

According to Hartshorne, "the principle of process" is that "the togetherness of what-does-not-become-and-what-becomes itself becomes . . . with the consequence that reality in its inclusive sense coincides with process (as something *indicated*, not merely named; process-now, not just process taken generically) and the further consequence that God, or reality itself, is Process-itself, our God now, more inclusively than [God] is immutable or eternal Being-itself" ("Tillich's Doctrine of God": 194).

But why should this principle of process be affirmed? Aside from the dialectical argument that the alternative principle—that fixed being is inclusive—has the consequence of denying the reality of process altogether (169), there is the appeal to our direct experience: "[O]ur experience, itself a process, discloses only processes and what can be abstracted therefrom[.] A 'being' which is neither any process nor any datal constituent of process, but something *simpliciter* more inclusive than all process—this *cannot*, it seems, have literal meaning, for nothing of the sort appears in experiencing!" (195).

March 1998