

COMMENTS ON GOD, NEO-NATURALISM AND A. N. WHITEHEAD'S PHILOSOPHY¹

William C. Tremmel

God is, to use James Bisset Pratt's interesting phrase, "the Determiner of Destiny."

W. H. Bernhardt²

I

Alfred North Whitehead's contributions to the religious philosophy of Neo-Naturalism (Immanentism) is extensive, but his final handling of the category of God is somewhat disappointing; this is because he limits God's dimension in creative process. In Whitehead's view both the world and God are anchored in creativity. Creativity is basic, not God. Things are not caused (given actuality) because of God, nor do they achieve their full status as actual occasions because of God, but do so because of what Whitehead identifies as the "principle of creativity."³ Both world and God are in the grip of creative process.

At this point Whitehead's God ceases being of essential value to an immanentist who sees God as the definitive source of creation and process--sees God as that that causes things to be (including the entire universe), and makes it possible for all things (including that universe) to become what they (and it) can become. Whitehead's God falls short of what God needs to be to be God, or so it might appear. This may not be complete rupture, for one can, perhaps, reform Whitehead's God category to include the dimension of creativity. I shall make an initial attempt to do this. Relying on Whitehead's philosophical thought, I shall,

William C. Tremmel has been a minister in Colorado, Professor of Religion at Kansas State College (Emporia), and at the present time Professor of Religion at The University of South Florida at Tampa. He has maintained a long association with Iliff, and has published several articles in this journal.

first, sketch briefly those categories of reality as stated in Whitehead's Panentheism that are pertinent to immanentistic thought.⁴

In viewing the categories of reality (as I endorse them to be and as I understand them to be in Whitehead's view), I should first identify the basic metaphysical assumption upon which they all depend. It is the presupposition that *everything changes*: this is a universe in which every actual entity, and system of actual entities (including the total cosmos), is driven by creative process and moves in creative advance. This is, of course, Whitehead's process metaphysics.

II

As Whitehead sees it, the Major categories exemplifying this ubiquitous creative process are:

1) *Novelty*. Every occasion in time is a new occasion. It is an occasion that has just come into being. There is nothing like it anywhere else, or ever has been, or ever will be again. Ontologically speaking "becoming" is a better word for any occasion, for any actual entity, for any new thing, than is "being" for occasions are always becoming, always changing, always new. Each spread-out moment is different from the preceding moment. It may be a moment as big as the universe, or as small as a sparkle of sunlight on the water, but it is a unique moment--it is new. The right now which is all the now there is, is always a new now. You can't step in the same river even once.

2) *Prehension*. Every occasion in time, every happening, is a grasping of all that preceded it: all that went into making it an actual entity. It is a systematizing of its past. Each entity in its becoming gathers up as its data for becoming all that went before it; and then, when it has fulfilled its maturity, it becomes the data for all that is to follow it. This ecological order, this interrelatedness, is world-wide. A person

comes into existence (a baby is born) and all subsequent happenings in the world are modified to some degree by this event. A frog jumps into a pond and ripples spread out not only across the pond, but across the universe. A clumsy drummer drops a cymbal in the old Buchtel Chapel and eventually the outmost planet in the farthest galaxy trembles. All that have been are the data for the becoming of what is right now. All that ever was is still a living influence in the newness of every emerging moment. When each right now fulfills itself, it is prehended as a datum for the becoming of the next now, and the next, and the next, and the next.

3) *Possibilities (eternal objects)*. This category, in Whitehead's philosophy, is constituted of the envisagement, or the conceptual entertainment, of all the possibilities available to the ever emerging, becoming cosmos; and the becoming of everything in the cosmos. Process proceeds in terms of options; i.e., by the appropriating of certain options from among the many possibilities of what might possibly be. According to Whitehead, these options, these possibilities, are conceptual forms residing in the "primordial" dimension of God (as Whitehead calls it). They act not only as options, but also as lures coaxing that the more ideal forms among the options be chosen.

An ever emerging newness is possible only if there are possibilities for change. A new entity, a new occasion, occurs because it has a possibility not only toprehend its past, but also to appropriate a possible future. The number of possibilities seems infinite, beyond imagination. There is a whole universe of possibilities for becoming, for relating, for improving, for error, for fulfillment, for failure, for whatever, and they can be critical possibilities.

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both . . .
And that has made all the difference.⁵

These possibilities that beckon and coax and cancel each

other out are not actual entities themselves, but eternal, everpresent, interrelated abstractions--eternal objects (Whitehead calls them). Actual entities and actual occasions exemplify possibilities *ex post facto*. Whatever is, is something that appropriated certain abstract possibilities in its becoming; but *ante facto* there are no "real," no actual entity possibilities. There are only abstract beckonings too numerous and too complicated ever fully to recognize, ever to comprehend completely in their complexity.

4) *Subjective Aim*. This is the goal of maturity for any actual entity in its becoming--the genetic direction toward which any becoming entity is properly directed. (E.g., in the fertilized embryo the human being is properly aimed at a mature--physically, emotionally, mentally, spiritually--adult human being; in positive-negative fusion, some 500,000 years after the Big Bang, nuclei and electrons "froze" into a collection of electromagnetically neutral atoms aimed at the production of an atomic world.)

5) *Cosmic Aim* (superjection). Some possibilities are more probable than others because creative process is not random advance, but directional advance. Borrowing for the moment some of the insights of Pierre Teilhard as he contemplated 4.6 billion years of earth's development, we can see a progression of complexification beginning in geogenetics, then moving inexorably to biogenetics, and finally to noogenetics--from geosphere, to biosphere, to noosphere. As William Carruth said it:

A fire-mist and a planet,
A crystal and a cell,
A jellyfish and a saurian,
And caves where the cavemen dwell;
Then a sense of law and beauty,
And a face turned from the clod,
Some call it Evolution,
And others call it God.⁶

In each forward advance one sees a prehension of the past, and an appropriation of certain possibilities, and an emergence of cosmic newness. Each stage of advance evidences both increase in complexity and system-wide unity. Complexification appears to have been an all-pervading tendency in the history of our world, but not more so than interrelatedness and sociality.

There appears to be a preferred direction to creative process, and this tendency makes some possibilities more probable than others. What the Omega point is, is unseeable at the moment, and may be so forevermore, but at least it has been speculated upon in Plato's ideal forms, and in Teilhard's ultra-hominisation of the noosphere, and in Whitehead's forever emerging actual occasions of contrast and unity. It is exemplified in the incessant cosmic quest for final goodness and beauty.

Whatever the specific aims may be, there is evidence of direction and order in creative advance. Ours is an orderly universe. It is going somewhere. It has cosmic aim.

6) *Consciousness*. Basically this is a feeling universe, a universe that is aware, a universe that is "conscious." When a balloon bounces in a breeze there is feeling/awareness/consciousness. When the magma erupts, Mt. St. Helens feels it, is aware of it, is conscious of it; and so is the magma. A sunflower turns its face in a love affair with the sun. The roots of an oak tree push their way into the septic tank "looking" for water. An educated ape named Koko tells lies. Plato explores the mysteries of the forms of things, and Freud explores the mysteries of the mind that explores the mysteries of the forms of things. It is all feeling, awareness, consciousness.

Teilhard suggests that with the emergence of the noosphere, the world became not just conscious, but self-conscious. Before humankind, life was a vast array of separate branches organized in a pattern of ecological interreactions, but with the emergence of the noosphere, through its developing pool of thought, evolution became not just a conscious process, but became a

self-conscious, thinking process. The world finally became conscious of itself. It became a self-conscious thinking world.

By a deep wide river, he sat down;
With his head in his hands,
God thought and thought,
Till he thought: I'll make me a man!⁷

7) *Creativity*. All the above is caught in advancing, creative process. Creativity is the desire that drives all creative process toward continuing diversity-in-unity (or unity-in-diversity)--the passion for creative process, for novelty, for newness in experience, in life, in feeling.

The many ingress into the one; and are increased by one; which is to say (in reverse) the one prehends the many and becomes a novel actual entity, a new actual occasion. This is the *how* of it, but what is the *why* of it? The *why* is a driving power called creativity. It is the dynamic (or the dynamics) of *everything changes*. It is the metaphysical power base of all that is real existence. It is "that ultimate principle by which the many, which are the universe disjunctively, become the one actual occasion, which is the universe conjunctively."⁸

And God stepped out on space,
And he looked around and said:
I'm lonely--
I'll make me a world.⁹

According to Whitehead, however, it was not God who decided to make a world, but creativity that "decided" to make a world; and this, according to Whitehead, because creativity has authority over both the world in its endless becoming, and over God in God's prehension of this world's endless becoming (in God's consequent nature, as Whitehead calls it). In Whitehead's words, "neither God, nor the world, reaches static completion," but both are "in the grip" of a reality more ultimate than either, namely, "the creative advance into novelty."¹⁰

8) *Objective Immortality*. "The moving finger writes; and

having writ, moves on: nor all your piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line."¹¹ There is a perishing, as Omar saw it, but there is also a continuation of the perished actual occasions in the ongoing feeling, memory, living, passing present. Occasions perish as subjective (living) entities. They cease to live, to change, to become, but they do remain as objective realities in the ongoing creative process of the world; and in the prehensions of God's consequent nature (as Whitehead calls it). Whatever happens, every actual entity, every actual occasion, in its perishing, becomes eternally fixed. It is preserved as an aspect of each progressing "right now." What has happened has lost its ability to choose and change, but has not itself been lost. It remains as the fixed datum of the emerging spread-out present. According to Whitehead, it has "objective immortality." It survives as an immortality of influence, and it survives as itself in the consequent nature of God.

To see Whitehead's view on this subject one must refer to his thinking on the consequent nature of God. This aspect of God is the temporal aspect--the aspect which is God's forever becoming. It is "the physical prehension by God of [the] actualities of the evolving universe."¹² This is God in temporality--God becoming, changing "with every other creative act."¹³

In this dimension, God's "being" is constituted by a process of becoming. This means, among other things, that God's "derivative nature is consequent upon the creative advance of the world."¹⁴ Not only the world, but God too is affected by each actual occasion in the cosmos, and the effect on God is from everlasting to everlasting. God prehends the occasions of the world, stores them, and passes them on as data for the new occasions of the world. Nothing is lost. It lives forever in the "silent memory" of God.

III

Additional Comments on Neo-Naturalism and Whitehead's Especially Congenial Categories

Immanentists declare God to be that in the world, the cosmos, the environing medium, that (1) causes things to be and, as creative process, sets the stage and supplies the impulse for things to become what they can become; (2) and is the final source to which humans turn in their effort to preserve religious values--to deal positively with those aspects of human existence that are disruptively (even at times horrendously) non-manipulable. Stated more technically by one of the primary figures in neo-naturalistic/immanentistic thought, William Henry Bernhardt:

The concept God designates that character, aspect, phase, or behavior of one's environing medium to which man appeals for religious values. More specifically, God is the religious name for the dominant phase, or the controlling power in reality as a whole, the power to which we ally ourselves, or with which we identify ourselves in our search for religious values. God is, to use James Bissett Pratt's interesting phrase, "the Determiner of Destiny."¹⁵

Again in a chapter entitled "the Logic of Absolute Immanence," Bernhardt asserted that in this system of theological thought, "God is defined in wholly immanent terms . . . no positive affirmations are made concerning God as a reality presumably transcending the Existential Medium, namely, that in which we live and move and have our being . . . God is defined by this school of religious thought as wholly, completely or absolutely immanent."¹⁶ In another place Bernhardt writes, "The logic of Absolute Immanence rests upon two assumptions: (i) Religious needs are continuous with other human needs, and find their satisfaction on the same level where they arise; and (ii) Religious thinking is also continuous with other forms of human thinking and must use recent methodologies in solving its problems."¹⁷

God is to be found in the natural order, and by rational/em-

pirical (modern) methods of fact and truth discovery. Whitehead, also, so identifies God, and the cognitive quest for God, and, in the astuteness of his philosophical observations, has much to offer immanentistic theological/philosophical speculation.

IV

Some Immanently Congenial Whiteheadian Categories

Whitehead's basic congeniality with neo-naturalistic/immanentistic thought is, of course, his whole process metaphysics, and his insistence on the natural order as both the locus of God, and the proper source of all God-knowledge. He sees a world of endless becoming; a world wherein there is order and purpose, and wherein options for newness are forever available. God's Primordial Nature, as Whitehead calls it, is (not unlike Plato's ideal forms) the conceptual entertainment of all the possible structures of existence. Such options/possibilities must be somewhere because their appropriation is everywhere evident in the ongoing processes of the natural order. Whitehead declares them to be in God. An immanentist might wince at this, asserting, perhaps, that possibilities emerge not out of God, but with the unfolding order itself; yet the obvious fact remains that possibilities which apparently have no status as objective facts are, at least, real as abstractions.

These possibilities stand not only as possibilities for change, but as lures to ideal creative advance. They are value forms. Through them the world, and its various parts, not only change, but change in the direction of greater diversity-in-unity. As possibilities, as ideal forms, these "eternal objects" (to use Whitehead's term), wherever they are, in nature or in God (or in both) stand as aesthetic and moral allurements to an ever emerging present. The cosmos, in all its parts, is endlessly coaxed to more perfect systems of complexification and order. In Whitehead's thought, this aesthetic concern is basic. Although Whitehead did not name it so (but an immanentist might), this

superjection might be called the "passion" of God's creative nature.

Whitehead's conception of God's Consequent Nature finds much endorsement in general immanentistic thought. Not unlike Plato's demiurge (demiurgos) of the *Timaeus*, Whitehead's God in final analysis has the characteristics of a divine artisan. God does not create the world, but works in its creation--in its creative advance.

In Whitehead's thought, God is not simply the cosmos unfolding in natural process. God is real, which means in Whitehead talk that God is an actual entity--even as the world is an actual entity, or a cricket is an actual entity, or a freight train is an actual entity. The major difference between God's actuality and that of worlds, crickets, and trains is that God is beginningless. God is the supreme case of actual entity while all other actual entities are lesser actualities, rising and perishing in their lesser becomings.

Other categories of Whiteheadian God-talk that are also congenial to immanentist talk are:

Cosmic Prehension. God prehends the world. The world is God's biography. Just as a person is not only his immediate changing self, but all that preceded him and were the data of his becoming, so is the cosmos the datum of God's "selfhood," of God's becoming.

Subjective Aim. At the start of each becoming thing (each actual occasion) God establishes the possible, proper, maturity (the fullness) of that thing--its aim. At the genetic beginning of each actual entity a template is presented; e.g., the aim of an acorn is to be an oak tree; the aim of a man/woman embryo is to become a human being (a mature adult human). This template business is one of God's involvements in creative process.

Objective Immortality. Because God prehends all the past, and thus preserves all past occasions (all actual entities and systems of actual entities), God embodies the past. Immortality

is in God. Things in their perishing, as we observed, do not cease to be. They continue to exist as influence in the ongoing creative advance of the world, and they continue to exist in the prehensions of God. All is eternally preserved in the "rememberings" of God.

Creativity. It is with the category of creativity that Whitehead's theology loses ground in immanentistic theology. Whitehead identifies creativity as the fundamental metaphysical fact of all reality. Both the world and God are in the grip of an ultimate power that transcends and drives all reality. If this is the way it is, creativity is God; and God, in God's primordial and consequent natures, is simply several functional principles of creative advance. Creativity is that that causes occasions to be, and God is simply that that endows them with subjective aim, offers them possibilities for change, and coaxes them to appropriate their most ideal possibilities.

This is not the only reasonable interpretation of creativity in Whitehead's philosophy. Instead of being the basic metaphysical character of reality, creativity can reasonably be identified as another aspect of God. Just as the creative aspect of God's primordial nature is the supplying of subjective aim, and the offering of possibilities (eternal objects) and aesthetic allurements for the creative advance of the world, the creative aspect of God's nature is the active desire to drive creative advance endlessly onward. God does not create by fiat, or with omnipotence, but with passion to have becoming happen. In God's creative dimension, God is the source of creative dynamic, the principle of process, a divine impulse--a passion to change. Just as God envisages possibilities, God emotes creative process.

Self-Consciousness. Whitehead discerns not only consciousness in God, but self-consciousness as well. God is not only aware as a balloon bouncing in the wind is "aware," but God knows that God is aware. God is conscious of God's being conscious. God is self-conscious; and this is not an unreasonable inference

to be extrapolated from panentheistic thought to immanentistic thought.

In humans, the human body in its encounter with its existential, dynamic environment gives rise to "person." Person transcends body in that it is not reducible to its physical origins. Person is more than "the sum of its parts." Furthermore, person has creative influence over the body. It can set goals for the body, stimulate physical process, create art forms for the body to accomplish, establish behavior patterns, and so forth.

Why not the same with God? Without distorting immanentistic categories, it seems reasonable that we, with Whitehead, might hypothesize that the world gives rise to the divine person--to one that envisages infinite possibilities (eternal objects) and one with a passion to create, and one with the ability to allure emerging entities and occasions (including the whole world) to appropriate those ideal possibilities. God is real. The very cosmos itself (the creative process) causes the personhood of God to be. Why not? Perhaps analogy will help with all this.

V

The Human Analogy:

Out of what might be regarded as a passion for creative process (for novelty, newness, life, feeling) the initial act of procreation is performed. Our children are conceived. In this act of conception the *subjective aim* of their lives is set down genetically. This, however, is not an act of absolute creation. It is merely an essential feature of initial creation. It is an actual occasion that sets in motion a process of becoming which will to a large degree be *self-creating* as it appropriates the possibilities of its becoming--as, among other things, our children, over the years, choose what they shall become (lawyer, doctor, merchant, thief), and how they shall become it.

There is, of course, in the parent's mind the "ideal becoming" that he or she should become (the parental desire); and this desire will be presented coaxingly before the becoming child; but it may not happen. The child may choose otherwise; may choose a lesser goal (something less than the parent's Platonic desire for him or her for the parent does not create omnipotently but influentially.)

The influence works both ways. Parent and child become involved in a system of mutual *prehensions*, which effect newness in their ongoing selves: which creates new selves. The inter-relating is different in one major aspect. The parent is an essential relationship in the child's life--the genetic relationship. Without that particular parent (those particular parents) there would be no child to become an adult. This is not the case in the prehension of child by parent. My life changes because of the children, but it doesn't begin because of them. I am, in this situation, the supercase. I do not need them for my existence; but they did need me. However, once they become, once the process of their being is established, my life is forever changed by their being. They are gathered up, prehended, in my ongoing reality, and for good or ill, joy or sorrow, my life is forever changed.

There is another aspect of the relationship between parents and children that is important to note: it is the fact of *objective immortality*. The fantastic and marvelous things that children do (in the eyes of their parents), and the horrible things they may do (in anybody else's eyes) fall into the past. They perish as living occasions. They are no longer immediate, subjective experiences; but they take on an objective immortality. They continue as a living part of the parent's life, and in the parent's memory--sometimes even more vividly than when the fantastic, marvelous, horrible, thing first happened.

The Divine Parallel: God and the World

God's relationship to the world is not unlike a parent's

relationship to a child.

1) Each aspect of the world's becoming is initiated in the passion of God to create, to set into motion new becoming, new reality. One major aspect of God's consequent nature (God's dynamic, changing, in-the-world nature) is the passion for novelty, newness, life, enrichment--aesthetic, moral, spiritual perfection. Each actual occasion, each actual entity, emerging in the world's ongoing, creative process is evidence of this divine creative passion.¹⁸

2) God enters "genetically" into each emerging occasion, each actual entity, by supplying the initial creative act and subjective aim for that ongoing occasion, for that developing entity.

3) The new occasion, prehending all that went before it, then advances (self-creates) into its future by appropriating various of the possibilities available to it.

4) Whatever actualities emerge through the occasion's appropriation of the possibilities offered to it and are then gathered up in the ongoing process of the world, are prehended by God. God's joy or suffering is increased as these choices reflect advance or decline in aesthetic value--in beauty or ugliness as envisioned by God in God's superjective (ideal) vision of a world of harmonious complexity.

5) All that is gathered up is retained. It takes on objective immortality. It is preserved not only as a source datum for the ongoing world, but is preserved also joyfully or sorrowfully in the memory of God.

As my father lives on in me as the gene transmitter of my paternal ancestry all the way back to the first of my kind, and as a dynamic influence in the ongoing of my development toward maturity, and as a loving memory, so does the past of the whole world continue in objective immortality in the ongoing "life" and "memory" of God. There are, of course, differences: my prehensions are limited, God's are not. I trace my ancestry to a

limited past, and my development to a limited system of encounters--grandfather, father, teachers, wife, children, books, adventures, etc. God traces God's ancestry to the entire past--to a past that had no beginning. It may be that the particular world we experience had its beginning some 4.6 billion years ago, but the logic of Whiteheadian metaphysics demands that since God had no beginning God's world had no beginning either. God does not need this particular world (this kind of world), but God needs *some* world. There always was a world because the consequent nature of God entails it.

Also, behind me there are ancestors and conditioning influences that I personally never met or directly experienced; thus I could not possibly remember them; and besides I have a faulty memory. Much of my past life has slipped away into forgetfulness; but not so with God. Not only are all past worlds prehended as conditioning elements in God's ongoing nature, but all past occasions live in God's unfailing "remembering." Occasions in their subjectivity perish, but not in their objective once-having-beenness. In God all is retained.

In all of this we can see (from my modified Whiteheadian position) that human personhood is not an unreasonable analogy when trying to envision a personhood of God. Can God not be regarded as the supercase of personhood?

C. S. Lewis someplace (in his *Mere Christianity*, I think) reports on a student who once expressed his distress over the usual Michelangelo (or even Santa Claus) way of portraying God--grand old man with a beard--and confessed, when questioned, that he personally thought of God as a great oblong blur. Lewis admitted that many people surely anthropomorphize God in a belittling sort of way--whittle God down to more manageable size--but that he personally regarded "person" as a more empirically legitimate and religiously meaningful metaphor than oblong blur, great or otherwise.

Charles Hartshorne argues even more persuasively that God is

not only personlike but is most basically characterized by humankind's most central and admirable quality--love. He tells us that we cannot know "what it is qualitatively like to be an atom but only what it is like to be a man doing things with atoms." It is therefore "perfectly 'logical'" to look to human experience for a model for reality rather than to "matter." "If love is the central reality of human experience, as science itself now testifies, then the idea that love, rather than stuff or bare spatiotemporal process, is the key to the universe is simply good epistemology. Also biology is finding that the social principle pervades all life, and this means that there is no anthropomorphism in taking love to be central to life at least."¹⁹

Alfred North Whitehead puts the personhood of God into philosophical perspective and identifies the consequent nature of God to be fundamentally "a tenderness which loses nothing that can be saved."²⁰

The wisdom of [God's] subjective aim prehends every actuality for what it can be in . . . a perfect system--its sufferings, its sorrows, its failures, its triumphs, its immediacies of joy--woven by rightness of feeling into the harmony of the universal feeling, which is always immediate, always many, always one, always with novel advance, moving onward and never perishing. The revolts of destructive evil, purely self-regulating, are dismissed into their triviality of merely individual facts; and yet the good they did achieve in individual joy, in individual sorrow, in the introduction of needed contrast, is yet saved by its relation to the completed whole. The image . . . under which this operative growth of God's nature is best conceived, is that of a tender care that nothing be lost.²¹

If what I have been saying is reasonable from an immanent-alistic, panentheistic (Whiteheadian) perspective, then it should be reasonable to think of God as possessing self-conscious personhood--as being, in fact, the supreme case of personhood in the universe as apparently humans are the supreme case of personhood in the biosphere.

ENDNOTES

1. Sometime 1938-41, Charles Milligan, with Iliffian taunts, lured me from comfortable "sophomore atheism." He trapped me into the world of Lindsay B. Longacre, Martin Rist, Harvey Potthoff and, especially, William H. Bernhardt, who, among other things, identified a basic element of the functional defining of religion as "reinterpretation," in which, among other things, one attempts to identify the nature of God. Cured of atheism, I am not yet cured of reinterpretation, as here indicated.
2. *The Iliff Review*, winter 1946, p. 25.
3. Alfred North Whitehead's *Process and Reality* is available in four editions with different paginations: Macmillan (1929), Cambridge (1929), Harper Torchbook (1960), and a "corrected" edition Free Press (1978). The Harper Torchbook is a reprint of Macmillan (1929), hence with the same pagination. To make checking references consistent, all references in this article use the Harper/Macmillan pagination. This reference is on p. 32.
4. In Immanentism, Whitehead's work might better be interpreted not as *pan-en-theos* (all-in-God), but as *theos-en-pan*, because Immanentism usually talks of God as the dynamic, creative aspect (or aspects) of the natural order. The order is not so much in God as God is in the order. In basic meaning the two terms (panentheism and immanentism) mean the same thing; namely, that all the actual occasions and entities of natural existence are either constituents of or aspects of both the world and God.
5. Robert Frost, "The Road Not Taken," from *The Poetry of Robert Frost*, ed. Edward Connery Lathem (New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, 1966), p. 105.
6. "Each In His Own Tongue," found in *The World's Great Religious Poetry* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 145.
7. James W. Johnson, "The Creation" from *God's Trombones* (New York: Viking, 1965), p. 20.
8. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 31.
9. Johnson, *God's Trombones*, p. 17.
10. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 529.
11. *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, trans. Edward Fitzgerald (New York: The Outing Publishing Co.), quatrain LI.

12. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 134.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 523.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 523-524.
15. *The Iliff Review*, winter 1946, p. 25.
16. *The Cognitive Quest for God and Operational Theism* (Denver: The Criterion Press, 1958), p. 48.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
18. Unlike Whitehead's God and world "gripped in creativity," I am here proposing, as stated elsewhere, that creativity is an aspect of God's consequent nature. It is the emotive, feeling, self-conscious, aspect. It is (in Whitehead's terms) to God's Consequent Nature as the eternal objects are to God's Primordial Nature.
19. Charles Hartshorne and William L. Reese, *Philosophers Speak of God* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 301.
20. Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, p. 525.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 525.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.