social; the social character of some things, such as human groups, can be and is known.²⁷ In fact, all men are related in so far as prehension is concerned. Hartshorne says:

The social is a synthesis of dependence and independence, as it is of change and permanence, or the one and the many, or order and creative freedom, or quantity and quality. It is the only conception of the universe that plays no favorites among the categories but

assigns to each a place in reality as such. It treats law and freedom, unity and variety, activity and passivity, as equally real and ultimate, each having its function in relation to the other.²⁸

This principle of sociality explains all their mutual relevance to each other. In the prehension of the other, man becomes aware of his neighbor. There could be no self apart from participation in the lives of others. All creatures are interrelated. "All of reality is charged with relationality. Every entity is marked by a dynamic relatedness to an other."²⁹ Nobody is alone by himself.

Everything is social including men and women. Each actual occasion influences each other. Dimaranan opines that there is really interrelatedness of creatures among themselves because "recent dramatic changes in climactic patterns all over the world, among other things, have reminded us about how the whole web of natural life in the world is intricately and delicately interwoven and interdependent."³⁰

Moreover, man's realization of his social character expresses sympathy towards others. He becomes participative in the community where he belongs. To participate is to take others into account, allow them to make a difference to oneself, and in some sense care about them. The more united men are among themselves, the more they are respectful, flexible and responsible in the society. Men are always connected. Connectedness is part and parcel of becoming in the process of actual occasion.

Principle of Creativity. For Hartshorne, man is always in a moment of creativity. He has always the opportunity to opt for or create himself. He is "engaged in a truly remarkable self-creative act."³¹ And precisely through the principle of creativity, man becomes spontaneous as he decides for himself without any external coercion. Creativity connects actual occasion with other actual occasions.

Moreover, man's decision becomes more meaningful when his/her decision is respected. Every decision or moment of satisfaction in his becoming implies novelty and creativity which obviously suggest a free act. "Within the limits imposed by the environment, every experience is self-creative; it is indirectly creative of the future. Directly, too, for every moment includes some anticipatory forward thrust, or purpose."³²

Principle of Contributionism. Man decides for himself. Every decision or choice, especially when "this" particular act reaches satisfaction and saturation, contributes to the making of himself in the present as influenced by the past. The occasion of human experience also enriches his life. His every decision

contributes to the whole welfare of the society. This is the principle of Contributionism. In this process there is the mutual contribution from man and the world for beauty and harmony. Man's decision for the future enhances himself (new self). Hartshorne contends that "to say that we live partly to enjoy our sympathies for others is to say that we live for the sake of others, which is a cumbersome way of saying that we live in at least some degree for the sake of others, which is the point at issue."³³

Moreover, contributionism allows man to enjoy the company of others. The moment given to him is of giving and sharing one's occasion with others. Again Hartshorne says,

The enjoyment of planning the welfare of others, as in making a benevolent will, is an enjoyment that occurs when the will is made and while the individual lives. But the future goal of the act is primarily the welfare of the legatees, which one may expect to outlast one's own enjoyment of the will-making or its results by many years. To deny that one ever makes the will for the sake of others will lead by the same logic to the detail that any act is done for the sake of the future. All action is self-enjoyed, but its *future* goal is not by any means always self-enjoyment.³⁴

In fact, "to be is to be contributory and to enjoy the contribution of others."³⁵ As man decides for himself, he grows continuously with the influence of the past. Each of us is, in his very being--his very life just as lived on earth--a contribution to the experience of the world.

As a consequence of the enhancement of his freedom, man becomes a co-creator of the world. "We are not only co-creators, with God, of the world, but in last analysis co-creators, with him, of himself."³⁶

Principle of Aesthetic Value. There is always value in the world. And, part of our constitution is to understand this value and harmony. Man is to be aware of the value set for him. Hartshorne puts these beautifully in words:

We can, I believe, know the *general principle* of God's purpose. It is the beauty of the world (or the harmonious happiness of the creatures), a beauty by which every creature enjoys its own glimpses and to which it makes its unique contributions, but each created stage of which only God enjoys adequately, everlastingly, and as a whole,



once it has been created....So God's purpose is the welfare of the creatures as the means, finally, to increase the divine happiness, whose value is no absolute maximum but an ever-enriched infinity.³⁷

In human freedom, value is identified when the occasion of human experience is satisfied. It is "aesthetic value" which is ultimately the purpose of God. Hartshorne says that "the value of life is in the experience of living."³⁸ This could also be called the principle of "harmony" and "order." This implies a kind of relatedness with another in unity or harmony; "it would probably be agreed that it is a kind of relation between things such that though they are felt to be different from each other, they are yet felt to be not merely different."³⁹ This exemplifies the saying "unity in diversity."

Furthermore, in the human search for meaning and value, he experiences beauty in the world and the beauty of his life in every moment of decision making in terms of value, harmony, balance, unity, goodness, and order. The world is constantly lured to heights of order and beauty, depths of compassion, goodness, and intelligence by the Unsurpassable Poet of the World, the Fellow-Sufferer who understands.⁴⁰

Towards a process model of education

The Human Person the Process Education

Let us now explore a model of education based on the process perspective of human nature and human existence. Imagine a person in process moving into an intersection. This person is a part of the traffic flow moving in one direction. But in the intersection, he faces the traffic and pedestrians from all directions, the traffic signals, the traffic rules, the road conditions and his personal concerns. He can move ahead quickly, slow down or stop. Of course, he may simply follow his plans before he entered the intersection but he will also be influenced by what is happening in the intersection; his plan may be changed or even forgotten. He is a person in process, living through a succession of intersections.

There are three important considerations in this analogy. First, the human person is changing and stable. He is in process, continuous with his past and changing as he moves toward the future. The person in the intersection must either continue with the plan or change course. Both options are real and either decision will be influenced by what is gone, what is happening in the intersection and what might happen down the road. The past and the future play a significant role in this drama of life. Second, the human person is individual and social. He is internally related to God and the world. This means

that God and the world are deeply woven into his plans and goals and the changes that he does along the way. Third, the human person is active and passive. He acts and is acted upon by both God and the world around him. He is not a spectator and he is not passively molded at the intersection. Thus, the human person is characterized by permanence and change. What are the educational implications of this?

The Role of the Educator

The educator begins at the intersection, which is a big, complex and awesome place; this intersection consists of family, media culture, "barkada," politics, Church or the local faith community, economics, the global village, fear of the future, God, society, etc. To begin education from other than this relationship is to spread out some segments of life, artificially treated in isolation from any other parts.

The educational implications of this insight on the human person's existence are:

First, a person is in process and is never finished. He is influenced by the past, present, and future. An educator should not ignore the past and the future. The family, friends, local faith community, they are all social process. Some presuppositions of this implication are: God is active; and the human person experiences God whether he is aware or not. However, God does not determine the process but persuades. Every moment involves decision making. He meets God (Jesus/Allah/Yahweh) in the intersection. He seeks for eternal life. He needs to decide. In this moment, the educator simply persuades, nurtures, and helps the person to decide. On the other hand, the student needs to consider the past and the future.

Second, the human person is interrelated to God, to other persons, and to the world in the intersection. He is transformed by the myriads of events, of both internal and external factors, which are part of the person's past. The human person who belongs to a particular culture and family is both aware and unaware of what is happening at the intersection. He receives, along the way, meaningful symbols, which may be symbols in worship, service, classrooms, friends, family, and society in general. Education then considers these factors that affect the human person and the educator should plan for these significant symbols.

Third, the person is interacting. He acts and is acted upon by the society and by God. He also influences the society and God. The student is part of the educational process. He is not simply passive. God influences him (students) and the student also influences God. Both enhance mutual interaction. The educator in this case must be open to possibilities and opportunities.

The Method/Approach of the Educator

There are three important methods proposed: First is the method of transmitting. The educator tells stories. He tells what goes on at the intersection and narrates the past and the future in relation to the present. Second is reflecting. The educator encourages the student to reflect on the story (past and future) and leads him to a personal reflection, to a critical reflection of his specific and particular situations. Third is transforming. The educator's story opens up the student's mind and feelings, his self from the outside. At the end of the day, the student decides for himself and his decision leads for the better, that is, a transformed self.

Goals and Aims of Process Education

Sociality/Relativity. The student should be seen as someone connected to the rest of reality. He/she (student) is not an isolated being. The task of education is to let the student realize his/her place in the greater scheme of things. Education serves as an eye opener for them (students) that life is best served in the context of sociality/relativity. For a concerned educator, the challenge is to let the students realize that they are part of reality. Each has his own uniqueness but is still related to one another. To be is to be related.

Creativity. The students should be seen as one who is becoming (in process). Their experience (actual occasion) is a moment of newness, new self, that is, a transformed self. Education sees to it that novelty in human experience is present. Students themselves are very creative. The task then of education is to encourage novelty and creativity, to let them realize that every moment is a chance to be creative. To be is to be creative.

Contributionism. The principles of sociality/relativity and creativity follow the principle of contributionism. Every moment is an opportunity to contribute to oneself, to others, to the world, and to God Himself. The task of education is to let the students, as co-creators of the world, see the value of their responsibility in the light of contribution, which may be little but worthwhile. To be is to be contributory.

Aesthetic Value. The principle of aesthetic value sums up everything. The experience of beauty or harmony and order manifest clearly the actual occasion's experience towards a purposive subjective aim. The ultimate experience of the students should be to experience the aesthetic value in life. The task of education is to paint what is harmonious and orderly society and to lead the students to appreciate the beauty of life despite its trials and

difficulties. After all, the ultimate aim of the human learning is not simply to be a good person or citizen but to experience the beauty of life set by God and the world for all. To be is to experience beauty, order, and harmony.

Connected Teaching

Sharing the process. An educational program sees to it that there is a connected teaching. The educator and students are not taken individually in the process but taken as connected beings. Both share the same concern for learning for both of them are important in the process of learning. The educator sets the atmosphere of learning while the students open itself through the story, reflection, and transformation.

Connected Classes. The connected class provides a culture of growth in process. As actors, the students actively participate in the intersection. In a connected class no one apologizes for uncertainty. It is assumed that evolving thought will be tentative. In the conversation/dialogue, both the educator and students collaborate in constructing a new interpretation. In connected classes, people get to know each other. They do not act as representatives of positions or as occupants of roles but as individuals with particular style of thinking and behaving. The vision of connected class follows directly from the conception of sociality/relativity. Education conducted on sociality or connectivity would help men and women toward community of people sharing the aesthetic value, harmony, and order.

Portrait of a Process Educator. The process educator creates groups in which members nurture each other's thought to maturity. It is important to let everybody voice their uncertainties in the intersection, after which everyone has to decide which way to go for the better.

The process educator cares for the students. He receives and accepts their feeling toward the subject matter. The educator acts in the interest of the student's projects, realizing that the student is an individual subject related with the rest. He treats the student as person in process.

A process educator is not just another student; the role carries special responsibilities. His role does not entail power over the students; however, it does carry authority, an authority based not on subordination but on cooperation.

A process educator is a believer. He trusts his students and encourages them to expand their thinking.

Bibliography

Books

- Hartshorne, Charles. *Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method*. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1970.
- _____. *The Logic of Perfection*. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1962.
- _____. *Omnipotence and Other Theological Mistakes*. New York: State University of New York, 1984.
- _____. *The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.
- _____. *Reality as a Social Process: Studies in Metaphysics and Religion*. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1971.
- _____. *A Natural Theology for our Time*. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1967.
- Hornedo, Florentino H. *The Power To Be: A Phenomenology of Freedom*. Manila: UST Publishing House, 2000.
- Lieb, Irwin (ed.). *Experience, Existence, and the Good: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss*, Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961.
- Lowe, Victor. *Understanding Whitehead*. Maryland: The John Hopkins Press, 1962.
- Maher, Michael. *Readings in Ethics*, ed. J.F. Leibell. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1926.
- Montalbo, Melchor. *Philosophy of God*. Makati, Metro Manila: San Carlos Seminary, 1996.
- Sia, Santiago. *God in Process Thought: A Study in Charles Hartshorne's Concept of God*. Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985.
- Viney, Donald Wayne. *Charles Hartshorne and the Existence of God*. New York: State of New York Press, 1985.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1929.

Journals

- David, Luis S. "The Consolation of Philosophy on the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom." *Philippiniana Sacra* 38, no. 114 (September – December, 2003): 461-477.
- Dimaranan, Vitaliano. "Walking on Water Like Peter and Jesus: A Retreat for Priests and Religious," *Lantayan: A Pastoral-Theological Journal* 5, No. 1 (Fist Semester 2006-2007): 7-50.

Unpublished Materials

La Guardia, Renan Michael. "Pebbles on the Cosmic Beach: From a Metaphysics of Interrelatedness Towards the Ethics of Contributionism in Charles Hartshorne's Process Thought." Dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University, 2001.

Santos, Ferdinand. "The Self and Its Others: Charles Hartshorne on Mnemonic and Communal Identity as a Contribution to a Metaphysics of the Person," PhD Dissertation, University of Leuven, 1998.

Electronic Sources

Christian, William A. "An Interpretation of Whitehead's Metaphysics." Article on-line; 1959. Available from <http://websyte.com/alan/termin.htm>; 2 May 2007.

Cobb, John, "Charles Hartshorne: A Biographical Essay." Article on-line; Available from <http://www.ctr4process.org/about/process/Hartshorne.shtml>; 3 May 2007.

_____. "A Christian Natural Theology Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead." Article on-line; 1965. Available from <http://www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=1085&C=1114>. 20 April 2007.

Endnotes

¹ Prof. John Cobb Jr. opines that Charles Hartshorne's concept of freedom is discussed in his *Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method*, (LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1970); however, it can also be found in some of his writings.

² **Actual occasions/actual entities** are the real things of which the universe is made. An actual entity is an experiencing subject and is constituted by its experience. Its experience is its real constitution. An actual occasion is an event which displays an experiential unity. Actual entities, then, are units of process, the final realities – "there is no going behind actual entities to find anything more real." Change is attributed to the creative contribution of each occasion, as well as the influence of other actual occasions, while endurance is due to the inheritance of common qualities from previous actual occasions in the sequence. This is true of all actual occasions from electrons and atoms to rocks and plants to humans and God. Humans are an extremely complex nexus of occasions with memory, imagination, and heightened conceptual feelings. 'Actual occasion' and 'actual entity' are thus interchangeable terms. The word



occasion implies a spatio-temporal location. However, since God is the one nontemporal actual entity, "the term 'actual occasion' will always exclude God from its scope." Quoted by William A. Christian in his *An Interpretation of Whitehead's Metaphysics*, (U.S.A.: Yale, 1959), [Article on-line]; Available from <http://websytc.com/alan/termin.htm>; 2 May 2007; Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), 27-28, 135.

³ Charles Hartshorne, *The Logic of Perfection*, (LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1962), 233.

⁴ Donald Wayne Viney, *Charles Hartshorne and the Existence of God* (New York: State of New York Press, 1985), 31-32.

⁵ Viney, *Charles Hartshorne*, 32.

⁶ Cf. Charles Hartshorne, *Omnipotence and Other Theological Mistakes* (New York: State University of New York, 1984), 111.

⁷ Florentino H. Hornedo, *The Power To Be: A Phenomenology of Freedom* (Manila: UST Publishing House, 2000), 62-63.

⁸ "Event is a minimal temporal unit, or cross-section, so to speak, of some actual process, such as the process of experiencing in a certain human being." Hartshorne, *Creative Synthesis*, 173 [Italics added].

⁹ Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 231.

¹⁰ Victor Lowe, *Understanding Whitehead* (Maryland: John Hopkins Press, 1962), 19-20.

¹¹ Hartshorne, *Logic of Perfection*, 230-331.

¹² Charles Hartshorne, *The Divine Relativity: A Social Conception of God* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948), 146.

¹³ Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 532.

¹⁴ Charles Hartshorne, *Reality as a Social Process: Studies in Metaphysics and Religion* (New York: Hafner, 1971), 61.

¹⁵ John Cobb, "Charles Hartshorne: A Biographical Essay," Article on-line; Available from <http://www.ctr4process.org/about/process/Hartshorne.shtml>; 3 May 2007.

¹⁶ Luis S. David, "The Consolation of Philosophy on the Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Human Freedom." *Philippiniana Sacra*, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 114 (September – December, 2003): 466.

¹⁷ Michael Maher, "Freedom of the Will," in *Readings in Ethics*, ed. J.F. Leibell (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1926), 89 [Emphasis is Maher's].

¹⁸ Charles Hartshorne, *A Natural Theology for our Time*, (LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court, 1967), 10.

¹⁹ Hartshorne, *The Divine Relativity*, 142 [Emphasis is Hartshorne's].

²⁰ Hartshorne, *Reality as Social Process*, 41; Cf. also Hartshorne, *Omnipotence*, 45.

²¹ Hartshorne, *Creative Synthesis*, 7.

²² The term used by Whitehead is "immanence" while Hartshorne's is "internal." However, for the purpose of this study, both can be used interchangeably. For his part, Hartshorne also accepts the term "immanence."

²³ Santiago Sia, *God in Process Thought: A Study in Charles Hartshorne's Concept of God*. (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985), 115.

²⁴ Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 32; Quoted also by Melchor Montalbo, *Philosophy of God*, (Makati, Metro Manila: San Carlos Seminary, 1996), 185.

²⁵ John Cobb Jr., "A Christian Natural Theology Based on the Thought of Alfred North Whitehead," Article online; 1965. Available from <http://www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=1085&C=1114>. 20 April 2007.

²⁶ Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 35.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 136.

²⁹ Ferdinand Santos, "The Self and Its Others: Charles Hartshorne on Mnemonic and Communal Identity as a Contribution to a Metaphysics of the Person," (PhD Dissertation, University of Leuven, 1998), 15.

³⁰ Fr. Vitaliano Dimaranan, "Walking on Water Like Peter and Jesus: A Retreat for Priests and Religious," (*Lantayan: A Pastoral-Theological Journal*, Volume 5, No. 1, - First Semester 2006-2007): 7-50.

³¹ La Guardia, Renan Michael. "Pebbles on the Cosmic Beach: From a Metaphysics of Interrelatedness Towards the Ethics of Contributionism in Charles Hartshorne's Process Thought." Dissertation, (Ateneo de Manila University, 2001), 111.

³² Lowe, *Understanding Whitehead*, 20.

³³ Hartshorne, *Reality as a Social Process*, 64.

³⁴ *Ibid.* [Emphasis is Hartshorne's].

³⁵ Charles Hartshorne, "Man in Nature," in Irwin Lieb, ed., *Experience, Existence, and the Good: Essays in Honor of Paul Weiss*, (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961), 93.

³⁶ Hartshorne, *A Natural Theology*, 113.

³⁷ Hartshorne, *Omnipotence*, 25-26. [Emphasis is Hartshorne's].

³⁸ Hartshorne, *Reality as Social Process*, 41.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁴⁰ Cf. Whitehead, *Reality and Process*, 532.