

< 後期オリエンテーション >

A．テーマ：宗教と科学の関係論構築に向けて プロセス神学（１）

B．演習の目的

「宗教と科学」の関係を現代世界の新しい問題連関において解明することは、現代キリスト教思想研究の中心的テーマの一つに他ならない。本年度は、こうしたキリスト教思想研究の動向を代表するプロセス神学について考察を深めてみたい。

まず、プロセス神学の基本的な議論を確認するために、カブの『ポストモダニズムと公共政策』を取り上げる。とくに、前半の内容を中心にプロセス神学への導入を行いたい。その後、グリフィンの『宗教と科学的自然主義』によって、プロセス神学の立場から「宗教と科学」関係論へと考察を進めてゆきたい。

プロセス神学は、ホワイトヘッドのプロセス哲学に依拠したキリスト教思想と考えることができるが、その理解には、ホワイトヘッドなどの関連思想を学ぶが必要になる。この演習では、参加メンバーの実情に応じて、必要な文献を補足的に扱う予定である。また、参加メンバー自身の問題意識に基づく研究発表の機会も設けたい。

C．テキストについて

John B. Cobb Jr., *Postmodernism and Public Policy*, State University of New York Press 2002

David Ray Griffin, *Religion and Scientific Naturalism*, State University of New York Press 2000

D．Griffin について

< David Ray Griffin - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia >

Dr. David Ray Griffin is a longtime resident of Santa Barbara, California, was a full-time academic from 1973 until April 2004, and is currently a co-director of the Center for Process Studies, and one of the foremost contemporary exponents of process theology, founded on the process philosophies of Alfred North Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne. He is also a leading exponent of theories that dispute the generally accepted version of the events of the September 11, 2001 attacks.

Griffin grew up in a small town in Oregon, where he was an active participant in his Disciples of Christ church. After deciding to become a minister, Griffin entered Northwest Christian College, but became disenchanted with the conservative-fundamentalist theology that was taught there. While getting his master's degree in counseling from the University of Oregon, Griffin attended a lecture series delivered by Paul Tillich at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California. At this time, Griffin made his decision to focus on philosophical theology. He eventually attended the Claremont Graduate University, where Griffin received his Ph.D. in 1970.

As a student in Claremont, Griffin was initially interested in Eastern religions, particularly Vedanta. However, he started to become a process theologian while attending John B. Cobb ' s seminar on Whitehead ' s philosophy. According to Griffin, process theology, as presented by Cobb, " provided a way between the old supernaturalism, according to which God miraculously interrupted the normal causal processes now and then, and a view according to which God is something like a cosmic hydraulic jack, exerting the same pressure always and everywhere (which described rather aptly the position to which I had come)" (Primordial Truth and Postmodern Theology, p. 3). While applying Whitehead ' s thought to the traditional theological subjects of christology and theodicy, Griffin found that process theology also provided a sound basis for addressing contemporary social and ecological issues.

After teaching theology and Eastern religions at the University of Dayton, Griffin came to appreciate the distinctively postmodern aspects of Whitehead ' s thought. In particular, Griffin found Whitehead ' s nonsensationist epistemology and panexperientialist ontology immensely helpful in addressing the major problems of modern philosophy, including the problems of mind-body interaction, the interaction between free and determined things, the emergence of experience from nonexperiencing matter, and the emergence of time in the evolutionary process. In 1973, Griffin returned to Claremont to establish, with Cobb, the Center for Process Studies.

While on research leave in 1980-81 at Cambridge University and Berkeley, the contrast between modernity and postmodernity became central to his work. Many of Griffin ' s writings are devoted to developing postmodern proposals for overcoming the conflicts between religion and modern science. Griffin came to believe that much of the tension between religion and science was not only the result of reactionary supernaturalism, but also the mechanistic worldview associated with the rise of modern science in the seventeenth century. In 1983, Griffin started the Center for a Postmodern World in Santa Barbara, and became editor of the SUNY Series in Constructive Postmodern Philosophy between 1987 and 2004.

< テキストへの導入 >

Preface

The central question of this book is simply whether there is anything essential to science that is in conflict with any beliefs essential to vital religion, especially theistic religion. My answer is No, but the dominant answer has been Yes.

a twofold equation: the equation of religion with supernaturalism and the equation of science , since about the middle of the nineteenth century, with a materialistic version of scientific naturalism. Given this twofold equation, the "scientific worldview" necessarily conflict, in various ways, with the worldview presupposed by religious believers. Unless these perceived conflicts can be overcome, the division in our culture between religious and anti-religious forces will not be healed.

the overriding issue is that of *worldview*.

My aim, however, is not simply to draw attention to this formal point, but also to suggest how the perceived conflicts can be overcome. This suggestion is oriented around a distinction between the "minimal" and the "maximal" construals of *scientific naturalism*. (xv)

naturalism in the minimal sense is fully compatible with theistic religion.

such as that provided by the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, the change from a supernaturalistic to a naturalistic form of theism need not lead to a weaker, less vital spirituality. It can, in fact, have the opposite effect.

If the fundamental problem is that of worldview, the solution must be primarily philosophical. What is needed is a philosophical cosmology that besides commending itself in terms of the normal criteria of adequacy and self-consistency, can also be seen as meeting the respective needs of the scientific and religious communities. The recognition of the capacity of Whitehead's philosophy to play this role has been blocked on both sides.

the widespread equation of naturalism with its maximal form. the suspicion that

Whitehead's philosophy was not fully naturalistic. / suspicion that it was not fully religious. This book seeks to show this assumption not to be true.

the John Templeton Foundation, the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences (CTNS)

Robert Russell, Ian Barbour (xvi)

Ian Barbour has also been the pioneer in relating Whiteheadian process philosophy to this discussion.

Jack Haught, Ted Peters

the Claremont School of Theology (xvii)

< 演習の日程と分担の確認 >

1 . 従来の予定

10/6, 13, 20, 27, 11/10, 17, 12/1, 8, 15 (9 回)

2 . 変更は可能か? 10 月は従来通り、11 月は木曜日 2 時限目

10/6, 13, 20, 27, 11/2, 9, 16, 23, 30 (9 回)

3 . 8 回、1 回に 5 ページ程度