Table of Contents

"Only by standing aside from any phenomenon and taking an overview can you discover its operative principles and lines of force." (McLuhan 1969)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Transversality against stereotypes

It is commonplace to see both African and European-based thought as the result of both legacies and trajectories of disparate worlds: they have portrayed each other stereotypically – and negatively – with the former as the central and primary repository of the communal impetus; the latter awash in the collateral personal damage of the Enlightenment – both viewing each other as monolithic; adherents of the former lifting up vestiges of tribal perspectives and the latter known sociologically and philosophically, and primarily, for its obsession with soul-less individualism.

The following extended 1960s-era expression of stereotypes, from a Northern/Western context is worthy of note:

> Before the invention of the phonetic alphabet, man lived in a world where all the senses were balanced and simultaneous, a closed world of tribal depth and resonance, an oral culture structured by a dominant auditory sense of life. The ear, as opposed to the cool and neutral eye, is sensitive, hyperaesthetic and all-inclusive, and contributes to the seamless web of tribal kinship and interdependence in which all members of the group existed in harmony. The primary medium of communication was speech, and thus no man knew appreciably more or less than any other-which meant that there was little individualism and specialization, the hallmarks of 'civilized' Western man. Tribal cultures even today simply cannot comprehend the concept of the individual or of the separate and independent citizen. Oral cultures act and react simultaneously, whereas the capacity to act without reacting, without involvement, is the special gift

of the 'detached' literate man. Another basic characteristic of distinguishing tribal man from his literate successors is that he lived in a world of acoustic space, which gave him a radically different concept of time-space relationships. (McLuhan, 1969)

Against stereotype, it is the contention of this interpretive work that differences are of degree, not of kind or logic, distilled in differences and similarities of communication and epistemological drive transversally discovered. This conversational interface between the relational ontologies of ubuntu and of the philosophy of organism will be the "interdisciplinary space for thinking between more than one knowledge system or reasoning strategy" (Van Huyssteen 1998:25).

This interdisciplinary conversation seeks to facilitate a rational, transversal conversation between the speculative cosmology of English mathematician and philosopher A.N. Whitehead – as primarily expounded in his (1978) *Process and Reality,* originally presented as a University of Edinburgh Gifford Lecture in "An Essay in Cosmology" and subsequently commonly known as 'process'[1] thought - and the operative principles and lines of force and congruent attractions and repulsions in the African concept of ubuntu[2] as "the fundamental identity and responsibility of the privileged human position

---

1   For an essential perspective on 'process' ontologies see Seibt *et. al* 2003: Introduction. We acknowledge here the strong *caveat* by Seibt (2005:2) against a formal equation of the terminology and structure of the philosophy of organism with the nomenclature of 'process' . It is employed here and throughout as a shorthand reference, aware of the formal inadequacy of its usage.
2   Notwithstanding the tradition in English citations of italicizing non-English words, it will be the convention of this project not to italicize the indigenous African word ubuntu - unless in a direct citation - for two reasons: (i) as commonplace acknowledgment that the legacies of the history of South Africa introduced upon the world stage the historically and paradoxically inter-related language, concepts and lived manifestations of both apartheid and ubuntu. Their introduction and subsequent inclusion into the English-language world-vernacular has mitigated the 'foreign' nature of both concept and language; and (ii) further to (i), italicizing one of the partners in this present

in the cosmic order" (Forster 2010b:7). Ubuntu has been arguably translated from one or more of the official South African languages as "a person is a person through other persons" (cf. e.g. Louw 2001:1, Forster 2010a, Forster 2010b, *et al.)*. Gade is instructive in noting that "there is no agreement on what '*ubuntu'* itself means" and in his opining that opposition to racial segregation gave rise to a "particular *new* idea, that *ubuntu* means the people are connected" (emphasis original) (2012:487). This work's ubuntu-process hypothesis and hermeneutic are both based on that very idea.

It is the basis of this transversal conversation that the streams of thought of ubuntu and Whitehead's, commonly-called 'process' thought, are not contradictory by virtue of their distinct conceptual origins in culturally and geographically-opposed hemispheres, but rather two expressions of the same existential and speculative, imaginative-yet-lived worldview - that of a relational ontology (cf. Forster 2010b). We examine intersubjectivity of the thought and behavioural parameters of both systems by way of both examination and critical engagement to reveal the liminal and blended space between the systems and among the internal components of each. It is the goal of our thesis to contribute meaningfully within the "ambivalence, the complexity and variety to be found in both African and Western communities" (Muller 2015:2).

We will find that the internal spaces of each and the shared space of ubuntu-process conversation form the message-bearing medium of postfoundationalist intersubjective relational ontology.

---

transversal conversation could be seen, unhelpfully, as privileging the 'European' partner in this dialogue with the consequence of the "other-ing" of its African interlocutor. For a sample discussion of an awareness of colonialist 'other-ing' see De Leon 2012.

1.2 Ubuntu-process

This project began as a thought experiment upon 'process' fieldwork to launch this particular European/Occidental-formulated system of thought in search of a lived example of its epistemological categories and intersubjectivity of being. Here, the transversal rationale places the philosophy of organism under the gaze of ubuntu in search of lived relevance and places ubuntu in a philosophical conversation with an interlocutor. This present work canalizes a multivalent flow of expressions and experiences between hemispheres of culture, epistemologies by way of cosmology, theodicies and narratologies.

This relationship which forms the basis of this present work is a conversation in the prehension and concrescence of mutually-encountering entities (whether speculative or 'real'). In the journey of laying out the conversation between 'process' thought and ubuntu we arrive at a unified yet internally variegated system of epistemology and ubuntu-process. A transversal encounter awaits in its modified integral theory, adapted critical realism and postfoundational embodied realism.

A fish does not know that she is in water (we are, of course, assuming this along with our silence as to a fish's drive to know) nor, in the case of gill fish, that she is 'filtering' water to extract oxygen in order to 'breath'. However, humans (and certain other sentients along the hierarchy of being) can know the physical, mental and metaphorical mediums in which we swim for our survival as a species and our identification as a

member of a society. Ubuntu and the philosophy of organism are seen as two sides of the same philosophical and existential river, two mutually-prehending objects/occasions which we will traverse, back and forth, alternately engaging and standing apart from each discipline to discern their respective "operative principles and lines of force" (McLuhan 1969).

1.3 Exegeting a postfoundationalist ubuntu

This work is an exploit of the intersubjective nature of the conversation between 'process' and ubuntu, as two disciplines each revealing their understandings and articulations of the intersubjectivity of life and thereby uncovering an epistemological postfoundational ubuntu-process capable of an expanded confidence in incorporating creaturely occasions of suffering as well as a transversal epistemological resource for a narratology. This goal will be achieved through an introductory distillation of key 'process' speculative cosmological/ontological categories with special attention to areas of both parallel convergence with and co-incident reverberation within the renown African aphorism ubuntu, variously translated; e.g. in Ramose (1999:49f), as "a person is a person through other persons". This synoptic accounting examines ubuntu tethered to the aphorism's African, cultural moorings while opening ubuntu's philosophical, anthropological and spiritual external limits and plumbing the depths of its internal relational ontology, moving it towards a postfoundational understanding of ubuntu.

At the outset, it must be acknowledged that while the lived application of ubuntu may be arguably understood as presuming a humanist moral impetus (e.g. Metz 2007:321,n3; 328, *passim*), the emphases of this present study is descriptive of an intersubjective

relational ontology by which a postfoundationalist ubuntu becomes with the philosophy of organism, an acceptance of a humanist explication which renders in its transversal conversation a conjoint, and all-encompassing, systematic cosmology, theology, theodicy, and narratology.

1.4. The conversational journey

The structure of this transversal conversation - between its introduction (1.0) and suggested trajectories of further investigation (5.0) – is in three sections: (2.0) "Whitehead's process ontology, where processes are structured productions with definitive result or culmination points...[as]...an ontology of events" (Seibt 2005:18), including an introduction to the eight descriptive fundamental categories of existence of the philosophy of organism; each interwoven with existential and philosophical affinities within the ubuntu worldview; (3.0) an exposition of Whitehead's 'process' ontological accounting of occasions of suffering; the ontological affinity of this 'process' schema and the inter-relatedness categorized by ubuntu relationships will invite that African aphorism into a hermenetic of dialogue with its interlocutor using the stepping stones of Whiteheadean categories; the challenging consideration of passive complicity of the divine realm in the "allowance" of creaturely suffering as the only alternative to a loss of free will be extended through a postfoundationalist portrait of ubuntu which does not pretend that suffering, evil and injustice is not part of the warp-and-woof of the creaturely domain; (4.0) the blended and dynamic space occupied by the relational activity and ontology of an ubuntu-process community is applied through a transversal conversation with neurolinguistics to reveal that the African aphorism reflected in the

aide memoire of the word ubuntu can be applied in the field of homiletics particularly and narratology generally.

1.5 Against dualisms of Cartesian, narrative and nostalgic natures.

The ubuntu-process systematic is a rejection by its conversational constituents of all bivalent, dualist thinking, notably the accepted transmission of Cartesian dualism:

> Ubuntu's respect for the particularity of the other, links up closely to its respect for *individuality* (emphasis given). But, be it noted, the individuality which Ubuntu respects, is not of Cartesian making. On the contrary, Ubuntu directly contradicts the Cartesian conception of individuality in terms of which the individual or self can be conceived without thereby necessarily conceiving the other (Louw 1998:4)

and the philosophy of organisms also diverges from Descartes

> by holding that what he has described as primary attributes of physical bodies are really the forms of internal relationships between actual occasions, and within actual occasions. Such a change of thought is the shift from materialism to organism, as the basic idea of physical science. (Whitehead 1978:309)

The historical observation is accepted here that oral expressions (preceded by pre-verbal expressions) predate written ones and that a community's ubuntu relationships preceded conceptual representations or orthography. However, a postfoundational ubuntu, against a McLuhanesque narratological gulf, acknowledges

> [t]he vanishing boundaries between orality and literacy that characterize contemporary African memory work, which is no longer restricted to enactments of traditional forms of remembrance. (Fabian 2006:147)

Müller (2015:1) offers a transversal navigational aid towards a postfoundationalist ubuntu by reflecting on two roles of nostalgia: optimistic and critical – respectively, "restorative and reflective". This ubuntu-process project maintains plural emphases on both restorative and reflexive presumptions of ubuntu's capacity to reflect its essential philosophical constructs and 'lived' experience, thereby revealing an expanded understanding of ubuntu and existential relevance of the philosophy of organism. This work (while respectful of the genealogy of ubuntu) is not a search for an Africa of "imperialist nostalgia" (Fabian 2006:146) in the face of – or, rather, in spite of – the advance of modernity, from which no country is left untouched.

To consider a concept reflexively – while accepting the widest etymology of reflexivity – is to gaze upon it as if by way of a rear window from a moving automobile wherein images may decrease in 'real' size (albeit not in felt importance). Congruently, to consider a lived experience restoratively is – while accepting the widest etymology of restoration – is an attempt to relocate 'that' , or portions of it, which held sway in the past and project it into a speculative future with the subject-object as the present-tense fulcrum.

An ubuntu-process rejection of all reflexive/restorative, 'lived'/speculative bivalence is fundamental to this project. We turn now to the multivalent cosmologies of ubuntu-process.

2.0 Philosophy of organism: a cosmology at the service of ubuntu

This program's five relational factors (2.1-2.4) set the stage for the philosophy of organism's ubuntu interface. The aphorism provides in its self-understanding the practical vectors toward which the conversation is necessarily directed, *via* the subsequent seven (2.5.1-2.5.7) components of this relational ontology. The direction of the conversation through these components will transition the relational ontology through acknowledgement of its postfoundational agenda, its acceptance of a bivalent uni-verse/pluri-verse.

The relational components set the stage for a discussion of the philosophy of organism's eight categories of existence and the subsequent conversation with a postfoundational result. We accept Whitehead's own caution (1978:7) against dogmatic certainty of ontological, philosophical structures and those who present them:

> The generalization is sound, but the estimate of success is exaggerated. There are two main forms of such overstatement. One form is what I have termed, elsewhere, the 'fallacy of misplaced concreteness.' This fallacy consists in neglecting the degree of abstraction involved when an actual entity is considered merely so far as it exemplifies certain categories of thought.

and in accord with his observation that

> [p]hilosophy has been haunted by the unfortunate notion that its method is dogmatically to indicate premises which are severally clear, distinct, and certain; and to erect upon those premises a deductive system of thought. (Whitehead 1978:8)

We proceed under the spectre of saying too much as well as too little. We strive to navigate in the liminal space. This *caveat* must also apply to any articulation of the African aphorism which would fail to confront the discussion as to whether or not ubuntu is a concept unique to a particular race or culture. Against all bifurcation, it is the

9

admitted hermeneutic here that a negative answer does not rule out the impact upon it by positively-prehended data unique to its worldview, nor does a positive answer rule out congruence with other relational ontologies.

With that introduction of worldview, while the overarching relational ontology of ubuntu-process provides both the internal speculative components and the 'superstructure' of this cosmology, the entry point and test of its veracity is in occasions when relations are strained by occasions of suffering, as a background to an understanding of the liminal space-time of narrative.

2.1 A postfoundationalist endeavour

The philosophy of organism engages a postfoundationalist understanding and applications of ubuntu, applied notably as a response to occasions of the range of creaturely sufferings – even as so far as to include that which any human culture would include under the rubric of 'evil'. This conversation considers fully an ubuntu account of occasions of suffering. This account enters into the topic of not only 'process' theoretical complicity of the divine in sufferings, which at every encounter await such resolution as God may offer in providing creaturely and cosmological advance, but also does not protect the human interconnectivity described, and lived, in ubuntu from complicity in its role in sufferings.

The fullest exegesis of 'a person is a person through other persons' then uncovers its humanistic-yet-metaphysical character in a postfoundationalist application of its central three components and contributors (1. a person, 2. the 'is' that is between those persons,

3. the other persons) to the field of communication. The discipline of neuroscience will be engaged to facilitate the process-ubuntu/ubuntu-process application of its relational ontology to narrative encounters. Parables taken from Hebrew scriptures and an African desert scene provide narrative touch-points for an ubuntu-process application.

Having placed the philosophy of organism at its service as an intersubjective interlocutor and drawing upon its ontological categories for exposition of its internal dynamics and a postfoundationalist external reach, the cosmological, theodical and narratological postfoundationalist applications of ubuntu reveals that the aphorism reflects an intersubjective systematic, not only reflective of "a strong humanist foundation from which to understand individuals' obligation to community" (Tschaepe[3] 2013:48) but also of a congruent physicality of the philosophy of organism which takes as its *sine qua non* both experienced physicality and speculative/metaphysical descriptive and prescriptive dynamics.

The ubuntu-process conversation is premised on the impossibility of the ultimate rendering of life or thought into divisions of 'real' and 'speculative' – notwithstanding cultural and scholarly suspicions - which we now address.

2.2 Suspicion of the speculative

Ubuntu-process cannot actually be internally divided into 'speculative' and 'lived': the speculative philosophy of 'process' has ontological implications arising from real life. The lived examples of ubuntu cannot be separated from the philosophical moorings

---

3 But without the dismissive anti-metaphysical firewall as presented by Tschaepe 2013.

evidenced at its every turn – no less than, at its best, the positive and healing reinvention of a society and at its worse in mimetic violence (addressed later) from which no member of a society is immune.

The applicability of speculative thought to existential questions is often doubted in voices arising not only from an understandable and deeply and painfully-learned African suspicion of, and/or outright rejection of, alien philosophies and pressures of modern internal and global pragmatic interests.

It is important also to note that suspicion (or outright rejection) of speculative philosophy/metaphysics by thinkers that such is untethered from the reality of lived experience – irrelevant at best, harking back to colonialism at worst - has common front with the likes of Marx, Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, to wit: "Despite all their differences, what unites the other exponents of self-realization is their common   critique of 'metaphysics' understood as a narcissistic attempt by reason to transcend the limits of language, or to evacuate the plenitude of time and history, by the elaboration of an eternally complete principle of ground or order or totality. Heidegger is the strongest voice here: as is well-known, he regards his 'event' as constituting a wholesale repudiation and destruction of the entire enterprise of philosophy'" (Bradley, 1991).

This conversation is between two systems, each admittedly liable to stereotypical oversimplification as one being heuristic (ubuntu) and the other systematic (philosophy of organism). That is not to say that a world of heuristic interactions is not without revelation of a system of internal organization, or order of interactions (and

interdependencies among the individual and the collective) just as speculative metaphysical systems can adequately indicate and diagnostically chronicle all human – and non-human - interactions.

Observers holding a suspicion that a European-originated speculative metaphysic is detrimentally value-less (i.e. morally suspect as an implicit exercise in neo-colonialism) when addressed towards (i.e. imposed upon) Africa are not alone in cautioning against philosophically *a priori* intellectual or scientific truth-claims. Whitehead himself challenges any equation of 'scientific' with 'objective' and value-free interpretations and schemes of explanations of all encounters of entities:

> Every scientific memoire in its record of the 'facts' is shot
> through and through with interpretation. The methodology of
> *rational* (emphasis added) interpretation is the product of the
> fitful vagueness of consciousness. (Whitehead 1978:15)

Those who reject any philosophical endeavour which does not take account of life as it is lived as irrelevant, also find intellectual accord in English empiricism and French enlightenment.[4] Whitehead himself speaks of the "social expression [of] the general consciousness of what in practice we experience" (Whitehead 1966:203) as a fundamental starting point of his philosophy – in harmony with lived ubuntu.

2.3 Conciliation in the liminal space: between the alligator and the hippo

---

4   English empiricists, Bacon, Locke, and Hume, rejected any rationalistic foundation—ontologically and epistemologically. These three philosophers were seen, explains Faber (2004:44-45), as "enemies of system" who demanded that empirical plurality prevail over constructed unities. The French Enlightenment philosophers, d'Alembert, Malebranche, and Voltaire, also criticized rationalist and subjectivist systems with an empiricism that claimed "a system could only be true *a posteriori* and not deduced from a priori categories."

This work seeks to provide a transversal meeting point of the two interpretive systems or schemes, aware of Whitehead's own critique:

> There may be rival schemes, inconsistent among themselves;
> each with its own merits and its own failures. It will then be
> the purpose of research to conciliate the differences.
> (Whitehead 1966:197)

This work begins with the assumption that conciliation between world views is a project worthy of the effort having first internalized the Whiteheadean rejection of a world of "Leibniz's windowless monads with their pre-established harmony" (Whitehead 1978:48) or to be truly Whiteheadean, even pre-established disharmony. This is a pursuit of comprehension of both systems.

 Phrasing this present conversation metaphorically (and it would be unwise to push the liminal and permeable boundaries of any metaphor's blended space too far in either direction), we are aware that the field of this transversal conversation risks at its limits a journey between a possible overly-defensive existential alligator on one side of the river and an all-too-esoteric hippo on the other.

At its best; this conversation reveals a constitutive intersubjectivity of a shared life on a single planet and the interconnectedness of ubuntu, delivered always in terms of the efficacious lightness of hopefulness and high ideals and loving personal and societal manifestations. However, life is not always experienced at its best. This conversation also reveals the capacity of ubuntu to provide an explanation of the worst in human

nature and how it happens that life at the nexus or mutual prehension of antagonists and protagonists provides the same space for destructive interactions.

Our parallel-yet-mutually-concrescent systematic journey will lead us through a dangerous and personal human journey discovering "how disturbingly intimate [is] the relationship between oppressed and his or her oppressor, the self and the other" (Brink 1966:199).

Ubuntu-process speaks to both thought-worlds and lived-worlds of relationships in which the 'good' and the 'bad' live in mutually overlapping proximity. Instances of the ubuntu "relational ontological approach to individual identity" (Forster 2010b:7) and the mental and physical convergences it outlines is congruent with the Whiteheadean "multiple nexus [describing] how those actual entities are really together in all subsequent unifications of the universe, by reason of the objective immortality of their real *mutual prehensions* (emphasis added) of each other" (Whitehead 1978:230).

2.4 The uncomfortable space

The blended space of such intersubjective mutual prehensions contains the essence of the Whitehead's philosophy of organism which reflects both the double function by which "[o]ne side makes process ultimate; the other side makes fact ultimate" (1978:7) – and ubuntu's ontology of interconnectedness. It can even be the site of physical, mental and emotional role interchanges.

In 1997 clinical psychologist Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela experienced such an ubuntu mutual prehension in a blended space-time during her prison interviews with former South African Police colonel Eugene de Kock.

She reflects on her experience which can only be described as embodying the fullest manifestation of ubuntu:

> Standing there stunned, in conversation with a broken man who had been an angel of death, I felt as if I were in the midst of a collision of scattered meanings within these prison walls that had enclosed our conversations. (Gobodo-Madikizela 2004:114)

A postfoundational ubuntu-process takes into full account all that has been, is, and will be encountered as subject-objects of that interface and the medium, and power of their mutual prehensions. In the following section, the 'interface and the medium" of such intersubjectivity is systemized in seven interrelated and mutually definitive relational fields.

2.5 A relational ontology of ubuntu-process

2.5.1 An ontology of 'events'

The simple phrase, transposed from its aphoristic shorthand, 'I am because you are' when drawing upon the 'process' exegetical and explanatory tool, reveals in its agents three-phase processive occasions/events/entities - i.e. (1)'I', (2) the interactive space between (3) us – as the active ingredients of the categorical constructs and relational *raison d'être* of the shared ubuntu-process relational ontology, to explain how it 'works'. Central Whiteheadean cosmological categories will be introduced and reflections on

their ubuntu natures will be discussed.

.

The philosophy of organism takes as its foundational ontology the interaction of agents. The actualities are *sina qua non* of the definitive relata- either positively or negatively experienced (prehended). In Whitehead's scheme, even negative prehensions, or relations, express the intersubjective "bond… [and]…"emotional complex" (Whitehead 1978: 41) between/among the agents involved. Being and acting are indistinguishable. The equation with ubuntu is evident: the active relation of the individual to the collective is determinative and definitive as an ontological reality.

"To grasp Whitehead's conception we have explicitly to abandon the customary way of thinking in terms of a substance which has qualities, as subject with its predicates. The entity is its acting" (Leclerc 1961:179). "[T]he actual world is a process...it belongs to the nature of a 'being' that it is a potential for every 'becoming' " (Whitehead 1978: 22). This 'becoming' is not a linear uni-directional process, just as a traditional ubuntu community, and its constituent members, experience the full community as including continual linkage of the past with the present projected into a future, i.e. the living and the no-longer-empirically-visible, as "the interrelationship between the 'living' and the 'living dead' (often referred to as the 'Ancestors')" (Forster 2010b:7). The presentational and relational intersubjective nodes of the philosophy of organism find both a speculative and no-less-lived affinity in the traditional African intersubjectivity of ubuntu, as observed by De Quincey (2005:182):

> more or less distinct centers within the vast and complex
> networks that surround us…Each of us is a meeting point, a
> center of convergence, for countless threads of relationship.

17

> We are moments in time and locations in space where the universe shows up…we emerge as *subjects* (emphasis added) from intricate networks of interrelatedness, from webs of intersubjectivity.

Whitehead expands De Quincey's use of 'subject' by articulation of the mutuality of interconnectedness in proffering the term 'superject' to account for the communal portion of novelty which transcends the subject offering it as novel datum for prehension and incorporation. An individual in an ubuntu community relies upon 'superject' information in order to become a properly-engaged subject-object.

> In the case of those actualities whose immediate experience is most completely open to us, namely, human beings, the final decision of the immediate subject-superject, constituting the ultimate modification of subjective aim, is the foundation of our experience of responsibility, of approbation or of disapprobation, of self-approval or of self-reproach, of freedom, of emphasis. This element in experience is too large to be put aside merely as misconstruction. It governs the whole tone of human life. (Whitehead 1978:47)

The advance into potential and prehended novel situations - from which even the familiar routines of life are not immune - is seen as the unavoidably on-going creativity of a multivalent universe (or rather, universe*s or* the pluri-verse). There are those (e.g. Yong 1998) who see strict and 'eternal' seriality in Whitehead's cosmological vectors. The philosophy of organism warns against such an interpretation: "the term 'creative advance' is not to be construed in the sense of a uniquely serial advance" (Whitehead 1978:35).

2.5.2 Not serial, not uni-directional

The philosophy of organism is not only *not* uni-directionally serial in its explanation of the continual evolutionary advance of the cosmos and presents a relational, ontological

structure of activity between subject and object which renders any understanding of a passive-in-the-interim, to be impossible. Expressed in another translation of ubuntu, "persons depend on persons to be persons" (Kruidenier 2015:3).

The intersubjectivity of ubuntu-process is a causal theory of relation "in which both relations and entities take their rise from an ontologically fundamental causal flux" (Wildman 2010).

> [I]n the African approach one cannot reduce identity simply to the experiences of the individual, or the perceptions of the group. One must employ an integrative approach that takes cognizance of both approaches. (Forster 2006)

The co-terminus of contrasts is an ontological given in the encounters of all entities, be they a collective, its individual constituents, or the process of their mutual relations. Total symmetry between the 'many' and the 'one' and, internal, among the 'many' that constitute the 'one, is not presumed and the expectation of an ontological state of stasis is contrary to the evolutionary model of ubuntu-process. On-going recalibrations of the relationship and source of data which comprises the mutual prehensions, concrescence and appropriations of 'process' eternal objects as provider and repository and final aim of relationships of imbalanced power as "no realized eternal object shall eliminate potential contrasts" (Whitehead 1978:278). Contrasts in life are not always – or hardly ever – without internal tensions in the shared space of their intersubjectivity. In fact, it is a philosophy of organism doctrine that each moment of ontological stability is by necessity accompanied by a concomitant degree of instability: "Every new condition can be absorbed into additional fullness of attainment. On the other hand, each condition is

19

exclusive, intolerant of diversities; except so far as it finds itself in a web of conditions which convert its exclusions into contrasts" (Whitehead 1978:223).

2.5.3 The transitoriness of events.

In the ebb and flow of an inter-personal conversation or encounter, the participants continue, to use Whitehead terminology, to mutually prehend each other in three ways: (1) for the duration of the encounter (2)in the not-yet-known future-tense contemplation of the yet-to-be-past shared space (and time!) and (3) the past event(s) in as much as it impacts the current one.

As Whitehead's philosophy or organism defines 'being' as perpetually dynamic, consisting of momentary balances arising out of imbalance as a transitory respite in the flux of all things. Any appearance of 'balance' presents itself in a fleetingly, momentary of "satisfaction" - between the 'then' and the 'not yet.' Any apparent balance occurs after past data has been considered (as a positive or negative prehension) and before the present data becomes eligible – by virtue of its contemporaneous existence – to be considered for ingression as "an element in the data of other entities superseding it" reflecting the experience of time in the present-yet-perishing in which it is felt that "[t]ime has stood still – if only it could" (Whitehead 1978:154). Whitehead typifies a sense of a momentary balance as a fleeting respite in the flux of things.

How to describe the datum of information which occupies each transitory moment? "The philosophy of organism presupposes a datum which is met with feelings, and progressively attains the unity of a subject" (Whitehead 1978: 155). 'Feeling' is the word

Whitehead uses to describe the intersubjective taking-account-of. For Whitehead the word 'feeling' includes the process through which "concrescent actuality appropriates the datum so as to make it its own" (1978:164) that datum is not limited to emotion: This understanding of data includes that which is positively appropriated into a subjective aim. An understanding and equation of the word 'feeling' solely with emotion is expanded in the philosophy of organism. 'Feeling' is the word Whitehead uses to describe "any kind of acting or being acted upon, in such a way that the make-up of the subject is affected" (Emmet 1966:142): "Feeling' is the term used for the basic generic operation of passing from the objectivity of the data to the subjectivity of the actual entity in question" (Whitehead 1978:40).

Each 'existant' in moments of the present is the satisfaction or resolution of intersubjectively- encountering subjects (which were, moments before, objects to be prehended and in successive moments and spaces will become "felt" as contributing to its successor existant. Whitehead prefers the word "superject" to refer to that which transcends its previous existent, awaiting subsequent valuation for consideration as part of a new existent: "This subject-superject is the universe in that synthesis and beyond it is nonentity" (Whitehead 1978:28) because 'it' has not yet been manifested in present space-time.

2.5.4 The One and the Many become one another

In this discussion of 'process, by which "[o]n one side, the one becomes many; and on the other side, the many become one" (Whitehead 1978:161) the

© University of Pretoria

individual as constitutive of the many and the many providing data for the individual – both mutually and intersubjectively definitive and constitutive.

Each processive moment is the result of decisions made by which, and in the nexus of which, we see "the reaction of the unity of the whole to its own internal determination. This reaction is the final modification of emotion, appreciation, and purpose. But the decision of the whole arises out of the determination of the parts, so as to be strictly related to it" (Whitehead 1978:25). In this transversal conversation, an ubuntu community also receives formative data from its constituents. A postfoundational process-ubuntu reading and experience of ubuntu begins with the hermeneutic of the primacy of societal influences upon its constituents and at the same time acknowledges the dynamic influence upon the subject-object "we" by its many constitutive "I"s.

A decidedly less-esoteric encounter of this intersubjective process was evidenced[5] on the infamous Robben Island[6] in the context of sport:

> The will to win had become endemic. This tension between
> mass participation and the celebration of individual skills and
> a real desire to be the best would prove to be one of the most
> volatile and debated elements of the sport of football on
> Robben Island. (Korr and Close 2008:166)

2.5.5 Being, Becoming and Perishing

The 'individual' both partially perishes and partially persists, with that-which-persists becoming 'new' in each subsequent "concrescence" and awaiting being encountered, or

---

5   We feel on solid ground in opining that such an experience of ubuntu as reflected in this subsequent citation was experienced on more than one occasion .

6   "A wind-swept lump of rock 7 miles off the coast of Cape Town, Robben Island was known as South Africa's Alcatraz (the infamous island prison off San Francisco)…In the early Sixties Cape Town's first line of wartime defence was to become South Africa's first line of attack on the men who opposed its apartheid regime. The security forces requisitioned the island from the military and erected 20-foot-high razor wire fences to mark out the perimeters of a new high-security prison, a vast institution that would house well over two thousand men" (Korr and Close 2008:21-22).

felt, by its successive entity. "The novel entity is at once the togetherness of the 'many' which it finds, and also it is one among the disjunctive 'many' which it leaves" (Whitehead 1978:21). The notion of each datum, taking into account, feeling, encountering that which is relevant to it is, as we understand it, is the same as to say that in the cosmology of ubuntu, the individual is not subsumed nor forgotten: 'a person is a person through other persons', that is to say that society is defined as the nexus of the "social order and of personal order" (Whitehead 1978:34, *passim*) by having as its defining characteristics "inherited throughout the nexus, each member deriving it from those other members of the nexus which are antecedent to its own concrescence" (Whitehead 1978:34).

The basic speculative, existential, phenomenological, psychological and sociological building blocks of the philosophy of organism and of ubuntu is a relational ontology, that is a relativity in which it is "the nature of a 'being' that it is a potential for every 'becoming.' This is 'the principle of relativity'" (Whitehead 1978:22). The 'becoming' described in the philosophy of organism is consistent with the inseparable link of "be-ing and becoming" as described by Ramose (2003b:274) as a "rheomode: The philosophical language of ubuntu…derived from the Greek word 'rheo' meaning to flow… [as]

> the understanding of entities as the dimensions, forms, and modes of the incessant flow of simultaneously multi-directional motion. This understanding speaks to be-ing rather than be!"

The state of being of the created order as experienced and as described in the philosophy of organism is the many-in-one in which: "Its being' is constituted by its 'becoming.' This is the principle of process." (Whitehead 1978:23). Any constituent datum which we encounter is comprised of - internally and externally, individually and corporately – and is defined as an "actual entity [as] the real concrescence of many potentials" (Whitehead 1978:22).

An actual entity (= actual occasions) in the philosophy of organism is one of the eight essential and ontologically relational concepts. Use of the word 'essential' is not to be confused with 'essentialist' nor a 'substantivist' concept of reality. In ubuntu also, the 'essence' of a person is in the relationship – mutual prehensions of/to others. In our mutually-explanatory scheme of process-ubuntu/ubuntu-process, the living beings we encounter are the end-state, which, paradoxically, is only a passing-through state; termed 'end' only because we can encounter it and others as a temporary way-station, as a temporary and fading *res verae* awaiting individual concrescence.

2.5.6 Evolution – including God

This category of existence concurs with the evolutionary formative and definitive social/personal world of an ubuntu community the formative evolutionary influence of a community, expressed in concurrence with the fullest meaning of ubuntu:

> [*H*]*ow* an actual entity *becomes* constitutes *what* that actual
> entity is; so that the two descriptions of an actual entity are
> not independent. Its 'being' is constituted by its 'becoming.'
> This is the 'principle of process': ubuntu the speculative
> observance of the formative importance of a lived community.
> (Whitehead 1978:23) (emphasis original)

The accounting-for of the subject-object gravitational forces within a traditional human society, included within Whitehead's theology of deity being the highest, or ultimate, form, finds its voice in the philosophy of organism by which "the notion of 'power' is transformed into the principle that the reasons for things are always to be found in the composite nature of definite actual entities – in the nature of God for reasons of the highest absoluteness, and in the nature of definite temporal actual entities for reasons which refer to a particular environment" (Whitehead 1978:19).

An ubuntu doctrine arising from an "African theology of relational-ontological identity [a] doctrine of God as the source of all being" (Forster 2010a:244) is consistent with the Whiteheadean expectation both of God's relational consequent nature and originative primordial nature.

Whitehead presents a doctrine of God in which deity is not freed of the cosmological, ontological 'laws' described in his *magnum opus* and reflects an intersubjective cosmology in which all entities-as-events – God, *qua* entity/actuality, included - are bound to, and bound by, the same ontological principles "without jeopardizing the integrity of natural laws" (Du Toit 2011:7). Whitehead (1978:222) articulates this as a 'process' doctrine by which

> [a]n actual entity feels as it does feel in order to be the actual entity which it is. In this way an actual entity satisfies Spinoza's notion of substance: it is *causa sui*. The creativity is not an external agency with its own ulterior purposes.

Thereby,

> [a]ll actual entities share with God this characteristic of self-causation. For this reason every actual entity also shares with God the characteristic of transcending all other actual entities, including God.

This ubuntu-process conversation qualifies for membership among "[t]he new cosmology debate… [by virtue of]…the premise that God voluntarily submits to laws that he himself decreed" (Du Toit 2011:8).

It is a doctrine of faith for Whitehead that God is defined twofold as both 'sender' and receiver', necessary and contingent. God is both necessary and primordial in providing possibilities to the complete range of the created order's 'appetition' for novelty (but not to the extent that the deity would be rendered limited as "'impure' by reason of synthesis with physical prehension" (Whitehead 1978:33). The co-terminal consequent nature of God "involves in its relationship to the evolving world without derogation to the eternal completion of its primordial conceptual nature" (Whitehead 1978:12-13): primordial in eternal persistence and contingent in responsivity.

This organic and evolutionary discipline presents a "mode of analysis applicable to every grade of individual actuality" (Whitehead 1978: 19) with 'individual' defined as an every-becoming actuality. Without the community, the individual is without definition and the limiting-yet-protective existential boundary (however in flux and permeable by subsequent prehensions.) For Whitehead, all entities are defined by the process of becoming. This transformational space-time is the environment shared between individuals, their chosen or assigned collective, and other members of their society.

2.5.7 Consciousness and interactions

2.5.7.1 Unity of pattern/diversity of input

In the philosophy of organism the presence and operability of a 'feeling' is "an application of the doctrine that a feeling appropriates elements of the universe [which] absorbs these elements into the real internal constitution of its subjects by synthesizing them in the unity of an emotional pattern expressive of its own subjectivity (Whitehead 1978:275). The rejection of all bifurcation is fundamental to this study of cosmology, anthropology, theology, theodicy and narratology.

The inter-defined, intersubjectivity of physical feelings and mental data conjoin in the liminal space of their interaction. Whitehead (1978:276) explains this ontolology as the interaction between "[t]he physical feeling [as] a real fact [and] the conceptual feeling [as the process of] valuing an abstract possibility." So too with ubuntu relationships: "a person is a person *through* other persons" (emphasis added) (cf. Louw 2001:1, Forster 2010a, Forster 2010b, *et al.*). While meanings of ubuntu vary (cf Gade 2012:487, *passim*), we hold that our ubuntu-process thesis supports a meaning (albeit in English translation) of reflectivity and mutual causality; hence, to include, 'I am *because* we are'.

The liminal space-time of the modal mutual encounter "is not a fact prior to process, but a feature of process, an abstract system of perspectives (feeling is always perspectival). Actuality is, actually, a continuum of potentialities in routes for the transmission of physical feeling. The transmission of purely mental feeling is not bound by it." (Lowe

1971:17-18) Placing this systematic relational metaphysical ontology at the service of an ubuntu 'lived' systematic, we find the provision of Whitehead's 'actualities" located in the entities which 'bracket' the liminal space-time of shared occasions, that is the "I" who is and the "we" who are - on either 'side' of the relationally-formed event.

2.5.7.2 Modes of feeling

The two modes of feeling – both in physical processes and all that is involved in mental processes – are the sum of all data. This is a postfoundational and integrated understanding of 'feeling' by which emotion slips past the ramparts of reason which is prescribed by the physical data of the world:

> We prehend other actualities more primitively by direct mediation of emotional tone, and only secondarily and waveringly by direct mediation of sense… [And] … [t]he two modes fuse with important effects upon our perceptive knowledge." (Whitehead 1978:141)

The caution against bifurcation of Whitehead's physical and mental "poles"[7] bears repeating: "The tendency to deify one aspect of man to the neglect of his other essential qualities is an instance of the fallacy of 'misplaced concrescence'" (Loomer 1971:77).

The measure of 'overlap' between 'feeling' and a sense of personal identity is determined in the philosophy of organism's understanding of the role of ability of an entity to decide. The broader efficacy of any occasion is determined by consciousness.

---

7   From a private conversation with Whitehead, Lowe (1971:9,n5) records that despite the "prominent" explanatory function of the concepts and terms of 'mental poles' and 'physical poles' in the latter's *magnum opus*, "Whitehead privately regretted that he had used them: too many readers thought they referred to substantially separate parts of each actual occasion."

The ability/tendency and very nature of an entity - from the earth to persons to the cosmos to God – to actually decide what *not* to take into immediate concrescence; to opt *in the negative* in occasions of physical and mental 'feelings is the *sina qua non* of a graded consciousness. Consciousness is a graded reality in ubuntu as well as in 'process' cosmology: "It is the feeling of absence, and it feels this absence as produced by definite exclusiveness of what is really present. Thus the explicitness of negation which is the peculiar characteristic of consciousness is here at its maximum" (Whitehead 1978:273-274).

Actual entities encounter each other by way of prehensions but "the complex of mental operations involved in the constitution of an actual entity…do *not necessarily* (emphasis added) involve consciousness" (Whitehead 1978:85), but their limitations are evident and options of negative prehensions of data are ever-present :

> Humans are confined by their biological nature: their consciousness of space and time sets limits. Then, there are limits imposed by ignorance, sensory and physical limits, the threat of the unknown (radical) evil), mortality and a world in constant flux. (Du Toit 2010:2)

The collective identity of a member of an ubuntu community does not render that member *tabla rasa*: "*participation* (emphasis added), from birth, through life and beyond this life, is key to the identity and role of the human person" (Forster 2010b:8). Whitehead portrays this participation as the incorporation of data by the prehending individual in a process akin to "mating the data with ways of feeling [which provoke] private synthesis" (Whitehead 1978:85). This individual convergence speaks to "subjective ways of feeling [which] are not merely receptive of the data as alien

facts...The breath of feeling which creates a new individual fact has an origination not wholly traceable to the mere data" (Whitehead 1978:85).

The concrescences which reveal the results of both conscious and preconscious encounters (i.e. Whiteheadean 'feelings') arise in this relational cosmology from "compatibilities and incompatibilities which impose the perspective, transforming the actual world into datum, are inherent in the nature of things" (Whitehead 1978:154).

Inherited societal and personal legacies may not be consciously known or expressed but we live their effects regardless. They shape us, and we them, regardless. The philosophy of organism rejects any bifurcation of entities, as does the intersubjectivity of ubuntu. Just as the identities of Whitehead's eternal objects and their manifested concrescences entertains 'windows' of mutual impact in both macro and micro worlds, so too with the anthropology of ubuntu which accounts for and responds to the complete spectrum of consciousness (cf. Forster 2010b:6). "In the place of the Hegelian hierarchy of categories of thought, the philosophy of organism finds a hierarchy of categories of feeling" (Whitehead 1978:166).

The relationally definitive hierarchical spectrum of consciousness in a transversally-understood process-ubuntu cosmology has some affinity with ego development theories as distilled in a description of human development by Cook-Greuter (2005:3) "as evolving in a spiral fashion, not lock step, with movement possible in all directions."

Life within the organism of ubuntu is one in which no-one is self-made but is recipient, repository, and fount of collective datum beginning as an unconscious prehension existing in both the sub-conscious 'feeling' of a fish in water *and* at the same time in a life in which one may choose to consciously extend one's data to another for the collective's being as an actual entity. "Thus process is the admission of eternal objects in their new role of investing the datum with the individuality of the subject" (Whitehead 1978:154). Ubuntu offers an elaboration of this:

> individuals only exist *in* their relationships with others, and as these relationships change, so do the characters of the individuals. Thus understood, the word 'individual' signifies a plurality of personalities corresponding to the multiplicity of relationships in which the individual in question stands. (Louw 1998:4)

The relational ontologies of ubuntu in which its participants 'swim' is a field of varying forces in which the 'plurality of personalities corresponding to the multiplicity of relationships' bespeaks an invitation to a systematic transversal articulation of its existential factors. This particular ubuntu-process systematic seeks a surgical conjoining of explanatory structures. Before we can proceed to further examine the success of this operation of applied rationality, an examination of the 'process' portion of the transplant by way of its categories of existence must be prepared, and it is to those categories that we now turn.

2.6.0 Eight 'process' categories of existence[8]

2.6.1 Entities, occasions, *res verae, res vera*

The apt description of an ubuntu community as a "multiplicity in relationships" (Louw 1998:4) finds its Whitehead echo (1978:147) in the latter's speaking of actual entities by which "an actual entity is composite" in an equal rejection of both solitary monads and all-absorbing collectives in poly-variant occasions,   combining ontologies of both privacy and publicity. "[T]he original, and perhaps most important feature of Whitehead's treatment of nature as a network of events is his view that the property of events is to extend over other events, so that large-scale events are systems of atomic events…called actual entities or actual occasions." (Emmet 1966:79)

The philosophy of organism concurs with the relational ontology of the ubuntu relation among individual entities and 'others' whereby both individual and the entity which is the collective are each actual entities which give life to the "ontological principle, as here defined, [constituting] the first step in the description of the universe as a solidarity of many actual entities. Each actual entity is conceived as an act of experience arising out of data" (Whitehead 1978:40).

The ongoing influx and 'feeling' of data which the collective appropriates and feeds back to its members after placing such data in the context of the society is the theatre of the provision of negatively- or positively-prehended possibilities. Each entity provides the "food for a possibility" (Emmet 1966:161) whereby individual membership in the

---

8   For a critical reflection of "longstanding concern about the linguistic 'relativity' of ontological categories" in relation to languages used to express them, see Seibt 2015.

society assures that individuals can be/become because of others – making the process of individual personhood reliant upon other persons. In an ubuntu society actual entities are formed by the inculcating of a "conceptual realization of a possibility as a form of definite characterizing a set of actual entities in their definite nexus with each other" (Emmet 1966:162) Mutual interdependence is evidenced in an ubuntu-process community because "[o]ther entities are required to express *how* any one item is felt" (emphasis given) (Whitehead 1978:41).

Where the philosophy of organism impacts on ubuntu's presumption of the sole data-source of the society is not in its symmetry of impact or relationality but in the asymmetry noted in the prior universality of available data from the collective occasion as an entity, rendered personal and individually appropriated by the private entity, as Whitehead (1978:47-48) illuminates: "The initial fact is macrocosmic, in the sense of having equal relevance to all occasions; the final fact is micro-cosmic, in the sense of being peculiar to that occasion." This relational ontology is consistent with "a central element of 'ubuntu' in relation to identity [in] the understanding that personhood (both in social structure and identity) is never understood without reference to the community of dignity." (Forster 2010b:8) It is noted here that a postfoundational ubuntu would include within the definition of 'dignity' those factors which paradoxically rule against it in real-life situations in which the presence of indignities would threaten a foundational, essentialist definition of ubuntu.

Consideration of the interactions of entities and the co-incidences of data-providing occasions (without any presumption that individual entities enter, or are entered, into the

collective without data-agency) invites acknowledgement of field of forces generated by both the ubuntu-process community and the mirror images (although not necessarily reversed in image) of the power of autonomy of its constituent members. Louw (2008; para 14) opines that ubuntu may "seem contradictory" in its maintenance of a relational ontology in which both individual and collective entities maintain agency. A postfoundationalist view of ubuntu reflects no such 'contra-diction' but rather a 'pro-diction' in which we "expose ourselves to others, to encounter [i.e. Whiteheadean 'prehend'] the difference of their humanness so as to inform and enrich our own" (Louw 1998 :para 16). This is consistent with the philosophy of organism which holds, says Whitehead (1978:56), that the "correct notion of how each individual actual entity contributes to the datum *from which* its successors arise and *to which* they must conform" is this:

> The reason why the doctrine of power is peculiarly relevant to the enduring things, which the philosophy of Locke's day conceived as individualized substances, is that any likeness between the successive occasions of a historic route procures a corresponding identity between their contributions to the datum of any subsequent actual entity; and it therefore secures a corresponding intensification in the imposition of conformity.

That is to say that in terms of ubuntu-process autonomy and agency, a personal entity, in the process of autonomously-driven becoming can do so because of the interface with other likewise occasions. Whitehead exchanges the application of the terms 'entity' and 'occasion' and employs them in close ontological proximity to 'nexus' and 'event'; whereby the world is panoply of occasions from which "whatever things there are" are extracted from them and an 'event' is a nexus of occasions (cf. Whitehead 1978:73). A

prehension is the encounter of these elements of membership in an ubuntu-process cosmos of entities.

2.6.2 Prehensions

The category of prehensions reinforces that there is an overarching and foundational unity in both the public extension and private realizations of the concrescence of relata. Actual entities exist (as processive existants) both, in human communal terms as well as 'process", both publicly and privately. The world is public and the individual is private and yet each involves both in this ubuntu-process rejection of existential dichotomies. "In the analysis (division) of actuality the antithesis between publicity and privacy obtrudes itself at every stage." (Whitehead 1978:289). (The fuzzy boundary between the public and the private will re-emerge in the discussion of both responses to sentient suffering(s) and narrative encounters.)

In Whiteheadean cosmology, "[p]rehension [is] a general word for the grasping, or taking hold of one thing by another, and so connoting an active coming together" (Emmet 1966:41).

Consistent with the above speculative cosmology, one of its many transversal exemplifications is found in the lives of members of a traditional community accepting, either by decision or default, the data presented as the community's norms and mores, as they relate at any given moment to contemporaneous pre-existent data. The relevance of an experience to an individual or a group is determined by the gradation of acceptance (fully-positive prehension or fully-negative prehension) reflecting grades of

compatibility with the collective as holding the key to identity and valuations. The, however-transitory presenting state is termed 'satisfaction.' In process-ubuntu/ubuntu-process an individual experience is not distinct from the corporate. With regard to collective in providing the *ab initio* criteria and location for the flux of the relationship of the 'one' to the 'many' and the 'many' to the 'one', we suggest that Whitehead's theory of prehensions may not now seem so speculative. Whitehead's one-substance cosmology insists on rejecting isolationistic individualism and its consequent isolationism.

Individuals experience life. It is individuals who bleed and love and hope. A people's collective joy and sorry is prehended and is concresced into its memory through the heart, soul and minds of its members as "the co-ordination of prehensions expresses the publicity of the world, so far as it can be considered in abstraction from private genesis" (Whitehead 1978:290).

In 'process', the public presentation of an actual entity is a reflection/manifestation of an attainment of the subject aim occurring by way of satisfaction of the arrival at a momentary terminus of a successful journey of the vector from past data to the present configuration (en route and momentarily awaiting its opportunity to provide data for subsequent/successive occasions). That is to say, that I am in the present tense experiencing the here now, having arrived (here and now) by way of an antecedent there and then. My experience of the 'not-yet' is limited to conjecture, contingent upon both current and implied trajectories into unrealized prehensions.

These influences upon my life becomes, through me experienced by others in my society. I live in a community and they can see me and I can see them and we relate and bump against each other and a society is created. We live, have physical relationships ('feelings") with others with whom we physically interact. Analogously, as a 'process' entity, in a visible ubuntu world, my life is the nexus of many mutual concrescences: "actual entities… analyzable (divisible) in an indefinite number of ways" (Whitehead 1978:19). It is the processive divisibility-amid-stability that gives a society its internal dynamic that assembles to re-create the Whiteheadean explication of the challenge to rationality in considering a divisible whole that cannot *really* be ontologically divided and parts individual agencies becoming 'one' where the many become one without *really* eliminating the agency or ontological relationality of its constituents. Shutte (in Forster 2010a:247) speaks to this for ubuntu: "All persons form a single person, not as parts for a whole, but as friends draw their life and character from the spirit of a common friend. They have a common identity." Whitehead (1978:288) describes the blended space of this common identity as an occasion of concresent process of natural "morphology of the internal relations which bind the actual occasions into a nexus and which bind the prehensions of any one actual occasion into a unity, coordinately divisible."

The space between the private and the public is a field of conscious and pre-conscious prehensions both accepted and rejected by the subject-object. Data which we do not wish to incorporate presents an occasion of negligible or absent efficacy but 'present' nonetheless as a "negative prehension [which] holds its datum as inoperative in the

37

progressive concrescence of prehensions constituting the unity of the subject" (Whitehead 1978:23-24).

Each actual entity – which is both each individual member of its collective, as well as the collective of which it is a constituent member – presents the world a "final causation" , however fleeting or relatively long-lived and that 'final' presentation is the very definition of that entity . This presenting occasion reflects the "process of self-formation through its organization of the data presented to it" (Emmet 1966:114). An actual entity is the singular (however composite*) res vera* which encounters the world and forms the collected *res verae* of the community or society of occasions. The process of the formation and maintenance of the ubuntu community is contained in the

> coherence, which the system seeks to preserve, is the discovery that the process, or concrescence, of anyone actual entity involves the other actual entities among its components. In this way the obvious solidarity of the world receives its explanation. (Whitehead 1978:7)

2.6.2.1 The ties that bind

Ubuntu provides a lived 'binding agent' to the philosophy of organism's cosmology which hold that unified entities, events, occasions can be better analysed/understood in its true depth and width by way of application of consideration at the hand of higher consciousness which renders each event as unified but nevertheless divisible. For an ubuntu community this means that individuals do not lose their agency in processing their shared ubuntu life. In Whiteheadean terms, this is a process of (i.e. derived from)/as (i.e.defined by) being a coordinately divisible, individual-communal relationship reflecting both individual and collective agency.

A 'process' response to the impact of divisibility upon the persistence of individual identity within a community can be employed to respond to the question posed to ubuntu seeking to know "how the existing individual can have any enduring reality at all, much less how [s/he] can be possessed of the freedom and responsibility that is usually reckoned the most valuable mark of personhood" (Shutte in Louw 1998:5). To this, Whitehead's (1978:288) "extensive [i.e. extending] connection" as the sheer act of individuals reaching out to make a connection and in the process and occasion of the nexus becomes the actual content as relatum of the encounter.

In one becoming many and in the many being extended by one, mutual efficacy is maintained but an ubuntu-process community can be fragile as it "incorporates both relation and distance" (Louw 1998:5) and "[i]f you abolish the whole, you abolish its parts; and if you abolish any part, then that whole is abolished" (Whitehead 1978:288).

A postfoundational reading of ubuntu's intersubjective constitution must call forth agency from its constituent members that they may persist (*per*, through + *sistere*, to stand, to set, to place) with one another in their individual self-definitions offering them as constituent, reflections and individual manifestations of their intersubjective linkages *qua* individuals with one another, i.e. consisting (*con*, with + *sistere,* to stand, to set, to place), with one another to construct (*con*, with + *struere*, to build) in the nexus of the shared space of their mutual prehensions. The intersubjectivity of ubuntu relationships as a collective Whiteheadean concrescence of Shutte's 'field(s) of personal energy' must necessarily include physicality.

The speculative construct of the philosophy of organism does not vitiate physicality. For the philosophy of organism, the response of an entity/person in the world begins, subjectively, in the world as presented and mediated *initially* by and in her/his culture as the context. For Whitehead (1978:81) "the most primitive perception is 'feeling' the body as functioning". Hence, the grounding of the philosophy of organism and its ubuntu conversational partner is a study in an intersubjectivity embodied cosmology. "It is," for Whitehead (1978:81) the "antecedent functioning of the body in sense perception [that provides] the 'withness' of the body. It is this withness that makes the body the starting point for our knowledge of the circumambient world" (Whitehead 19787:81).

2.6.3 Nexus

The third category of 'process' existence, nexus, as "Public Matters of Fact" (Whitehead 1978:22). Whitehead's ontological activity of prehension "is founded upon the doctrine that there are no concrete facts (i.e. prehensions) which are merely public, or merely private...Prehensions have public careers, but they are born privately" (Whitehead 1978:290).

Applying the explication of the relational ontology of ubuntu to Whitehead's explanatory category of nexus yields the public manifestation of the subjective aims of relata upon their concrescence. In our ubuntu-process the "I/We" - the actual entity of 'process' - which experiences and is experienced in a "particular spatial and temporal" (Whitehead 1978:22) way - is a way of existential paradox of constancy-amid-perishing. For example, witness a scene in the movie *Scrooge* (1951): the central character begins a Christmas morning, having triumphantly 'survived' an evening's encounters with ghosts

of his own past and personality, with a celebratory "I'm not the man I was, I'm not the man I was" - and yet, there he stands, to declare the new among the old professing the new as a witness to a "relational invariant" (Ricoeur 2005:247), in the face of the perpetual perishing of a Whiteheadean ontological 'event'[9].

The public 'face' of the process-ubuntu comes into view as actual entities extend themselves into the world toward novelty (i.e. situations, eternal objects, not yet prehended) because "...nature is never complete. It is always passing beyond itself." (Whitehead 1978:289) For Whitehead, the human nexus is the result within time and space of such reaching out-but the philosophy of organism concedes that connections of human physical extensions are necessarily finite "[E]xtensive connection...is the fundamental organic relationship whereby the physical world is properly described as a community" (Whitehead 1978:268).

This construct echoes "the African approach [by which] one cannot reduce identity simply to the experiences of the individual, or the perceptions of the group." (Forster 2006:6, n.7) in the "mutual implication of extensive whole and extensive part. If you

---

9   The adequacy of the 'process' 'event' in accounting for the persistence-over-time and through space is considered by Ricoeur (2005:227) in noting the "search for a relational invariant , giving it the strong signification of permanence through time." Ricoeur would explain - in decidedly ubuntu-process terms - that Scrooge's 'sameness' through time and space resides in the "concept of relation and a relation of relations" (2005: 225). Ricoeur posits the failure of narrative occurs when it fails to address the crisis of identity of 'sameness' distinct from 'selfhood'. Ricoeur (205:225-228, *passim*) describes 'selfhood' as a "permanence in time" noting that such a concept appears akin to ruling out a metaphysic, which he denominates as the "further fact" of life – an existential necessity. Ubuntu-process presents itself as a relational ontology that acknowledges efficacious autonomy of individuals and the collective which they constitute. Ricoeur's metaphysical "future fact" is reflected in the ubuntu-process intersubjectively-shared nexus as the source of identity.

abolish the whole, you abolish its parts; and if you abolish any part, then that whole is abolished" (Whitehead 1978: 268). The 'feelings' which make up the currency of the conversation between the individual and the collective (in the case of strict 'process' "feelings are the details of the process intermediary between this unity and its many data" (Whitehead 1978:88).

The conceptual 'space' by which and in which the individual and collective consider each other for relevant prehensions of each other's data is the metaphysical conduit through which both human actors and speculative data move on their vector toward their respective subjective aims. Our current understanding of both schemes of philosophy of organism and ubuntu intuits concurrence of ontology by way of a modified equanimous relational within an asymmetrical bias for the collective but containing the paradox of intersubjective causality which blurs hard distinctions between objective and subjective encounters.[10] The philosophy of organism and the schema of ubuntu each see the community as the genesis of data where "objective data pass into subjective satisfaction" (Whitehead 1978: 88). 'Satisfaction' in this programme refers to resolution of the encounter of entities which formulates identity, regardless of however fleeting its time and irrespective of the space of the human emotional response to such resolution (cf. the de Kock interview revealing abhorrence-yet-connection, in Gobodo-Madikizela 2004:114).

---

10 By contrast, cf. Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. For discussion of Kant's "causality and objectivity" see i.e. Pederson 2011: *passim*.

The philosophy of organism's existential category of a nexus is the ontological 'place' constituted by the prehensions by entities of each other - the result of internally-made 'decisions' as to relevance. In Whiteheadean terms, this satisfaction, or resolution, is the irreducible defining characteristic and determinant of life. It is suggested in this work that this satisfaction holds its currency at both levels of micro (quantum) and macro (general relativity) manifestations of life and this interactive, intersubjective process itself constitutes and defines an 'actual entity' at the same moment and in the same space in which - and importantly by which - a fundamental actual entity both perishes and continues toward is "contentment of the creative urge by the fulfillment of its categorical demands" (Whitehead 1978:239).

The ontological satisfaction at the nexus provides the terminus locale for potential consideration yet-un-experienced (felt) data and "embodies what the actual entity is beyond itself… [and, in fact,]… [a]n actual entity is at once the subject experiencing and the superject of its experiences" (Whitehead 1978:29).

The formative role of the private individual in a community is to ensure the community's public continuance: "The pragmatic use of the actual entity, constituting its static life, lies in the future. The creature perishes and is immortal" (Whitehead 1978:82) awaiting the potential recall to some future feeling and to be revealed in a societal setting as a public matter of fact.

We have seen the working out of philosophy of organism's public category of nexus.

We turn now to the philosophy of organism's fourth category of existence which Whitehead terms as evidence in the subjective forms which experience the aforementioned nexus encounters by which an entity's subjectivity comes to the efficacious foreground as the working out of the subject/superject/object relationality.

2.6.4. Subjective forms

Individual persons are at the same time themselves a mass of intersubjective and interactive biological and mental beings-as-becomings and as an interactive social collective reveal the same creation (and perishing) of their respective collectives. It is fundamental to the philosophy of organism and to ubuntu that a single ontology applies both at the level of general relativity and quantum worlds, both creaturely individual realms and the larger spheres of existence.

Accepting Whitehead's (1978:8) *caveat* that "[m]etaphysical categories are not dogmatic statements of the obvious; they are tentative formulations of the ultimate generalities", ubuntu-process, in its intersubjective presentation of a merged speculative and 'lived' ontologies, moves synoptically towards a "one-substance cosmology" (Whitehead 1978:19), which applies to co-participants in the subject-object nexus evidenced in the aphorism's liminal space between 'person' and 'persons'.

The ubuntu-process community is comprised of real individuals as well as micro and macro societies, both as organic "actual entities...drops of experience. complex and interdependent… [with constant] recurrence to the notion of a plurality of actual

entities… [which form, both individually and collectively] …the subjective forms which are the final real (i.e. definite) things of which the world is made up" (Whitehead 1978: 18).

It is the shared claim of the philosophy of organism that the prehending subject is not subsumed under the collective. It has already been noted that the process of concrescence determines that the 'subject' is actually subject-superject, defined as an actual occasion and is of "dipolar constitution, physical and mental, indissoluble" (Whitehead 1978:244).

The initial impetus of this speculative venture is in the "composite nature of definite actual entities… [that is to say] …no actual entity, then no reason." (Whitehead 1978:19) The interaction of life provides the evidence of intersubjectivity and the support for this transversal conversation between the philosophy of organism and ubuntu: the individual is only completed by its association/identity of the society of entities of which it is a part:

> In short, an identity claim that comes closer to the truth of who one is must take cognizance of the interior and exterior life; it must heed individual and social characteristics. (Forster 2010b:6)

The 'taking cognizance' is reflected in the personal acknowledgement that I can only 'be' in as much as 'we are'. In other words: "The subject completes itself during the process of concrescence by a self-criticism of its own incomplete phases...[and] limits the ontological principle by its own autonomy" (Whitehead 1978:244).

45

Consistent with the theme of this work, the physical and mental situation and inter-relatedness of individuals offer manifestations, both momentary and persistent into a future, of a nexus and give evidence of two inseparable patterns in the philosophy of organism: individual quality and intensity.

The processing and filtering of experiences by an individual by the criteria of quality and intensity *vis à vis* what is being encountered, or felt, is this philosophy's subjective form. The subjective portion (forms) forms of existence provides the speculative dynamic and lived experience of life's hierarchy of a "progressive integration of feelings" (Whitehead 1978: 232). The subjective form, as the description of the private function of an actual entity (compositely formed), is responsive to and responsible for the filtering and processing of that which is encountered (felt) by the entity. Whitehead defines "a simple physical feeling [as having the] dual character of being the cause's feeling re-enacted for the effect as subject" (Whitehead 1978: 237). The processes of incorporating (i.e. 'feeling') data is itself a process of providing subsequent data to be consequently felt in time and space.

The subjective form within the philosophy of organism (Whitehead 1978:234-235, *passim*) becomes the intersubjective relationality of ubuntu, being constitutive of content and manner, meaning and symbol. For example, an encounter of a musical note is one example of a 'feeling' by a subject-superject who (1) receives the note, (2) processes and interprets and in a sense embodies the note, and then (3) transmuting it into a biological response, thereby completing the "emotional pattern". It is received and responded to in

46

this three-fold pattern as its subjective form gains complexity: "the datum, the pattern of emotional quality, and the pattern of emotional intensity" (Whitehead 1978: 234) – each portion is indelibly linked to each other, to the sender and the receiver of the music. This analogy is fundamental to Whitehead's anthropology which holds that the physical prehensions precede mental ones. (This becomes especially relevant for this work in the fields of justice as it overlaps with injustices and the blended spaces of the narrative enterprise.)

Differing subjective forms are correlated in both the philosophy of organism and ubuntu by the projection of present events into subsequent and consequent futures in as much as each event contains "the real potentiality for them (the elements) to be derived from itself" (Whitehead 1978:27).

Personal and subjective, encounters are the result of subjective forms encountering each other but are not felt consciously as their first point of prehension. As a fish encounters her/his life within the aquatic context it is unlikely that s/he ponders the basic facts of the properties of H_2O. Under normal, non-threatening, conditions, we may assume that the encounter, or feeling, of the qualities of its contextual data may continue to be felt un- or pre-consciously.

The subjective forms become personally felt by way of a hierarchy of awareness. As a member of a community my childhood recollections and encounters can be lived out without regard to larger consequences or histories. The time and experiences of awakening from youth to adult, from life as a recipient of community traditions to an

47

individual capable, willing and participatory in the transmission of community traditions may be seen as one example of the middle ground of contrast which Whitehead presents as the subjective form involved in feeling the contrast between the "'theory' which may (emphasis original) be erroneous and the fact which is 'given' "(Whitehead 1978:161) in consciousness.

Human life reflects both predictability and surprise: "There is no reason, so far as our knowledge is concerned, to conceive the actual world as purely orderly, or as purely chaotic" (Whitehead 1978:110). That is to say, that the contingent nature of reality reflects mitigates certainties: "[T]hose elements of our experience which stand out clearly and distinctly in our consciousness are not its basic facts; they are the derivative modifications which arise in the process" (Whitehead 1978:162). Those modifications arise in the interconnective play between order and chaos congruent with the implicate and explicate orders of Bohm's theoretical physics (Bohm 1980:xviii, *passim*).

Any presumption that the *a priori* data of a community removes individual agency is challenged not only by an individual's characteristics and autonomy but in the philosophy of organism's cosmology which describes the sum of reality in which "there can be no 'many things' which are not subordinated in a concrete unity" (Whitehead 1978: 211), yet life is contingent: "[W]e can never survey the actual world except from the standpoint of an immediate concrescence which is falsifying the presupposed completion" (Whitehead 1978:211). Also, the contingent agency of encounters yields falsifiable entities in ubuntu because "a person is a person *through* other persons" (emphasis added) (Louw 2001, Forster 2010a, Forster 2010b, *et. al*.).

There are two modes – or poles between which life vacillates - by and through which the world is encountered and by and through which we encounter the world as originating in "simple causal feelings" and "conceptual feelings" each received by entities with varying degrees of relevance. The first provides the philosophy of organism with its cosmological, existential intersubjective/inter-related foundation while the second providing "integrations of conceptual prehensions with physical prehensions of the physical pole" (Whitehead 1978:33). "No actual entity is devoid of either pole." (Whitehead 1978:238; cf Lowe 1971:9, n5).

We shall see the working out of the primacy of subjective forms and processes of integration that arise from the juxtaposition - and interchangeability, intersubjectivity, and mutual prehensions – of victim and perpetrator.   In subsequent discussion of communication/narration we will see, hear and feel the working out of this ubuntu-process doctrine of concrescence and the intersubjective blurring of cause and'effect will be seen.

2.6.5 Eternal objects/potentials

The 'process' ontological category of eternal objects is one of the *sine qua non* ontological building blocks with essential status as "extreme finality" (Whitehead 1978:22) shared only with the category of actual entities as *res verae*, discussed above). Perhaps the word 'object' is unfortunate as one of its definitions in English may lead the reader to imagine a sort of quantifiable singularity. This is short-hand for a category of existence constituted by pure potentials, awaiting the focus in an individual life, and

lived time and in lived space. In the language of the "African view of personhood", this can be restated as "[t]he fundamental human reality…as a field of personal energy in which each individual emerges as a district pole or focus." (Shutte 2004:52-53)

Whitehead offers that "intensity is the reward of narrowness" (Whitehead 1978:112). This metaphysical observation finds its lived example in the fact that I, as an individual, cannot possibly show evidence of every past (personal or societal) influence at all times. The context in which I find myself in any given moment will determine the relevance of any pure potentials swirling around in my brain (or DNA) to a present moment of either thought or action. Speaking in a Whiteheadean way, the many (influences) must become one at any given moment. All data is not lived at the same moment, but all data may, or may not, be considered (prehended) for inclusion into a resultant concrescence. The context, and hypothetical projection of future relevance of each moment, will provide the Whiteheadean subjective aims.

Analogously, out of the pure potential information there is more film, more action, more emotion, even more quantifiable technological expertise not reflected in a final version of any blockbuster movie. To draw upon a technology of another era, there is more 'film' on the cutting-room floor than in the finished movie; or, there is more information on the web than an individual will ever access. Forster (2010b:7) articulates the African view that broader influences outside of the individual which include "God, the ancestors and spirit beings at peace" continue, seen and unseen, to be available for prehension as "a datum for the novel concrescence" (Whitehead 1978:211). By this process, the community is re-formed; it comprises "operations transforming entities which are

individually alien (i.e. autonomous) into components of a complex which is concretely one" [which subsequently provides reciprocal but not necessarily symmetrical] "datum for a new concrescence" (Whitehead 1978:211).

Information, influences and data which form a well of community resource from which individuals both draw from and are drawn from are all potentially available to the individual member of that society but not all reveal themselves, or are drawn upon at all times. Potentials become kinetic when deployed in service of a relevant concrescence. But there is intersubjectivity between what is potentially available to be accessed (prehended) and what is employed in any given concrescence. The Whiteheadean doctrine of prehensive interactions (second category of existence) presents an existential cosmology: "there are no concrete facts which are merely public, or merely private" (Whitehead 1978:290).

There are various, non-competing yet often co-existent ways in which the many become the one. In fact, there is an "infinite diversity of modes of ingression" (Whitehead 1978: 149) by which an individual incorporates social legacies in ubuntu communities.

Potentialities (eternal objects) have a dual reference in this philosophy of organism. Just as individuals are both a collection, and reflection, of personal characteristics, so too societies reflect their own universal characteristics (that is to say, their characteristics hold currency within their universe). The behavior and world-views of individuals and societies become reflectors and manifestations of "universal" standards (within both their respective micro and macro universes): I am constituted by, and am related to,

myself; my society is constituted by, and is related to, itself; I am related to others; my society is related to other societies. Herein process-ubuntu offers an explanatory category of existence from Whitehead's eternal objects which protects (if such protection is required) the notion of individual autonomy coincident with, but not subsumed by, a corporate identity.

The philosophy of organism speaks of this dual, intersubjective, characteristic of eternal objects in its classification of their potentialities as being in "two species, the 'objective' species and the 'subjective' species." (Whitehead 1978:291). The traditional African intersubjective relationship with unseen realms reflects eternal objects in their objective species as a "real physical fact, with its physical consequences… [thereby providing] providing the basis for the "solidarity of the world" (Whitehead 1978:291). In the objective mode, eternal objects are the "forms" (Whitehead 1978:292) which we physically encounter in life. We think it confuses the modes somewhat when Whitehead includes both Platonic and mathematical forms in this objective modes of being but the point seems to be that the objective mode of all eternal objects, pure potentialities, considers the real, physical world as "a medium" (Whitehead 1978:291) of its relativity to, and within, the world.

For Whitehead, the subjective mode of experiencing pure potentialities is constituted by an "emotion, or an intensity, or an adversion, or an aversion, or a pleasure, or a pain... a subjective form of feeling of one actual entity (*res verae*)" (Whitehead 1978:291).

In process-ubuntu, the definiteness, *res verae* (actual entities) of the world (individuals, their physical and emotional presence and interactions), is determined by the both the subjective encounters as well as the relations-which-transcend individual subjects (philosophy of organism's 'superject'). The primary relationship of physical occasions (the visible presence of anything) is in the connection which extends between entities. Each encounter which transforms the subject/object yields a 'feeling' – the descriptor of any such transformative operation (cf. Whitehead 1978:211).

When pure potentialities, eternal objects, are manifested by the process of concrescence into an actual entity it provides datum for subsequent consideration. In the life of a community of beings, this feedback loop provides both a subjective aim and "extensive connection" (Whitehead 1978:288). This extensive connection also provides explanation for the "the creative advance of nature" (Whitehead 1978:289) outside of (but inclusive of) human societies (occasions).

The reaching out by individuals to their communities, the reaching 'in' of the communities toward their component members reflects the reality of ubuntu as well as the philosophy of organism's metaphysical necessity: "If you abolish the whole, you abolish its parts; and if you abolish any part, then *that* (emphasis original) whole is abolished" (Whitehead 1978:288). This intersubjectivity can be expressed as an ubuntu reality: by saying that a person is a person through other persons is to outline a reality of self-referentiality on all fronts.

It is in the juxtaposition of both subjective and objective existential and metaphysical extension that Whitehead introduces discussion of physical time and space. In process-ubuntu, to speak of one is to speak of the other. Do the ubuntu-process extensions of *res verae* of life's manifested eternal objects defy space and time? Process-ubuntu answers, yes: the community provides the space and time frames for its constituents. "The extensiveness of space is really the spatialization of extension; and the extensiveness of time is really the temporalization of extension. Physical time expresses the reflection of genetic divisibility" (Whitehead 1978:289).

It may be accepted that the genetics of a community largely determines which eternal objects might, or might not, contribute positively to its subjective aim[11]. So too, individuals of societies of entities will determine at each moment which eternal objects presented by the community will be appropriated; that is, which of the 'many' existent and/or presenting societal data will become part of the 'one' that is the individual.

Says the philosophy of organism: The contemporary world is a swirl of eternal objects awaiting presentation as actual, perceived as "datum for contemporary actuality and is therefore continuous-divisible but...is in fact divided and atomic" (Whitehead 1978:62). The use of the word 'atomic' refers not to a pre-quantum understanding of reality but rather to the 'one' that 'becomes' when the many coalesce around a particular subjective

---

11 We would opine that while the predictability of an individual and communal responses based on predictable subjective aims may be reflective of a bedrock of identity, such unwavering predictability is not the overarching characteristic of *homo relationis*, as may be encountered in an analogous uncertainty principle found as part of evolving, creaturely DNA. To wit: one of the uncertainty principles inherent in creaturely evolutionary factors is provided by what Richard Dawkins (1989:15) observes as an "exceedingly improbable" natural event by which a "particularly remarkable molecule replicator was formed by accident". A further uncertainty lies in the fact that the replicator gene occasionally fails to perfectly replicate.

aim. In this speculative cosmology as well as in lived community life, the individual provides the eternal object of both subjective and relative modes of ingression: the community and I provide each other with data for subsequent and consequent ingression. This cosmology seeks to do justice to Descartes who "saw the natural world as an extensive spatial plenum, enduring through time" (Whitehead 1978:238).

What are the criteria for the appropriation by individuals of socially-provided eternal objects from which to choose? Each prehenion and successful concrescence of data by an individual is determined by the individual agency responding by way of "diversity of relevance" (Whitehead 1978:3).

Each individual carries within her/himself the totality of her/his culture and yet all characteristics are not visible or manifested all the time. The philosophy of organism begins with the ontological principle: "everything is positively somewhere in actuality and in potency everywhere" (Whitehead 1978:40). It falls to the subject/object of a prehension to consider its subjective aim thus selecting/being selected from among pure potentials (eternal objects) giving an opportunity for (albeit momentary) manifestation as a received/perceived felt datum passes "from the objectivity of the data to the subjectivity of the actual entity in question" (Whitehead 1978:41).

In the life of a community, ubuntu-process accepts Whitehead's ontological principle that no experience is lost, but "those eternal objects which are not felt are not therefore negligible" (Whitehead 1978:41) because some other one, some other place and some

other time may have 'need' of the eternal object unused in a present intersubjective encounter.

2.6.5.1 Hierarchy of Eternal Objects

The philosophy of organism understands patterns in life to be reflective of the manner of contrasts of eternal objects. While nothing in process-ubuntu is 'lost', some pure potentialities are more 'potential' than others. The Whiteheadean 'sensa' are used to describe eternal objects whose ingression in life occurs at such a basic level that it constitutes, and reflects, a necessary minutest metaphysical category, rather than any parallel in, for example, human physiology. The idea of an eternal object as an irreducible ontological category is helpful in both a speculative hierarchy of thought-experiment and experience as providing (because all eternal objects share these characteristics) the basis for a "logical variable, in both forms, the unselective 'any' and the selective 'some' " (Whitehead 1978:114). This category is analogous to an experience of this writer in attending a community event in a small community, in which strangers (i.e. visitors) had not heretofore been in attendance, overheard regular community member to declare, "There was no-one there last night". However, in reality, all chairs in the room were filled but - and this point is key - mostly by persons unfamiliar to the traditional attendees. In metaphysics, as in communities, there appears a hierarchy of potential candidates for prehension into a community and its member individuals based on perceived, or real, relevance to the prehending entity.

To restate, this conceptual hierarchy is not a moral commentary on a speculative eternal object's 'value' but rather its presentation as a starting point for consideration of further 'higher grades' of intersubjectivity. It is commonplace to say that a human society may

be judged by how it treats its most vulnerable. So too, the intersubjectivity of sensa's relationship with more complex eternal objects demands cognizance of their metaphysical-therefore-conceptual eligibility, and "potentiality for ingression [as a] rescue from its shallowness of zero width." (Whitehead 1978:114). The 'shallowness of zero width' is not only a 'rescue' for the philosophy of organism but its conversational partner ubuntu which, at its most postfoundational can, and must

> entertain not only one thin story about *ubuntu*, whether it is
> the idealistic positive story, or the pessimistic skeptical story,
> but the thick story with all its paradoxes and perspectives.
> (Müller 2015:3)

Each lived experience provides a *sensum*, as a minimal eternal object, each requiring "only its intrinsic apparatus of individual and relational essence… [not any particular] patterned contrasts [but the] synthesis of all ingredients with data derived from a complex universe" (Whitehead 1978:115.) It is in the expansive complexity of eternal objects that the philosophy of organism finds the concept of contrast both instructive and definitive. This lack of moral presumption in the activity of a concrescence may provide a disturbing challenge and contrast to a presumption that an ubuntu community cannot describe, account for, or include that complexity which boosts and which may also destroy a community:

> Complexity is defined as the "realization of contrasts, of
> contrasts of contrasts, and so on..." [the subjective aim of
> which is the] "selection of balance amid the given materials"
> [witnessed in] "the urge towards the realization of the
> maximum number of eternal objects subject to the restraint
> that they must be under conditions of contrast...[which is the
> creative advance into novelty which seeks to] maximize the
> integral intensity derivable from the most favourable balance.
> (Whitehead 1978:278)

To restate: the consideration by an entity of remote possibilities, and the ability and urge to exhibit a concrescence of more balanced eternal objects is reflective of "higher organisms" . This ability to conceive of the balance (or to reject such balance) of increasingly complex data is also a hallmark of hierarchical - defined in process-ubuntu as not necessarily levels of power but levels of complexity - human societies in times of the intersubjective encounters of varying social and personal agendas. Over-simply stated, when the poor meet the rich, the powerless encountering the powerful or even the interaction of individuals to their respective groups; 'I am because we are' does not negate differences but rather blurs their boundaries.

Ubuntu and the philosophy of organism both "blur the sharp distinction between what is universal and what is particular" (Whitehead 1978:48): a person is a person through other persons.

While the veil between entities may be travelled both in speculative and lived worldviews, not every influence is at play at every moment. Decisions of incorporation, or rejection of data at hierarchies of degrees of acceptance or rejection, are made consciously or subconsciously. The philosophy or organism (explained in Whitehead's ninth speculative category of obligations of all forms of existence) concurs with the lived experience that we are first social, discovering ourselves amid others. "A central element of ubuntu in relation to identity, is the understanding that personhood (both in social structure and identity) is never understood without reference to the community of dignity" (Forster 2006). Just as an ubuntu community forms its constituent parts by the

'many' reflective of each 'one, so too the Whiteheadean cosmological events-as-entities begin in an ubuntu way:

> The initial fact is macrocosmic, in the sense of having equal relevance to all occasions; the final fact is microcosmic ,in the sense of being peculiar to that occasion (Whitehead 1978:47-48).

While acknowledging the problematic Western/Northern philosophical, medical, scientific acceptance and imposition of the "subject-predicate dogma" (Whitehead 1978:49) - commonly credited or dismissed as Cartesian dualism, attributed to (or blamed on) René Descartes - both the philosophy of organism and ubuntu appear, paradoxically, to share kindred starting points in that same Descartes, as Whitehead notes in an account of Descartes pondering his awareness of particulars only by beginning with universals (Whitehead 1978:48-49, *passim*). However, Whitehead rejects Decartes' *judicium* method of getting from macro to micro, while appropriating the latter's '*inspectio*' and '*intuitio*' into his "notion of a 'positive' prehenion' (1978:49). This is congruent with ubuntu's relational process of "taking cogniscence" (Forster 2010b:6).

When criteria are applied to the ingression of eternal objects, in human society, there may (or may not) be resentment because of human attachment to the realization of preferred, and selected eternal objects. The relative nature of potentialities' purity stands out in relief in the context of what might have been. Put simply, one's personal or group desires may be in harmony or may be antithetical to another group or individual with

whom one is relating. In sum, decisions, judgments and propositions are all involved in the processing of such data.

Social *status quo* may represent comforting and hard-earned stability and it may, at the same time, represent an impediment to similar comfort to others. In the same way, societal revolutions may represent an urge toward change in regime and they may, at the same time, represent antinomian motivations. In the philosophy of organism this seeming paradox of multiple interpretations of pure potentialities is evidence that there are "diverse prehensions of the same eternal object" (Whitehead 1978:227).

Another example of the complexity of considerations of higher eternal objects is encountered when that which has not until the present moment been experienced present novel data: "[A] novelty has emerged into creation. The novelty may promote or destroy order; it may be good or bad. But it is new, a new type of individual, and not merely a new intensity of individual feeling" (Whitehead 1978:187).

Eternal objects are purely potential, yet to be realized. A proposition, however, in the philosophy of organism, slips onto our prehensive screens by way of presentation to our feelings, interpreted as horror, relief, purpose, etc.

There are two – albeit indelibly interconnected – modes of prehensions of novel data: physical and mental. It is the mental capacity which processes the prehension of a proposition, which presents a type of existential and metaphysical contrast. Propositions are the sixth of eight categories of existence.

2.6.6 Propositions

Propositions do not, in the philosophy of organism, fall under the filter of existential judgments. Whitehead differentiates between resultant prehension-led judgments and the consideration or entertainment of a propositional contrast thus: "...a proposition can be *true* or *false* [whereas] a judgment can be *correct* or *incorrect*." (emphasis original) (Whitehead 1978:191) Whitehead defines judgments as yielding forms of one of three responses: (1) yes (2) no (3) suspended. The three species result from the following processes: (1) common ground in a unity between "the pattern of the objectified nexus with the predicate" (Whitehead 19787:270), (2) the ground of unity is replaced with "contrast involving incompatible diversity" (Whitehead 1978:270), and (3) "some propositions are the data of feelings with subjective forms such as to constitute those feelings to be the enjoyment of a joke. Other propositions are felt with feelings whose subjective forms are horror, disgust, or indignation" (Whitehead 1978:25). The boundary between 'I' and 'we are' is fuzzy. In addition to (and consequent with) Whitehead's cosmological categories of being of eternal objects and actual entities, all other existens and encounters in the philosophy of organism perform ubuntu's role, which is to "only express how all entities of the two fundamental types are in community with each other, in the actual world" (Whitehead 1978:25): their intersubjectivity negates apparent bivalence.

2.6.6.1 Whiteheadean feelings and ubuntu encounters

The relevance of these criteria of judgment to the lived ubuntu-process is that the essential doctrine in this organic philosophy defines the primary function of a proposition as a "lure for feeling" (Whitehead 1978:25). Lived intersubjectivity

61

involves more than pure 'yes, no or maybe-yes-maybe-no. "The judgment is a decision of feeling, the proposition is what is felt; but it is only part of the datum felt" (Whitehead 1978:193). We may ask, 'Which part? Whither clarity in such a world of uncertainties of life which present their own novelties for consideration.

"The philosophy of organism is mainly devoted to the task of making clear the notion of 'being present in another entity" (Whitehead 1978:50) via its eternal objects. Whitehead's eternal objects are

> those elements which express how any one actual entity is
> constituted by its synthesis of other actual entities, and how
> that actual entity develops from the primary dative phase into
> its own individual actual existence, involving its individual
> enjoyments and appetites. An actual entity is concrete because
> it is such a particular concrescence of the universe.
> (Whitehead 1978:50)

Ubuntu's movement of individuals and communities into greater humanity can explain this Whiteheadean cosmology: "[a] person grows more fully human (cf. the organic philosophy's 'particular concrescence' above), more fully truly in their identity, through engagement with other persons" (Whitehead 1978:50).

Accepting that individuals are 'defined' by their relationships in a society, who is it that 'does' the relating? This cosmology offers the definition of an individual as a dynamic temporary coalescence of selected data. So who/what is responsible for the selection? Critics of Whitehead's speculative cosmology, who observe that since it may appear to some as a description of personal identity as "a set of serially ordered occasions wherein the mental pole dominates the process of prehension resulting in the possibility of both

personal memory of the past as well as a creative advance into the future" (Yong 1998), overlook its ontological doctrine by which "[t]he theory of 'prehensions' embodies a protest against the 'bifurcation' of nature. It embodies even more than that: its protest is against the bifurcation of actualities" (Whitehead 1978:289).

The ubuntu-process response rests on a postfoundational view of personhood and identity achieved in the interaction between the individual and the community. The "perpetual perishing" (Whitehead 1978:29) of actual entities accounts for the incorporation of new data and constantly-changing relations while the 'immortality' of an actual entity is seen and known objectively for subsequent consideration. Actual entities are decisive, yielding subsequent realities and are indecisive upon achieving realization. There is an "internal principle of unrest" (Whitehead 1978:29) which drives the individual, urges it toward the next novel world. Lived evidence provides that "intersubjectivity from an African perspective suggests that a person grows more fully human, more truly in their identity, through engagement with other persons" (Whitehead 1978:29).

"Similarly the 'person' studied by the psychologist is to some extent an abstraction: he is the historic route of a society of actual entities, every one of which continually perishes but is objectified in the satisfaction of the succeeding ones – or not, if the historic route intersects that of a motor-bus" (Wightman 1961:350).

The cosmology of ubuntu invites verification at the quantum level of reality as a field of tension/force in a "a dynamic whole in a constant state of change" (Forster 2006).

Whitehead applies the term appetition to describe the "principle of unrest, involving realization of what is not and may be...All physical experience is accompanied by an appetite for, or against, its continuance" (Whitehead 1978:32).

Prehensions which form each moment and each quanta (whether that quantum is defined by the microscopic world or if we choose to limit our cosmological regresses to the human form) are asymmetrical. This asymmetry provides the partial ground (Longo 1972:4) of the creative advance into novelty by which relevance for a subsequent future is determined: not every data can be incorporated in every subsequent moment, contrasts are subjectively called for and objectively provided.

We return to Whitehead's category of existence, propositions. Before there is consciousness of integration of received data, present relevance and the urge to creative advance into the next moment or entity, there exists a "propositional feeling" (Whitehead 1978:256). Whereas eternal objects are what they are (or have become what they have become, as they await future partial consideration by other entities), a proposition "constitutes what is felt" (Whitehead 1978:187) about a judgment, it "emerges in the analysis of a judgment" (Whitehead 1978:193).

The importance of propositions to the Whiteheadean scheme expands the parameters of 'feelings', for the 'lure of feelings' is fundamental to the cosmology of both philosophy of organism and that which adds depth to what would be shallow physical encounters. An ubuntu society in which others' presence is devoid of the range of feelings would not be

64

true life: "The individual and the collective, the interior and the exterior are all constituent elements of true consciousness, and thus true identity" (Forster 2006).

Whitehead phrases that same reality thus: "The physical datum in itself illustrates an indefinite number of eternal objects...but with the growth of the mental pole, evidenced by the flash of novelty in appetition, the appetition takes the form of a 'propositional' prehension" (Whitehead 1978:184). Because of cultural overuse of the word 'theory', Whitehead substitutes propositions: "The primary function of theories [propositions] is as a lure for feeling, thereby providing immediacy of enjoyment and purpose" (Whitehead 1978:184).

It is observed here that the traditional African notion of personhood reflects "engagement with other persons" (Forster 2006), calling upon a relational ontology which includes in its cosmology the greatest of personal depth – surpassing a communal life of bare coincident physical datum, more than just physical survival. Whitehead applies the provision of feelings, by way of propositions, and the (i.e. 'magnetic'?) lure of them as the "basic generic operation passing from the objectivity of the data to the subjectivity of the actual entity in question" (Whitehead 1978:40). To repeat, "[t]he 'lure for feeling' is the final cause guiding the concrescence of feelings," (Whitehead 1978:185) as distinct from 'judgment' and 'consciousness' (although the latter two are not totally unknown in 'feelings'). Whitehead argues for a central role for 'feelings' in understanding of both speculative and lived intersubjectivity by suggesting that logicians reading Hamlet would not expect the 'to be or not to be' soliloquy to bear the function of "judging whether the original proposition be true or false [at the expense of] "aesthetic

delight" (Whitehead 1978:185) - we receive an emotive invitation through the gateway of the speech.

The philosophy of organism also defines 'feelings' as differing in intensity and in quality. These factors of feelings constitute the subjective form of an entity which controls the final (momentary) presentation, that is "realization… [as the]…pragmatic aspect of the feeling" (Whitehead 1978:233). It is an ontological principle of the philosophy of organism and of ubuntu that strict bifurcations of life are rejected. As such, intensity and quality, while reflecting differing-yet-connected functions, cannot be separated. Analogously, Whitehead offers the example of an encounter with a musical note (Whitehead 1978:234 passim). A listener provides the concrescence for a note but is identified as a listener only because of the note; surely a case of an ubuntu relationship. Secondly, the sending-receiving context of the note provides an analogy to the "complex ordered environment composed of certain other actual entities which, however vaguely, is felt..." (Whitehead 1978:234). The environment surrounding a concrescence provides the process cosmology with a physical feeling having its ubuntu-process mirror, at a macro level, in the community and at a quantum (biological) level in the internal motivations and responses deep within an individual which, by extrapolation, functions within an individual's body, rendering it as a relative macro world.

Simple causal feelings and conceptual feelings are the two primary feelings in Whitehead's cosmology. One individual experiences another and the encounter occurs on two levels: (1) basic becoming-aware-of and (2) the more-profound conceptual feeling as "feeling its capacity for being a realized determinant of process… [containing

66

and reflecting both] "immanence and transcendence" (Whitehead 1978:239) - and in both cases "relevant to something not itself" (Whitehead 1978:240).

In an ubuntu community there is no bifurcation between the community and its constituent individuals yet neither is sublimated. So too, Whitehead: "The consciousness is what arises in some process of synthesis of physical and mental operations" (Whitehead1978:242). "All awareness, even awareness of concepts, requires at least the synthesis of physical feelings with conceptual feelings" (Whitehead 1978:243). In process-ubuntu, actual occasions entertain, encounter, influence (or not) each other from physical and/or mental poles. The two functions differ in kind at a macro level and differ by degree at the micro level but are interconnected.

The conduits, mediums and 'facts' of feelings are irrespective of physical or mental poles of origination, while at the same time are sent to, and arrive for, entertainment and prehenion for subsequent concrescence in modes relevant to the subject processing them as that subject becomes a superject of further re-transmission. It bears repeating that the seemingly dichotomous Whiteheadean terms 'physical pole' and 'mental pole' are open to misinterpretation as referencing two distinct ontological modes. "As an antidualist, Whitehead rejects the doctrine that mind and bodies are distinct, disparate entities" (Brown et al. 1971:9). The terms are so prevalent in *Process and Reality* that it also bears repeating that in Lowe (1971:9,n5) he admitted that he "privately regretted" them.

In process-ubuntu, the collective provides the datum awaiting prehension in the physical mode awaits being felt by the individual for entertainment in the mental mode-rendering

the mental mode as the primary field of analysis by individuals. Whitehead calls this analysis 'division', the outcome of which is the outreach of datum from one moment to its subsequent and partial consequence which "underlies the spatio-temporal relations of the universe" (Whitehead 1978:221).

The manifested acts (the 'final' stage of a 'process' concrescence/ appropriation of data) are the lived paradoxically-temporarily final-yet-transitional act of the impulses of a community as felt and known and lived by the individual: "the final fact is microcosmic...the decision of emphasis, finally creative of the 'satisfaction' " (Whitehead 1978: 47-48). There is a cosmological regress (or rather, ingress) of constituent components of a society finding its 'satisfaction' in the individual member; and "the initial fact is macrocosmic, in the sense of having equal relevance to all occasions." - there is a cosmological extension (objective immortality) provided by the existence of the larger community in the sense of infinite extension of context, with calculations of relevance to both the persistence-amid-perpetual perishing of data, unexhausted in its multiplicity.

In indigenous cultures, the society provides, in Whiteheadean terms, "a process of realizing an individual unity of experience… [which]..at once limits and provides opportunity for the actual occasion" (Whitehead 1978:129).

2.6.7 Multiplicities/Disjunctions of diverse entities:
How an ubuntu community 'gets along' as One.

We now enter a discussion of the philosophy of organism's seventh and penultimate (although its influence is not to be conceived of as serially involved with the others) category of existence: multiplicities. This ontological category systematizes the relational dynamics of ubuntu and supports a non-serial reading of the concrescences of the philosophy of organism. The African rubric reflected in "*Umuntu*, best paraphrased as all and everything it takes to be human" (Fabian 2006:150) determines that the "we are" of a collective society of entities (which is its own entity), *also* (emphasis added) depends upon its many "I"s:

> A multiplicity merely enters into process through its
> individual members [and the]only statements to be made
> about a multiplicity express how its individual members enter
> into the process of the actual world. (Whitehead 1978:29)

The philosophy of organism rejects the definition of any individualities as "windowless monads with their pre-established harmony" (Whitehead 1978:48). The notion of a pre-ordered, pre-established harmony of any collective is also rejected in the question of "how complex societies can maintain integrity through the flux of prehension and concrescence" (Wildman 2006). This hermenetical response begins its formulation in the shared life of communities and their reverberation with the philosophy of organism: the relationship between individual and multiplicities just *is* and "cannot be defined or explained. But its formal properties can be stated" (Whitehead 1978:288).

Between the community and its individuals, the philosophy of organism observes a fundamental "vector character of prehension" (Whitehead 1978:317) between individual

and multiplicities.   The vector character of influence from multiplicities to individuals (as well as in the reciprocal direction) is the ordered influence of a community upon its constituent individuals. The number of entities (i.e. amount of data) to be prehended by the individual is both irrespective of the individual in its persistence and is selectively relevant – maintaining its unity while its constituent realities perpetually perish and are replenished (at least for the life and consciousness of its prehended and prehending members).

Despite, or rather because of, the galaxy of multiplicities available to individuals, there is a limit to the 'reach' or extensive connections which entities can properly process. It is the system of the society, in which an individual lives, that persists as the individual grows (and individual relationships change in the growing) chronologically from infancy through childhood and into maturity and beyond this life of physical prehensions. Creaturely limitations must necessarily triage its prehensions.

We pay attention within our limitations to the parts of the world's multiplicities which are relevant to us, as English poet T.S. Eliot opined:

> ...humankind
> Cannot bear very much reality.
> Time past and time future
> What might have been and what has been
> Point to one end, which is always present. (Eliot 1922:14)

So too, does Whitehead observe that decisions are made at the point of present-tense prehensions (both positive and negative) with resulting concrescences reflecting personal relevance:

> It is a mark of high-grade organism to eliminate, by negative prehension, the irrelevant accidents in its environment, and to elicit massive attention to every variety of systematic order...each nexus can be prehended in terms of the analogies among its own members, or in terms of analogies among the members of other nexus bit yet relevant to it. In this way the organism in question suppresses the mere multiplicities of things, and designs its own contrasts (Whitehead 1978:317).

As no two individuals-as-entities are absolutely identical, so too communities-as-societies-as-multiplicities are not homogeneous and yet a unity persists among/within both. "The individual of an actual entity involves an exclusive limitation." (Whitehead 1978:45) In this anthropology and sociology decisions from among surrounding multiplicities defines both individuals and multiplicities of entities (other members of the relevant society). The delimiting of relevant data "is the definiteness essential for the synthetic unity of an actual entity." (Whitehead 1978:45) An influence from a relevant surrounding multiplicity, ingressed by the process of concrescence into the individual's reality, is not elicited from (or presented by) components of the multiplicity as a simple "addition to the included elements [but rather] each actual entity includes the universe, by reason of its determinate attitude towards every element in the universe" (Whitehead 1978:45).

For the philosophy of organism, as in an ubuntu community, congruence is sought in macro- and micro-world of ontological, behavioural, relational and cognitive dynamics, confirming, again, that both 'process' and ubuntu "blur the sharp distinction between what is universal and what is particular" (Whitehead 1978:48). The word "multi-verse" provides a helpful concept reflecting the role of multiplicities in this process-ubuntu, for

"[a] multiplicity is a type of complex thing which has the unity derivative from some qualification which participates in each of its components severally; but a multiplicity has no unity derivative *merely* (emphasis original) from its various components" (Whitehead 1978:48) .

In the unity of a community, there is a blurring of community values and of my own. That unity is the self-identity of the community and the individual's part in it. But, as the philosophy of organism help me to observe, the unity of the community's multiplicities does not rest merely upon individual contributions to its corporate life. Some individual traits follow the vector of my influence into the community and some do not. There is a 'perishing' involved in the negative prehensions of some traits of its individual entities by the community -as-entity. So too, the presence and identity of the community-as-multiplicity/multi-verse is the result of the offer and presence, and vector, of my immediacy and its own for its concrescence into a repeated completion as "the perishing of immediacy" (Whitehead 1978:85).

Individual members of a society, as Whitehead's superject (acting as subject and yet surpassing each moment to become object of subsequent realization or 'satisfaction') are understood to be constituted by and in the process of attaining "objective immortality" (Whitehead 1978:84) by way of having been being prehended by the multiplicity-as-entity.

An ubuntu-process community is one in which all interactions – in relationships, words, deeds, thoughts, emotions, identity, values – finds intersubjective life in the space

between the manifestations of those characteristics. The role of that space is to provide the conduit, theatre and data for the creativity which is the advance of each new, i.e. 'novel', situation – however familiar (or not). It is this concept of creativity which provides the ultimate ontological category and life-impetus.

> 'Creativity' is the principle of novelty. An actual occasion is a novel entity diverse from any entity in the 'many' which it unifies. Thus 'creativity' introduces novelty into the content of the many, which are the universe disjunctively. The 'creative advance' is the application of this ultimate principle of creativity to each novel situation which it originates. (Whitehead 1978:21)

How can a community that has known itself (and members to each other) for generations mutually prehend each other with novelty? This cosmology rests upon the ontology by which we might have known each other before now but that was then and each 'now' becomes a 'then' for both individuals and the community. Individuals present themselves to each other anew each moment bearing legacy and uncertainty, privacy and publicity; our shared multiplicity-as-society becomes re-comprised with its corporate legacy and uncertainty, privacy and publicity with its individual components - which we provide as both contributing and contributed entities.

We come together to make our society and our society makes us from its multiple entities. The seventh category of philosophy of organism's categories of existence, multiplicities, is sub-titled "Pure Disjunctions of Diverse Entities" (Whitehead 1978:23). That is to say, that just as sentient biological entities are comprised of intersubjective entities harmonizing their activities to manifest an apparent unity-despite-diversity, so

73

too multiplicities-as-societies present, and re-present, themselves as the result of their respective 'subjective aims' rendering

> an advance from disjunction to conjunction...at once the togetherness of the 'many' which it finds, and also it is one among the disjunctive 'many' which it leaves; it is a novel entity, disjunctively among the many entities which it synthesizes." (Whitehead 1978:21)

The intersubjective ontology of process-ubuntu ontology is this: "The many become one, and are increased by one. In their natures, entities are disjunctively 'many' in process of passage into conjunctive unity" (Whitehead 1978:21). This interaction of multiplicities holds sway for cultural norms, communication and explanations of both individual and societal relations. "Each task of creation is a social effort, employing the whole universe. Each novel actuality is a new partner adding a new condition" (Whitehead 1978:223). The on-going relationship between an individual and its society reflects an "event-pluralism over a materialist or substance ontology" (McHenry 1992:103). The centrality of the subject/superject in the philosophy of organism offers systematic accord to the importance of the individual in a community alongside the centrality of the "event ontology" (Whitehead 1978:106) of the ongoing relationship; again, I am because we are involved in some relation: this metaphysics and personal identity "give the concept of an event a primary place" (Whitehead 1978:115).

Just as individuals are divisible into component parts-in-living-relation, so too are societies. The multiplicities that make up societies are similarly divisible-since the same laws apply to the widest range of existence. Members of the multiplicities, as objects, "are ingredients, *whats* (original emphasis) of events. They provide structures for event-

sequences, but they are not the basis of their own survival" (Whitehead 1978:107). This last point is to say that no-one is truly a self-made person without need of community.

We are made, nurtured, and continue in relations by way of communal occasions. The communities of my origin as well as the communities of my adulthood provide the "efficient cause" (Whitehead 1978:293) of the process of my being. The presence that is Wayne is the 'satisfaction' of coalescing data (whether the Wayne which results in this concrescence is satisfactory is, perhaps, for others to decide), or the aim of the prevenient concrescence which led, nurtured and engaged me. These multiplicities can be analysed by way of Whitehead's process of coordinate division. I am an "extensive continuum" (Whitehead 1978:293) as is the plurality/multiplicity of the society of which I am a part, comprising as it does the "complexity of the occasion" (Whitehead 1978:293).

The multiplicities of the societies of which I am a part are, for Whitehead, repeated "in the creative advance from creature to creature, each creature including in itself the whole of history and exemplifying the self-identity of things and their mutual diversities" (Whitehead 1978:228). While the same rules of concrescence apply to multiplicities as well as individuals, Whitehead cautions against seeing too much reality in multiplicities by demanding homogeneity. Societies share many common traits but are not replications of each other (despite appearances of sameness by outsiders. Whitehead prefers the word multiplicity to 'class' because the latter term implies sameness. He also rejects typifying a society as a 'class' as prone to description by a sameness which would deny its reality-in-relations.

Groups are comprised of relating beings in a process of becoming: groups do not bleed, groups do not die-individuals bleed and die and love. Process-ubuntu multiplicities must have their unity amid diversity/disjunctions. Whitehead rejects an imaginative construct of group homogeneity as analogous to "an appeal to an imaginary terrier to kill a real rat" (Whitehead 1978:228).

There must be *res vera* similarities between members of a group and the group constituted as a living event-in-relation. How data is transmitted from the environmental multiplicities to individuals is described in the philosophy of organism's category of transmutation as "the way in which the actual world is felt as a community, and is so felt in virtue of its prevalent order" (Whitehead 1978:251).

Community mores and world-views are transmitted to individual constituent members who in turn provide a type of feed-back loop of data ('feelings'), having taken into account new societal and environmental data in which the individual finds her, his or itself. (The use of the singular is a convenience-a plurality of actual occasions presenting their concrescences of prehended data is, of course, also a reality-in-action.) "In this way the nexus (or its part) ...is the objective datum of a feeling entertained by this prehending subject" (Whitehead 1978:27).That which is public, and shared, becomes private and represented both to other members of the society and fed 'back' to the multiplicity-as-event-in-action. The process of the 'feeding back' of data in the relationship-as-action is referred to by Whitehead as 'reversion.' When a society presents a unitary focus of interest its component individuals live orderly lives. An unfocussed

community interaction yields the opposite of an orderly community and the antithesis of a peaceful group of individuals.

Speculatively-speaking, this perceptual unity is transmitted ('reversed') thus:

> When there is discordance among...various conceptual feelings, there will be elimination, and in general no transmutation. But when, from some (or all) of these sources of impartial conceptual feelings, one dominant conceptual feeling emerges with adequate intensity, transmutation will supervene. (Whitehead 1978:252)

The category of multiplicities - being also dubbed the disjunction of diverse entities - demands acknowledgement that the relationship-as-event-action among a society of occasions awaiting further prehension and realization-by-concrescence involves data which is not incorporated into a constituent member's final (if only momentary) aim-in-becoming. The process of disjunction of constituent parts of available data for ingression by an entity by a negative prehension provides one of the five delimiting factors in the event-life of the relationship. Relationships are about "transitions affecting a concrescence" (Whitehead 1978:251).

The delimiting of transitional factors or data is presented in philosophy of organism as a four-fold process with – because process-ubuntu rejects subject-predicate bifurcations – permeable categories of the process of becoming: factors of (i) subject, initial data to be felt, negative prehension of some data, the objective datum and the final stage of "how the subject feels that objective datum" (Whitehead 1978:221).

The divisibility of diverse entities represents an ubuntu-process category of existence reflected in the plurality of data from which entities may prehend relevant novelty, leaving by default those data negatively prehended to be ingressed by other members of the collective (or not), thereby rendering into the community-as-action-event its diversity even while concurrently transmitting a presence of unity.

What this means in a *res vera* community is this: the community functions as one but not everyone is identical to every other one. The formative concrescence that leads to the formation and sustenance of an individual, derived from the community, is not ingressed by each individual the same way. Communal influences may be felt to a greater or lesser degree, or may be presented to constituent members in varying degrees. I will represent and manifest a Whiteheadean conjunction of data in as much as I have 'concresced' that which I feel relevant to myself. There will be a disjunction between my prehensions, and the data presented by virtue of my felt relevance and also by the manner of the data's presentation by the representatives of the community with whom I engage in a relational ontology. I will choose, or have chosen for me, data from the multiplicity of eternal objects in whose galaxy I find, or place, myself. The mutual influence between me and my community can appear to be temporal- and space-defying leaps.

The living event of my becoming is the net result (subjective aim) arising through, and in some cases in spite of, disjunctions in both my prehensions and among the presenting community- but the same explanations account for both micro- and macro-levels of existence. The "event-sequences" (McHenry 1992:107) of existence reflect both continuous, is continuous/conjunctive-disjunctive multiplicities of entities.

What is felt as the natural paradox of the common life of an individual in the event ontology of a community has its speculative systematic in Whitehead's appreciation for the co-existence of the disjunctive or discontinuous reality co-present in the cosmos with continuity: a unified play between the very small and the very large. Whitehead echoes quantum mechanics, as well as general relativity:

> Like quantum theory, Whitehead holds that all physical experience happens in leaps or definite epochs of becoming. But what is particularly revealing about the findings of quantum mechanics is that, at the base of things, the discontinuous ('disjunctive'?) existence of fundamental particles forms the continuous existence of the larger physical bodies...crucial in explaining how [Whitehead's] basic ontology of events could form the various levels of enduring 'societies'. (McHenry 1992:104)

Ubuntu-process understands individual members of a community to be the concrescence of data provided by the community, the 'satisfaction' and 'subjective aim' of the coordination of its various components. It is the same with communities of which individuals are a part. Whitehead applies "genetic division" (Whitehead 1978:283) to reveal components of individual concrescences. The functions of a society, as a region of event-in-becoming, can be examined by the how and the what of its extensions among its component individual as well as extensive relations into other societies.

The conjunctions and disjunctions of the entity of a society are seen in its impact upon its constituent individual occasions. I am related to my community on two levels: my actions are defined by the society and in that society I am the repository of its past and a

living product, a microcosm of its life as event-in-becoming. In the application of ubuntu by my community to my 'becoming', they/it provide/s "presentational immediacy… [providing] [t]he actual world [as] the 'objective content' of each new creation" (Whitehead 1978:65), [as well as the] extensive continuum [as] one relational complex in which all potential objectifications find their niche. It underlies the whole world, past, present, and future [and] involves both the property of indefinite divisibility and the property of unbounded extension" (Whitehead 1978:66).

Individual autonomy is not lost, thanks to the divisibility of the multiplicity and the disjunction of a community's diverse entities does not translate into a separation or sublimation of composite entities. An ubuntu community "is divisible; but its real division by actual entities depends upon more particular characteristics of the actual entities constituting the antecedent environment" (Whitehead 1978:66-67). An individual-in-becoming "has the unity of a wider society, in which the social coordination is a dominant factor in the behaviours of the various parts" (Whitehead 1933:265).

2.6.8 Contrasts/Synthesis-Ubuntu space-time

The social coordination of contrasts comprises the "modes of synthesis of entities in one [p]rehension" (Whitehead 1978:22). This is explained further as the process whereby the potentials of the cosmos yield specificities determined by relevance. In other words, the many become one which feeds again into the many; or, the reality of 'we are' becomes synthesized in the 'I am':

> For the practical purposes of 'human understanding,' it is sufficient to consider a few basic types of existence and to lump the more derivative types together under the heading of 'contrasts. The most important of such 'contrasts' is the 'affirmation-negation' in which a proposition [i.e. potentials] and a nexus [specificity] obtain synthesis in one datum. (Whitehead 1978:24)

Recalling the category of eternal objects, the information in and through them is bundled in the widest understanding of varieties of amounts which has a potential for being considered "into becoming of actual entities" (Whitehead1978:23) by virtue of the operations of a three-fold becoming: "Subjective Unity, of Objective Identity, and of Objective Diversity." (Whitehead 1978:228) I feel myself to be a whole, I am made available to others for their prehension and there is diversity in the process. I am all of these at the same time, just as the community is experienced as a unity and diversity. The coming into being of each entity is the activity occupying the space between them and acting on them as frames of the concrescence.

I encounter a fellow-traveler, I prehend a brother or sister of my community – and my mental state(s) is formed in that encounter. There is a "conceptual reproduction" (Whitehead 1978:249) of the data positively prehended in our encounter and my response, my feedback, to you for your subsequent and consequent processing is termed a "conceptual reversion" (Whitehead 1978:249). The process 'comes together as a concrescence: "in synthesis there must always be a ground of identity and an aim at contrast" (Whitehead 1978:249) and derived-from-Cartesian dualism is avoided as the encountered feelings are intersubjectively mingled – that is, your feelings are only a concept to me until I encounter them (as mine would be to you):

> In these ways, conceptual feelings pass into the category of
> physical feelings. Also, conversely, physical feelings give rise
> to conceptual feelings (Whitehead 1978: 246).

The role of society, as seen in the philosophy of organism, is to "elicit that complex into importance for its members, and secures the reproduction of its membership" (Whitehead 1978:92).

Whitehead's use of the word 'contrast' is not to be identified with incompatibility, but rather, "[t]he realization of a pattern necessarily involves the concurrent realization of a group of eternal objects capable of contrast in that pattern. The realization of the pattern is through the realization of this contrast" (Whitehead 1978:115). The contrasts prehended by individuals play out in a hierarchy of realizations from the simple to the more complex. The activity of a community in its intersubjective events-in-becoming, and individuals in it (including myself), enters into a higher consciousness within the community, and in the constituent objects, and "[c]onsciousness requires that the objective datum should involve (as one side of a contrast) a qualified negative determined to some definite situation" (Whitehead 1978:243).

Negative prehensions can provide evidence and opportunity for constituent members of a society to discern the level of identification with the community. A vibrant community requires vibrant constituents. It is commonplace that a vibrant citizenry will 'negatively prehend' (i.e. call to account by rejecting a harmful concrescence) its own collective when individual autonomy is threatened: " 'oppressive' communalism which robs persons of their identity and rights, as is seen in many places throughout Africa and the

world, is not the intended outcome of the ubuntu ethic in the African world-view" (Louw in Forster 2006).

The weaving (i.e. *pllicare*, to weave) together (i.e. *com*, with) of intended and unintended outcomes defines life's com-plicatons. It is the thesis of this work that those complications are more so in an ubuntu society, in the light of its intersubjective nature involving all manner of relationships which rejects any subject-predicate bifurcation of space/time, joy/sorrow, proximity/distance, like/dislike, trust/mistrust - both positive and negative prehensions all revealed in the manifested concrescence of a life-as-becoming.

In a lived ubuntu context this complication or juxtaposition and intersubjective conversation of contrasts also offers both a philosophy and lived ontology whereby "the simple distinction between the indigenous and the imperial can no longer be made." (Brink 1996:212) Such amalgams are never so simple, but rather multiple and ever-changing:

> The term 'multiple contrasts' [applies] when there are or may be more
> than two elements jointly contrasted, and it is desired to draw attention
> to that fact...[I]t is real unities being more than a mere collective
> disjunction of component elements" [the contrasts support the
> Whiteheadean doctrine of] emergent evolution. (Whitehead 1978:229)

Ubuntu contains the individual sense of being as identified by group membership but members of groups do not actually cease to exist, regardless of perceived or real-

time/real-space concurrence of identity, a collective history or any concurrent will for an imagined future. Both individual and corporate identities bring their respective past occasions/concrescences, lived and living, to become relata in present and future occasions. There is mutuality between the community's memory, contributed to by its constituents and individual memories borne by the members. There are both spatial and temporal dimensions to the relata of individual and group to which s/he belongs (or seeks to belong) recorded in the hearts and minds of the community.

Applying a transversal conversation between the discipline of human geography and studies into the phenomenon of collective memory, process-ubuntu's collective-individual relationship can be expressed:

> The collective memory [as] the intersubjectively available knowledge of events and objects within the framework of a particular group [accessed by] [e]ach (individual) memory [as] a 'view point' on the collective memory. (Halbwachs in Werlen 1993:176)

Whitehead observes human love-hate with the past; seeking to escape past horrors while at the same time wishing to maintain selective portions of a past. To this existential dilemma, he offers no escape. In the grip of a history and on the precipice of an unknown future, he observes the paradox of the present containing the past with a vector into a future (without presumption of a uni-directional impetus):

> The world...craves for novelty and yet is haunted by terror at the loss of the past, with its familiarities and its loved ones. It seeks escape from time in its character of 'perpetually perishing.' Part of the joy of the new years is the hope of the old round of seasons, with their stable facts – of friendship, and love, and old associations. Yet conjointly with this terror, the present as mere unrelieved preservation of the past assumes the character of a horror of the past, rejection of it, revolt... (Whitehead 1929:400)

In a traditional ubuntu community, ancestors of the 'past' are similarly still present and efficacious in the community's total life which trespasses past-present boundaries, and believed to be offering to the still-visibly-living occasions of novel data (and also receiving such) as a matter of course: "The unity and harmony of personhood...stretches from the world seen through the naked eye to the world of ancestors" (Forster 2010b:8).

Consistent with the cosmology of ubuntu-process is the acknowledgement in human geography of the role shared space: "Spatially, the material world, with the symbolic memories it embodies, is the sphere in which the individual agent, from his or her position in the social and physical worlds, enters relations" (Werlen 1993:176).

Whitehead offers three meanings of space related to a process-ubuntu relational ontology:

> (i) the unique four-dimensional manifold of event-particles or (ii) an assigned instantaneous space of some definite spatio-temporal measure-system, or (iii) the timeless space of some definite spatio-temporal measure-system. (Whitehead 1961:124)

Whitehead distinguishes between instantaneous and timeless spaces, pointing out a paradox in efforts to mathematically measure "spatial distances between event-particles" (Whitehead 1978:124). Striving to account for speculative space(s) invites process-ubuntu presumption of shared communal 'space' (identity') which allows for the conterminal presence of individuals in their own 'space(s)'.

Whitehead hypothesizes that concepts of time are based upon measuring systems, divisible "into spatial and temporal measurements according to the different circumstances of the observers" (Whitehead 1978:122). While acknowledging such subjectivity,   Whitehead (1933:138) cautions that any study of consciousness "should not be twisted to mean that any facts of nature can be interpreted as illustrating any laws that we like to assign".

In concurrence with an ubuntu community's commonplace awareness of its past, living in its present and projecting familiarity into unknown futures, Whitehead (1961:125) presents three classes of individual entities' existence relative to time: (i) that which precedes the given entity ("according to the time-reckonings of all spatio-temporal measure-systems"), (ii) that which is contemporaneous ("in some spatio-temporal measure-system or other") and (iii) that which succeeds the entity in question ("according to the time-reckonings of all spatio-temporal measure-systems".

In the philosophy of organism, each of the three time frames function within their own respective temporal-spatial systems, while expressing concurrent positive and negative prehensions of predecessor and successor alike and yet paradoxically intersubjective as "the ultimate baffling mystery of nature – its advance from the past to the future through the medium of the present" (Whitehead 1961:126.)

2.7.0 Transversal ontologies

In discussing the relationship(s) between the subject of an act or influence and the object of an act or influence, the use of the subject-object dichotomy is helpful only in as much as place and person locators, as the individualities and the ontologically conjoined form an ubuntuesque diversity-in-unity not delimited by static essentialism. Lived ubuntu may be seen as an African manifestation of the discipline of human geography in which "the objective and subjective perspectives are not mutually exclusive" (Werlen 1993:205). Process-ubuntu reflects a conversational drive towards an integrated subjective-objective relational unity. The urgings of 'process' concrescence is the activity of mutual encounters. For Whitehead, the activity of integration "lies at the very heart of the concrescence" (Whitehead 1978:265) as the result of the interaction "of subjective unity, of objective identity and of objective diversity" (Whitehead 1978:266).

2.7.1 Traversality of ubuntu-process

Transversal affinities present themselves between the flesh-and-blood cultural reality (and its philosophical articulations) of an African ubuntu life with the philosophy of organism's *sina qua non* of "physical purposes" (Whitehead, 1978:276). To pose such an affinity is to acknowledge that "familiarity between Western and African philosophies is not the same thing as to affirm identity between them [however] [d]ialogue being the basis of deliberation, it is clear that the liberation of philosophy is possible only through dialogue" (Ramose, 2003a: 7). This current work also accepts the interdisciplinary claim that "[i]n spite of appearances, the two lessons are not incomparable" (Wiredu 2007:73).

The ontological principle of Whiteheadean inter-relational thought process and worldview challenges any bivalence, bifurcation or monadism of any existens –

87

individual and/or communal – including any system of thought that would seek to drive any wedge between "I" and the "we", that is between what is universal and what is particular" (Whitehead, 1978:38). The process of becoming in ubuntu-process ontology is one in which each moment is an amalgam of intersubjective event having the origins of its present in a past which bears a hint of its future in subjective aims based on not just "diversity of relevance...[but also] the whole gamut of relevance" (Whitehead, 1978:43-44) at each processive, processing and processed moment whereby " 'many' presupposes the term 'one,' and the term 'one' presupposes the term 'many' " (Whitehead, 1978:21), in which time(s) and space(s) overlap.

In an interview subsequent to the publication of his *On the Postcolony*, Mbembe does not contradict a processive, non-linear view of African history, narrative and identity, whereby realities, events and occasions are prehended positively or negatively – not as any present-time moral verdict but reflecting co-terminal grades of meaning, variable longevity and efficacy in the present - involving "a transformative relation" (Mbembe in Hoeller 2002). The past is prehended and its relevance graded by a subjectively-determined future for a present concrescence. The search for compatibilities among apparently disjunctive data paradoxically includes judgements about them arising from subjective aims being withheld during their intersubjective concrescence; with momentary prehensions marked by the perpetual perishing of data deemed irrelevant and yet awaiting a possible future consideration. In a private interview, Mbembe describes the modern African ubuntu process which

> [e]xist[s] only as a set of sequences and connections that
> extend themselves only to dissolve. It is a reality that is made

up of superstitions, narratives and fictions that claim to be true
in the very act through which they produce the false, while at
the same time giving rise to terror, hilarity and
astonishment ...Indeed, I define the postcolony as a timespace
characterized by proliferation and multiplicity. As a temporal
formation, the postcolony is definitely an era of dispersed
entanglements...

[and] the unity of which is produced out of differences. From
a spatial point of view, it is an overlapping of different,
intersected and entwined threads in tension with one another.
(Mbembe in Hoeller, 2002)

A postfoundational ubuntu relational process concurs with Whitehead's "efficacy of

physical feelings..."

[which] considers a single subject, subsequent to the nexus,
prehending this multiplicity of scattered feelings as the *data*
for a corresponding multiplicity of its own simple physical
feelings, some pure and some hybrid. It then formulates the
process by which in that subject an analogy between these
various feelings-constituted by one eternal object, of whatever
complexity, implicated in the various analogous *data* of these
feelings-is, by a supervening process of integration, converted
into one feeling having for its datum the specific contrast
between the nexus as one entity and that eternal object.
(emphasis given) (Whitehead 1978:250)

Ubuntu-process explains the 'how' of its employ in the service of the movement and

manifestation of the "ultimate metaphysical principle [which] is the advance

from disjunction to conjunction, creating a novel entity other
than the entities given in disjunction. The novel entity is at
once the togetherness of the 'many' which it finds, and also it
is one among the disjunctive 'many' which it leaves.
(Whitehead 1978:21)

Occasions of experiences of/by individuals in each other's company (regardless of duration) are not merely shared as co-terminal sensory events immune from true inter-relations nor does the experienced data qualify as universal (i.e. communal) only if it transcends direct personal appropriation. Rather, ubuntu-process presents the components of life as both encountered and transmuted to other(s), forming a Whiteheadean indivisible "experiential togetherness" (Whitehead, 1978:190). Rejecting Kant's view which bifurcates subject and object whereby "no element in the temporal world could itself be an experient", Whitehead (1978:190) observes that subject and object act upon each other with mutually-experient history and novelty. The inter-subjective relational ontology of experiential togetherness becomes the existential, ontological, cosmological gravity which draws entities together and equally observes the efficacious force of repulsion or negation – with their loci at work (or rest) in the liminal space which they share in their intersubjectivity. He also rejects Bradley and Leibnitz as portraying cosmologies of "a single experient, the absolute, or...windowless monads" (Whitehead 1978:190). This attraction/repulsion can be expressed in an ubuntu community in the inter-relation of the "I am" and the "we are" which subsumes neither subject/object.

2.7.2 Three-fold ubuntu-process

The philosophy of organism sees reality as three-fold processes as intra/inter-active societies of existens in a horizontally-egalitarian mode of mutual efficacy (expressed here without hierarchy):

 (1) in the particular, private, individuals – consisting of/persisting in their respective, compatible, indivisible biological, mental and psychic/spiritual components;

(2) in the collective, public – comprised of their indivisible and inter-related compatible individual, constituent components; and

(3) in the process of the interaction and evo/devo-lution of what Mbembe's observes as "intersections and entwinements...of the "very compositeness"(Hoeller, 2002) of the intersections of private and public and what happens at their interface. This mereology is the locus of the inter-being-ness of the creative process of the co-definitions of the individual/and the collective. This "creative process is rhythmic:

> it swings from the publicity of many things to the individual
> privacy; and it swings back from the privacy of the private
> individual to the publicity of the objectified individual.
> (Whitehead, 1978:151)

The existential rhythm between/among the individual(s) and their larger society may be typified as latent, unawakened in its private mode while it awaits a critical mass of a public mode. Ubuntu-process sees the collective as providing "the ideal" with the constituent individual(s) providing the "actual". The encounters of life (via prehensions) are lived out in the collective theatre but are processed individually - having "public careers, but they are born privately" (Whitehead, 1978:290).

An individual (the person who exists and persists through other persons) fills many roles in a community, as well being the constituent of that community of whatever size. The intra- and inter-relationships "exhibit transversality in that they diagonally lie across, extend over, intersect, other social roles and lines of force. Multi-dimensional process concrescences and transmutations which are both medium and message of ubuntu

91

relations account for the varying degrees of intensity of both 'horizontal' and 'vertical' relationships of all entities, being the subject-object of relations.

The affinity and modes of thought between the philosophy of organism and ubuntu mirror the relationships defined by the relational ontology which describe a three-fold worlds of (1) the entities that comprise individual persons, (2) their convergent, concresent and transmuted presence in the space which reveals the common life; (3) the entities' collectives of which s/he is a formative constituent. This three-fold cosmology exegetes ubuntu and allows us to truly enter into both the text of the aphorism and the lived three-fold, interconnected, reality of which it speaks: (1) a person *is* a person (2) *through* (3) other persons.

The activity that occurs in the space between entities is the field of the creative advance into novelty at each moment provides the nexus of transversal thinking as "a viable third epistemological option beyond the extremes of objectivism and relativism, of foundationalism and nonfoundationalism" (Van Huyssteen 1998:24): either epistemological extreme being an instance of what the philosophy of organism observes as an instance of "misplaced concreteness...[which]....consists in neglecting the degree of abstraction involved when an actual entity is considered merely so far as it exemplifies certain categories of thought." Transversal rationality is defined as speaking to "points of intersection between different discourses, overlapping areas with shared rational concerns" (Stone 2006:85) enabling the freedom of the participants and their interactions to be experienced as a unity "receptive to temporal passage and changing conditions...[in] successive moments of consciousness" (Schrag 2006:28).

Whiteheadean ontological categories of positive and negative prehensions observe that which ubuntu lives, that there is a hierarchy of consciousness and decisions of presentational immediacy. Formatively responsive (and responsively formative) decisions do not by necessity demand that their prehensions occur consecutively either temporally or spatially: ['C]reative advance' is not to be construed in the sense of a uniquely serial advance" (Whitehead 1978:35) and includes entities which will incorporate data from successive moments more or less, determined by "compatibility and contrariety" (Whitehead 1978:148). The extensions of data which our minds and bodies either simultaneously or independently – even momentarily – either generate or encounter are an extension of the influence of entities and those extensions reflect the "general scheme of relationships providing the capacity that many objects can be welded into the real unity of one experience" (Whitehead 1978:67).

The extension of an entity's influence is the "extensive connection" which defines both the Whiteheadean "fundamental organic relationship" (Whitehead 1978:288) and is the ontological mode of ubuntu.. The extension itself, the bare 'reaching out' is not the key but rather that nature (including humans) "is always passing beyond itself. This is the creative advance of nature" (Whitehead 1978:289). It is this communal process which provides the formative and definitive cosmos for the individual-in-community. The one and the many cannot be distinguished and yet neither loses its identity; that is, the community provides the real and tangible stability while its constituent subjects provide the real and actual variety in an intersubjective ubuntu dance:

93

> The universe is at once the multiplicity..and solidarity... The solidarity is itself the efficacy of the macroscopic *res vera*, embodying the principle of unbounded permanence...[t]he multiplicity is composed of microscopic *res verae*...[o]n one side, the one becomes many; and on the other side, the
> many become one. (Whitehead 1978:167)

Whitehead goes further: "apart from the experiences of subjects there is nothing, nothing, nothing, bare nothingness" (Whitehead 1978:167). An ubuntu community *is* the field of interactions of the *res vera* (the individual) and *res verae* (the multiciplicity): "[I]ndividuals only exist in their relationships with others, and as these relationships change, so do the characteristics of the individuals" (Louw 1998).

The space-time locus of the interactions of the individual and her/his community in the process-ubuntu cosmology invites a discussion of the liminal space which is created in an interaction. The locus of the interface of the aforementioned trinity of entities invites discussion of the constitution of that ontological space as formative of both individuals and the ubuntu society to which they belong in which the respective interactive internal and external integrities of *res vera* and *res verae* are maintained and their respective modes of knowledge upheld in the face of concrescences and transmutations.

The integrity of personal identity in the interactive space-time in which process-ubuntu entities exist is maintained in the constructs of the philosophy of organism which "blur the distinction between what is universal and what is particular" (Whitehead 1978:48) as does the ubuntu worldview as, in its ideal presentation, "overcomes, and corrects, many of the effects of radical dualism between self and other" (Forster 2010b:6). Leaving

94

behind foundationalism - which could mistakenly default to either individual *res verae* or the collective *res vera*. The intersubjective space each occupies principally and incidentally is an evolutionary conversation between *res vera* and *res verae* as their interface provides the conduit and theatre for the mutual explanation of new data and providing cognitive tools to process questions of relevance. Individuals and their body-collective require each other to assist in navigating "beyond the extremes of objectivism and relativism, of foundationalism and postfoundationalism" (Van Huyssteen 1998:24).

The incorporation of new data by an individual into the larger society and by the larger society into individual appropriation is as much a case of exclusion, negative prehension, of some information from the concrescence based on decisions of individual and collective relevance. Even information not kept or directly responded to forms part of the shared experience. In both positively-prehended and negatively-prehended data, "mutual sensitivity expresses the notion of final causation in the guise of a pre-established harmony" (Whitehead 1978:221). The intended outcome of an ubuntu interface between *res vera* and *res verae* is "based upon a complex active interrelationship of beings that share a common meaning in community ...[as] an intersubjective (shared ontological) approach to identity" (Forster 2010:9).

2.8 The Blackness of Ubuntu

Such a 'common meaning in community' as ubuntu presumes is not to be equated with cultural or racial homogeneity. Such equation, or racial claim, would be a case of Whiteheadean "misplaced concrescence [which] consists in neglecting the degree of abstraction involved when an actual entity is considered merely so far as it exemplifies

95

certain categories of thought" (1978:7-8). Stated otherwise – and here Wiredu (2007:74) reminds Africa that "it is important to note the influence of thinkers in the black Diaspora"- Gates (2012:x) speaks of a postfoundationalist view of blackness from his authoritative standpoint of the black Diaspora: "it is a simple fact that sometimes we define ourselves in terms of each other, and sometimes we do not." It is an example of Whiteheadean relationship of the 'one' to the 'many' that there are, at least, "one thousand streams of blackness" (Walker 2012). The ontological flux in whole-part relations both upholds and challenges, soothes and chafes in both personal and political realms (and receives back in kind). The liminal space between, and the lived relationships of, the "We are" and the "I am" is an in-between space-time of multivalent causality, the theatre of Whiteheadean permanence-amid-flux-amid-permanence that transcends the Atlantic ocean: "[I]t is important to note the influence of thinkers in the black Diaspora" (Wiredu 2007:74), and "it is a simple fact that sometimes we define ourselves in terms of each other, and sometimes we do not" (Gates 2012:x). Any presumption of group homogeneity also comes under the microscope of an intersubjective relational ontology.

The respected wisdom arising from the black Diaspora notwithstanding, the equation here of the relational ontology exhibited and lived among the Diaspora and its African progenitors raises (at least) two considerations with regard to discussion of the multivalent options of personal identities. The first, Does the displacement of identity – through the colonization of Africa at home and through the slave-trade abroad (for example in the locale represented by Gates et. al.) – still hold in the 21st century?

In a personal interview, Mbembe (Hoeller 2002) enunciates the Whiteheadean paradox of stability-amid-flux in presenting a fuzzy boundary between past and present in an African racial identity "liberated from the past...[while]...not advocating the erasure of the past", and that

> [a]s far as Africa is concerned, colonialism is over. Apartheid is over too. Africans are now the free masters of their own destiny. This is why from an intellectual and political point of view, there is not turning away from the difficult work of freedom...this does not mean to negate history or to erase memory... [but]... to be attentive to those signs of the times which signal the entry into other configurations of human experience (Hoeller 2002).

Mbembe's configuration of the composite nature of 'postcolony', reflecting a Whiteheadean affinity, does not rule out the voices of the Diaspora which would present the identification of blackness with African, within boundaries and allegiances remaining permeable:

> As a temporal formation the postcolony is definitely an era of dispersed entanglements, the unity of which is produced out of differences. From a spatial point of view, it is an overlapping of different intersected and en-twined threads in tension with one another. (Hoeller 2002)

The second query- cautiously approached, given the occidental ('Western') origins of the second vocal cord of this particular voice of ubuntu-process – arises from evidence of apparent transatlantic reverberations of it among Africa and its black Diaspora. One of many indicators of such continual reverberations – by no means unique to this present epoch – is in the "Afro-Atlantic aesthetic tradition" (Walker 2012:xl). The question is this; Can race and place be equated? Is a philosophical anthropology, or a relational

ontology, transferrable out of its context regardless of whether the answer is either a "Yes" or a "No"?

The response offered here is consistent with the world of permanence-amid-flux, that is the perpetual perishing amid objective immortality - neither foundationalist, reductionist nor dysfunctionally relativistic - through the concrescence of the shared *res vera*. Ubuntu-process maintains that all boundaries are paradoxically both definitive (positively prehended) and transgressable (negatively prehended). This also holds in consideration of the equation of blackness with Africa and, hence, the universality of an African philosophy. Their influence and realities meet and co-exist, prehending both positively and negatively in the overlap/underlap evidenced in the 'in-between' juncture of past and present. Ubuntu-process both reflects and challenges the cultural milieu[12] of its origins, proposing a universality arising from the permeability of its boundaries.

A person is formed by her/his geographical environment (ostensibly 'permanent' in terms of its availability, yet perpetually perishing in its multiplicity to be encountered) and yet we can transcend it either physically or mentally. The question of our relationship to our place is not meant to suggest a bivalent arrangement but rather one in which the internal and the external prehend one another in varying degrees. The "close association of land and life" is the ground, in all its meanings, of the disorienting cleavage felt in the "existential, call it ontological memorial... [reflecting]...an

---

12   "Although…things black are not necessarily African or African Diasporic, and things African Diaporic are not necessarily black...they are almost interchangeable, although readers should bear their distinctiveness in mind" (Gordon 2014:98).

inextricable connection between memory and the construction of individual or collective identity" (Ramose 2003).

The topic of the memory, whether experienced in its disruption through the memory of a Diaspora or that of African effects of colonialism, provides a nexus of transatlantic blackness and Africanity[13] – it is suggested as an ontologically-felt reality existing in the concrescence, the remembrance of which is both the permeable domain of self-knowledge which at the same is "never complete without reference to one's roots, to the past which is one's history" (Ramose 2003), and yet "cannot be achieved through black racial romanticism" (Mbembe in Hoeller 2002).

Just as there is a range of personal and collective prehension of one's past and legacies of identity, so too is there a hierarchy of complexity available for response to lived environments. An over-simplistic articulation of this hierarchy of complexity would note that a rock has a limited range of prehensive ability; the human – and this hierarchy is by no means a commentary on human moral steadfastness or otherwise – is arguably at the pinnacle of complex responses to surrounding and internal data. It is to the

---

13   An equation of Africa with a homogeneous blackness, especially among black diaspora, is placed critically in historical context in Diamond (1999:377-378): "Most Americans and Europeans equate native Africans with blacks, white Africans with recent intruders, African racial history with the story of European colonialism and slave trading....The five major human groups to which Africa was already home by A.D. 1000 are those loosely referred to by laypeople as blacks, whites, African Pygmies, Khosian, and Asians." . In the context of 'colonialism' – defined as territorial and human incursion – Bantu ubuntu and isiXhosa Um*ntu* take on delimiting historic tribal parameters: "Bantu farmers who acquired cows and sheep spread out of their homeland in West Africa and within a short time overran the former hunter-gatherers in most of the rest of sub-Saharan Africa. Even without acquiring crops, Khosian peoples who acquired cows and sheep around 2,000 years ago displaced Khoisan hunter-gatherers over much of southern Africa."   By the way, the result of his *magnum* research leads Diamond (1999:163-164), in his chapter "How Africa became black" to conclude: "An extraterrestrial visiting Earth 10,000 years ago might have been forgiven for predicting that Europe would end up as a set of vassal states of a sub-Saharan African empire" (Diamond 1999:398).

Whiteheadean hierarchy of entities and ubuntu's assignment of primacy to the human co-resident of the cosmos that we now turn.

2.9.0 Transversal hierarchies

2.9.1 Of human Being

Ubuntu-process cosmology accepts that in the world there is a hierarchy of ability of the created to respond with varying degrees of intentional agency to the prevailing environment in which it prehends all data in which it exists. The ability to respond in a variety of ways to a surrounding data places individual entities along the cosmological hierarchy. Stated more succinctly, the ability to decide what to prehend and what not to prehend gauges where we are in the world.

In this cosmology there is a hierarchy of ability to respond to the prevailing society which forms the environment. The ability to respond in a variety of ways to the environment marks the variances along the cosmological hierarchy, including, more precisely, the ability to decide what not to prehend.

Lower grades of life *re*ceive, the higher *per*ceive: "The more primitive types of experience are concerned with sense-reception, and not with sense-perception" (Whitehead 1978:113), The difference between reception and perception of data being the entity's vantage point prescribed by grades of intensity and narrowness- and respective breadth or narrowness of response(s). Whitehead describes lower grades of sense-reception as indicative of lower levels of discrimination, narrowness, "…

triviality, vagueness, and massive uniformity" (1978:112) at the higher levels, percipients encounter nature (and each other) with a higher grade of width - which necessarily includes the unacceptable – and "contrasts, but always negative prehensions of irrelevant diversities. [In sum,] the lower organisms have low-grade types of narrowness; the higher organisms have intensified contrasts in the higher categories" (Whitehead 1978: 112).

The hierarchy of the creative, and responsive, is not meant to imply antithesis among the 'ranks':

> Enough for us to know that the lower is not in hopeless enmity to the higher, but its basis and support, a feeder to it, a source whence it mysteriously draws its creative strength for further effort, and hence the necessary pre-condition for all further advance. Thus beneath all logical or ethical disharmonies there exists the deeper creative, genetic harmony between the lower and the higher grades. (Smuts 1927:346-347)

2.9.2 Of God

"The description of the generic character of an actual entity should include God, as well as the lowest actual occasion, though there is a special difference between the nature of God and that of any occasion." (Whitehead 1978: 110). The difference between creation and a theistic creator for Whitehead is that "[a]part from God, there could be no relevant novelty. Whatever arises in actual entities from God's decision, arises first conceptually, and is transmitted into the physical world" (Whitehead 1978: 164).

The ubuntu-process deity occupies the 'top' of the hierarchy of being and all metaphysical principles as "their chief exemplification" (Whitehead 1978:343) – not an anthropomorphic extension. In fact,

> the religious connotations inherent in ubuntu do not suggest the imposition of a particular form of spirituality or religion within social contexts marked by diversity and secularism. Ubuntu, it is argued, can very well support 'secular spirituality' which is spiritually experienced without the strictures of organized religion. (Nkhata 2010:38, n37)

Whitehead, despite being one of its cultural/religious inheritors in his time and place, has placed on trial and found wanting Western Christianity, the development of which was the historical result of a type of a West-upon-West internal battle by which "[w]hen the Western world accepted Christianity Caesar conquered; and the received text of Western theology was edited by his lawyers" (Whitehead 1978:342). As such, Whitehead implies that the edicts of Christianity's founder exceed that tradition's contemporary cultural boundaries – and have done so for quite some time:

> There is, however, in the Galilean origin of Christianity yet another suggestion which does not fit very well with any of the three main strands of thought. It does not emphasize the ruling Caesar, or the ruthless moralist, or the unmoved mover. It dwells upon the tender elements in the world, which slowly and in quietness operate by love; and it finds its purpose in the *present immediacy* (emphasis added) of a kingdom not of this world. Love neither rules, nor is it unmoved; also it is a little oblivious as to morals. It does not look to the future; for it finds its own reward in the immediate present." (Whitehead 1978:343)

The emotional tenor of the 'process' transcendent (primordial) and immanent (consequent) natures of God finds a willing conversational partner when "postcolonial African theologians speak of hope" (Veldsman 2011) as Whitehead's schema implicitly

portrays a subject-object God related to the world by "the tender elements in the world, which slowly and in quietness operate by love" (Whitehead 1978:343).

The mutually-defined natures of God are held together in an ubuntu way: each 'is' because 'they' are – with tender elements being inevitably implied as constituent of the liminal space between/among them. It is also an ontological truth that the range of emotional affectivity must also be accounted for alongside the cognitive dimensions of all prehensions.

The 'process' deity of Whitehead is understood as reflecting two natures, distinct in their respective fields of agency and yet sharing ultimately-inseparable fields of efficacy: "Either side can only be explained in terms of the other" (Whitehead 1978: 347). In the philosophy of organism, all entities interact in two – indivisible - ways: objectively physically) and subjectively (mentally). These modes combine to evidence concrescences, the process of which applies to everything – including deity. The inter-operative and intersubjectively consequent and primordial natures of God are described – without each factor proscribing the other - by this "dipolar character" (Whitehead 1978: 277; cf. Whitney 1985:81; cf. Lowe 1971:9,n5).

Each entity in the cosmos' hierarchy of entities contains both the presence of God and evidence of a response to the lure of God: divine transcendence understood as God's necessary, primordial nature and God's immanence as understood to be of the contingent, consequent nature. The interrelatedness of the primordial and the consequent is of the nature of mutual 'completion' with the deity receiving data from the world and

103

entities of the world receiving their "lure for feeling, the eternal urge of desire." (Whitehead 1978: 344).

The primordial nature of God "is deflected neither by love, nor by hatred, for what in fact comes to pass...[as] the principle of concretion – the principle whereby there is initiated a definite outcome from a situation otherwise riddled with ambiguity." (Whitehead 1978: 344-345, passim). The consequent nature of God accounts for divine responsiveness to the world: "[B]y reason of the relativity of all things, there is a reaction of the world on God" (Whitehead 1978:345).

The two natures of God are both distinct and yet – consistent with the rest of the cosmos - interdependent. One may venture an ubuntu articulation of God's dual modes in this way: God can be immanently actualized exactly (with ontological delimiting exactness) because God's becoming is transcendent. That is to say, God's general, overarching 'ubu-' nature offers transformative occasions which come to fruition in particular '-ntu' events: "Ubu evokes the idea of being in general [with] ntu as the nodal point..." (Ramose 2001: para 3).

Also, the aphorism understood postfoundationally reads that transcendence is also co=-dependent upon immanence; the particular is the constitutive reason-for-being of the general: others can (also) be because I am. God's primordial nature persists by the derivation of his consequent nature from the temporal world. The second half of the problem concerns the completion of each fluent actual occasion by its function of

objective immortality, devoid of 'perpetual perishing' and yet everlasting in familiar-yet-adapted form, bearing familiar-yet-evolved content for a future prehension.

As primordial, God is "the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality" (Whitehead 1978:343). As consequent, God provides to all entities "the particular providence for particular occasions" (Whitehead 1978:351).

In sum, God and the entities of the world define each other:

> By reason of this reciprocal relation, the love in the world passes into the love in heaven, and floods back again into the world. In this sense, God is the great companion – the fellow sufferer who understands. (Whitehead 1978:351)

As God is seen and experienced in 'process' thought as the 'chief exemplification' of all created relations in the world and that African relational ontology brings a definition of salvation (i.e. justice) "as the true realization of the self that God intends one to become ...[in]...sustained relationships and growth in true identity" (Forster 2010a:250), then it must follow in this transversal conversation that even in the face of suffering ubuntu-process can account for optimism in the cosmos' evolutionary creative advance into persistent life-giving novelty:

> [G]rowth of God's nature is best conceived,[as] that of a tender care that nothing be lost. The consequent nature of God is his judgment on the world. He saves the world as it passes into the immediacy of his own life. It is the judgment of a tenderness which loses nothing that can be saved. (Whitehead 1978:346)

Equipped with the categories of existence of the philosophy of organism at the service of ubuntu's relational ontology, we turn them both now to identity-challenging occasions which are set in relief against backdrops of life-affirming ideals. Ubuntu-process concurs

with Wiredu (2007:3) that "authenticity in African philosophy presupposes a background of crisis". Such relational and systematic authenticity applies its litmus test of suffering to its cosmology. The examination of suffering constitutes the next section of this cosmology.

3.0 Theodicy/Androdicy/Gynodicy of ubuntu-process

An ubuntu-process response to suffering concurs with Wiredu (2007:73) who underscores that as such, an authentic relational ontology and systematic response to suffering must necessarily apply suffering *per se* as the litmus test of relevance. In a postfoundational ubuntu-process response to suffering, any redemptive presumption may appear momentarily shallow, making it admittedly liable therefore to a legitimate charge of complicity – from which it does not shy away.

3.1 Suffering

For Whitehead (1978:34), the overall rubric which qualifies an occasion to be defined as 'evil' is whatever such occasion reveals "the characters of things [which] are mutually obstructive ... [and resolved in] the struggle with evil [as] a process of building up a mode of utilization by the provision of intermediate elements introducing a complex structure of harmony."

Any discussion of existential 'harmony' must address disharmony. The search for harmony, i.e. justice, places on trial all understandings of God, of men, of women and what we understand our inter-relationships to be as a species.

This search for a postfoundationalist ubuntu-process response is confronted with the search for an androdicy (*andro*-man*; dike*-justice, judgment) as well as a gynodicy (*gyne*-woman) as well as a search for an understanding of human relationship to the natural world (*geo*-earth). These theatres of disharmony thereby reflect the fullest spectrum of relational violence as

> [m]ultidimensional and multifarious It is physical, geographical, spiritual, psychological, sudden or latent. It is metaphysical, because for some religious beliefs, it involves the deed-consequences scheme in terms of rewards and punishments, even beyond this world into the otherworldly life;

and

> [I]t can be a national, multinational and universal phenomenon. It presents some contradictions, because, though it is abhorred in general, some individual states use it as a means to achieve ultimate good or misuse it for their own selfish interests.

Further,

> [i]t becomes more of a repulsive mystery when it is seen as institutional and integral part of religion which fundamentally should avoid it. (Munyaneza 2001:39)

3.1.1. Is God complicit?

The Shakespearean-expressed "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune...[and]...[t]he heartache and the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to" (Hamlet, Act 3, Scene 1) are positively prehended in as much as they benefit and negatively prehended in as much as they impede, filtered if you will, by which "the good they did achieve in individual joy, in individual sorrow, in the introduction of the needed contrast, is yet saved by its relation to the completed whole" (Whitehead 1978:346). The essence of Whiteheadean theodicy is found in the doctrine that creaturely goodness prevails, through all things, and is taken into the very evolving nature of God by which, in its "operative growth, ...revolts of destructive evil, purely self-regarding, are dismissed into their triviality of merely individual facts" (Whitehead 1978:346). It is the starting and ending points of God (although, of course, not in a serial sense) that the Divine presence takes in all goodness into a primordial presence, offers it back to the entities engaged in life and in a consequent concrescence is present to creatures in the manner of "a tender care that nothing be lost" (Whitehead 1978: 346).

This theodicy has implications for both members of a community and their communities as members of the ubuntu-process hierarchy as both individual and corporate entities comprised of their respective corpuscular constituents with the Divine understood not as an exception but rather the chief exemplification of metaphysical principles. In the philosophy of organism, the 'ultimate' is the ongoing (i.e. evolutionary) process into newness at each moment prescribes the characteristics of God. The transcendence of God is not unique: "Every actual entity, in virtue of its novelty transcends its universe, God included" (Whitehead 1978: 94).

This challenging doctrine holds that God is as much subject-object of suffering as creatures (but with the added role of providing a creative lure into novelty) combined with the understanding that for all entities - *homo relatio* included - all suffering would be redeemed - does not relieve either God or creatures of the implication of causal culpability, within the scheme of ubuntu-process, in cases of suffering because of this holistic anthropology, spirituality, relational ontology and theodicy:

> [I]n Africa] God, humankind, extrahumans and subhumans are all regarded as integral parts of a single totality of existence. God's actions are not experienced as extra-ordinary. African metaphysical thinking is holistic... (Du Toit in Forster 2006)

Similarly, Whitehead affirms the creaturely-divine relationality as being one of degree, not of kind:

> God's existence is not generically different from that of other actual entities, except that he is 'primordial'... (Whitehead 1978:75)

The ubuntu-process evolutionary ontological sharing between God and the hierarchy of all creation (people included) does not permit a belief in deity/deities as functioning at the expense of creaturely agency. Ubuntu-process holds to the doctrine of

> mutual influence between God and creatures. God has no monopoly on power, since all creatures have some autonomy... [and, at its least] responsibility for evil is shared by all beings. (Whitney 1985:121-122, *passim*)

It is an admittedly hard doctrine, that entities are responsible, qua entities, as the intersubjective subject-object of our own sufferings in the course of life and that the

resolution of the range of sufferings (including those termed 'evil') must often await resolutions both within and/or outside of personal and corporate agency. The meaning of sufferings cannot be known in the moment because all present moments are, in a sense, locked into their "presentational immediacy [which] gives no information as to the past or the future" (Whitehead 1978:168). The consequent nature of God receives creaturely experiences by which the divine performs "an efficacious role in multiple unifications of the universe" (Whitehead 178:349) by which "[t]he function of being a means is not disjoined from the function of being an end. The sense of worth beyond itself is immediately enjoyed as an overpowering element in the individual self-attainment. It is in this way that the immediacy of sorrow and pain is transformed into an element of triumph" (Whitehead 1978:350). This is to say that the ubuntu-process deity is not bound to tragedy and thereby in our intersubjective connectedness to God is freed as the primordial nature of God "refuses to be made hostage of the mechanism of evil and punishment" (Talstra in Veldsman 2011:2).

The eventual triumph of the goodness – however long-lasting or fleeting - may seem cold comfort to the suffering and yet the application of a postfoundational ubuntu-process intersubjectivity does not insulate itself nor its creaturely or *divine* participant(s) from incorporation into "all and everything it takes to be human" – including suffering and evils (Fabian 2006:150).

This evolution, or emergence, of an ultimate harmony out of situations of macro and/or micro disequilibria is a teleological necessity for divine and/or creaturely realms ass the articulation of a "Natural Theology [by which] we cannot divorce our understanding of

the fact of our biological evolution from its larger cosmic context (e.g.: existence of carbon) from the history of the universe (e.g: fine-tuning of the universe)" (Veldsman 2011:6).

Parabolically speaking, the call to fine-tune (or even course-tune) an out-of-tune musical instrument with the attendant restoration of its desired optimum reverberations with potential prehending listeners' "cerebral cortex devoted to particular kinds of processing [which] can't help but function in terms of the anticipations and resolutions they were designed for" (Jourdain 1997:313) is based on the acceptance of the instrument's dystopian offerings. The widest range of musical options for the given instrument is the *sina qua non* not only of its ontological multiplicity and component individual entities but demands acknowledgement of its nature which includes the freedom – and perhaps nature – of being out of tune.

For its part, a postfoundationalist, non-exclusive, ubuntu and its inclusion of not only occasions of suffering but those who may cause it, and occasions in which it arrives unbidden, challenges a philosophical and existential "reliance on easy oppositions and binaries, on Manichean models, and on predefined otherness (*however understandable – and sometimes necessary – those reactions may have been at the time*) (Brink 1996:199) (emphasis original)

In the 'process' doctrine of the 'fine-tuning of the universe', the processive and evolutionary movement of the cosmos and the interchange of *relata* among sentient and non-sentient co-participants "has been described by some of the greatest intellects [e.g.

Plato and Aristotle] as a real incoming of forms into real potentiality, issuing into that real togetherness which is an actual thing" (Whitehead 1978:96). The cosmos of ubuntu is one in which the *fuzzy* boundaries between individual entities and the collective entities they/we 'create' in intersubjective concrescence is constantly passed and re-passed by its participants.

In the context of this theological treatise in the applicability of an ubuntu-process response to suffering, consideration of the intersubjective concrescent nexus of men and women necessitates an address on asymmetrical justice with the regard to gender differences. A postfoundationalist ubuntu rejects any claim to the impermeability of entities which includes entities of men and of women. The status of women becomes a necessary topic, addressed in the succeeding section.

3.1.2 Is human suffering Eve's fault?

In response to the above question, One may ask, 'Who said she was, or is?' The answer can be traced within Christianity to, at least, no less an influential thinker than second-century theologian Tertullian (c.155/160-220 A.D.). His legacy to the faithful (notwithstanding his historic importance to the Church and its arguably broader theological debt to him) includes his exegesis of the Hebrew Bible's narrative of origin which places upon Eve the responsibility for sin and, by extrapolation, for general suffering and placed the historically doctrinal - and messianically-necessary -

consequent guilt squarely upon all women for that which Tertullian (2002) concluded

being the human capacity that

> derives from women [as] the ignominy, I mean, of the first sin and the
> odium (attaching to her as the cause) of human perdition.

and thereby sealing many Christian opinions concerning women, as he further

pronounced:

> The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt
> must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway: you are the
> unsealer of that (forbidden) tree: you are the first deserter of the divine
> law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant
> enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On
> account of your desert that is, death even the Son of God had to die.

So, the question returns in this project's search for an ubuntu-process that accounts for a

theological cosmology: 'Is suffering Eve's fault?' The postfoundational relational

ontology of ubuntu-process challenges the Christian faith-narrative of the myth of

origins generally and the 'genesis' of suffering as gender-specific, particularly expressed

by Tertullian, and successors of his theology and its attendant spiritual/religious

anthropology.

In the context of an exegetical rationale for God's ordering of the cosmos, a brief

reference to a particular historical interpretation of the divine 'ordering' of human

relations based on an interpretation of the creation of men and women as preserved in

the Judaeo-Christian scriptures and its interpreters of Tertullian persuasion, Whitehead

(1978:95) rejects out-of-hand "the Semitic theory of a wholly transcendent God creating

out of nothing an accidental universe", and consequently any interpretation of human

origins of suffering as lodging in progenitors as nothing other than metaphors: "The book of Genesis [as] too primitive to bear upon this point".

The second 'creation' story as recorded in the Hebrew scriptures' Book of Genesis (2:21-22) with its serial account of creation of life on earth has been historically interpreted as theologically (and thereby culturally) enshrining a particular interpretation of a paradigmatic claim to male primacy over women and thereby enshrining an interpretation of unequal interpersonal relationship based on gender, with extrapolations leading to continual inequalities. (It is noted here that the first account of human origins (1:27) neither states nor implies a seriality of gender creation. Regardless of the silence of Genesis 1:27 ("So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them" (NRSV)) *vis a vis* any gender-driven hierarchy, it is commonplace for Genesis 2:22 ("And the rib that the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man" (NRSV)) to be interpreted as the definitive divine text of divine authority for the assignment of women to a secondary (i.e. lesser) social status. It is an observation that is not unique to feminist scholars that "[t]here is no biblical story that had a more profound negative impact on women throughout history than the story of Eve"[14] (Milne 1988:21).

In terms of Western biblical studies, scholar Pamela Milne reminds us of her scholarly colleague Phyllis Trible's observation:

> [N]one of the traditional patriarchal claims is altogether accurate and most are simply not present in the story itself.

---

14 "She is called Eve because she is the mother of all living things (Genesis 3:20). This explanation of the name is a popular etymology...The actual root meaning of the name Eve is uncertain" (Milne 1988:14).

> Some patriarchal claims, [Trible] argues, actually violate the rhetoric of the biblical account. (Milne 1988:17)

The first biblical account (1:27) presents an ubuntu-process picture of the arrival of male and female at the same time and we are not told what they are made of other than that they reflect the image of God. The second version (2:22) places the man's creation first and the whole creative endeavour concludes with the fabrication of the woman from the man's body. Trible supports her charge that the traditional interpretation of the 'pecking' order of man as ontologically superior to women to be incoherent, to wit:

> ...man is said to be superior because he is created first (Genesis 2:7), while woman is deemed inferior because she is created last (Genesis 2:22). But these same patriarchal interpreters never argue that humans are inferior to animals because they were created after animals (Genesis 1:27)...On the contrary, they regard the final creative act in Genesis 1 as the pinnacle of creation. If this interpretive principle were applied consistently, the creation of the woman in Genesis 2 would be seen as the crowning achievement of divine creativity. (Trible in Milne 1988:17-18)

The presumption of a one-time, *ex nihilo*, utopian static order of creation in which static symmetry of the created order was the order of cosmic 'day' is not upheld in process-ubuntu but rather, as Whitehead (1978:95) maintains, an "evolutionary doctrine [of] aboriginal disorder". Whitehead here is in concert with coherent "Western" scholarship as well as holding forth the invitation that studies of ubuntu take account of a narrative of an ever-changing (i.e. evolving) cosmos "with all its paradoxes and perspectives" (Müller 2015:3).

Among the paradoxes to be factored in this ubuntu-process conversation is the force-field (for good and/or ill) which exists in a culture where male and female identities and

roles may be proscribed (albeit culturally reinforced as 'essential' to a society. This field is 'located' in the liminal space between entities at micro and macro levels. Consideration of binaries both deemed 'natural' or imposed by culture (and supported by some theologies/sociologies) comes under examination of this present ubuntu-process program. This examination highlights – in the particular discussion of male/female relationships – the intersubjective encounters not only between gender inter-identities but also intra-identities.

The whole hierarchy of being (hierarchy in terms of 'given' agency) is responsive to the God-provided creative advance into novelty by which there is a cosmological attractant within each person, lure toward self-actualization (including gender affirmation) in community with other people, with nonhuman nature, and with the divine spirit. This lure is also present in nonhuman life; "it is that power by which nonhuman organisms live from moment to moment with some satisfaction relative to *their* (emphasis given) situations. From a process perspective, this lure is God, or at least one aspect of God" (McDaniel 1990:212).

3.2 An ubuntu-process response to all disequilibria

The permeable thresholds of ubuntu-process account which allow for justice and equality to be known also allow for injustice. The fuzzy boundaries among entities are evidence again in a recounting of the appearance at the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Winnie Madikizela-Mandela as once the "embodiment of suffering, resistance, survival, and all the images associated with the

fight against apartheid, was questioned as a perpetrator" (Gobodo-Madikizela[15] 2004:101).

The fuzzy boundaries of all ubuntu-process entities are evidenced in this observed TRC vignette involving Madikizela-Mandela:

> ...she approached Stompie Siepie's mother while the cameras rolled. With a triumphant smile and open arms, she embraced her. I watched the moment of contact between the two women: the mother's humble smile and return of the gesture, and Madikizela-Mandela's triumphant smile, enacting her imposing power through her embrace. Two smiles: one a symbol of power, and the other a symbol of impotence. (Gobodo-Madikizela 2004:102)

Symbols of power and symbols of impotence prehend, even define, one another: some are absorbed into the new entity, others have their concrescence postponed but "there is no element in the universe capable of pure privacy". (Whitehead 1978:212). It is a doctrine of the philosophy of organism that even contrasts which we find painful find their tender reception and by extrapolation, divine harmony despite prevalent disharmony in this present epoch:

> [I]t is but an image-the image under which this operative growth of God's nature is best conceived, is that of a tender care that nothing be lost. The consequent nature of God is his judgement on the world. He saves the world as it passes into the immediacy of his own life. It is the judgement of a tenderness which loses nothing that can be saved. (Whitehead 1978:346)

---

15 Gobodo-Madikizela was a member of the TRC Committee on Human Rights Violations, established 16 December 1995, with public hearings beginning April 1996; its reports were presented to President Nelson Mandela 29 October 1998. Reports of open public hearings can be found in *Truth and Reconciliation Report of South Africa Report*, Vol. 4. Available from: ttp://www.justice.gov.za/trc/report/finalreport/Volume%204.pdf.

The relational and intersubjective ontology of ubuntu-process critically confronts any mythical (defined as any narrative bearing upon universals with particular impacts) concepts reflecting either an *ex nihilo* or *in nihilo*. In terms of issues of gender relations, Whitehead's earlier-stated rejection of a primitive exegesis of the Genesis report of male-female relations is harmonious with so-denominated "African feminism" as a rejection of "Western feminist assumption ...that the public and private spheres are separated into gendered spheres [for]...in many parts of Africa, such lines are not as rigidly demarcated" (Blay 2008:69).

The permeable boundaries of process-ubuntu allow a deep illumination of times and spaces which defy tidy differentiations among the good and bad - when protagonists and antagonists share each other's traits. In issues of justice in relation to gender power dynamics which respects uniqueness, the postfoundationalism of ubuntu-process accounts for a communalism that does not remove any participating constituent's essential nature but neither does it protect that nature from having to consider (via prehensions) and to take account of (in concrescences) both similarities and dissimilarities. An ubuntu-process response to gender inequalities can facilitate the voicing of the shared space not only of the communal story (the One) but of individual prehensions (the Many).

Shared narrative is as the cosmos itself: an intersubjective interplay of actual individuals and actual communal units as the interplay of "static vision and the dynamic history" (Whitehead 1978:167). Here 'static' means a temporary state of mutual prehensions

between/among individual even as the data of the larger society demands concrescence by its sheer weight and history.

The narrative is but one example of the ubuntu-process cosmology - encounter is both conjunction and disjunction of the single shared story prehending the individual narratives gathered with an impending creativity and novelty of flux:

> The universe is at once the multiplicity of *res verae* and the solidarity of *res verae*. The solidarity is itself the efficiency of the macroscopic *res vera*, embodying the principle of unbounded permanence acquiring novelty through flux. The multiplicity is composed of microscopic *res verae*, each embodying the principle of bounded flux acquiring 'everlasting' permanence. On one side, the one becomes many; and on the other side, the many become one. (Whitehead 1978:167)

3.3 A search for an authentic ubuntu response to crises

Since "the very concern with authenticity in African philosophy *presupposes* (emphasis added) a background of crisis" (Wiredu 2007:73), ubuntu-process must surely find its test of authenticity when applied to experiences which include the whole hierarchy of being – including crises.

The cultural home of ubuntu and the philosophy of organism concur on a definition of evil as any encounter whose net effect runs counter to the harmony of wholeness:

> When the direct feeling of such Destruction dominates the whole, there is the immediate feeling of evil, and the anticipation of destructive or weakened data for the future. (Whitehead 1933:263)

So too "[in] the African world-view, [t]he world *ought* (emphasis added) to be harmonious, balanced and good." (Daniel 2009:151) – but life involves both and narrative endeavours must reflect both because "the state of light and the state of dark are present at the same time to the mythteller, like the light and dark phases of the moon" (Kane 1998:167).

There is an "intermingling of Beauty and Evil" (Whitehead 1933:259) and the world's (including human) relationships are fraught with the panoply of deontological expectations –both met and unmet. We cannot simply flip a switch to disengage inharmonious prehensions. From the perspective of this ubuntu-process scheme, it would be ontological violence to the agency of entities, to disassociate or to try to protect a relational ontology from speaking to the widest range of existence and *res* interactions. To do so would be to randomly delimit an ill-defined subset of the 100% of an individual person or persons or a community. The exhibition of 'humanness' and 'humanity' – regardless of *vera* or *verae* origin from their respective existens – within true multivalent thinking, cannot be purged of occasions of a lack of 'humaneness' . It is our thesis that, aside from the evidence that the definitions into English of ubuntu are many (e.g. Forster 2007:*passim*; Forster 2010a:n8, n14; Louw 2001:15), even such an "an evasive concept" as ubuntu (Müller 2015:1) can still reflect congruence with the Whiteheadean vector of meaning through which a fruitful interdisciplinary conversation can emerge.

The traditional understanding of ubuntu and the philosophy of organism each concur in the definition of experienced evil as that which destroys wholeness: " 'destruction as the dominant fact in the experience' is the correct definition of evil" (Whitehead 1933:259).

This ubuntu-process, whereby private prehensions take their cue from the public/communal and individual relational modes of being, is not a prophylactic against privations, threats to collective identity or survival or from the spectrum of lived threats ranging from the merely inconvenient to experienced evils, as one scholar has voiced:

> The real communalism practices by ancient Africans was not as bright as the Afroscent nationalists painted it...They forget that if the African communalism was as bright and as good as they painted, Africa would not have been terribly backward as it were which warranted the slave trade and the subsequent colonization. (Okeke, 2011:1)

Acknowledging the best-case impetus of ubuntu as an African gift to the world does not remove the reality that interactions of harmony are "often not the first activities or attitudes that spring to mind when one reflects on Africa" (Louw 2010: 2).

A relevant ubuntu-process must account for "occasions of experience...measured as much by the alternative that they reject as by those that they accept" (Weiss 2009). A philosophical or hermeneutical rejection - or even abhorrence - of threats to existence or peaceful harmony does not protect anyone from their reach. Creatures, in fact all of creation, is formed both by exposures constructive and destructive. Ubuntu as an expression of a particular lived manifestation of ubuntu-process is more than a semantic

that retreats from personal or societal dysfunction as a healthy body cell might from an infectious presence, lest it be contaminated.

To truly know ourselves and the world around us – multivalent entities all - is a lived program of accommodation and integration, not bifurcation or loci of the fallacy of misplaced concrescence, which is the mistake of seeing the whole limited by its parts. We are not in the first instance divided up into various sections such as the physical body, the soul and spirit. 'Process' and ubuntu affinity is reinforced in what affects the *res verae* affects the *res vera*, and that which affects the whole affects the parts:

> [I]n the African approach one cannot reduce identity simply to the experiences of the individual, or the perceptions of the group. One must employ an integrative approach that takes cognisance of both approaches... (Forster 2006: n5).

To limit an intersubjective ontology to the best of human nature would be to impose *a priori* and would *de facto* impose a bivalence which would prove to be a negative restriction on the widest possible hierarchy of sympathy of the world - from the 'highest' to the 'lowest' of creation (including a deity, however seen as efficacious or otherwise) in the realms of a discussion of theodicy. Discussions of theodicy can be viewed as a wrestling with the nature of divine jurisprudence. The philosophy of organism presents a conception of God which "is not to be treated as and exception to "all metaphysical principles, invoked to save their collapse. He is their chief exemplification" (Whitehead 1978:343). This is consistent with ubuntu which links all earthly creation "..from minerals through vegetables, animals and humans, links stones to the departed and God

himself (Mudimbe 1985:189-190). Ubuntu-process accounts for loci of occasions of mutual prehensions of injustice and justice human-to-human, human-to-creation and human-to-divine. For this schema not to respond to this obligation would be a case of a Whiteheadean (1978:93) "fallacy of misplaced concreteness".

An authentic ubuntu-process response to suffering is a response to the call for authenticity within the "the whole gamut of relevance" (Whitehead, 1978:43-44). To be fully and completely relevant is to account for the complete experience of the world. We cannot, therefore, exclude suffering in the panoply of experience in the fullest of relational ontologies. To be a "full and complete human being" (Ramose 2001:para 9) is to experience life in which "[m]ental and physical operations are incurably intertwined" (Whitehead 1978:317).

Gade (2012) systemized the spectrum of understandings of ubuntu, with that aphorism reflecting a range of membership from defining a definite moral quality – with the presumption that it means a positive quality - to the widest interconnection of all persons. In this speculative 'range' of ubuntu understandings is included an understanding of how one may be excluded from an ubuntu understanding of selfhood and communal membership. In his survey of South Africans of South African descent (SAAD), Gade (2012:484) found

> that some SAADs define *all Homo sapiens* as persons, whereas others hold the view that only *some Homo sapiens* count as persons: only those who are black, only those who have been incorporated into personhood, or only those who behave in a morally acceptable manner (italics original).

Ubuntu-process holds to the definition by which no entities are exempt from membership in reality, contra the doctrine that a person is a person *only* "because he or she possess or displays the [*of acceptable*] characteristics of 'ubuntu' (emphasis added)" (Forster 2010b:8).

The acceptance of the fluidity of all boundaries impacts ubuntu towards the inclusion of *all* persons leading to a postfoundational understanding of ubuntu, which acknowledges that "there is no African philosophy which is not a product of cultural construction [and that] the moral domain admits a multiplicity of moral orders (there is no single moral order for all human beings)" (Coetzee 2003:322).

A postfoundationalist rendering of ubuntu strives to loosen it from the xenophobic legacy of creaturely evolution: "Sapiens instinctively divide humanity into two parts, 'we' and 'they'….

> We are all responsible for each other, but not responsible for them. We are always distinct from them, and owe them nothing…They are barely even human." (Harari 2014:194-195)

The ubuntu-process doctrine takes seriously that "[o]ne cannot be fully human without being in relationship" (Forster 2010a:247) , therefore, one cannot *not* be in relationship with those *with* whom one has, expressed in Whiteheadean terms, even a negative prehension – be it consciously or unconsciously. A postfoundationalist ubuntu decries xenophobia.[16]

---

16 In the context of the negative delimiting of 'humanity' to one's own group to the point of xenophobia and the ubuntu-process search for a postfoundationalist ubuntu, cf. Harari (2014:196): "In the language of the Dinka people of the Sudan, 'Dinka' simply means 'people'. People who are not Dinka are not people. The Dink's bitter enemies are the Nuer. What does the word Nuer mean in Nuer

Ubuntu-process also decries any fear (*phobia*) of incorporating suffering into its cosmos because such states are not foreign or strange (*xeno*) to anyone.

3.3.1 Incorporating occasions of suffering/injustice

For Whitehead, the consideration of sufferings introduces, without apology, the field of religion into the philosophy of organism as part of the creative advance into hope.

It is a statement of faith in the philosophy of organism that 'evil' is defined as that which does not and will not *ultimately* persist: "the struggle with evil is a process of building up a mode of utilization by the provision of intermediate elements introducing a complex structure of harmony" (Whitehead 1978:340). As humanly complex and unsatisfactory as such harmony may seem to be in the occasions of suffering where we may find ourselves, there is a basic assumption of the efficacy of hope:

> It is always open to us, having regard to the imperfections of all metaphysical systems, to lose hope at the exact point where we find ourselves. The preservation of such faith must depend on an ultimate moral intuition into the nature of intellectual action-that it should embody the adventure of hope. Such an intuition marks the point where metaphysics-and indeed every science-gains assurance from religion and passes over into religion. (Whitehead 1978:42)

---

language? It means 'original people'. Thousands of kilometers from the Sudan deserts, in the frozen ice-lands of Alaska and north-eastern Siberia, live the Yupiks. What does Yupik mean in Yupik language? It means 'real people'." Gade (2012:498) offers a summary of two types of understandings of ubuntu: exclusive, by which society would stamp one's moral passport as 'unacceptable' and inclusive through which there are no refugees to membership in humanity. The philosophy of organism completes its portrait of ubuntu to be radically inclusive.

Transversal rationality has its genesis in the science-theology debate presented arguably as a confrontation of disciplines to the extent that "[c]ertain tensions remain deeply embedded at the heart of the engagement, and with them important issues about the nature of the enterprise itself [emerging and prehended as] "shared rational space" (Bennett 2012:2). That rational mode of the engagement serves as servant to the emotive mode of the parable's true payload: the construction of a new narrative which arose from a source story meeting its target.

The liminal space and timeless expanse of the parabolic occasion presents an analogous Rubicon - defined as "a bounding or limiting line; *especially*: one that when crossed commits a person irrevocably"[17] - between 'African' ubuntu and the 'Western' philosophy of organism. Once crossed, however, the liminal transversality cannot then be undone.

> does not provide the massiveness of emphasis capable of dismissing its contrary elements into negative prehensions...There are various types of order, and some of them provide more trivial satisfaction than do others. Thus, if there is to be progress beyond limited ideals, the course of history by way of escape must venture along the borders of chaos in its substitution of higher for lower types of order. (Whitehead 1978:110-111)

For both the philosophy of organism and of an ubuntu community, the goal – however perpetually perishing – is higher grades of order even in the face of creaturely-defined chaos. It is a Whiteheadean challenge to both occasions of suffering as well as to the

---

17 See *Merriam-Webster* [Online] 2015 at http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rubicon

presumption of a utopian community that it would be an instance of the fallacy of "misplaced concreteness" (Whitehead 1978:7 *et passim,* 1925 in 1978:18, n 1) to view any living organism, such as a community as inhabiting an ultimate *omeg*a end-state, whether good or bad, just or unjust. In this cosmology, hope rests in both the Whiteheadean definition of the role of God's contingent nature and the commonweal trust in the efficacy of positive prehension, even optimistic definitions, of the application of the aphorism *umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*, i.e. "a person is a person through other persons" (Shutte in Louw 1998).

Ubuntu and its dialogical partner share optimism both in theology and in the theatre of human field of force (cf. McLuhan, 1969; Louw 2008) - both persuasive and coercive - respectively:

> [t]he immanence of God gives reason for the belief that pure
> chaos is intrinsically impossible."

and

> the immensity of the world negatives the belief that any state
> of order can be so established that beyond it there can be no
> progress. (Whitehead 1978:111)

The relational ontology of ubuntu-process provides a metaphysics of justice as an "ontology plus epistemology – it combines an ontological theory of types of entities...with an epistemological theory of knowledge and truth." (Seibt 2005:4)

An evolutionary and postfoundational intersubjective ubuntu-process can contribute to the search for truth in justice even in – in fact, especially within - the interface of competing truths and injustice in communities in search of healing as hereby defined as

a realignment of the involved entities in their blended ubuntu space(s). Turner's observations (1996:112) apply:

> Blending is a basic process; meaning does not reside in one site but is typically a dynamic and variable pattern of connections over many elements;

that is to say,

> [p]erception and conception seem to us one unitary whole, but they involve blending.

In a narratological and existential echo of ubuntu in the search for inclusive justice that prehends, takes account of direct and collateral damage, seen and unseen, from interconnected oppressor and oppressed we learn about justice: I can see, hear and know justice because others have shown it and spoken it to me.

3.3.2 Of women

An ubuntu narrative that places that traditional African worldview and life stream within a postfoundationalist conversation will be emboldened to observe the mutual prehension - even concrescence - of peace and violence in the same event, both of which can be accounted for if the aphorism is considered postfoundationally:

> Women experience several traditional practices of hospitality that are accompanied by risk of disease and violence and economic strains. These acts of hospitality and caring *are* (emphasis added) acts of *ubuntu* in the community. (Kruidenier 2015:6)

The application of the ubuntu-process transversal conversation to occasions of injustice offers a trajectory of explanation to occasions of suffering known not only anecdotally but arising from scientifically-bounded research into narratives arising, such as The Second Cluster of the Ubuntu Project of the Centre for the Advancement of Scholarship whose mandates included an examination of personal and communal interactions to reveal "whether the concept of *ubuntu* is indeed primal in the shaping of identities" (Kruidenier 2015:1). In the context of evaluation and recommendations from observations of personal narrative-building in addressing gender injustices, the methodology and observations of personal and communal agency and theological engagement renders the deployment of an ubuntu-process hermeneutic of meaning-seeking consistent with a feminist hermeneutic of justice which draws to "unsettle the power structures of those more privileged" (Kruidenier 2015:2).

The motive of existential and lived practicality of the ubuntu-process conversation is, in the first instance, known in a community's search for greater degrees of positive ubuntu within its members and, especially, in the liminal spaces which its members share and, in the second, by the philosophy or organism's insistence that "[o]ne practical aim of metaphysics is the accurate analysis of propositions; not merely of metaphysical propositions, but of quite ordinary propositions such as 'There is beef for dinner today' " (Whitehead 1978:11). Ubuntu-process asks of its blended ontological space: Is there justice today? An expansion of a postfoundationalist ubuntu understanding of justice must begin in earnest with a study of the very word in its composite nature – which now begins.

3.3.3 *Via* Etymology: Ubu-/-ntu

A word-study of ubuntu (albeit in English translation from its indigenous source) provides an etymological magnifying glass for a study of the trinity of the aphorisms' operative and ontological factors: the person, the liminal space, and the other persons: i.e. a person/is through/other persons. This particular study aims the trajectory of its search for meaning at occasions of suffering.

A postfoundationalist ubuntu accounts for life lived in the face of specific sufferings and restorative existens generally amid deteriorations encountered particularly. Any generally external prehending subject-object cannot be ultimately separated from its particular internal modes of being, as noted in this etymology of ubuntu:

> Ubu evokes the idea of being in general. It is enfolded being before it manifests itself in the concrete form or mode of existence of a particular entity. In this sense ubu is always oriented towards ntu. At the ontological level there is no strict separation between ubu and ntu. Ubu and ntu are mutually founding in the sense that they are two aspects of being as an oneness and an indivisible whole-ness. Ubu as the generalized understanding of being may be said to be distinctly ontological; ntu as the nodal point at which being assumes concrete form or a mode of being in the process of continual unfoldment may be said to be distinctly epistemological. (Ramose 2001:para 3)

Ubu cannot be separated from ntu: the former provides the universal and the lived individualities of the many ntu reflect the node of particular concrescences – confirming the ontological principle and intersubjectivity (worth repetition unto tedium) which

130

"blur the sharp distinction between what is universal and what is particular" (Whitehead 1978: 48).

In ubuntu cosmology, the global reaches to the individual, the public reaches into the private as does the private influence the public, the individual influences the community. This scheme of extensive reach leaves no place unaccounted for – in good times and in bad times. As Whitehead (1978:288) points out, "There are no important physical relationships outside the extensive scheme."

3.3.4 Extending the postfoundationalist reach of ubuntu-process

Occasions which present destruction of wholeness, oneness or their inter-relation encompass and reflect the range of subjective aims from instability to annihilation and find their entrance into prehensive possibilities as a consequence of creaturely freedom as the outcome of relationships which are "living, dynamic, fluid and constantly changing" (Forster 2010:4). When encountering evil(s), the philosophy of organism reverberates with "the maintenance of harmony and equilibrium in the wholeness of creation [as] of fundamental importance in the African world view" (Forster 2010:7). Such equilibrium – which includes an accounting of all disequilibria -   is equally presumed in process-ubuntu whereby, in reflecting the

> infinitely various components of experience...we must appeal
> to evidence relating to every variety of occasion. Nothing can
> be omitted, experience drunk and experience sober,
> experience waking, experience drowsy and experience wide-
> awake, experience self-conscious and experience self-
> forgetful, experience intellectual and experience physical,
> experience religious and experience sceptical, experience
> anxious and experience care-free, experience anticipatory and

131

experience retrospective, experience happy and experience grieving, experience dominated by emotion and experience under self-restraint, experience in the light and experience in the dark, experience normal and experience abnormal. (Whitehead 1933:226)

Any endeavour, thought, or action which seeks to isolate any experience from its ontological place along the above spectrum would be to seek to function in a one-sided cosmos of unending goodness. Such a utopian world does not exist.

Transversal rationality between ubuntu and the philosophy of organism can be employed in discussions of the range of sufferings defined as anything that would seek to splinter the inter/intrasubjectivity of ubu and ntu, the *res vera* from the *res verae*, by way of our "morally ambivalent natures,... [m]oral awareness, [and] the depths of depravity" (Stone 2006:86).

"The common character of all evil is that there is some concurrent realisation of a purpose towards elimination." (Emmet 1966:269). Threats of elimination are encountered all along the hierarchy of beings. The multiplicity of effort in human endeavours as nodal points includes those efforts that fall short of the ideal. The human community includes persons

> who help one to grow through affirmation, nurture and care, and others who help one to grow through conflict, disappointment and struggle (emphasis added). This is part of becoming truly human. (Forster 2010a:250)

To seek to isolate nodal points of suffering from the cosmos, or any co-participant would be to cleave, arbitrarily the multiplicity of a corporate collective from its constituents. There can be no presumption that any society is immune from members' disharmony:

> the members can only exist by reason of the laws (i.e. ubu)
> which dominate the society, and the laws only come into
> being by reason of the analogous characters of the members
> (i.e. ntu) of the society. (Whitehead 1978:91)

In other words, to deny ubuntu-process fullest exposure and inclusion of injustice (potential and/or kinetic) in its systematic and not to demand of it an accounting on the observation that the fullest of humanity includes the fullest spectrum, is to perform, a type of unhelpful "theodicy of the text...[which]..."renders evil and injustice external to it" (Gordon 2014:97). This prophylactic attempt to 'protect' the fullest ubuntu application from contamination can be seen as akin to occasions of selective readings of philosophical texts by which

> the idea of reading canonical texts by European thinkers
> without there being racist elements in those texts is a naïve
> expectation....And in some instances, our efforts to render
> them and their thought completely consistent with all that is
> right and good is not much more than a collapse into theodicy
> in secular form. (Gordon 2014:97)[18]

---

18 The observation of the application of "double consciousness" in seeking to immunize concepts from the fullest context of their origins is not to diminish their helpfulness but a caution to the fullest humanity behind their formation: "Hume, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche and many other European thinkers were human beings who carried and exemplified the mores of their society. Some were better than others in this regard, but all, in the end, were *human beings* (original emphasis). Readers who forget this look for the divine" Gordon 2014: 97). Notwithstanding, he does not dismiss the import of seminal Western/European thinkers in their challenging of inherited intellectual boundaries. (cf Gordon 2014:100)

This ubuntu-process conversation invites an "ontological reach" (Gordon 2014: 99) past the limits of the constituent disciplines reflected in its constituent ontologies. In the context of the current discussion of the range of sufferings occurring from of un-/sub-conscious behaviour representing the range of sentient and non-sentient (allowing for such in this discussion at this point) to the opposite extreme of a suffering attributed to a metaphysical realm or deity (theodicy) as a "teleological suspension of disciplinarity" (Gordon 2014:100). It has been established that ubuntu (even without its process categories) does not bifurcate communalism from the life and autonomy of its individual constituents; that is to say that "true Ubuntu incorporates dialogue, i.e. it incorporates both relation and distance" (Louw 1998); and how much more 'distant' could entities be then when at enmity?

It is that distance-defined space into which the widest range of relationships is located – including the creaturely range of loves and hates, ecstasies and sufferings – in a shared multivalent historicity which, at the same time

> underscores the importance of agreement and consensus...
> [while] [r]especting the historicality of the other [which]
> means respecting his/her dynamic nature or process nature...
> An Ubuntu perception of the other is never fixed or rigidly
> closed, but adjustable or open-ended. It allows the other to be,
> to become. (Louw 1998)

The multivalent manifestations and experiences of the range of suffering(s) reveal the discernment of di-vergent/multi-vergent prehensions and consequent concrescences as part of an ubuntu-process view of the created order - including (i) the "notion that no entity can be divorced from creativity "in the dictionary sense of the word [meaning]

134

creare, 'to bring forth, beget, produce'" (Whitehead 1978:213) in this world - for good or ill - "which is never the same twice, though always with the stable element of divine ordering" (Whitehead 1978:31); (ii) the autonomous freedom to both respond to and contribute to intersubjective relations - 'free', meaning free to respond to data in a 'yes' (positive prehension), 'no' (negative prehension), 'yes and 'no' (mixed prehensions) or 'perhaps not yet' (negative prehensions); (iii) advance (as movement, "not uniquely serial" (Whitehead 1978:35) and not by default in the sense of riding on a type of upward-bound moral escalator) into novelty (meaning situations unpredicted, not for amusement, and necessarily contingent upon particular or general relevance(s) being ontologically revealed at each concrescence; and (4) self-determinate as volitional agents contributing to the interrelationships.[19]

The existence of creaturely sufferings challenges the stance that sickness, suffering and evil(s) presents a perversity of what it is to exhibit the fullest human capacity for expression of full engagement, fulfilling one's responsibility as a constituent member of 'the many' who form a society's collective One.

To only partially positively prehend another entity does not, in the philosophy of organism, eliminate certain data from consideration but, rather, a 'negative' prehension continues to be a relationship. To declare someone who has broken a social code or mores as as not 'having' ubuntu for having broken an accepted code is to hold even the rejected relationship in a type of abeyance. This is not the same as living as if it does not exist – it is to hold it in abeyance until some future unknown occasion. In ubuntu-

---

19   For a challenge to consideration of the viability of a transversal application of 'process' ontological categories to an African (e.g. Shona) relational context, see Graves (1998).

process, such a 'rejected' occasion does not ontologically cease to exist nor does the relationship with it end. In a postfoundationalist ubuntu-process a negative prehension – that is an experience that lies outside of a desired subjective aim but is still prehended because the relationship is maintained in order that the community "take cogniscence" (Forster 2010b:6) of it. Negative prehensions are available for some future consideration or contemplation. In other words, the invisible world is not divorced from the visible: no event "reaches static completion" (Whitehead 1978:349).

Every moment is an instance of "evolutionary emergence" (Weiss 2009:7). The evolution of one moment into the next is not a bare repetition of its successor but incorporates new data, however minute, however private and unseen. Even the most trivial data not yet prehended must be accounted for in its embodiment in the new moment. The liminal space in which this intersubjective encounter occurs between past and present is the perceptual nexus in which the moment's "origins become subordinate to the individual experience" (Whitehead 1978:213). Multivalent causes and effects of sufferings find their manifestations arising from the interplay of individuals and the society which they constitute and the greater the number of factors being considered, there is an unavoidable rise in complexity and risk of increased disorder. Here the spectrum of sufferings from the trivial to the catastrophic are understood as part of the same spectrum of the data of the created and evolving/creative order.

Horrendous events are both perpetrated and suffered by-products of creaturely freedom:

> Each new step in the evolution of beings into more complex
> life forms, however, brings with it new possibilities also of
> great discord. In stimulating more complexity and thereby

136

more intense forms of experience, God risks the possibilities of more intense diversity and discord; but the divine lure toward intensity and complexity also makes possible the enjoyment of the more valuable aesthetic harmonies. (Whitney 1985:149).

In the ubuntu-process consideration of suffering(s) "[i]t is not the task of theodicy to try to justify individual evils as such" (Whitney 1978:218-219) nor can one arbitrarily decide which part of an individual's nature can be portrayed as uninvolved in the evolutionary, creative movement into each moment's novelty – whether benevolent or malevolent. Traditional ubuntu does not remove from an individual either his/her individual or collective freedom. So too, as 'process' philosopher/theologian Charles Hartshorne (1967) observes, the theodicy of the

the philosophy of organism allows for – insists upon – the freedom of all entities to exercise agency within their necessary subjective aim:

> Risk of evil and opportunity for good are two aspects of just one thing, multiple freedoms and there is no guarantee that individual creatures (including those on the microscopic level) will not produce evils with little redeeming value for others. And yet, every experience – every good and every evil – has 'some value from some perspective. (Whitney 1985:219, n93)

Horrendous events such as genocides are certainly corporately noted and witnessed but they are directly prehended/encountered as individual deaths: "as a multiplicity of private centres of feeling" (Whitehead 1978: 212).

Uncertainty and chaos "is not to be identified with evil; for harmony requires the due coordination of chaos, vagueness, narrowness, and width" (Whitehead 1978:112). That a

firm definition of such harmony which would render sufferings acceptable defies philosophical and existential categories of both ubuntu and the philosophy of organism.

Unacceptable and acceptable data co-exist: "The right chaos, and the right vagueness, are jointly required for any effective harmony" (Whitehead 1978:112). The nature of this 'effective harmony' rests, and is experienced at its most basic and its most expansive, along a spectrum determined by subjective relevance gleaned from a real world, and from actual relationships, neither "purely orderly, or as purely chaotic" (Whitehead 1978:110).

"It is fundamental to the metaphysical doctrine of the philosophy of organism, that the notion of an actual entity as the unchanging subject of change is completely abandoned" (Whitehead 1978:29). In the endeavour of thinking about struggles of life (sentient and non-sentient) a central observation which must follow from this doctrine is that nothing commonly perceived or received as either good or evil can remain in the same state in which it has been experienced.

This is not to say that what is perceived as evil must necessarily take a sudden turn for the even-worse, nor that the good necessarily perform a perverse 180-degree turn into evil, but rather that change is unavoidable by all entities, events and occasions and, secondly, that the manner in which the changed-into state - however spatially or temporally defined - is experienced will determine the resultant effects of its concrescence as good or evil. In other words "...it belongs to the nature of a 'being' that it is a potential for every 'becoming'. Thus all things are to be conceived as qualifications

of actual occasions...*how* an actual entity becomes constitutes what that actual entity is" (emphasis original) (Whitehead 1978:166). It is in the "analysis of the experiences of subjects" (Whitehead 1978:166) that the quality of goodness or evil is revealed reflecting "a hierarchy of categories of feeling" (Whitehead 1978:166).

Subject and object, being mutually dependent and definitive, prehend one another and are part of one another, indivisible to varying degrees determined by relevance to their respective but mutually-prehending subjective aims. This propels us toward the awkward existential reality in which 'I am because we are. This may be personally awkward because it means that my occasions of goodness, and of evil, are relative to my/our subjective aims. Goodness and evil, for discussion as representative words reflecting the extreme ends of a spectrum of inter-relationships, "require a process of selection [as] at once the measure of evil, and the process of its evasion...thus the struggle with evil, is a process of building up a mode of utilization by the provision of intermediate elements introducing a complex structure of harmony" (Whitehead 1978:340).

The arrival at existential harmony can be implied in the balancing act evidenced when an event or occasion takes account of its environment, whereby "in each concrescent occasion its subjective aim originates novelty to match the novelty of the environment" (Whitehead 1978:102). When a subjective aim purposively selects to positively (vice negatively) prehend and repeat concrescences which perpetuates the dominance of destruction, or destructions therein is the experience of evil. Fundamental to both speculative and lived experience is that " 'destruction as a dominant fact in the

experience' is the correct definition of evil." (Whitehead 1933:259) Also, the philosophy of organism holds that the nature of evil is seen and experienced when "the characters of things are mutually obstructive" (Whitehead 1978:340). Manifestations of evil, and good, reflect their deeper, paradoxically-shared source.

For Whitehead, "good and evil lie in the depths and distances below and beyond appearance. They solely concern inter-relations within the real world. The real world is good when it is beautiful" (Whitehead 1933:268). To limit the African gift of the truth-claims of ubuntu to its face value would be to presume that simply "pronouncing the phrase" (Wildman 2006:2) would be to guarantee in all contexts where traditional relationships persevere that those societies where such intersubjectivity holds sway would be providing the world with an unqualified mini-cosmos of "nurturing compassion for all human beings, promoting ecological responsibility, discriminating between reality and wishful thinking, or attaining any other worthy goal" (Wildman 2006:2). Regrettably, the achievement of such a realized utopian eschatology wherever the footprint of ubuntu rests is not borne out by history.

The full intersubjective import of the relational ontology of ubuntu would be lacking if both individual and collective experiences of malevolence, evil, suffering, struggle or even inconvenience would be left out of this conversation between the speculative and 'real time' cosmology of ubuntu. This present work contends that the positive social aspects of ubuntu as well as Whitehead's insistence upon the practicality of a speculative constructs would be, respectively cheapened and rendered unhelpful without occasions of the fullest range of behaviours (from unfortunate to abhorrent) being part of the

conversation. Process-ubuntu, in its inclusion of examining encounters with the worst, as well as the apparently most congenial, of relationships provides an intersubjective, relational cosmology which "spans all the way from physical interaction to the mediation of value in relations of social, psychological, moral and spiritual importance" (Wildman 2006:5).

Ubuntu-process accounts for occasions in which divine justice, human systems of justice and the balance of the non-sentient natural world enter human consciousness. It is to that we now turn. While process-ubuntu seeks to outline a comprehensive, unified structure of understanding, it is helpful to distinguish fields of endeavour; hence the following sections addressing 'evil' as it relates to a theist's presumption that evil may be defined as that which separates the creature from the creator. While the word 'evil' may seem too strong, or not strong enough, to represent the range of ways in which a fallible human may be distanced (by acts or thoughts of omission or commission-in Whiteheadean terms, by positive or negative prehensions), it is commonplace to use the term 'justice' as a corrective, even counterpoint, to the term 'evil'.

The theist takes this further to equate a/the deity (*theos*) with the resolution or correction or removal of the dis-ease of real or perceived injustice; ergo, the term and meanings and hermeneutic of "theo-dicy" (*theo*- the- (from Latin, God-) + Greek *dikē* judgment, right). Similarly, it appears at its face that ubuntu-process implicates, on a sliding scale of sins of omission/commission, not only God but all of creation – the 'living' and the 'not-living' – in the world's injustices:

> "[T]rue identity arises not only from harmonious relationship with other living human persons, but also through harmonious relationships with God, the ancestors, and all of creation." (Forster 2010a:248)

Despite the observation that the crux of Whiteheadean *dikē* is found in the ultimate balance of the good – which does not anaesthetize the world from the widest range of discord – "The Discord in the universe arises from the fact that modes of Beauty are various and not of necessity compatible" (Whitehead 1933:266); and that, at the 'end of the day' optimism and truth prevail:

> There is a blunt force about Truth, which in the subjective form of its prehension is akin to cleanliness - namely, the removal of dirt, which is unwanted irrelevance. The sense of directness which it carries with it, sustains the upstanding individualities so necessary for the beauty of a complex. Falsehood is corrosive. (Whitehead 1933:266)

The relational ontology of ubuntu-process, perhaps uncomfortably, reinforces mutual complicity in occasions of injustice and the corrosiveness of *malum* as both ubuntu participants (individual and the collective) because "[t]he African belief system and value system naturally accommodates both the individual as well as the community as ontologically interdependent without reducing the ontological density of the community" (Ntibagirwa 2011).

This density of relationships involves the complete hierarchy of relata and so the notion of justice must include the deity as the chief exemplification of relational categories. In considering patterns of human behaviour which gives rise to personal and societal

142

benefits of ubuntu, "the cohesion of social systems depends on the maintenance of patterns of behaviour ... [and]...the stability of such patterns, and the modification of such patterns, is the necessary condition for the realization of the Good" (Whitehead 1965:21).

Whitehead offers an analogy of the positive/negative spectrum of human relationships in a work of art:

> ...in a picture, the geometrical pattern may be good, but the relationship of colours may be horrible [giving rise to] "the truth that no entity is merely characterized by its individual character, or merely by its relationships....the drawing may be good, and colour effect may be a failure. The whole topic of Good and Evil arises. And you cannot discuss Good and Evil without some reference to the interweaving (cf. ubuntu) of divers patterns of experience. (Whitehead 1965:22)

When destruction is experienced as part of the 'interweaving' of life's patterns, then the quality, and manifested quantity, of the humanity presumed of individuals and community defined by ubuntu is similarly damaged. Safeguards and remedies for healing are sought. Ubuntu offers a hermeneutic by which to recognize that both individual and community healings from the effects of evils must be preceded by safeguards against repeat offences against both individual and communal entities as process events: "The aim of the community is to safeguard humanity in the individual and, on the other hand, the permanent concern of individuals is how humanity can be safeguarded in the community as it is in their person" (Ntibagirwa 2011).

To understand how an ubuntu-process society provide safety to its constituent and composite entities, one must look at the ways in which the created and self-created-in-

143

process reality may be rendered unsafe - vulnerable to the range of destructions-as-evil. In a utopia, ubuntu will lead to manifestations of the compounding of the *summum bonum*. In a dystopia, such intersubjectivity will also lead to manifestations of the compounding of *summum malum*. Utopian and dystopian concrescences each reflect the intersubjectivity of their respective constituents. Human visions of utopias reflect the characteristics of the Good which the collective society seeks to emulate, while dystopias reflect qualities of that which a society fears. Order and disorder have a multivalent ubuntu-process relationship in the cosmos.

Ubuntu-process distils yet another interpretation of ubu-/-ntu, expanding its reach and meaning for personal identity: "Your pain is My pain, My wealth is Your wealth, and Your salvation is My salvation" (Nussbaum 2003:1). Occasions of intensity are those events around which personal identity coalesce. We know where, and how, our personal stories 'fit' because of the narratives of events. It is through its narratology that ubuntu-process can serve as a conduit of confirmation and realization of personal identities – past, present and future.

Having uncovered a postfoundationalist application of ubuntu-process in the field of sufferings we turn our ubuntu-process binoculars toward the sharing and formal chronicling of such. In terms of a possible yet-another paraphrase of the aphorism at hand, Occasions of suffering become part of the contingent narrative which is prehended by the overarching collective narrative. This process presents the opportunity for yet-another paraphrase of the aphorism at hand: I share my story because others have shared theirs. The stage is now set for the narratological study which follows.

4.0 Narratology

The contribution of ubuntu as a mode of personal identity combined with the trajectory of the philosophy of organism that renders a postfoundational understanding of the aphorism's essential ontology more accessible outside of its prehension of cultural uniqueness demands that this ubuntu-process conversation speaks to the "mystery and complexity of human consciousness and individual identity from different angles" (Forster 2010b:1). It is precisely in the occasion of the blended space of interpersonal and inter-societal narratives that 'different angles' of human consciousness are prehended.

The significance of the role of narrative is not only fundamental in the formation of and the elucidation –and interpersonal encounter – of personal identity but an omission of narrative as a factor – not just as a catalyst - in intersubjectivity would render impotent not just this ubuntu-process programme but any attempt to present an ontology of identity. Ricoeur (2005:245) underscores this: "[S]olutions offered to the problem of personal identity which do not consider the narrative dimension fail."

4.0.1 Metaphors and models

 "[M]etaphors and models play such a decisive role in all cognitive development" (Van Huyssteen1989:142) that they can almost be guaranteed to not only aid us in processing ideas but can also slip past our consciousness to help us suspend belief so that its lessons may permeate. Here we can transversally deploy an affinity observed by a reviewer in a work of Mary Stella Okolo between "Literature (creative writing) and Philosophy (love

for knowledge, a deep appraisal and giving meaning to lived realities)" (Achieng 2009:151).

This transversal process-ubuntu conversation is thereby amenable to such artistic expressions as available from by two literary exemplars, C.S. Lewis and, below, A.A. Milne:

> Halfway down the stair
> It's a stair
> Where I sit.
> There isn't any
> Other stair
> Quite like
> It.
> I'm not at the bottom,
> I'm not at the top;
> So this is the stair
> Where
> I always
> Stop.
> Halfway up the stairs
> Isn't up,
> And isn't down.
> It isn't in the nursery,
> It isn't in the town.
> And all sorts of funny thoughts
> Run round my head:
> "It isn't really
> Anywhere!
> It's *somewhere else*
> Instead! (italics added) (Milne 1924)

The space between entities is, indeed, 'somewhere else'.

In C.S. Lewis (1950), *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardobe*, the central fictional narrative is framed by reference to a non-fictional English scene during the Second World War. The 'real' world exists on 'one side' of a wardrobe and on the other side –

146

through a passageway formed by the wardrobe – is the mythical world in which the protagonists (four children) acquire the roles of long-awaited heroes of the residents (including talking animals) of that world (Narnia). They become kings and queens of the magical country, assisted by a messiah figure (the Lion). The wardrobe provides the liminal, transitional chamber of the heroes' transformation from children to battle victors and back again. No metaphor or image is air-tight and certainly not Lewis' wardrobe because *any* environment – it is here posited – "is not a spatio-temporal container, in this view, but rather that which can be prehended, which opens up possibilities of non-proximate influences, actions at a distance, and the like" (Wildman 2006:7).

The journey across/through a life-changing threshold is the beginning of the end of one world and the end of the beginning of its counterpart on the other side. The overlap boundary/threshold of our metaphorical appears able to narrow or widen, depending upon the development need of that which is passing through it en route to its new destination. To support this, at one point, one of the children wonders about the existential width of the threshold he is experiencing: "I suppose this whole country is in the wardrobe" (Lewis 1950:61). It is an observation worthy of a later discussion as to the relation of parts to the whole and whole to the parts (e.g. 5.4.1).

Ethnographer Arnold Gennep (1960) observed three stages involved in the crossing of a threshold: separation, transition, and incorporation. The second phase is particularly relevant to the transitional liminal topic at hand, most-helpfully described from the biological and psychological acumen of the discipline of midwifery: "If there is a secret

door to birth, to giving birth, what would it look like? What's behind, around, or in front of it? Is anyone in the picture?" (England and Horowitz 1998:38). As a partial answer, the children in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* are drawn into - and through - the threshold, seeking "an enlargement of [their] being" (Edwards 1998:157).

The metaphor of the Lewis protagonists points us to the transversal conversation of this work: the concept of liminality as a quality of 'in-between' space and/or a state is of the outmost importance in describing interactions of social and cultural phenomena: i.e. spaces of culture, geography, gender, race, etc. The inter-/intra the liminal spatiotemporal continuum is transcendently experienced between individuals and between the individuals and the collective (each component, having its own personality, defining a 'society' (Weiss 2009:50, n16) which they constitute delimits spatiotemporal worlds (in a permeable-boundary way) by the relevance of data being prehended.

Amid the unity of all things which is the "uniform scheme of relations among actual occasions that define earth local time and space", Whitehead further "suggests that each society defines its own spatiotemporal scheme, so that actuality is patient of many such schemes" (Weiss 2009:18). What is the nature of the shared space(s)? For Whitehead, the intermediary space-time is the region of "boundedness between inside and outside" (Whitehead 1978:301). There, Lewis' mythical space-time travellers are aware of their present (albeit temporary) epoch and (at least momentarily) hold an awareness of past events but do not (or are not required to) ponder potential prehensions of future (narrative) moments which await as they 'exist' on either side of the liminal space. The past provides the context for the ever-recurring present. That is to say, that "no actual

occasion survives as a whole beyond its present immediacy; only its individual prehensions become objectified as each successive moment of the universe moves from disjunction to conjunction" (McHenry 1992:61).

Just as in Lewis wherein the image of an unchangeable wood-and-nails transitional spatiotemporal nexus-space and locus of the wardrobe is challenged by the protagonist's transition through it, so too the notion of moments and individuals as firmly-bounded foundationalist and essentialist containers of identity is challenged by process-ubuntu whereby "[e]ach occasion has its physical inheritance and its mental reaction which drives it on to its self-completion" (Whitehead 1933:190) and "[e]ach moment of experiences confesses itself to be a transition *between* (emphasis added) two worlds, the immediate past and the immediate future" (Whitehead 1933:192).

The influence of data provided by the past upon the present in the liminal space of interaction and co-determinations is in the form of narratives which narratives, which may include the figurative variety and are inter-subjectively presented as subject-object data for both individual and collective incorporation. 'I encounter through the encounter of others':

> The liminal region shared by past, present and future occasions is the "mutual exposure [which] epitomizes the conduct prescribed by Ubuntu. (Louw, 1998)

What is the spatiotemporal relationship? Ubuntu-process' relationships of "relation and distance" (Louw 2001:10) does not operate in a vacuum pending a visible interpersonal encounter. So too, the philosophy of organism:

> This whole metaphysical position is an implicit repudiation of
> the doctrine of 'vacuous actuality'. (Whitehead 1978:xiii)

The causal transmission of identities arises in the limen of the spatiotemporal nexus which is the definitive identities of all participants. It is only in events of mutual identity that relations can be spoken of in the ontological "before and after, above and below, inside and outside, and so forth" (Weiss 2009:17).

> [E]ach event, viewed in its separate individuality, is a passage
> between two ideal termini... [which is] the]...many things
> acquiring complete complex unity. (Whitehead 1933:236)

The communal source of "various figurative narratives" and the incorporating and reframing source of their constitutive individuals-as-co-determinant events) comprise "two levels of philosophical thought [...] discernible in African traditional thought" (Wiredu, 2007:77). The former, communal thought, provides the individual with her/his first narrative frame by which to interpret the world in the context of its data inheritances: 'we are' appears as the field in which 'I am" becomes.

The inherited narrative will take on a life of its own in the 'between' space-time of its encounter. The lived experience of a delivered and encountered mythology (figurative narrative) will be a process-ubuntu occasion of polycausality: a multivalent encounter in which "the state of light and the state of dark are present at the same time to the mythteller." (Kane 1998:167) It is the doctrine of ubuntu-process that this multiplicity is co-terminally experienced by the myth receiver. The space-time location of Lewis' mythical characters while temporarily 'located' within the narrative frames of a 'real'

house, wardrobe and Narnia, offers a 'visual' representation of the faculty of just how a datum becomes incorporated into the realities of the speakers, hearers, the individuals and the collection of the constituent multiplicities.

An ubuntu-process relational ontology sees the narrative subject-object encounter as congruent with the encounter between individuals, their own private processive data, seen and unseen; between individuals within a community, among a community with its members and a community with other communities. These intersubjectivities, in which each entity is an occasion of the acquisition of a new *res vera* story in a co-experienced exchange of portions of the stories brought into the encounter by the individual res verae of the participants, is analogous to musical polyphony, e.g. "an African drum song that gives an experience of the interwoven voices of the animals...[as an] echo in human expression of a world in which everything has intelligence, everything has personality, everything has voice...[with the] human listener being simply a part of that network" (Kane 1998:191-192).

The stories frame an experienced universe which feels real; our relationships feel permanent and yet are ever-changing in a feeling of a nexus of permanence-amid-flux. The stories, the songs, reflect Whiteheadean both a perpetual perishing and yet have an objective immortality. Ubuntu removes neither individual autonomy nor corporate will – as liminal boundarylands both firm up and give way as walls alternately appear and disappear - as the one becomes many and the many become one and the one becomes part of the many again – intermingling while not being subsumed. Hence, the ubuntu-process experience of a narrative is one of "communal thought which is represented by

such things as proverbs, maxims, popular doctrines and various figurative narratives" (Wiredu, 2007:77).

In each concrescence, there is the potential capacity for the datum to be experienced by both "physical and mental poles of an actual entity. No actual entity is devoid of either pole" (Whitehead 1978:239).

Narratives are encountered both as kinetic and potential data: there is no bifurcation of the experience but it is felt both as solid and fluid and the boundary between them is itself both reliable and transient. In this process-ubuntu cosmology, individuality is an illusion and all individuals are defined by their context (the 'we are' determines who "I am) and the space between the individual and her/his society is its own space-time, defined by context.

Orality constantly challenges and traverses the boundaryland between speaker and hearer, the visible and invisible, and even between individuals and between communities, regardless of *raison d'être* and size of the multiplicity - in contrast to the written word which "inserts itself like a crystal wedge between thought and feeling, between mind and body" (Kane 1998:246). Narrative frames set boundaries to both oral and written accounts and

> [t]he boundary – the membrane – is the place where truth is
> felt, and truth is the nourishing exchange of energy between
> everyday life and the extraordinary. With literacy, that
> permeable boundary is hardened. In effect, the boundary is as
> hard as the written page. (Kane 1998:141)

4.0.2 The shared space of homiletics.

The task of the preacher is to render (i) written and oral sacred texts, (ii) the living 'text' of her/himself and (iii) the co-participant auditory and visual recipients/percipients into one Whiteheadean embodied occasion and a concurrent ubuntuesque shared space between the "I" and the "we".

The essence of the applicability of any system of thought is in its embodiment in reality and its offering of hope in situations of dire need, even suffering and its implications for any religion and for the task of those who are called to roles of its promotion and promulgation. The task of the preacher/priest is to be placed in the liminal space, the mutual concrescence of the divine and the world which is seen as the theatre of "appetition and physical realization" of divine and human actions:

> God and the World introduce the note of interpretation. They embody the interpretation of the cosmological problem in terms of a fundamental metaphysical doctrine as to the quality of creative origination, namely, conceptual appetition and physical realization. (Whitehead 1978:343)

In terms of narratological/homiletical applications of interdisciplinary conversations with ubuntu-process, interesting further work awaits in the field of the homiletical application of ubuntu-process in the narrative preaching task of intra- and inter-relatedness of text-speaker-audience, known by some homileticians as Audience Oriented Preaching (AOP).[20] The application of an ubuntu-process understanding of the

---

20 E.g. cf. Fred B. Craddock, 1995. *Preaching*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN; Thomas G. Long, 2009. "A Likely Story: The Perils and Power in Narrative in Preaching", *Preaching from Memory to Hope*, Westminster John Knox, Louisville, KY. 1-26; Eugene L. Lowry, 2012. *The Homiletical Beat: Why All Sermons Are Narrative*, The United Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, TN ; 2001

encounter provides an exegetical tool to mine *all* the liminal spaces overtly and covertly involved in the prehensions of the homiletical encounter and each concrescence evidenced by: 1. the life and mental processes involved in the composition or re-assembling of the source narrative; 2. the resource and conduit by which the preacher/priest receives the data; 3. the life, faith and study of the preacher/pastor/priest; 4. the positive and negative prehensions which the preacher/priest brings to the homiletical encounter and subsequent/consequent concrescences which s/he brings to 5. the positive/negative prehensive narratives in life and processes of the percipient/recipient/subject/object/target of the narrative (i.e. audience),

When a narrator recounts a story which has been received through a written medium – or oral, living 'text' - it becomes the task of the presenter to enter into the narrative frame/space to reclaim the original multiplicity, re-animating the unified story which lives in the borderland, awaiting its retelling in the ubuntu-process force-field of energy exchange.

A story-teller is navigator, pilot and intersubjective/superjective fellow traveller in a space/time leaving/arriving narrative journey during which the "many become one, and are increased by one" (Whitehead 1978:21). Homiletics is the exercise of providing an

---

(1980) *et. al.* For critique of Lowry, see Fleer, D. 2000. "The Sermon: Dancing on the Edge of Mystery, Euguene L. Lowry", *Leaven* Vol. 8 (2) "Wisdom", Art 12. Available at http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1668&context=leaven. (Accessed 18 August 2015). For a representative response *contra* "narrative preaching"/AOP, see, Lee, Woo Je, 2003-4. "A critical evaluation of the audience-oriented preaching theories of Fred Craddock and Eugene Lowry". Unpublished DTh thesis, Stellenbosch University, SUNScholar Research Repository. Available at http://scholar.sun.ac.za/handle/10019.1/49742. (Accessed 18 August 2015). At this juncture, we opine that the negative portrait of "audience oriented" homiletics as assigned by many to "narrative preaching" is a miscalculation of its central source and orientation and may not be precisely accurate in its implication that the formative hermeneutical lens of "narrative preaching" is, in fact, an eisegesis favouring the audience at the expense of the primacy of exegesis of sacred text.

opportunity for the concrescence of data arising (or latent) within the speaker, the speaker's resources, the hearer, the hearer's resources and the context in which speaker and listener prehend each other as actual entities. The craft and art form – and faith commitment - places the speaker (and presumably the hearer(s)) within a particular field of narratology.

During a homiletic experience of speaker-hearer a process-ubuntu methodology captures and assists analysis and incorporation into the speaker's repository as well as into the hearer's appropriation of data that has been concresced into the amalgam of awaiting data (memory) -to form and be formed by the subject-superject. In other words, the process of a language encounter is a multi-dimensional intersubjective process by which an individual's thoughts may become the community's thoughts (and *visa versa*) as "the many become one and are increased by one" (Whitehead 1978:21). That is to say that internal pre-existent narratives will variously impact the processing of newly- presented narratives (or previously-known narratives presented in a novel way) just as the presentation of heretofore unknown narratives (or previously-known narratives presented in a novel way) will variously impact narratives pre-existing in the collective mind and of its constituent members.

An authentic homiletical reality calls upon personal authenticity on the part of all participants. The interface of narratives is an occasion of the arousal of the widest range possible of feelings relevant to identity "not only based on the tasks or roles of the individuals, it is a true intersubjective identity that is shaped in and through shared life in the community" (Forster 2010b:9).

The primary narratological/homiletical currency is that of words.[21] For Whitehead (1978:183) "language is handy as an instrument of communication...[but]...depends upon the constitution of the percipient subject to assign which species is acting as 'symbol' and which as 'meaning'." and is "always elliptical"[22] (1978:260). The preacher, *qua* person, in sermon preparation and in delivery is - and ontologically occupies - an organic narrative manifestation of the relational ontology wherein that person is a person principally through other persons. The blended space of the sermonic offering reflects many concurrent mutual prehensions. The nexus of the preaching 'moment' is the convergence of meaning and symbol, content and form. Eugene L. Lowry (1989:27) gives an overview of the agents of the homiletical concrescence: "[t]he biblical story is the specific content – the vehicle. The sermon is the form."

In the philosophy of organism, the inter-relational sermonic moment is an ubuntu "object". As an object-as-event of multiplicity-in unity it – as does everything, every one, every 'many', every collective – has the characteristics of both immanence and transcendence: "as a realized determinant it is immanent; as a capacity for determination it is transcendent; in both roles it is relevant to something not itself" (Whitehead 1978:239-240) .

---

21 Notwithstanding the founding "Rules of the Friars Minor" (Franciscans) papal document of 1223 that confirmed St. Francis of Assisi's ecclesiastical mandate to preach, St. Francis cautioned members of his Order: "Let none of the brothers preach contrary to the form and institution of the holy Roman Church, and unless this has been conceded to him by his minister. But let the minister take care that he does not grant this leave indiscreetly to anyone. *Nevertheless, let all the brothers preach by their works*. And let no minister or preacher appropriate to himself the ministry of brothers or the office of preaching, but let him give up his office without any contradiction at whatever hour it may be enjoined him. Wherefore I beseech in the charity which God is all" (emphasis added). (SacredTexts.com 2011, Chapter XVII).

22 Defined, in essence, as the act of leaving words out. Cf. *Merriam-Webst*er [online] at http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ellipsis

The 'not itself' and elliptical nature of language is poignantly observed in Gobodo-Madikizela (2004:85):

> Language communicates. At the same time, it distances us from the traumatic events as it was experienced, limiting our participation in the acts of remembering. We cannot fully understand what victims went through, in part because the impact of the traumatic event cannot be adequately captured in words.

The homiletician has choices to make: In which direction shall a narrative turn? From whence comes the narrator? The 'audience'? Where does a particular narrative take those co-participants? In Whiteheadean terms, the preacher facilitates a relational ontology between a biblical text and the congregations' text-of-life: a story is a story only through other stories. Both 'source' and 'target' texts will either positively or negatively prehend each other with the result being "conformation of feeling to fact" (Whitehead 1978:186) (i.e. (putting into words the already-known - stating the 'obvious') or to present for the 'feeling' of the hearer(s) a narrative which includes its own "alternative potentiality" (Whitehead 1978:187).

The living text of both preacher and congregation, provide the boundaries within which their respective subjective aims, priorities, fears and hopes will engage in as much as an 'alternative potentiality' for personal and social transformation has been envisioned in the encounter: "People make the deepest analogies that they can, as constrained by their conceptual repertoires" (Hofstadter and Sanders 2013:360). The personal 'data' which

resides as repository of physical and mental narrative repertoires that become engaged in the ubuntu-process narrative 'moment'

The co-prehending participants - including the elements of the narrative to be experienced - comprise the process-ubuntu's concrescence that is about to enter a new, that is novel, concrescence (even if it bears familiar components|). The private life stories become a "public matter of fact" (Whitehead 1978:22) - a private story is only a story through other stories.

The actual occasion of the homiletical encounter's universe is a field in which a story takes on a life of its own, fed by speaker and hearer(s) which intersubjectively provides both opportunities for concurrent and subsequent prehensions - positively or negatively prehended in the present yet perishing (although remembered in whole or in part) within the space-time continuum of the homiletical encounter. It is an ubuntu-process expectation upon the preacher, and her/his co-participating audience, that "to be truly human means being in relationship with others persons who give form and substance to one's true humanity" (Forster 2010a:245). The homiletical fields of force at the nexus of form and substance are an interwoven fabric calling practitioners to encourage and to convict.

An instructive critique of contemporary homiletical projects comes from the 19th-century pen of American humourist and writer Finley Peter Dunne (1902:240) who coined a phrase in the context of newspaper the journalism of his day. He opined that among the functions of the newspaper of his day was that it "comforts the afflicted, afflicts the

comfortable." Reframed – and applied more optimistically to the preacher's endeavour, the ubuntu-process calling of the preacher may not be dissimilar in the entering into the lives involved in the homiletical movements:

> Stories have the character of allowing us to enter into them. We identify with the figures in them and find them telling the story of our lives. And this is one of the functions of the stories in the Bible – they let us enter into their events, to experience and feel what has happened, so that the story becomes our story and the happening an event in our situation. (Achtemeier 1989:15)

To enter into another's story is the induction to empathy, as observed by Gobodo-Madikizela (2004:127) "because there is something in the other that is felt to be part of the self, and something in the self that is felt to belong to the other." Taking cues from Dunne (1902) places the preacher in the threshold, liminal space between 'feeding' those to come to hear the Word in the mode of the Christian Gospel According to St. Matthew 5:6 (Blessed are those who hunger...) and inspiring a galvanizing-into-action sometimes necessary discomfort toward greater social-gospel responses to occasions of injustice.

Expanding an ubuntu-process treatment of homiletics into a more broadly-narrative treatment, we see the story as a "concrescence - its data, its emotions, its appreciations, its purposes, its phases of subjective aim - beyond the determination of these components" (Whitehead 1978:47). Language always fall short of the fullest meanings possible and yet it is the tool of the transmission of our past, the context of our present and the mode of provision of data to be presented to our futures. Languages are not direct but rather derivative of our experiences:

All our science, all our explanations require concepts, originating in this experience of derivation. In respect to such intuitions, language is peculiarly inadequate. Our powers of analysis, and of expression, flicker with our consciousness."
(Whitehead 1933:164)

While narrative content is the presenting importance of a narrative, the prehensive space/time of a story's frame bears most of the freight of a story's import, impact and mutual concrescence between speaker and hearer(s). When the narrative is called upon to assist in the delivery and receipt of informative or emotive data which may threaten harmonic and peaceful aims of a process-ubuntu society, the frame of the occasion can 'speak' before orality. The framing of a narrative, its actors and its words, sets the tone for a story's components even before the words begin: "We learn the patterns of stories before we learn their meanings" (Atwood 2013).[23]

Language's shortcomings notwithstanding, it falls upon that vehicle of expression to engage in the act of bearing a load of significance between either side of a river of meaning as well as providing the current, determining its flow and depth. On one side is the sender, on the other bank awaits the receiver and yet such a clear subject-object bifurcation is impossible in the relational cosmology of process-ubuntu. A narrative event's intersubjective sender-receiver, i.e. subject-object are only "relative terms" (Whitehead 1933:176) because the 'object' of the narrative is "a component in the experience of the subject, with an affective tone drawn from this object and directed towards it" (Whitehead 1933:176).

---

23 Canadian author Margaret Atwood (2013) referencing her 1986 *Handmaid's Tale,* Anchor, New York in *The Guardian Weekly.*

The reference to the affective tone evidenced in a communicative event or occasion strongly implies that one cannot separate a cognitive message from its emotive medium. The subjective aim of a communication will, in its blended space, include in its delivery/reception loop of receiver-senders-receivers both cognitive and emotive data. The Whiteheadean sense will account for the totality of the entities – relative to emotive and cognitive repertoire available along the hierarchy of being. Ubuntu-process ontology leaves all bifurcations behind, concurring with a relational ontology which "expands our understanding of emotion to include judgement, thought and appraisal" (du Toit 2014:3). Any narrative encounter will adhere to the cosmology describing the intersubjective, blended, space.

This subject-object intersubjectivity cannot be separated from the conduit of their shared space. The 'I-dentities' of the entities of both speaker and hearer exist in this inter-relationship inseparable from the "we" sharing the experience. In a setting in which numbers of participants surpasses two, this intersubjectivity takes on exponential growth with the addition of the physical numbers of the superjects involved.

When communication occurs between individuals (as a collectivity of prehensions) there is novelty - a new 'thing' is created, its existence in time and space is paradoxically irrespective of time and place as an instance reflecting antecedent data whose relevance will be revealed, and subsequently positively prehended to form in its encounter with the 'other' a new entity. Data negatively prehended may be only temporarily or spatially deferred for a future concrescence. The event of communication reflects "that there is

nothing in the Universe other than instances of this passage and components of these instances" (Whitehead 1933:236).

The mental processing – the dividing up of intersubjective mutually-encountering data (i.e. narratives brought into the hearing event by an intended audience) - of a shared narrative is a living case of process explicated ubuntu in which the speaker/hearer 'is' because their shared space 'is' – but not a homogeneous entity: "[e]very meaning of 'together' is to be found in various stages of analysis of occasions of experience...and no things *are* (emphasis original) except in components in experience or as immediacies of processes which are occasions in self-creation. (Whitehead 1933:236).

Instances of self-recognition as well as mutual recognition in the blended space have as their subjective aim not only encounters with both the familiar and the novel. There will also be an inevitable negative prehension, a rejection, of parts of that which the hearer brings to the speaker/hearer blend: "Thus perishing is the initiation of becoming. How the past perishes is how the future becomes" (Whitehead 1933:238). The construction, or evolution, of a shared space is the witness of data both accepted and held in abeyance (or rejected for some future reception). It is in the efficacy of liminal space(s) constructed and encountered between speakers-hearers included in the homiletical occasion which gives birth to the blended meaning of parables.

4.0.3 How one story makes sense of another

In seeking to understand and express the concurrence of the dual modes of thought and life expression of process-ubuntu, we now apply the mental instrument of parable,

defined as the "projection of one story onto another." Story is here defined as the organization of "experience, our knowledge, and our thinking.". The application of parable and story is here treated as a projection, which is the function by which "one story helps us make sense of another." (Turner 1968: preface)

The space occupied by that which is communicated and projected/received (prehended and concresced) by subject-object/intersubjective/ 'superjective' participants has a mode of existence consistent with the three-fold character of philosophy of organism's actual entity and describes the process of ubuntu:

> (1) the character 'given' for it by the past...
> (2) the subjective character aimed at in its process of concrescence...
> (3) the superjective character which is the pragmatic value of
> it specific satisfaction qualifying the transcendent creativity.
> (Whitehead 1978:87)

The interrelatedness of a process-ubuntu communicative, and communicated, entity is experienced in three ways:

 (1) as existing speculatively in/as a blended space thanks to the concrescences which follow mutual prehensions (the creative decisions of which being both positive and negative, as here defined),

 (2) as existing in real time and real space which may be either co-spatial and co-temporal,

 and also can

(3) exist between individual and / or groups which are not co-terminus or co-spatial.

The sharing of a story - that is the mutual enjoyment as a subjective aim of a story - is the mental activity of the concrescence of the data presented by a speaker mixing with the data presented by the hearer. This mixing in shared space, the blended space of a narrative, fits with the philosophy of organism's definition of a concrescence as "the building up of a determinate 'satisfaction,' which constitutes the completion of the actual togetherness of the discrete components." (Whitehead 1978:85) The blended space in which the newly-constituted shared story is co-experienced by speaker/hearers is the temporary completion of the concrescence. It is temporary because it is followed immediately, and with immediacy, by subsequent/consequent data. A story both is and yet is not. Its existence is determined by the constant feeding/fueling by both speaker and hearer. In other words, "'[c]ompletion is the perishing of immediacy" (Whitehead 1978:45) and, paradoxically, the story persists in the memory and joins the repository of both the mental societies (defined by this process-ubuntu) of both speaker and hearer(s) in "private synthesis" (Whitehead 1978:45). That synthesis known in both entities of individual participants in the encounter as well as the collective societal entity - it is an intersubjective process supported by the inter-relationship(s) constituent of the narrative encounter shared by a given 'society' of entities.

In a narrative encounter - that is in our example a homiletical ethos - the relationships constructed by the sharing of a blended narrative space (either in real time or imaginatively, either single or collective) creates an ubuntu-process society whereby my hearing and experiencing of the story is conditioned and shaped not only by my own life story but that the story/stories shared by the collective with which I may be sharing the hearing of it. The identity of the hearer is shaped by the identity I find in the

relationship(s) to others – seen and unseen - in the homiletical encounter. In any particular encounter, I am because we are and I contribute to the collective analysis of the story and I must add my story to that of my community: my story is because other stories are. In the words of the philosophy of organism, the homiletical experience and process becomes definitive of a "society":

> Thus a society is, for each of its members, an environment with some element of order in it, persisting by reason of the genetic relations between its own members. Such an element of order is the order prevalent in the society. (Whitehead 1978:90).

For Whitehead, a story fits his definition of both a nexus and a society, because stories provide occasions of order and disorder, particular subjective relevance and decisions of negative prehension, which is elimination because of non-relevance. Nexus reflecting a special social order are a society and nexus reflecting a non-social reality are not. A story's progress through the speaker and hearer's mind both accepts and rejects portions of a story's spoken or unspoken constitutive factors. The construction of the blended space of a story reveals both what is needed to 'move' the story along and the mental capacity to ignore possible extraneous factors. The excitement of the homiletical experience for both speaker and hearer is to navigate between the uncertain shores of what is relevant and what is not. The creation and enjoyment of a blended space is the activity of determining just how I will travel with the narrative and how the collective similarly travels and upholds the narrative 'success' in delivering the construction of the blended space.

The philosophy of organism's intersubjective nature of the unified/unifying experience of a collectively constructed and experienced narrative reflects an intersubjective experience which holds in its creative advance into novelty the sometimes asymmetrical contrast between individual and collective occasions (the 'how' of a narrative) as well as individual and collective nexus or society (as an event) as the resultant extension or moment(s) in time (the 'what') shared via a shared narrative. It is observed that "[t]his contrast between individual becomings, and the progressive summation of such becomings, is crucial to Whitehead's metaphysics". (Shaviro 2009:18-19)

Ubuntu is definitive of this cruciality, evidenced in the experience of a narrative experienced in and by a collective nexus/society and by its inter-related participating constituent individuals. The philosophy of organism sees the play of data in a vector from an event projected toward a novel event and that subsequent (without, paradoxically, any presumption of necessary seriality) played 'back' against prior data and both concrescing to form a novel entity in the shared narrative space. Whitehead (1978:249) names this

> reversion [as a] secondary origination of conceptual feelings with data which are *partially identical with, and partially diverse from*, the eternal objects forming the data in the first phase of the mental pole. (emphasis added)

In a narrative encounter reversion calls for some information to be incorporated but not all. A postfoundationalist ubuntu application to narrative means integration without sublimation of identities of/within individuals or collectives. "In short, in the African approach, one cannot reduce identity simply to the experience of the individual, or the

166

perceptions of the group. One must employ an integrative approach that takes cogniscence of both approaches and more" (Forster 2010:6, n7).

The homiletician/story-teller engages in a narrative for the purpose of elucidating a mythologically-supported and reinforced truth. The listener (be s/he singular or part of a collective) similarly covenants to participate in the shared narrative space and can do so inasmuch as her mythological repertoire reverberates with the speaker. There will be points of agreement and points in which tensions in either narrative 'fact' or delivery may create tensions of interpretation. In Whiteheadean terms, there will be both positive and negative prehensions among the panoply of data being sent, received, shared, accepted and rejected as the novel moments within the narrative encounter and exchange unfolds.

4.0.4 Story as multidimensional validation

There are two initial modes of a story-occasion encounters and together they frame and create the creative liminal third 'target' mode by over-lapping/over-reaching or under-lapping/under-reaching their respective 'fuzzy', permeable boundaries. That is to say that the narrative encounter is three-fold for the entities involved: (1) those in which all or part of the story are known to all and tacitly agreed upon substantively a priori of a contemporaneous communal experience of them, (2) there are narratives of which all or part of the story has been unknown until the creation of the blended space, and (3) a 'fuzzy mixture of familiar and novel encounters. The thought-life of an intersubjectively-experienced narrative motif as any recurring theme (i.e. setting, character, personalities, emotion, conflict, resolution and/or transmitted truth) is exchanged as a complex polyphonic society of "various horizons of being that sound in

the voice of myth: the storyteller, the listeners society in its past and present community, and finally, nature, felt to be the source of stories..." (Kane 1998:192).

Opportunities for homiletical speaker-hearer prehensions within the above metaphorical polyphony take on a narrative presence reflected within ubuntu-process of "a multidimensional validation" (Forster 2010:5). The ubuntu-process rejection of all bifurcation establishes the field for respective acknowledgment of the integrity of speaker, that which is being communicated, and the audience. It establishes the blended space created by the conjunction of individual and group identity and narrative flow. Such a context of a shared, and sharing, narrative will draw upon and speak to authentic identities of all 'events' and 'occasions' of the shared experience. This authentic concrescence of identities is both covertly and overtly involved in a narrative experience, taking "cognisance of the interior and exterior life, it must heed individual and social characteristics and it must be based upon an understanding of its wholeness within the context of both higher and lower levels of consciousness" (Forster 2010:6).

4.0.5 Ontology of shared narrative

Process-ubuntu ontological concrescence leads to an analysis of conformational (positively prehended) and non-conformational (negatively prehended) datum. The determining question differentiating a positive, accepted - but-not-infallible prehension and a negative, rejected-but-not-forgotten is one of relevant to the subjective aim of the participating entities-as-events, motivated toward harmony.

Before taking in new information from the propositions being considered, in order for "many to become the one" (Whitehead 1978:52) consistent with a subjective aesthetic harmonious aim, the novel data must be measured against the question posed by the ethos and standards of humanity, 'Will the new data complete or rend the fabric of the prehending life?' Ubuntu-process answers:

> The subject completes itself during the process of concrescence by a self-criticism of its own incomplete phases. (Whitehead 1978:244)

A narrative occasion bears its own incompleteness as it positively or negatively prehends the entities which form the speaker(s)-hearer(s)/subject-superject(s). As the actual entity/occasion of the hared narration enters in - and is entered into within - the concrescence of the blended space it reflects neither solely the speaker(s) nor the hearer(s) but both as well as its own data. The homiletical occasion is a lived example, even as it exhibits the perpetual perishing of data as it is mutually prehended. The homiletical experience is the narrative expression of an intersubjective relational ontology of the ethics of ubuntu: "not just me, it is not just you, it is not just the material reality, neither is it just the spiritual reality; true reality is a sacred interweaving of all these thing" (Forster 2006:21).

In a homiletical setting, the larger society need not be physically present to be prehended as participating in the concrescence of the narrative or its constituents' data. The Whiteheadean ontology is similarly unencumbered in its consideration of a role for unseen data that may be past in space-time but still contributes to the analysis of the subjective aim of the entity which is created in the blended space to which both speaker

and hearer and their shared cosmos participate: "The first phase of the Whiteheadean process of creating an actual entity is to assess the entire already-created past. It is reasonable to suppose that an entity needs a sufficient linkage to the universe to be able to acquire a standpoint" (Stapp 2007:103).

Narrative is the currency of by which value is discerned in identity and relations. As Forster (2010b:10) observes:

> The notion of personhood and identity is achieved in the interaction *between* (emphasis given) the individual and the community... [and]... the content and values of this interaction (as well as the description of the harmony of such interaction) is found and expressed in the ethics of ubuntu [reflective of an] intersubjective understanding of the fluid formation of identity.

The consciousness in/by which the subject-object being-as-becoming shared narrative-space perpetually parishes-and-yet-exists has the ontological character of a process-ubuntu 'event', 'occasion' and 'entity'. The narrative encounter is an entity resultant from a concrescence consisted in a field or region of both positively- and negatively-prehended entities. The shared space of a narrative event is a region of feelings arising from the 'actual occasion' of the individual consciousness of constituent subject-objects as well as a homiletically-constructed blended consciousness. The consciousness involved in the shared homiletical space of a narrative occasion creates its own universe of certainty-amid-uncertainties. Creativity is uncertainty with a vector toward an unknown resolution of its constituent and personally-determined relevance.

To restate, an ubuntu-process exegesis of the homiletical event is: the interplay of a story's origin (or text), the speaker, the hearer (which become the speaker-hearer), the space of the story which occupies the speaker's repository, the space of a story brought into the relationship by the hearer, the shared space of the aforementioned stories' mutual prehension which concresce in a shared speaker-hearer space, a internal time of the unfolding of the story within the source (text), the internal time of the appropriation of the story elements within the speaker, the time reflected within in the story brought into the speaker-hearer space by the hearer and the consequent time of the created blend of the shared amalgam story (determined by the valuations of speaker-hearer constituents/participants). The shared blended space incorporates the 'virtual' time elements of the vectored narratives to create a space-time occasion both dependent upon its constituent parts and independent from them. Phrased simply: when we meet, I bring my story, gleaned from other(s), you bring yours, we present them, they will positively or negatively prehend each other's components, a new story arises from the concrescence to which we lend our respective levels of assent, drawing from that shared ubuntu encounter, our respective relevant concrescences.

In the cosmos of the sermonic space-time universe/multiverse, the process by which the hearer understands and appropriates to a total, or varying, degree, the sermonic content provides a myriad of entities to be prehended. The blended sermonic space-time provides the "universe as apprehended by a subject situated in space and time... [and]...includes all of the universe as it is experienced" (Weiss 2009).

"Reality (for the constituent participants in the homiletical universe) is a "vast society of actual occasions" (Weiss 2009). Narrative components are the eternal objects which are ordered by the felt relevance the prehending objects. A speculative but instructive explanation of the relation of stories and thoughts brought into the speaker-hearer occasion is assisted by Weiss as his essay concerns the "nature of eternal objects and of the relations that they form to each other and to actual occasions" (Weiss 2009).

In a process-ubuntu narrative event, the shared, agreed-upon portions of a narrative become categorized as actual occasions characterized by the synthesis out of data mutually encountered between text (in the case of written narrative traditions), storyteller and audience. All facets and factors of story line, among characters and their relationships reflected in the story, provide the necessary creative tensions to give actual occasions, as story, excitement in delivery and, if you will, gains its traction in reaction: "Their importance, for themselves and for the world, is measured as much by the alternative that they reject as by those that they accept" (Weiss 2009).

The individual prehending components of the participants' story which they bring into encounter with the shared story are eternal objects and, as such - because one does not know how one will appropriate elements of a story until one actually encounters it - are "in their nature abstract...to transcend particular concrete occasions of actual happening" (Weiss 2009). The actual happening that awaits the individual participant in the narrative encounter is the story in its shared elements.

Seeing an eternal object as reflective of the speaker's and/or hearer's narrative-yet-to-be-mutually-encountered presence - that is her/his "particular individuality" (Whitehead 1925:159) - the persons sharing a narrative space reflect two Whiteheadean principles: "the individual essence is merely the eternal object considered as adding its own unique contribution to each actual occasion" (Whitehead 1925:159), and "eternal objects. cannot be divorced from its reference to other eternal objects" (Whitehead 1925:160). In terms of the relational ontology of a narrative cosmology, the individual participants in the created actual occasion of the speaker-hearer blended space-time, as well as the components of a story shared, reveal the essence of process-ubuntu in their "relational essence [which] determines how it is possible for the object to have ingression into actual occasions" (Whitehead 1925:160) with the internal relationships.

4.0.6 Mutually-prehending stories and the 'literary' mind

Ubuntu-process suggests itself as a blend of lived and quantifiable evidence with a methodology of inquiry which sees only a distinction of degree not of kind in the ontological and epistemological claims of a strictly-defined "narrative approach" (a la Müller 2005:*passim*; *et. al*. in Deyer 2014:4) which favours "thematic analysis, structural analysis, dialogic performance analysis and visual analysis" (Dreyer 2014:6) and a strictly-defined metaphorical school which focuses predominantly upon a story's content at the expense of its container while "little attention is given to research methodology" (Dreyer 2014:5). This application of process-ubuntu as an intersubjective methodology is uneasy with such a bifurcated approach[24] because it sees all boundaries

---

24 In addition to Müller (*passim*) , Dryer (2014) examines the dichotomy of narrative and metaphor as expounded by, for example, in Ganzevoort (2012), Riessman (2008), Czarniawska (2004), Hyvärinen

as necessarily contingent upon context with subjective aims of prehenders providing both conduit and filter of data. The permeable fuzzy veil between content and container is supported by Turner's exposition of the activity surrounding the blended space of an encountered broader narrative(s) with meaning nested in the prehenders.

Is this simply extreme relativism writ large? Ubuntu-process answers unapologetically, although not 'simply - 'Yes' – and writ small as well. Our stories overlap and intermingle. Paraphrasing Meyhlan (2013:3): How does narrative work? It works by the "projection of story" (Turner 1966:7), his working definition of which follows:

> Parable...as the expression of one story through another – has seemed to literary critics to belong not merely to expression and not exclusively to literature, but rather, as C. S. Lewis observed in 1936, to mind in general (emphasis given). If we want to study the everyday mind, we can begin by turning to literary mind exactly because the everyday mind is essentially literary. (Turner 1966:7)

For Turner, the word 'literary' does not mandate written stories at the expense of oral or pre-writing cultures and by 'everyday' he means everyone:

> [T]he everyday mind has little to do with literature. Although literary texts may be special, the instruments of thought used to invent and interpret them are basic to everyday thought...the mental instrument I call narrative or story is basic to human thinking. (Turner 1966:7)

(2006) and other significant influences in the debate. The suggestion of a narrative-metaphor dichotomy is instructive when applied to stereotypical church-academy tensions by which the academy may portray the Church as preferring faith claims to intellectual rigour and where faith communities may stereotype the academy as being dismissive of faith perspectives in favour of a hermeneutics of suspicion.

174

4.0.7 How language works: a neuroscience-process/ubuntu transversality

This is consistent with the primacy of African orality in the formation and transmission of story:

> reason manifests itself first through the spoken language. Writing is an invention which depends on the prior existence of the spoken language. Accordingly, the speaking human being *(homo loquens)* precedes the writing human being *(homo scriptans).*(Ramose 2003a:7)

Language is the shared, and sharing, medium of the mental interactive processes of source-blended space-target descriptive of the ubuntu-process intersubjective Whiteheadean prehensive process which awaits its sharing. Individual construction of personal stories precedes the articulation of their content. Individuals are narrative targets-in-waiting. The stories of a community, a society are presented to its constituent members as a data source. The blended space is the concrescence of positive prehensions of images and meaning. This systematic portrayal of thought and language a la Turner (1996), Hofstadter D. and Saunder E. *et. al.* aligns with the philosophy of organism finding its existential and phenomenological evidence in the ontology of ubuntu and the latter's function of explaining creaturely interconnectedness. In terms of human language, the explanation here of the construction of the liminal space which both individuals and their collectives inhabit is found in this unpacking of the aphorism "a person is a person through other persons" (Ramose 1999:49f). It is in this way that ubuntu itself can answer the question of how language 'works' and in terms of describing the intersubjective reality of being, it is in ubuntu's transversal conversation with the philosophy of organism and its cognate disciplines that answers to the questions

"How does language do this, or how does ubuntu do this?" (Meylahn 2010:3) can begin to be revealed.

In the philosophy of organism all reality is events and all events are "composite" – this must, by definition, include the moment when a narrative occasion brings together stories in place in the minds of the presenter before s/he considered what story to share. It is our thesis that the composite nature of the composite narrative-sharing event is another Whiteheadean example of a general, that is universal, enfolding (ubu-) of the particular (-ntu) entities. This applies to an intended audience (whether individual or collective). It also applies to the particular 'story' as it is prehended in the shared, blended space of both presenter, and receiver.

It is important and fundamental to both 'process' thought and ubuntu that the boundaries between that which is universal and that which is particular are not only permeable but do violence to each. Just as "I am because we are" so too the philosophy of organism rejects "the false notion suggested by the contrast between the natural meanings of the words 'particular' and 'universal'" (Whitehead 1978:50).

In the context of an application of ubuntu-process to narratology, postfoundationalist ubuntu-process intersubjectivity seeks an accommodation of its liminal space to descriptors of cognitive sciences. The shared space blending in the encounters of a narrative "takes for granted the act of projection by each reader or viewer into the

176

scenes, identifying with one and then the other of the characters" (Hofstadter & Sander 2013:361).

The shared space is not just a theatre of the acoustic and rational also of the emotive and the scale or intensity of acoustic, rational or emotive data is a function of the experience of the narrative data moving in a vector sort of manner among the perceivers, giving witness to ubu-ntu:

> Thus 'emotion' is emotional 'feeling'; and what is 'felt' is the presupposed vector situation. In physical science this principle takes the form which should never be lost sight of in fundamental speculation, that scalar quantities are constructs derivative from vector quantities. In more familiar language, this principle can be expressed by the statement that the notion of 'passing on' is more fundamental than that of a private individual fact. (Whitehead 1978:212-213)

It is a fuzzy boundary around a blended narrative amalgam of subject-object that permits us to accept invitations to participate to varying degrees in a narrative space. In Whiteheadean terms, whether we either positively or negatively prehend information or sounds or sights or feelings as a successful concrescence "depends on one's aesthetic preferences, which are often unconscious, and in any case are prejudices that lie deep in the makeup of one's way of looking at the world" (Hofstadter & Sander 2013:364).

The inadequacy of a complete translation into English of ubuntu – or perhaps succinctly in any language – is quickly revealed as qualifiers enter the domain the moment parabolic walls, doors, windows, roof are attached in the application of epistemological parables invited into a conversation. As Turner (1996:106) observes:

177

> Meaning is a complex operation of projecting, blending, and
> integrating over multiple spaces. Meaning never settles down
> into a single residence.

The cognitive sciences concur with a metaphorical turn on ubuntu which offers hope for a homiletician (or any story teller or anyone sharing an ontologically liminal space. In fact, it is reflected in the relational ontology of ubuntu-process that every entity occupies another entity's liminal space): I can imagine because others imagined before me. And I make your story part of me by virtue of the evolutionary every-prehending nature of our mental spaces because "the dynamism, distribution, projection, and integration we see in blending are actually central and pervasive elements of everyday thought" (Turner 1966:106).

The scientific method, as per i.e. Hofstadter & Sander (2013) and Turner (1996), applied in concert with ubuntu-process finds a natural subject-object of consideration, in some circles, of a narrative-metaphor dichotomy. The application of an ubuntu-process, in examining the components of the 'blend' of a narrative's originating, presenting and targeting spaces, yields evidence of the cognitive science in the tracking of the vector movement of a story as both conduit, deliverer and subject-object target of data. As pondered by Meylahn (2010:3), "How does language do this?" Process-ubuntu answers: Story 'A' is because story 'B' is and when the two are, as blended (applying the cognitive conceptually surgical and double-edged device of positive and negative prehension) there I, as participant-audience, am the person I am because others (offering their content and context as datum for my prehension and subsequent/consequent concrescence) are the persons they are.

4.1.0 Narratology at work

4.1.1 A parabolic journey through II Samuel 12:1b-6

An extended journey into a narrative applying ubuntu-process, guided by Turner's schema, will illuminate the liminal spaces of the subject/object story, its internal participants and the subject/object prehenders of the reader/hearer prehenders of the story. We shall see how an entity, in this case a story, can be an entity through others through the narrative explication of ubuntu seen in the application of Turner's narrative tool to a story from the Hebrew Prophets.

In the account of II Samuel 12:1b-6, Israel's king, David, was, as may be expected of an absolute monarch, accustomed to claiming all that lies within his realm. His collective resources included the individuals of his kingdom who lived, loved and died as part of his collective and at his fiat. On one particular day he happens to view the wife of one of his subjects[25], Bathsheba, reposing in a private moment on the roof her house. David is physically attracted to her and she, as chattel of the kingdom – and thereby property of the king – becomes target of and object for his temporary pleasure. The relationship becomes more binding when Bathsheba reports that she is pregnant with his child. David responds to this situation by summoning the woman's husband Uriah, one of his military commanders. In due course, David receives a report of the success in battle of Uriah's troops. The biblical story-line does not draw the link explicitly but the reader/audience is

---

25   Bathsheba's legal and cultural status as a 'person' under her contemporary law and culture and thereby discussion as to her status as bona fide 'subject' of the king in a 'modern' understanding is a topic of historic and historical gender relations outside of present work. A particular hermeneutic would observe that without personal agency, allegations of her 'complicity' in the event may be a case of misplaced eisegesis – misplaced narrative concrescence.

179

led to believe that Uriah's success and David's offering of a reward provides a 'cover' for David's actions and Bathsheba's pregnancy. That 'cover' presents itself to David in the convergence of an opportunity to offer this particular commander with a reward for the latter's military acumen and the possibility of Uriah, and more culturally significant Bathsheba, being unable to prove David's parentage of any progeny arising from David's concupiscence. However, the king's plan is foiled. Uriah rejects the king's offer – twice. The reader/audience is led to make the connection, see the contrast and create a mental blended space between Uriah's revealed contextual leadership ethics and the lack of it in David. At this point of the narrative, again the reader/audience is led to make the connection on her/his own between the rejection of David's offer and Uriah's impending demise. David orders Uriah to be placed in the heat of a subsequent battle and give orders to Uriah's direct chain of command that Uriah be placed in the harm's way in a subsequent battle, so much so that his death will be guaranteed. The king's battlefield plan is successful (from the king's perceptive). The biblical narrative has, in effect, pre-loaded the parable's impact on the audience by the literary device of dramatic irony (allowing the audience to know the motivation for the prophet's parable prior to its delivery to David):

> When Uriah's wife heard that her husband was dead, she mourned for him. After the time of mourning was over, David had her brought to his house, and she became his wife and bore him a son. But the thing David had done displeased the Lord, and the Lord send Nathan to David.. (II Samuel 11:26-12:1a, NRSV)

It is at the point of the expression of the Lord's displeasure with David's behaviour that the biblical narrative introduces the sample parable to be examined as a "literary parable as only one artifact of the mental process of parable" (Turner 1996:5). The parable (II

Samuel 12:1b-5) illuminates the components of a parabolic narrative: comes from the mouth of the Prophet Nathan delivered to David for the purpose of expressing on behalf of God the divine displeasure at David's behaviour and drawing him into the 'source' story in order that he might see that his actions have made him the 'target' of the parable. His realization of his sin is delayed until he has been drawn into the narrative 'blend' too far to escape its conviction. Turner's source-projection-blend-target analysis of how a parable 'works' presents a cogent illumination of one possible (overly) simplified expression of the philosophy of organism's process of prehension, subjective aim-expressed-as-a-vector-awaiting-concrescence followed by the data from that concrescence providing the general ubu- for, in its turn, percepta as specific –ntu; this, in turn, providing the information and emotion which becomes part of the general ubu-, confirming an ubuntu-process as the "many become one, and are increased by one" (Whitehead 1978:21).

Before turning to the point of the application of methodological and narrative analysis of Turner and process-ubuntu, a summary of the parable which the Prophet Nathan uses to catch the conscience of the king in II Samuel 12:1b-6. (Textually, this is followed by Nathan having to explain the parable to David in II Samuel 12:7a, followed by the prophet 'driving the point home' in 12:9b and the conclusion/climax of the story in David's confession of his sin 12:13).

4.1.1.1 The parable 'trap' is set

Nathan's parable follows: A rich man has many flocks and herds. Nearby is a poor man with only one lamb who was purchased when only a kid. The lamb has been raised as

one of the family even as far as eating of the man's food, drinking from his cup and lying on his bosom, treated as a beloved child. One day a traveller visits the rich man and, as would be the custom, is to be treated hospitably by a meal of lamb. The rich man steals the poor man's lamb for this purpose. When David hears this parable he is incensed and proclaims to Nathan that the rich man in the parable should pay for his thievery by compensating the poor man fourfold and should also forfeit his life for having shown no empathy, no sympathy and not pity for the poor man. The point of the parable finds its mark as the prophet announces that the actions of the rich man are in fact David's actions followed by David's confession.

4.1.1.2 The parable 'trap' is sprung

The neuroscience of Turner (1998:101) 'unpacks' the parable:

> Nathan has pretended that it is the space of the rich man and the poor man that is the target, and the space of family domesticity and affection that is the source ('the ewe lamb was like a daughter to him'). In doing so, Nathan has led David to construct a strong blended space that contains specifics of both the story of the rich man and the poor man and the story of the relations between members of a family ...David thinks he knows where this information is directed, and why: It is to clarify the iniquity of the rich man and ensure his condemnation. But then Nathan announces that the target of the projection of this blended space is not the story of the rich man and the poor man, but the story of David, Uriah, and Bathsheba.
>
> This is veiled parable: In order to prevent the listener from resisting the

> > The storyteller veils the intended target while building up the blend with the right structure for his real purposes. In the case described by Nathan, that blend includes family affection, relations of power and its abuse, and categories of just and just behaviour. Once the slightly blended space is fully constructed, Nathan lifts the veil from the real target and conjures David to project inferences from this blended space to it....The final target strongly resembles the source - both source ('it was like a daughter to him') and final target (Uriah, Bathsheba, and David) concern the destruction of a family.

> The establishment of counterparts has been so successfully developed by Nathan that David has no escape.

4.1.2 Ubuntu-process exegesis applied
Parable 1: How the poor man caught a king

An ubuntu-process exegesis of storyline and methodology reveals: The anticipated 'global' and unity of the space a collective ubu- of data in the mind of the hearer that s/he is about to hear a complete story about a rich man and a poor man and their mutual prehension as individual –ntu constituents of the subject-object narrative. Each of the composite elements of the teller, the story and the audience/reader is because assembled together they are. The whole story is a singular 'many' which becomes, in its various encounters, 'one' and is, in the encounters, increased by one (cf Whitehead 1978:21).

David positively prehends premise but negatively prehends the storyteller's intended target. The concrescence of the mutual and liminal blended space is positively prehended within the cosmos of the story of the rich man and the poor man but negatively prehended in terms of the actual concrescence intended by the storyteller. The misplacement of the audience in the momentary creation of a (mis)understood-but-no-less actually experienced ubuntu (ubu + ntu) holds the key to the power of the narrative being encountered. The audience is drawn into a level of ubuntu within the narrative in an instance (or instances) of Whiteheadean misplaced concrescence from which the recipient/participant (i.e. David) "has no escape" (Turner 1998:101) when the global ubu- shifts to his own actions and his personal –ntu inevitably must follow because he is part of the story: he is because the characters in the narrative are because they have been joined in the liminal space which identifies the story's actors. who positively prehends

the account but reveals a negative prehension that he is to eventually 'switch' identities with the rich man.

An ubuntu-process narrative (storyline and methodology) offers: The anticipated 'global' and unity of the space a collective ubu- of data in the mind of the hearer that s/he is about to hear a complete story about a rich man and a poor man and their mutual prehension as individual –ntu constituents of the subject-object narrative. Each of the composite elements of the teller, the story and the audience/reader is because assembled together they are. The whole story begins and ends as a single entity but under the philosophy of organism, it is "in their natures, entities are disjunctively 'many' in process of passage into conjunctive unity" (Whitehead 1978: 21).

4.1.3 Ubuntu-process exegesis applied
Parable 2: The lion and the corn

We will experience that the power of a parable bears no relation to the word-count of the story. The following extended application of an ubuntu-process exegesis is congruent with the literary analysis and methodology of Turner (1998). The application of that conversation yields an illuminating understanding of the poetic device used, admittedly, at the expense of an emaciated Tanzanian lion in Matthiessen (1983:195):

> ...[i]n the hungry months of summer, a walking husk of mane
> and bone, so weak that the dry weather wind threatened to
> knock it over.

The 'hungry months of summer' set the context. Readers will know of hunger as the source of the physical feeling, and thereby investment, in the scene. 'Months' is

184

employed here to give a lens of an extended time frame. Before being introduced to the target of the scene, the lion, the feeling of hunger is further reinforced by the context of summer. The audience is invited not only to projects its recollections of individual hunger for food but also of summer and its accompanying heat. There is in the first phrase the creation of a blended space between the audience and the scene which is about to unfold. A second blended space is created between the audience and its remembrances of the motion and physicality of walking. An empathy with the lion has already begun as the human source data is joined with the target lion in the act of walking. The blended, liminal time, season, motion between reader/audience and lion has been set. It is time for a shift and the creation of a new blended space between the source lion and a visual description of its mane. The power of the newly-created blended space between the lion's mane and the premonition of the blended space of the effect of the wind on the creature is presented as the reader/audience is compelled to visualize the target image of corn silk (sigma) by the invitation of that projected image by way of reference to the corn husk and, further, the source image of the lion's mane blowing in the wind is presaged in the image of the visual and textural nature of corn silk. The husk has become the target space and although it does not walk the source reader/audience is compelled to visualize an exterior container void of its contents (a de-husked cob of corn). The blended space being constructed is now one which positively prehends the nature of corn silk atop an empty husk now bearing the feeling of that emptiness akin to human hunger. The concrescence of images reflects both positive prehensions in those characteristics which have contributed to the blended space and negative prehensions of images which do not contribute to the being-created image of a walking, hollow-hungry creature with a mane. The target of the lion has not yet fully emerged as source images

185

have not been assembled in an auto-motive blend of capabilities. The source of the readers/audience's human legs provides the explanatory to the mention of bone. The mane – the visual image of a partial creature with a mane – is now augmented in the addition of bone. The source image of husk remains with us as we have been told that, since husks are empty, any sense of life is lacking – there is bone but flesh, meat, sinew, muscle are negatively prehended in this blended space. Tension is created in that bone and hair are not given joining body parts. The blended space is incomplete. Negative prehensions have successfully eliminated what would be a distraction of the remainder of the parts of a corn plant and what would give the lion signs of its former potency and life-force. The blended space of plant, human and lion weakness is so-named as weak. The conjoined and merged individual components of the lion's weakness are brought together in the word 'weak' as the many become one, as the particularities of the parts of the lion and images of the reader/audience as particular –ntu become a unified ubu-: the concrescence of positive prehensions becomes 'short-handed' in its reference to 'weak', receiving depth of blended image in the liminal space which is the blended space of all the images heretofore perceived. The collected image is now ready as a concrescence for further, subsequent and consequent positive and/or negative prehensions. The weakened, emaciated creature that we have construed from the blended images becomes now the source image which is led by narrative vector into an encounter with the "dry weather wind." The reader is compelled to project an experience of having encountered a wind of the type that will knock things over. The narrative ends with the blended space of wind striking an object or living thing being held in abeyance.

Matthiessen does not tell us explicitly that the lion dies or is actually blown over. For us to assume either would be a case of narrative misplaced concrescence – but with all the narrative vectors pointing to that resolution of the story, the narrative tension continues, impelling the reader/audience to stick with the author as the larger account proceeds and the story unfolds.

The process, *qua* process (i.e. philosophy of organism) of the mental construction of an image of the lion is a concrescence results from decisions of both positive and negative prehensions of parts of that animal, combined with congruent decisions involving the mental conjuring and deployment of parts of a corn plant engaged for the purpose of sustaining the motion of the narrative.

The methodology of the blended space in the nexus of images 'works' as a parable, applying the methodology of ubuntu-process reveals that the audience, as individuals' prehension of the images *is* because the collective memory of the amalgamated images *are*. The image of a complete lion is a global ubu- out of which a particular –ntu is evoked. The collective ubu- which had resulted from the amalgam of the new convergence of images – in this case that of partial lion meeting partial corn plant - becomes a particular –ntu in the appropriate of that image invoked i the convergence. This ubuntu-process articulation of such liminal convergence is congruent with the proposal of neuroscientist Antonio Demasio "according to which

> the brain contains records of combinatorial relations of
> fragmentary records; the recall of entities or events arises
> from a reactivism, very tightly bound in time, or fragmentary

records contained in multiple sensory and motor regions.
(Turner 1996:111)

5.0 Trajectories for future ubuntu-process transversal conversations

The following further trajectories of theoretical interdisciplinary conversations are suggested by way of the application of the relational ontology of ubuntu to the respective disciplines are suggested: the application of ubuntu-process' interrelatedness to the natural environment, further examination of the dynamics of the ramifications of the permeability (i.e. 'fuzziness') of personal and communal thresholds, implications of a postfoundationalist understanding of ubuntu with reference to epistemologies and ontologies reflected in integral theory/critical realism/embodied realism, examination of ubuntu dynamics as it points to real-time meretopologies and, finally, the personal and communal mimetic dynamics.

5.1 Of the environment and other tribes.

The challenge to any metaphysic and orderly construct of a lived is how such constructs can lead to marked social improvements or even arrive at definitions of such. Further investigation by way of the process-ubuntu lens is invited into challenges of contemporary human factors in assaults on environmental eco-systems; continual application also awaits the relational ontology of ubuntu-process to issues of jurisprudence (including further restorative justice initiatives) and the effects of a postfoundational understanding of the 'Other'.

5.2 'Fuzzy' boundaries of ubu-/-ntu

What is it that defines the liminal space between individual and group and what transpire there? Just as in Whitehead's cosmology that there is no reality or identity outside of relationality, so too ubuntu describes "a mutual fraternity between the greater community and human individuals" (Mcunu in Forster 2010b:10) reveals boundaries of a 'fuzzy'[26] nature between positive and negative prehension(s) within ubuntu. Mutual concrescence is the post-prehensive amalgam of a 'type' of essence of both individuals and their collective which subsequently emerges, to be prehended by subject-objects of its intimate acquaintance. It forms an "objective immortality" (Whitehead 1978:245) which becomes un-immortal in its perpetual perishing as it is sacrificed to novel prehensive decisions arising from the subjective aims of the succeeding subjects-objects.

That is to say that I, myself, encounter each moment anew because I have been encountered by another. Both individuals and their collective are participating occupants of the liminal space, and time, of "[e]ach creative act [as] the universe incarnating itself as one, and there is nothing above it by way of final condition" (Whitehead 1978:245). By the phrase "nothing above it" is meant that all of creation – the total range of being and hierarchy of consciousness - is within its evolving realm.

---

26 Here 'fuzzy' refers to formal term 'vague logic': "The term 'vague' comes from Bertrand Russell and his work on multivalued logic in the early part of the twentieth century. Jan Lukasiewics worked out the first formal vague or 'fuzzy' or multivalued logics in the 1920s and 1930s. Philosopher Max Black extended vague logic to vague sets in 1937" (Kosoko 1993:298). And Lofti Zadeh in a 1965 paper " 'Fuzzy Sets'...applied Lukasiewics multivalued logic to sets or groups or multivalued sets – sets whose elements belong to it to different degrees...Fuzzy logic did not come of age at universities. It came of age in the commercial market and leapfrogged the philosophical objections of Western scientists." (Kosoko 1993:19-20)

Ubuntu-process accepts the fuzziness of all boundaries and rejects "ontological dualism [which] does not have a place in the African system of thought" (Wiredu 2007:76). As such, a transversal conversation between ubuntu-process also accepts the "multivalence [of] "fuzzy logic" (Kosko 1993:21). The notion of the formal logic term "fuzzy" reflects ways of thinking which are "very old and have many ancestors" (Kosko 1993:67), i.e. "the African Logician...can within moments create scenarios where statements can be both true and false at the same time" (Okeke 2011:2,11)[27] What is seen as traditionally Western 'logical' thinking is challenged, also, by concrescence of opposites as described in formal fuzzy logic whereby "everything is a matter of degree" (emphasis original) (Kosko 1993:18) in the intersubjective space accounts for the juxtaposition of "shades of gray, blurred boundary, gray area, balanced opposites, both true and false, contradiction, reasonable not logical" (Kosko 1993:67). This expression of multivalence in which the developmental 'middle' is not excluded and concurs with the "African Logistician... [who]... can within moments create scenarios where statements can be both true and false at the same time" (Okeke 2011:2).

For Whitehead, events, once manifested, reflect stable atomicity and distinctiveness as well as evolutionary and transcendent potential for some future concrescence and change while at the same time maintaining a self which is both a knowable and advancing into processive novelty.

---

27   While no culture or philosophical school is monolithic, process-ubuntu's postfoundational transversal adherence to multivalence (cf. Kosko 1993) challenges Jaja and Badey (2012:99) who opine that a person "cannot be both virtuous and not virtuous at the same the eyes of the African."

For the philosophy of organism, personal identity is paradoxically both anticipatory and realized in that "[c]ontinuity concerns what is potential; whereas actuality is incurably atomic" (Whitehead 1978:61). Whitehead's schema finds its African concurrence in the explanation of Okeke of the formal law of complementarity by which '[t]he complementary mode is a logical state of potency while the contextual mode is a logical state of actuality." (Okeke 2011:3). The 'included' middle ground between an ubuntu individual and the collective, of which s/he is a part, yet constituting the whole, is the forced of the "active engagement in the development of the 'self'. (Forster 2010a:245)

The ubuntu-process challenge to stereotypical 'Western' thinking is not alone in its challenge to stereotypical caricature of all Western ontologies as linearization of thought.[28] Ubuntu-process observes that within the larger African 'set' of the community/ies and Africanity are contained the subsets of varying levels of interface(s) by way of "the interaction between the individual and the community. (Louw 2006:20). This presents a postfoundationalist meaning to identity, expressed in terms of fuzzy logic, to mean "that subsethood or containment value can take any (emphasis added) value between 0% and 100%." (Kosko 1993:297, *passim*)."

Essentialism (i.e. acknowledgement of the efficacy of individuals) is held in tension with relativity in ubuntu-process. Homogeneity is uncomfortable with multiplicities as the latter calls us "to see Nature once more in her fluid and creative plasticity and to formulate our conceptions afresh from this deeper point of view" (Smuts 2007:24). It is

---

28 Academic "Western" challenge to ontological linearity/serial causality can be traced in history at least to "the fundamental Einsteinian formula representing physical continuum which rejects ontological "*causal* independence" (italics original) (Whitehead 1978:61n/61), properly understood: "The real equation reads $e=mc^2 + $ *infinitely many terms*"(italics original) (Kosko 1993:107 n)

through the encounters of multiplicities that the "we are" of a society, or family by which "individual members enter into the process of the actual world" (Whitehead 1978:29).

The call for a relational ontology that rejects any 'scientific' atomization of all particularities has been heard from diverse voices seeking to extend the intuition of "the unity of reality in all its range, the unity of life in all its forms, the unity of ideas throughout human civilisation, and the unity of man's spirit with the mystery of the Cosmos" (Smuts 1927:vi).

The transversal conversation between ubuntu-process and neuroscience speaks of the universal ubu- in its 'combinatorial relations' but also presents a challenge to those who may seek to argue that a cultural presumption of the primacy of the collective necessarily removes the identity and agency of its individual –ntu constituents.

This congruence and convergence also supports the process-ubuntu articulation of fuzzy boundaries of the collective which ontologically allows the ubuntu process to accommodate, describe and embolden the audience to claim its liminal convergent function of responsibility not only for the best of human nature but also its worst. The speculative and lived paradox contained in the convergence of this relational ontology in a community reflects both community cohesion and adhesion[29] but immunizes neither the community nor individuals from destructive centripetal forces. The possible

---

29 Cohesion as "the property of like molecules (of the same substance) to stick to each other due to mutual attraction" and adhesion as "the property of different molecules or surfaces to cling to each other"; as defined on .*Diffen* website: http://www.diffen.com/difference/Adhesion_vs_Cohesion.

192

disintegration of ubu- is ever-latent (awaiting positive prehension into a concrescence) by its ontological attachment to particular, and possibly destructive, -ntu. Applying Damasio's construct:

> Mental evocations that seem to us so unitary and solid are instead always fleeting reblending of reactivated fragments in a very tight and intricate interval of time. (Turner 1996:111)

While this present work acknowledges challenges to narrative engagement,[30] the application of an ubuntu-process exegesis to a story's content, context, the frame of the story and acknowledgement of the essential (but not essentialist) nature of the liminal activity. This trans-disciplinary ubuntu-process practical metaphysics and methodology fits within the "performative praxis of post-foundationalism" (Veldsman 2008:8).

5.3 Integral Theory/Critical Realism/Embodied Realism

While "the chief error in philosophy is overstatement" (Whitehead 1978:7), any pretext of ubuntu-process as claiming a complete integral theory as posed, for example, by Wilbur's Integral Theory (Wilbur 1997) is held in abeyance. However, this schema would claim an affinity to metaphysics, *contra* Wilbur in which "metaphysics is replaced by critical philosophy" (Wilbur in Marshall 2012:196).

Congruent with formulations of critical realism of Bhaskar and Danermark , the ubuntu-process conversation does in fact reveal an intersubjectively relational ontology in which "[t]o this inner complexity and internal relationality we then of course need to add the

---

30 For a brief but helpful introduction to voices of disagreement with narrative parameters, see Dreyer (2014:1-2, *passim)*.

193

external relationality or outer complexity of the phenomena's context." (Bhaskar and Danermark in Marshall 2012:199). The modification of critical realism (CR) of ubuntu-process find their articulation in Van Huyssteen's modified CR by virtue of the fact that the 'realism' of ubuntu is modified by virtue of the unavoidably referential and metaphorical nature of the aphorism: ubu- must be qualified as to which global cosmos it refers and –ntu does not in itself delimit which, or how, the private (i.e. individual and particular entity) participates in the public (i.e. collective entity). It invites metaphorical, metaphysical elaboration the nature of which finds a cognitive and critical 'fit' in the philosophy of organism with such a transversal application supported by the cautious critical realist Van Huyssteen as he:

> points out that he is only willing to argue for a qualified and weak form of critical realism insofar as the referential claims are derived from a basic assumption and good reasons without the reasons being conclusive (Van Huyssteen in Veldsman 2008:224, n7)

The use of figurative, referential language and reliance not only upon seeking to grasp Whitehead's language of philosophy but also anecdotal – but no less culturally verifiable and falsifiable – data from lived examples of ubuntu's originative African society combine to yield an ubuntu-process close to reflecting a form of both an integral intellectual, and existential, theory as well as a critical realist schema in as much as:

> [a] critical realist stand is realistic because in the process of theological theorizing this concept enables us to recognize this cognitive and referential nature of analogical languages as a form of indirect speech. It is also critical, however because the role of metaphoric language in theology would teach us that models should never be absolutized or ideologized, but should retain their openness and provisionality throughout the process of theorizing. (Van Huyssteen in Veldsman 2008:224)

Detailed analysis of process-ubuntu's convergence and divergence with integral theory and critical realism lies outside of this present work's primary goal of examining an ubuntu-philosophy of organism conversation. Such a dialogue/multi-logue awaits further examination.

As we have seen, ubuntu-process is confident in the shared philosophical categories and lived experience of fuzzy *ad intra* and *ad extra* boundaries (a la Kosko, 1993). The delimiting 'process' cosmology's liminal spaces of mutual prehensions and their respective consequent concrescences and the corresponding permeable territory of the nexus of the person and the persons of ubuntu entities find a conversational partner defined neither solely by the epistemological focus of integral theory nor the ontological primacy of critical realism. While critical realism and integral theory both contain affinities with ubuntu-process this current conversation finds harmony with the discipline termed 'embodied realism' as "a middle path between ontology and epistemology" (Murray 2015:3) .

For Whitehead, all entities are both subjectively encountered and in that prehension made real for the encountering subject-object as well as "really objective in the immediate actuality" (Whitehead 1978:215). In the concept of embodied realism a relational ontology of what is 'real' is implied and a transversal conversation between critical realism and integral theory is facilitated in that same species of interrelatedness

195

in ubuntu-process which has as its central focus the "'between' of the I-Thou" (Forster 2010b:9).

The embodied realism of Lakoff and Johnson's *Philosophy in the Flesh* presents an understanding of a relational ontology hinged in Turneresque metaphors "grounded in our embodiment... [of ...sensory-motor primitives [and a relational ontology in the liminal spaces defining] relationships as enclosures" (Lakoff and Johnson in Murray: 2015:4). Ubuntu-process would add that the boundaries of such conceptual and lived 'enclosures' are decidedly permeable. Philosophical agreement between this factor of embodied realism and ubuntu-process is further reinforced in the shared acceptance of the malleable boundaries afforded reality by "evolutionary forces" (Murray 2015:11) yielding prehensions of *all* (emphasis added) "phenomena that falls within the fuzzy overlap at the conceptual split (i.e. at the gray area...)" (Murray 2015:4). The shared interest of ubuntu-process and embodied realism is evident when the latter's

> categorical boundaries are *softened* (emphasis given)...when
> that are treated as softened, since studies show that they
> always are fuzzy. (Murray 2015:4; cf. Kosko 1993).

5.4 Other ontologies

Whereas this work exhibits humble concurrence with Seibt (2005:2) who observes that "Whitehead's process metaphysics as set out in *Process and Reality* contains an ontological scheme that still presents the most comprehensive, technically most developed process theory hitherto available", further systematized work remains in the application of the ubuntu partner in this particular ubuntu-philosophy of organism

196

conversation to the range of individual and collective psychologies and sociologies inherent in the cultural and academic caldron of ubuntu.

A postfoundationalist understanding of ubuntu, embellished with the tool of the philosophy of organism is eminently placed to engage, by virtue of its emphasis on the relational ontologies evidenced in the liminal spaces of co-participating entities of a society and its/their constituent members, with philosophical orthodoxies that have heretofore been legitimately stereotyped as in either polarized static or dynamic camps. One on hand, there is the persistent legacy of 20th-century ontological studies which holds "the traditional preoccupation with 'static' entities, despite its scientific orientations and despite scientific developments (relativity theory, quantum physics) suggesting the primacy of processes or events" (Seibt 2005:1). On the other hand there this a tendency to reduce/expand explication of dynamic systems so little more than "dynamic conception of tropes" (Seibt 2005: 2,n3).

By engaging in the discussion of the range of ontologies, a postfoundationalist understanding of ubuntu, in conversation with the philosophy of organism, can navigate its proper liminal expertise away from static foundationalist presumptions of men and women and their societies as "non-evolving units" [thereby denying] its "complex (emergent, non-linear) interaction dynamics" (Seibt 2005:24).

5.4.1. Meretopology.

A logical allusion could be inferred in Richard (2011:249) to the psycho-social dynamics of ubuntu in its relational ontology which gives witness to both a mereology ("the theory

of whole and parts") and a teleology ("the concept of boundary"). The currency of an ubuntu relation as the ongoing mutual prehension between the collective and it constituents must certainly qualify for further formal conversation with Whiteheadean meretopology. It remains for further study to plumb the applicability of a postfoundationalist ubuntu in an understanding of the liminal space involved in relations and the formal expressions of what it is to cross those thresholds in personal relationships. The crossing of boundary thresholds between a person and the persons which an ubuntu definition places as co-determinative is reminiscent of Whitehead's "extension" (1978:67; cf. Richard 2011 *passim*) as "the capacity that many objects can be welded into the real unity of the one experience".

Ubuntu-process, in its consideration of Ricoeur (2005:225) aligns itself with the more formal articulation of its "simple primitive, that of connection" (Smith 1996:2) but not to the extent that there would be the acceptance of an infinite ingress. After all, the ubuntu doctrine determines that individuals (in formal logical nomenclature, a 'primitive', essentialist and foundationalist) as "Leibniz's windowless monads" (Whitehead 1978:48) do not exist: they, *qua* individuals, have no relations solely in and of themselves. The project of ubuntu-process intuits further examination by the academy of the formal discipline of meretopology with its merelogical component's "primitive [being] the relation of parthood or constituency" (Smith 1996:3). The topological strain in further meretopological study must begin constrained by the liminal boundaries of the shared, blended spaces of the ubuntu-process relational ontology.

5.5 Mimesis and longing

Finally, the intersubjectivity of ubuntu-process points to further examination in the direction of affective mimesis as explanatory, predictive and "fundamental to human psychology both within the individual and in social relations" (Garrels 2006:69). A transversal conversation between ubuntu-process and studies in the discipline of pre-verbal psychology illuminates the affective nature of the liminality of intersubjective concrescence at its superlative locus, suggesting "human interactions are most meaningful when they are imitative in nature" (Garrels 2006:61).

The mimetic reality of a relational ontology wherein a person is a person (without question) but *primarily* through the prehensions of data arising from the concrescences provided for by the public cosmos outside of her/his private cosmos, is a matter of rationality but not existential reality:

> The distinction between publicity and privacy is a distinction
> of reason, and is not a distinction between mutually exclusive
> concrete facts. (Whitehead 1978:290)

That "[i]mitation is both a measure of self-other understanding and a prime engine of its development" (Garrels 2009:61) and means that a society held together by the glue of all that is meant by ubuntu must, with "mimetic scholars and imitation researchers,[31]

> take seriously our imitative nature, not only as a positive
> interpersonal mechanism necessary for human development
> and rich intersubjective experience, but also as the primary
> condition from which rivalry and violence emerge in human
> relations and society at large. (Garrels 2009:50)

---

31 Garrels (2009:48) states that his purpose is to advance a transversal conversation "concerning the convergence between empirical research on imitation and René Girard's theory of psychological mimesis."

"Thinking about *ubuntu* and the way in which it can or should be integrated into today's society, entails a hermeneutical process [as an examination of ubuntu as speaking to the liminal, concrescent] mix of desire, nostalgia, and what is *really* happening (emphasis given)" Müller (2015:3). Extending the transdisciplinary ubuntu-process hermeneutic calls for future examination of a transversal dialogue with studies into imitation/mimetic desire will yield yet another postfoundational "hybrid understanding of ubuntu" (Müller (2015:4).

It can be accepted that a community's relational ontology is that of a collective 'parent' (*res vera*) of its constituent members (*res verae*). The mimetic relationship of parent and child is paradigmatic and the blended space (à la neurolinguistics) of the narratives being acted out is instructive for a transversal ubuntu response to occasions of the world's (intentional and unintentional) sufferings. Müller (2015:4) is not alone in observing that "[o]n a naïve level, children are playing the serious games of adults. Their play becomes the mirror of the adult world".

A further postfoundational look at ubuntu in the field of aggression and violence is research that is called for to open it up to deeper appreciation of its role as an intersubjective liminal medium, providing an expanded understanding, articulated by Garrels (2006:77) "[of] imitative reciprocity…to account for the pervasive nature of human rivalry and violence.

> We literally do not know what to desire, and in order to find
> out, we watch the people we admire: we imitate their desire.
> Both models and imitators of the same desire inevitably desire
> the same object and become rivals.

This transversal conversation extend to other members of creation as a postfoundational ubuntu-mimesis sees humans as an extension of "all of the created order" (Forster 2010b:7) and when applied as a single-vector "worldview based on a single transhistorical plot [then] battle between good and evil is formulated by 'scapegoating the mythical enemy'" (Müller and Boym in Müller 2015:2).

It is the challenging postfoundationalist ubuntu-process that invites further examination of the role of mimesis in an ubuntu-process community which seeks to give witness to reconciliation within the same community that is known to isolate its own. A postfoundationalist ubuntu community does not shy away from examining its scapegoating dynamic – just as South African society has impressed the world with its cultural reinvention, notwithstanding continual struggle.

As summarized by René Girard (1996:2) "We are reconciled by what or by whom? The only possible answer, if you do understand scapegoating as genuine, is that we must be reconciled by that same *victim* (emphasis original) that divided us. Therefore this victim is both extremely bad and extremely good." This ontological and mimetic drive, with all its experiential weakness and strengths, sorrows and joys, presses upon us a desire to live out the creative advance into novelty in ways that lift up both a community and its members with life-affirming persistence amid perpetual perishing. As the African aphorism is poignantly interpreted by Müller (2015:6), "I long, therefore I am".

Bibliography

Achieng, Roseline M. 2009. "Mary Stella Okoko: African Literature as Political Philosophy", Council for the Development of Social Research in Africa (CODESRIA), Dakar and ZED Books, London & New York, 2007. *African Sociological Review* 13(2). 150-154.

Achtemeier, E. 1989. *Preaching from the Old Testament*, Westminster/John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

Atwood, M., 2013. "My hero: George Orwell", *The Guardian Weekly* 15 February, 39

Bennett, P. 2012. "Life Beyond Critical Realism: Developing Van Huyssteen's Transversal Approach to the Science/Theology Dialogue" European Society for the Study of Science and Theology (ESSSAT), In: Evers, D. *et al.* (eds.) *What is Life? (Issues in Science and Theology* Vol 7*).* Edinburgh: T&T Clark. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/5616686/_Life_Beyond_ Critical_Realism_Developing__Van Huyssteen_s_Transversal_Approach _to_the_Science_Theology_Dialogue. (Accessed 18 August 2015).

Blay, Yaba Amgborale 2008 "All the 'Africans' are Men, all the 'Sistas' are "American," but Some of Us Resist: Realizing African Feminism(s) as an Afrocological Research Methodology," *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, Vol.2, No. 2 March. 58-73. Available from: http://www.jpanafrican.com /docs/vol2no2/AllTheAfricansAreMenAllTheSistas.pdf)

Bohm, D., 1980. *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. Routledge, London & New York. Taylor and Francis e-library 2005. Available from: http://shenjiva.com /DavidBohm-WholenessAndTheImplicateOrder.pdf (Accessed 13 July 2015).

Bradley, J., 1991. "Whitehehead, Heidegger, and the Paradoxesof the New", *Process Studies*, Vol. 20 (3). 127-150.

Brink, A., 1996. *Reinventing a Continent: Writing and Politics in South Africa*. Zoland, Cambridge.

Brown, D.; James Jr., R.E.; Reeves, G. 1971 *Process Philosophy and Christian Thought* . The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc., Indianapolis and New York.

Coetzee, P.H. 2003. "Morality in African Thought", *The African Philosophy Reader*. Eds. P.H. Coetzee and P.J. Roux Eds. Second Edition. [Kindle Edition] A Text with readings. Routledge: London. 321-336. Available from: http://www.docstoc.com/docs/81721439/? (Accessed 15 May 2012)

Cook-Greuter, S.R. 2005. Ego Development: Nine Levels of Increasing Embrace. Available from: http://www.cook-greuter.com/9%20levels%20of%20 increasing%20update%201%2007.pdf. (Accessed 03 September 2014)

Czarniawska, B. 2004. *Narratives in social science research: Introducing qualitative methods*, Sage, London.

Daniel, Kasomo 2009. "An investigation of sin and evil in African cosmology," *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*. Vol. 1(8) December. 145-155.

Dawkins, R. 1989. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

De Leon, Jennifer (2012) "The Borderlands of Language: Using Italics for "Foreign" Words (Part I)" *Ploughshares at Emerson College*, Weblog [Online] Posted on 27 August 2012. Available from: http://blog.pshares.org/index.php/the-borderlands-of-language-using-italics-for-foreign-words-part-i/ (Accessed 13 July 2015)

De Quincey, C. 2005. *Radical knowing: Understanding consciousness through relationship*. Park Street Press, Rochester VT.

Diamond, Jared 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York.

Dreyer, J.S. 2014 "The narrative turn in practical theology: A discussion of Julian Müller's narrative approach', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 35(2), Art. #889, 9 pgs. Available from: http://dx.doi.og/10.4102/ve.v35i2.889 (Accessed 01 August 2015)

Dunne, F. P. 1902. *Observations by Mr. Dooley*, R.H. Russell, New York.

Du Toit, C.W. 2004. "Technoscience and the integrity of personhood in Africa and the West: Facing our technoscientific environment", in C.W. Du Toit (ed), *The integrity of the human person in an African context: Perspectives from science and religion*, 1-46, Research Institute for Theology and Religion, UNISA.

_____2011. "Shifting frontiers of transcendence in theology, philosophy and science", *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 67(1), Art. 3879, 10pgs. DOI: D10.34102/hts.v67i1.879. (Accessed 03 September 2015).

_____2014. "Emotion and the affective turn: Towards an integration of cognition and affect in real life experience", *HTS Teologiese Stuies/Theological Studies* 70(1), Art. #2692, I pgs. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ hts/v70i1.2692 (Accessed 01 August 2015)

Edwards, B.D. 1998. *C.S. Lewis and the case for responsible scholarship* Available from http:///www.discovery.org/a/157 (Accessed 9 July 2013).

Eliot, T.S. 1922. "Burnt Norton", *The Four Quartets*, Harcourt, Orlando. Available from: http://www.coldbacon.com/poems/fq.html. (Accessed 24 August 2012)

Emmet, Dorothy 1966. *Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism*. Second Edition. MacMillan, London.

England, P. and Horowitz, R. 1998. *Birthing from within: an extra-ordinary guide to childbirth preparation*. Paterna Press, Alburquerque, New Mexico.

Faber, R. 2004. "Whitehead at Infinite Speed" in Christine Helmer in cooperation with Marjorie Suchocki, John Quiring, and Katie Goetz (eds), *Schleiermacher and Whitehead: Open Systems in Dialogue*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 44-45

Fabian, J., 2006. "Forgetting Africa". In M. Ntawangwi, D. Mills & M. Babiker (eds), *African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice*. Dakar & London: Council for Development of Social Science Research (CODESRIA), Dakar and Zed Books Ltd., London. 139-153.

Forster, D.A. 2006. "Identity in relationship: The ethics of ubuntu as an answer to the impasse of individual consciousness" in C.W Du Toit ed. (2007) *The impact of knowledge systems on human development in Africa*. Research Institute for Religion and Theology. University of South Africa, Pretoria. 245-289. Available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ubuntu. (Accessed 16 October 2008).

_____ 2007. The impact of knowledge systems on human development in Africa. University of South Arica, Pretoria, in Thomas Kochalumchuvattil, June 2010. "The Crisis of Identity in Africa: A Call for Subjectivity", *Kritike* Vol 4(1) 108-122. 110. Available from: Koch.alumchuvattil_june2010.pdf. (Accessed 13 January 2014)

_____ 2010a. "African relational ontology, individual identity, and Christian Theology: An African theological contribution towards an integrated relational ontological identity". *Theology*. July/August Vol CXIII No. 874. 243-253

_____ 2010b. "A generous ontology: Identity as a process of intersubjective discovery – An African theological contribution", *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 66(1), Art. #731, 12 pages. DOI: 10.4102/hts.v66i1.731. Available at: http://www.hts.org.za (Accessed 29 April 2012)

Gade, C.B.N. 2012. "What is Ubuntu? Different Interpretations of South Africans of African Descent" *South African Journal of Philosophy*, Issue 31 (3) 484-03. Available from: http://www.academia.edu/1928441/ What_is_Ubuntu_Different_Interpretations_Among_South_Africans

_of_African_Descent (Accessed 13 July   2015)

Ganzenvoort, R.R. 2012. "Narrative approaches", in B.J. Miller-McLemore (ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to practical theology*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester. 214-223.

Garrels, S.R. "Imitation, Mirror Neurons and Mimetic Desire Convergence between the Mimetic Theory of René Girard and Empirical Research on Imitation", *Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture*, Vol. 12-13. 47-86.

Gates, Henry Louis Jr. 2012. "Foreward" in Rebecca Walker (ed), *One Thousand Streams of Blackness*. Soft Skull Press, Counterpoint imprint; Berkeley, Calif. ix-x

Gennep, Arnold. 1960 *The Rites of Passage*, Kindle version, trans. Cizedom, M.B. and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Introduction by Solon T. Kimball. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. Accessed from Amazon.ca.

Girard, R. 1996. "Interview with René Girard", *Anthropoetics: Special Issue on René Girard* Vol 11(1) June, Interview, Marcus M Müller. Available from: http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/archive/anth0201.pdf . 12 pgs. (Accessed 29 September 2015)

Gobodo-Madikizela, P., 2004. *A Human Being Died That Night: A South African Woman Confronts the Legacy of Aparheid*. Mariner/Houghton Mifflin Co.: Boston & New York.

Gordon, L.R. 2014. "Black existence in Philosophy of Culture", *Diogenes*. [Online] Vol 59 (3-4): 96-105. University of Connecticut. Available from: http://dio.sagepub.com.   DOI:10.1177/0392192113505409.   (Accessed   10 November 2014).

Graves,T.H. 1998. "A critique of Process Theodicy from an African Perspective", *Process Studies*, vol. 12, no. 2 (Summer) 103-111. Available from: http://www.religion- online.org/showarticle.asp?title=2741. (Accessed 3 March 2015)

Guattari, Félix 1984 *Molecular Revolution: Psychiatry and Politics*, trans Rosemary Sheed. Penquin, New York.

Hartshorne, Charles 1967. *A Natural Theology for Our Time*. LaSalle, Ill., The Open Court Publishing Company, LaSalle, Ill.

Hofstadter, D. & E. Sander 2013. *Surfaces and Essences. Analogy as the fuel and fire of thinking*, Basic Books/Perseus, New York.

Honorius III, 1223. Encyclical: *Solet Annuere. On the Rules of the Friars Minor*, 29 November, http://www.capuchins.org/RuleofStFrancis.pdf. (Accessed 03 September 2015)

Hyvärinen, M. 2006. "Towards a conceptual history of narrative", in M. Hyvärinen, A. Korhonen & J. Mykkänen (eds.), *the travelling concept of narrative*, COLLeGIUM: Studies Across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol.1 20-41. Viewed 16 February 2013 from http://hdl.handle.net/10138/25742

Jaja, J.M. and Badey P.B. 2012. "Logic in African Philosophy: Examples from two Niger Delta Societies," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. April Vol 2(4) 95-102

Janoff-Bulman, R., Sheikh S., Hepp S. 2009. "Proscriptive versus prescriptive morality: two faces of moral regulation", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* March, Vol. 96(3):521-37.Availableat http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov /pubmed/19254101. DOI 10.1037/a0013779. Accessed 18 August 2015

Johnson, C.S. 2005. Review of Nzegwu, N. "Feminism and Africa: Impact and Limits of the Metaphysics of Gender", in Wiredu, K. (ed) 2004, *A Companion to African Philosophy*, Blackwell Publishing Co., Malden, MA and Oxford, UK, in *APA Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience*, Vol. 4(2) (Spring),11-12. Available from: http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.apaonline.org/ resource/collection/950518C1-3421-484C-8153-CDA6ED737182/ v04n2BlackExperience.pdf.

Jourdain, R. 1997. *Music, the Brain, and Ecstasy: How music captures our imagGeorgen*, William Morrow and Co., New York.

Harari, Y.N. 2014. *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. Imprint. 2014. Signal/McClelland & Stewart, Canada.

Kane, Sean 1998. *Wisdom of the Mythtellers*, Second Edition. Broadview Press, Peterborough, Canada.

Kimball, S.T. 1960 in Arnold Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. Kindle Edition, Introduction.

Kline, G. L., 1989. *Alfred North Whitehead: Essays on his philosophy*, ed G. L. Kline, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.

Kochalumchuvattil, T. June 2010. "The Crisis of Identity in Africa: A Call for Subjectivity"*Kritike* Vol 4, No. 1. 108-122. 110. Available from: http://www.kritike.org/journal/issue_7/kochalumchuvattil_june2010.pdf. (Accessed 13 January 2014)

Korr, C. and Close M. 2008. *MORE THAN JUST A GAME Soccer vs. Apartheid: The most important soccer story ever told.* Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Press, New York.

Kosko, Bart 1993. *Fuzzy Thinking: The New Science of Fuzzy Logic.* Hyperion, New York.

Kruidenier, R. 2015. "Trying for better circumstances (Zama Zama): Exploring *ubuntu* amongst marginalised women in an informal settlement", *Verbum et Ecclesa* Vol. 36(2), Art. #1433. Available from http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v3612.1433. (Accessed 15 July 2015)

Leclerc, I., 1961. *The Relevance of Whitehead: Philosophical Essays in Commemoration of the Birth of Alfred North Whitehead,* George Allen & Unwin, London.

Lewis, C.S. 1950. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe.* Illus. Pauline Baynes, Harper Collins, New York.

Longo, J. W., 1972. *Whitehead's Ontology.* State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y.

Loomer, Bernard 1971. "Christian Faith and Process Philosophy" in Brown, D., James, Jr., R.E., Reeves, G. (eds) *Process Philosophy and Christian Thought.* The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc., Indianapolis and New York.

Louw, Dirk J. (1998) "Ubuntu: An African Assessment of the Religious Other", Paper presented to the Twentieth Congress of Philosophy 10-14 Aug, Boston. Available from:http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Afri/AfriLouw.htm. 10 pgs (Accessed 16 October 2008)

_____2010. "Power sharing and the challenge of ubuntu ethics" in du Toit, C. (ed.) *Power Sharing and African Democracy: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.* Pretoria: Research Institute for Theology and Religion. UNISA. Available from: http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/4316/Louw. pdf?sequence=1. (Accessed 13 January 2014)

_____2011 "Ubuntu and the challenges of multiculturalism in post-apartheid South Africa", *QUEST: An African Journal of Philosophy* (Special Issue. African Renaissance and Ubuntu Philosophy) Vol. XV (1&2), 15-36. Available from: http://www.quest-journal.net/Quest_2001_PDF/louw.pdf (Accessed 13 July 2015)

Lowe, Victor 1971. "Whitehead's Metaphysical System" in Brown, D, James Jr. R.E., Reeves. G. (eds.) *Process Philosophy and Christian Thought*. The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc., Indianapolis and New York. 3-20.

Lowry, E.L. 1989. *How to Preach a Parable: Designs for Narrative Sermons*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN.

Marshall, Paul 2012. "Perspective. The meeting of two interactive metatheories," *Journal of Critical Realism*, Vol. 11, Issue 2. 188-214. Available at https://metaintegral.org/sites/default/files/Paul%20Marshall%2C%20 Two%20Integrative%20Metatheories%202012_pubd.pdf; DOI: 10.1558/jcr.v11i2.188 (Accessed 17 August 2015).

Mattheissen, Peter 1983 (1972). *The Tree Where Man Was Born*, E.P. Dutton Inc., New York.

McDaniel, J. 1990. "Six Characteristics of a Postpatriarchal Christianity", *Zygon,* Vo. 25 (2) June. 187-217.

Mead, G. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*, University of Chicago, Chicago, in Stanley J. Grentz, Stanley J. 2001. *The Social God and the Relational Self*, Westminster John Knox, Louisville; cited by Bass, D. B. 2012. *Christianity After Religion The end of church and the birth of a new spiritual awakening*, HarperCollins Publishers, New York.

Mbembe, Achille (2002) Interviewed by Hoeller, Christian. "Interview with Achille Mbembe", *Springerin Magazine Quarterly.* Available from: https://academia.edu/210673/Review_of_Mbembe_On_the_Postcolongy_H-Africa_Review_March_2002. (Accessed 16 April 2014)

McHenry, L. B., 1992. *Whitehead and Bradley: A comparative analysis*, State University Press, Albany, N.Y.

McLuhan, M., 1969, Interviewed by Eric Norden, "The Interview: Marshall McLuhan" (Part 2),[Online] Playboy Magazine, March. Available from: http://www.mcluhanmedia.com/m_mcl_inter_pg02.html. (Accesed 12 April 2012)

Mcunnu, T.N. 2004, "The dignity of the human person: A contribution of the Theology of Ubuntu theological anthropology", unpublished MTh Thesis, Department of Systematic Theology, UNISA.

Metz, Thaddeus 2007. "Toward an African Moral Theory", *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol. 15(3), 321-341.

Meylahn, Johann-Albrecht 2010. "Poetically Africa Dwells: A dialogue between Heidegger's understanding of language as the house of Being and African Being-with (ubuntu) as a possible paradigm for postfoundational practical theology in Africa", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 31(1) Art. #381, 9 pgs, DOI: 10.4102/ve.v31i1.381. Available from: http://www.ve.og.za. (Accessed 01 August 2015)

Milne, A.A. 1924. "Halfway down", *When We Were Very Young*, Illus. Ernest H. Shepard, E.P. Dutton, New York.

Milne, Pamela J. "Eve and Adam — Is a Feminist Reading Possible?" *Bible Review* 4:3 (1988):12-21, 39.

Mudimbe Y.V. 1985. "African gnosis philosophy and the order of knowledge: An introduction." *African Studies Review.* 28 (2/3).

Müller, J.C. 2011. "Postfoundational practical theology for a time of transition", *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 67(1), Art. #837, 5 pages. Available from: http:www.hts.org.za/index.php/HTS/article/view/837/ 1573 DOI: 10.4102/htx.V67il.837. (Accessed 13 January 2014)

_____ 2015. "Exploring 'nostalgia' and 'imagination' for ubuntu research: A postfoundationalist perspective," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 36(2), Art. #1432, 6 pages. Available from http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v3612.1432.   (Accessed 24 July 2015)

Munyaneza, M. 2001. "Violence as institution in African religious experience: A case study of Rwanda", *Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture*, Vol. 8, Spring. 39-68.

Murove, M.F. (ed) 2009. *African ethics: An anthology of comparative and applied ethics*, University of Kwazulu-Natal Press, Scottsville, KY.

Murray, Tom (in press 2015) "Contributions of Embodied Realism to Ontological Questions in Critical Realism and Integral Theory". In Bhaskar, R., Esbjörn-Hargens, S., Hedlund, N. & Hartwig, M. (eds), Metatheory *for the 21st Century: Critical Realism and Integral Theory in Dialogue*, Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group, London and New York. Chapter. Available from http://perspegrity.com/papers/EmbodiedRealism_CriticalRealism_IT.pdf (Accessed 18 August 2015).

Nkhata, M.J. 2010. "Rethinking governance and constitutionalism in Africa: the relevance and viability of social trust-based governance and Constitutionalism

in Malawa" LLD thesis, University of Pretoria. Available from: http://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25693/00front .pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Accessed 15 May 2012)

Ntibagirirwa, S. 2011. "Responsible leadership, African value system and Africa's quest for economic development". Unpublished paper, International Conference on Business and Information, Bangkok; 4-6 July.

Nussbaum, B. 2003. Ubuntu: Reflections of a South African on our Common Humanity", *Reflections,* Vol. 4 (2) 21-26.

Nzegwu, Nkiru 2003. "Sisterhood", African *Women & Feminism: Reflecting on the Politics of Sisterhood*, Africa World Press, Trenton, NJ. 1-24 in Blay, Y. A. 2008 "All 'Africans' are Men, all the "Sistas" are "American," but Some of Us Resist: Realizing African Feminism(s) as an Afrocological Research Methodology," *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2 (March)

Òkè, Moses 2005. "From and African ontology to an African epistemology: A critique of J.S. Mbiti on the time conception of Africans" *QUEST: An African Journal of Philosophy / Revue Africaine de Philosophie* XVIII: 25-36

Okeke, Jonathan C. 2011. "Project on African Logic, from thought system to algorithmic model: Impact on Science, Technology and Human Development". Paper, "authenticity in African philosophy presupposes a background of crisis". Science and Human Development conference, University of Nigeria, Nusukka; 30 Nov-3 Dec. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/1153291 (Accessed 19 May 2014)

Peat, F. D. 1992. "Non-locality in nature and cognition", *Nature, Cognition and System II Theory and Decision Library*, Vol. 10. 297-311. Available from: http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-011-2779-0_17. (Accessed 25 March 2014.

Pederson, D. 2011. "Causality and Objectivity: The Arguments in Kant's Second Analogy",*Aporia*,No.21:1,11-24 .Available from: http://aporia.byu.edu/pdfs/ pederson-causality_and_objectivity.pdf (Accessed 13 July 2015)

Ramose, M.B. 1999. *African philosophy through Ubuntu*, Mond books, Harare.

_____2001 "An African perspective on justice and race" , *polylog:Forum for Intercultural Philosophy* 3. [Online] Available from: http://them.polylog.org/3/frm-en.htm (Accessed 25 February 2015).

_____2003a. "Discourses on Africa", *The African Philosophy Reader*. Eds. P.H. Coetzee and P.J. Roux Eds. Second Edition. A Text with readings. Routledge:London.1-9,1-114. Available from: http://www.docstoc. com/docs/81721439/? (Accessed 15 May 2012)

_____2003b. "Ubuntu Philosophy", *The African Philosophy Reader*. Eds. P.H. Coetzee and P.J. Roux Eds. Second Edition. A Text with readings. Routledge: London. 270-280. Available from: http://www.docstoc .com/docs/81721439/? (Accessed 15 May 2012)

Richard, S. 2011. "Whitehead's Meretopology and the Project of Formal Ontology", *Logique et analyse*, 54(214) 249-285). Received by personal email 17 April 2015.

Ricoeur, P. 2005 (1992)"Personal Identity and Narrative Identity", *Self and Subjectivity*, Kim Atkins (ed) Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 225-234.

Riessman, C.K. 2008. *Narrative methods for the human sciences*, Sage, Los Angeles.

*Scrooge.*1951. (Film adaptation of Dickens, C. 1843. *A Christmas Carol*, Chapman & Hall, London), Motion picture, Director Brian Desmond Hurst, United Artists, USA.

SacredTexts.com 2011. "Rules of the Friars Minor", *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi* [online], Trans. Paschal Robinson (trans.) Chapter XVII. Available from: http://www.sacred-texts.com/chr/wosf/wosf06.htm.
 (Accessed 03 September 2015).

Scelta, G.F. 2011. Ethiopian Christian Liturgical Chant. Master's thesis. University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies Anderson. Available from: http://www.thisisgabes.com/home/writing. Accessed 16 August 2015

Seibt, J. 2003. *Process Theories: Crossdisciplinary studies on dynamic categories*, J. Seibt, (ed.) Kluwer Academic Publishers, the Netherlands. vii-xi.

_____ 2005. "Process Ontologies", *Metafisica e Ontologia* , ed. G. Imaguire, Philosophia Verlag, München. Available from: https://www.academia .edu/460451/Process _Ontologies. 27 pgs. (Accessed 07 September 2015).

_____ 2015."Ontological Scope and Linguistic Diversity: Are There Universal Categories?" *The Monist*, Vol. 98 (2015) 318-343.

Shakespeare, William. Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Ed. K. Deighton. London: Macmillan, 1919. *Shakespeare Online*. 20 Feb. 2010. Available from: http://www.shakespeare-online.com/plays/hamlet_3_1.html (Accessed   15 March 2015).

Shaviro, S.   2009. *Without Criteria: Kant, Whitehead, Deleuze and Aesthetics*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

_____2002 *African Philosophy through Ubuntu*, Mond Books, Harare.

Shrag, C.O. 1994 "Transversal Rationality" in Timothy J. Stapleton (ed), *The Question of Hermeneutics: Essays in Honor of J. Kockelmans (Contributions To Phenomenology)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands. 61-78; 68

_____2006."Traces of Rationality: Acknowledgement, Recognition, and Repetition" in Schultz F. L. (ed) *The Evolution of Rationality: interdisciplinary essays in honor of J. Wentzel Van Huyssteen,* William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids and Cambridge. 19-25.

Shutte, A. 2004 *Ubuntu: An ethic for a new South Africa*, Cluster Publications, Pietermaritzburg.

Smith, B. 1996. "Meretopology: A Theory of Parts and Boundaries", Data *and Knowledge Engineering*, Vol.20. 287-303 .Available from: http://ontology.buffalo.edu/smith/articles/Meretopology1.pdf. 22 pgs. (Accessed 14 July 2013)

Smuts, J.C. 1927. *Holism and Evolution*. Second Edition. Macmillan and Co., London. Available from: http://www.archive.org/details/holismandevoluti032439mbp. (Accessed 29 January 2015)

Stone, J.A. 2006. "Van Huyssteen in Context: A comparison with Philip Hefner and Karl Peters" in Shultz F. L. (ed) *The Evolution of Rationality: interdisciplinary essays in honor of J. Wentzel Van Huyssteen*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K. 3-86

Strachan, J.J. 2015 "Narratives of difference and sameness", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 36(2), Art. #1445, 8 pgs, Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v36i2.1445 (Accessed 01 August 2015)

Tertullian (c. 155-160-220 A.D.) "Modesty in apparel becoming to women in memory of the introduction of sin into the world through a woman", Book I, Chap. 1. *The Apparel of Women* Book I, Chap. 1. Trans. S. Therval. Available from: http://aren.org/prison/documents/religion/Church%20Fathers/On%20the %20Apparel%20of%20Women.pdf . (Accessed 30 September 2015)

Tschaepe, M. 2013. "A Humanistic Ethic of Ubuntu: Understanding Moral Obligation and Community," *Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism*, Vol. 21(2), 47-61.Available from: http://www.academia.edu/5866310/A_Humanist_ Ethic_of_Ubuntu_Understanding_Moral_Obligation_and_Community. (Accessed 2 September 2015)

Turner, Mark 1996. *The Literary Mind: The Origins of Thought and Language*, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.

Van Huyssteen, J.W. 1998. *Duet or Duel: Theology and Science in a postmodern World,* Lectures for the 1998 Diocese of British Columbia John Albert Hall Lectures. Centre for Studies in Religion and Society in the University of Victoria, Trinity Press International, Harrisburg, Penn.

Veldsman, D.P. 2007. "(Everybody) @ Home? A Phenomenological Perspective on the Experience of Incarcerated Existence in the Contemporary South African Society" *Scriptura*, Vol. 94. 81-99.

_____ 2008. "Wentzel Van Huyssteen: Telling the Story of Religious Awareness with Inter-Disciplinary Integrity from an Evolutionary Epistemological Perspective" *Scriptura* Vol 98.(2008:2) 222-230. Available from: http://scriptura.journals.ac.za/Accessed 5 July 2013

_____ 2011. "The suffering of creation within God's good creation: an unfinished systematic-theological perspective on evolutionary theodicy." *ProPsalms Seminar*. 9 pgs. Available from: http://up.academia.edu/ProfDanie Veldsman. (Accessed 15 June 2014)

_____ 2014 "With reasons of the heart before God. On religious experience from an evolutionary-theological perspective" NGTT DEEL Vo. 5, No 1, Paper presented at: 15th European Society for Studies in Science and Theology Conference, *Do Emotions Shape the World?,* 30 April – 4 May Assisi, Italy.

Weiss, Eric 2009. "A Commentary on Chapter Ten of Science and the Modern World by Alfred North Whitehead" *Process Studies*, Volume 14. Available from: http://ericweiss.com/a-commentary-on-chapter-ten-of-science-and -the-modern-world-by-alfred-north-whitehead. (Accessed 30 January 2010)

Werlen, B. 1993. *Society, Action and Space: An alternative human geography*. Trans. Gayna Walls; Brennan, T. and Benno Werlen (eds), Routledge, London.

Whitehead, A.N. 1925. *Science and the Modern World*. The Macmillan Company, New York.

_____1926. *Religion in the Making*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

_____1933. *Adventures of Ideas*. The Free Press, New York.

_____1965. *A Philosopher Looks at Science*. New York: Philosophical Library.

_____1966. "In Defence of Speculative Philosophy" in D. W. Shelburne (ed), *A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality*, The Macmillan Co., New York

.

_____1978 *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology* (Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh during the Session 1927-1928),

Corrected Edition. (eds) Griffin, David R. and Donald W. Sherburne, The Free Press, New York.

Whitney, Barry L. 1985. *Evil and the Process God*, The Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston, N.Y.

Wightman, W. P. D. 1961. In I. Leclerc (ed), *The Revelvance of Whitehead: Essays in Commemoration of the Birth of Alfred North Whitehead*, George Allen & Unwin, London. 335-350.

Wilbur, K. 1997, "An Integral Theory of Consciousness", *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, Vol. 4 (1). Available as "Excerpt C: The Ways We Are in This Together: Intersubjectivity and Interobjectivity in the Holonic Kosmos", from http://www.kenwilber.com/Writings/PDF/IntroductiontotheIntegral Approach_GENERAL_2005_NN.pdf. (Accessed 16 September 2014.)

Wildman, Wesley J. 2006. "An Introduction to Relational Ontology," in Polkinghorne, J. and John Zizioulas (eds), 2010 *The Trinity and an entangled world: Relationality in Physical Science and Theology*,Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.55-73. Available from: http: //wesleywildman.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/docs/2010-Wildman-Introduction-to-Relational-Ontology-final-author-version-Polkinghorne-ed.pdf. (Accessed 8 May 2014)

_____ 2010. "An Introduction to Relational Ontology". Available from: http:// www.scribd.com/doc/57704456/72-1010-Wildman-Introduction-to-Relational-Ontology-Final-Author-Version_Pol-King-Horne-Ed. (Accessed 17 June 2011)

Wiredu, K. 2007. "Philosophy and Authenticity", *Shibboleths: A Journal of Comparative Theory.* Vol 1(2). 72-80.

Yong, A. 1998 "Personal Selfhood (?) and Human Experience in Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism", Paper presented to the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, Boston. 10-15 August. Available from: http://bu.edu/wcp/Papers/PPer/PPerYong. htm. (Accessed 8 November 2011)

Žižek, S., 2008. *Violence: Six Sideways Reflections*. Picador, New York.