TEN

CHAPTER NINE: DIALECTIC

Dialectic deals with conflicts -
    overt or latent;
    in religious sources, tradition, in pronouncements of authorities,
        writings of Theologians;
    regarding contrary orientations of research, interpretations, histories,
        styles of evaluation, horizons, doctrines, systems, policies.

Not all opposition is dialectical (some differences will be eliminated by
discovery of fresh data; some are perspectival).

Fundamental conflicts stem from cognitional theory (implicit/explicit),
ethical stance, religious outlook --- will be overcome only through conversion.

Dialectic brings such conflicts to light, and provides technique for objectifying
subjective differences and promoting conversion.

1) HORIZONS

    Literal sense - bounding circle, limit of one's field of vision.
    Recedes and closes with movement of standpoint.

    As vision, so too scope of knowledge, range of interests -- are bounded --
    and vary with one's historical period.

    Social background and milieu

    Education and personal development.

                                    ***

    Differences in horizon may be complementary (worker, foremen, supervisors, etc),

    Genetic (successive stages in single biography or history),

    or Dialectical (intelligible/unintelligible, true/false, good/evil).

                                    ***

    Horizons are structured (organic, contextual) resultant of past achievement --
    and condition and limitation of further development.

2) CONVERSIONS AND BREAKDOWNS

    (De Finance)   { HORIZONTAL - Choice of decision within established horizon
    Exercise of Freedom | VERTICAL - Set of judgments and decisions moving us from
                                     one horizon to another

Vertical exercise may be continuous, developing sequence

OR and <u>about-face</u> - <u>conversion</u>
∨ new begining

{ Intellectual
Moral
Religious }

INTELLECTUAL CONVERSION

MYTH =
{
Elimination of myth concerning reality, objectivity, human knowledge.
Knowing is like looking
Objectivity is seeing what is to be seen, not seeing what is not there.
Real is what is out there now to be looked at.
}

This myth overlooks distinction between ⊢World of Immediacy (Conforms to myth's view
Reality
Objectivity
Knowledge

⊢World Mediated By Meaning
⊢External/internal <u>Experience</u> of Cultural
  Community

⊢Cumulatively developed <u>Understanding</u> of
  Community

⊢Checked & rechecked <u>Judgments</u> of
  Community

SO —
{
<u>Knowing</u> is experiencing, understanding, judging, believing
Criteria of <u>objectivity</u> are compounded criteria of E,U,J,B
<u>Reality</u> is given in experience
              organized and extrapolated by understanding
              positied by J & B
}

Not just technical philosophical point.
Empiricism, idealism, realism name three <u>totally different horizons</u> with no common
  identical objects.
Person in one never means what a person in the other means.
Examples of science, history, myth. Relevant to Church, method—

MORAL CONVERSION

Changes criterion of decisions and choices from satisfactions to values.

<u>Existential Moment</u>: We discover for ourselves that our choosing affects ourselves no
                less than the chosen or rejected objects.
                And that it is up to each of us to decide for himself what he is
                to make of himself.

                Time for exercise of vertical freedom: Moral conversion consists
                in opting for the <u>truly good</u>.

Such conversion falls far short of moral perfection - deciding is one thing, doing another

RELIGIOUS CONVERSION

Being grasped by ultimate concern; other-worldly falling in love; total and
permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualification, reservations.

Dynamic state prior to and principle of subsequent acts.

Interpreted differently in different religious traditions - for Christians it is
God's love flooding our hearts through Holy Spirit given to us.

Gift of Grace $\begin{cases} \text{Operative} \\ \text{Co-operative} \end{cases}$

***

When all three conversions occur within single consciousness relationship may be
conceived in terms of <u>sublation</u>.

Moral goes beyond intellectual; religious beyond moral –- but intellectual and moral
and neither negated or diminished.

***

But <u>Sublation</u> does not imply that first occurs intellectual conversion. then moral,
then religious.
On the contrary, causally, first there is gift of God's love, and from it moral
conversion and seeds of intellectual conversion.

Besides conversions there are breakdowns.
- Cognitional self-T neither easy to grasp or verify
- Values <u>Vs</u>. carnal pleasure, wealth, power
- Religion: illusory comfort, opium, mythic projection?

Elimnation, motivation, distortion of not all but some religion, some moral precepts,
some types of metaphysics summons forth more of the same in the name of balance,
consistency - and this in various ways among different groups, and thus not only
dissolution but division, incomprehension, suspicion, distrust, hostility, hatred,
violence.
The body social is torn apart.

3) DIALECTIC: THE ISSUE

Twofold issue of dialectic/ twofold deficiency of history, interpretation, research.

1. Dialectic has to add to the history that grasps what was going forward a history
that evaluates achievements, that discerns good and evil.
(Meinecke, Becker) for besides potential, formal, and full acts of meaning there
are also active acts of meaning proper to the fourth level of intentional
consciousness.

2. Dialectic is concerned with the gross differences between standpoints arising from the fact that historians with opposed horizons endeavor to make the same sequence of events intelligible to themselves.
Resolution of these differences requires nothing less than conversion.

In brief, phase one is incomplete if restricted to research, interpretation, history for they approach but do not achieve an encounter with the past.

They make data available, clarify meaning, narrate what occurred.

Encounter is more -- it is meeting persons
Appreciating their values
Criticizing their defects
and allowing their words and deeds to challenge the very roots of one's living.

4) DIALECTIC: THE PROBLEM

Presence or absence of intellectual, moral, religious conversion gives rise to dialectically opposed horizons -- which involve mutual repudiation.

There is the babel of opposed value judgments
Opposed accounts of historical movements
Opposed interpretations of authors
and different selections of relevant data.

To a great exent natural science (limiting its questions to those that can be settled through an appeal to observation and experiment, and drawing its theoretical models from math) escapes this trap -- but not completely:
    (eg, Mechanistic determinism
        Bohr's complementarity.)

Human sciences manifests more acute problem insofar as reductionist extend methods of natural science to the study of man. (Von Bertalanffy, Winter)

Both natural and human sciences, then, have problems not to be solved by empirical method.
But if they can more or less successfully evade or skirt them, theology can be methodical only by meeting them head on.

5) DIALECTIC: THE STRUCTURE

Two levels: upper of operators, lower of materials to be operated on.

Operators are two precepts: develop positions, reverse counter-positions.
    Positions are statements compatible with intellectual, moral, religious conversion;
    They are developed by integration with fresh data and further discovery.

Before being operated on, materials have to be

Assembled-	Researches, interpretations, histories, and events to which they refer.
Completed-	Evaluative interpretation and history.
Compared -	Seeks out affinities and oppositions in completed assembly.
Reduced -	To basic affinities and oppositions that manifest themselves in various ways.
Classified-	Distinguish which affinities & oppositions have sources in dialectically opposed horizons.
Selected -	Picks out these basic affinities and oppositions, dismisses others.

6) DIALECTIC AS METHOD

Dialectic is pattern of related and recurrent operations - but does it yield progressive and cumulative results?

Compare dialectic as implemented by intellectually, moral, and religiously converted person, and by one who has experienced none of these conversions.

In the first case, the investigator will know from personal experience just what intellectual, moral, and religious conversion is.

He will have no great difficulty in distinguishing positions from counter-positions.

In second case, investigator may have only what Newman called a _notional_ apprehension of conversion.

He will recognize radically opposed statements, but in those areas where he is personally under-developed he will mistake positions for counter-positions and vice-versa.

He will degrade the past.

***

Positions and counter-positions are not just contradictory abstractions.

They are to be understood concretely as opposed moments in on-going process.

Human authenticity is not some pure quality, some serene freedom from all oversights, all misunderstanding, all mistakes, all sin.

Rather, it is withdrawal from inautheniticity -- and the withdrawal is never a permanent achievement.

Human development is largely through the resolution of conflicts, and, within the realm of intentional consciousness, basic conflicts are defined by the opposition of positions and counter-positions.

***

Only by overcoming his own conflicts through cognitional and real self-transcendence can the theologian hope to discern the ambivalence at work in others and the measure in which they resolved their problems.

Conversely, only through knowledge and appreciation of others can the theologian come to know himself and fill out and refine his apprehension of values.

7) THE DIALECTIC OF METHODS - PART ONE

The task of dealing with conflicts between opposed philosophies, theologies, methods pertains not to the methodologist, but to "Dialectical" theologians, who will not attempt to prove his position or refute counter-positions, but to exhibit diversity and point to the evidence for its roots.

However, the methodologist cannot totally ignore the conflict of the philosophies and methods generated to defend and justify various horizons - especially as they touch on his own work: thus remarks on linguistic analysis and idealistic premisses.

MAC KINNON PAPER   p.254   (352)

1) Mental acts do not occur without sustaining flow of expression
2) Ordinary meaningfulness of ordinary language is essentially public and only derivatively private.
   Children and foreigners learn a language by learning how it is ordinarily used.
3) What is true of the ordinary meaningfulness of ordinary language is not true of the <u>original</u> meaningfulness of any language - ordinary, literary, or technical.....unqualified meaningfulness originates in expressed mental acts
   is communicated and perfected through expressed mental acts
   and attains ordinariness when perfected communication is extended to a large number of people.
4) If one conceives language as the expression of mental acts, one will conclude that philosophic problems have their source not only in linguistic expression but also in mental acts, and it could happen that one would devote much more attention to the mental acts than to the linguistic expression.

But one may feel that mental acts are just occult entities or, if they really exist, that philosophers are going to keep on floundering indefinitely if they pay any attention to them, or, at least, if they make them basic to their method.

A reductionist view of meaningfulness refuses to admit any appeal to originating mental acts for an account of the meaningfulness of language.

8) THE DIALECTIC OF METHODS: PART TWO

Talk about mental acts can occur in genetically distinct horizons.

The more differentiated the horizon, the fuller, more accurate, and more explanatory will be the talk.

Fully differentiated consciousness has four realms of meaning:
   1) <u>Common sense</u> (everyday meaning - ordinary language)
   2) <u>Theory</u> (language is technical, <u>objective</u> in reference)
   3) <u>Interiority</u> (objective talk of subject rests upon <u>self-appropriation</u>)
   4) <u>Transcendence</u> (language of prayer or prayerful silence)

Realms of <u>common sense</u> and <u>transcendence</u> interpenetrate in primitive undifferentiated consciousness, which lacks realms of <u>theory</u> and <u>interiority</u>.

Differentiation of consciousness, recognition of world of theory serves man's
   1) <u>Practical Bent</u> (from magic to science)
   2) <u>Critical bent</u> (from myth to philosophy)
   3) <u>Religious concern</u> (aberrations - purification)

Shift into world of theory demands development of special technical language.

Differentiation of common sense and theoretical worlds illustrated by:
1) Platonic Phenomenal and noumenal
2) Aristotle's "First For Us" -- "First Absolutely"
3) Aquinas' Hymns and Systematic Theology
4) Galilei's Secondary and Primary Qualities
5) Eddington's Two Tables

Differentiation of these two realms places technical science, philosophy and theology all in realm of theory.

Development of science forces philosophy to migrate from world of theory to finds its basis in world of interiority.

As common sense provides scaffolding for entering world of theory, so common sense and theory provide scaffolding for entry into world of interiority.

Transition from CS to Theory introduces objects not of direct experience
Transition from CS and theory to interiority promotes us from consciousness of
    self to knowledge of self.

Relations between language and mental acts:
1) Language that refers to mental acts must be developed (Snell, Aristotle,Aquinas).
2) Differentiation of consciousness and development of systematic thought
    and speech about mental acts vastly enlarges capacities of ordinary
    language (Augustine, Descartes, Pascal, Newman).
3) From within world of interiority, mental acts as experienced and
    systematically conceived are a logical first-from which one can proceed
    to epistemology and metaphysics-but this first is logical, not genetic.

9) THE DIALECTIC OF METHODS: PART THREE

An a priori rejection of present approach can also stem from idealist tendencies.

Karl Jaspers is clearest expression: self-appropriation is indeed an
    existenzerhellung, a clarification of the subject's own reality, but it is
    not objective knowledge.
        I agree
My view is that the heightening of consciousness in self-appropriation reveals
    not the subject-as-object, but the subject-as-subject.

But like any valid transition from data through inquiry and understanding,
    reflection and judging, the objectification and intelligent and reasonable
    affirmation of the subject revealed in the heightening of consciousness yields
    objective knowledge of the subject.

Jaspers' idealist tradition does not share this view.

Two disparate meanings of "object":
1) Object in world mediated by meaning -- what is intended by question, and what becomes understood, affirmed, decided by the answer.
2) Object in world of immediacy -- already, out, there, now, real.
3) What *...*

Two meanings of objectivity:
1) In world of immediacy the necessary and sufficient condition of objectivity is to be successfully functioning animal.
2) In world mediated by meaning objectivity has three components -- experiential, normative, absolute.

Typical Confusions
  Naive realist
  Naive idealist - Berkeley
  Rigorous empiricist - Hume
  Critical idealist - Kant
  Absolute idealist - Hegel

Third meaning
— what can be manipulated, controlled
— what ought not be "

Kierkegaard marks a trend --	Faith
Nietzsche	Power
Dilthey	Concrete human living
Husserl	Constitution of our intending
Bergson	Elan Vital
Blondel	Action
Pragmatists	Results
Existentialists	Authentic subjectivity
Ricoeur	

Shift in meanings of subjective/objective

Disagreement in philosophy, ethics, religion explained by subjectivity

But one may distinguish authentic/inauthentic subjectivity

In world mediated by meaning and motivated by value, objectivity is simply the consequence of authentic subjectivity.

10)   SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON TRANSCENDENCE

Gift of God's love
1) In undifferentiated consciousness (sacred objects, places, times, offices, etc.)
2) Differentiation gives rise to special theoretical questions concerning divinity, order of universe, destiny of man, lot of individual.
3) Self-appropriation leads to objectification of religious experience

Quite distinct from these objectifications in common sense and theory and interiority is the emergence of the gift as itself a differentiated realm -- cultivated by prayer, self-denial

Two effects of this
    1) First withdraws subject from CS, theory, interiority to "cloud of unknowing"
    2) Then intensifies, clarifies, purifies objectifications referring to
        trancendent in CS, theory, interiority.

Secular man of 20th century -- CS/theory familiar but in history of East
and West, CS/ transcendence predominant