

Hartshorne asks, What makes becoming "the inclusive or concrete form of reality"? He answers: Because of "the unique relatedness or relativity of becoming" (*CSPM*: 26 f.).

But, then, my question is, Why isn't this answer sufficient? What need is there, *metaphysically*, to add—as he insists on adding—Because becoming is "experience or awareness as such"?

The qualification, "metaphysically," is important. There may very well be a need to add this *philosophically*—when philosophy is about its second, more concrete, inclusive, *existential* task, as distinct from its first, more abstract, included, *analytic* task.

26 February 2006