1

Questions: Tuesday August 10th, 1971

> (from Rev. Mr. Sykes) Does your position admit of partial conversion - that is. of an inadequately appropriated change of view? Because if it does not then it seems not to do justice to some of the human ambiguities with which one is familiar (e.g. in relation to human love); and if it does, then it seems to me that it is misleading to use the 'horizon' metaphor (a spatial metaphor) of the changes involved in conversion.

- You mentioned this morning that religious and moral conversion ere likely to chronologically precede intellectual conversion. Do religious and moral conversion play a role in bringing intellectual conversion about? If so, would you please briefly explain their role.
- a) It is not clear to me how it is possible to be suthentic-ally religiously converted and yet not to be also morally converted. It seems to me that moral conversion 1811/1868/18 eo ipso and of neces ity must be presentin one who whom the state of being in love and its consequent acts are present.

b) To ask a closely related question: why do you consider tt so crucial to maintain a very clear distinction between the two conversions?

4.(from Fr. Sala) You said that dialectic deals with value judgments. Now values are the objects of human operations at the 4th level of consciousness. I don t see clearly why you relate dialectic to the moral level. I take as a clear instance of dialectic your exposition of the movement from NT to Nicea (DDTrino I). Then dialectic is a matter of spotting out the insufficiencies of the various doctrines about Christ, of finding the origins of these insufficiencies in the non-correct thematization of our cognitional structure, of relating these insufficient doctrines (counterpositions) inasmuch as each one tried to overcome the insufficiencies of the previous, till a setisfactory solution was found in Nicea, in which an intellectual conversion is implied. I see that your whole account presupposes that you have take

0

# 1 q 4 cont.

s clear stance about the fundamental notions of knowledge and reality. In other words, only a men who is intellectually converted can truthfully account for the whole movement, since he has correctly thematized the cognitional structure, which was operative in the movement itself from NT toNices.

But I don't see what this intellectual stance has to do with moral decision. One could want or decide to live up to the exigencies immanent in the cognitional structure, nevertheless one may not yet have reached the intellectual ## conversion (as I fear is the case for many of us).

- a) In FOUNDATIONS OF THEOLOGY David Tracy suggests that it is necessary to justify critically the moral and religious (pp. 218-9) prior to the explicit argumentation about God, but that you fail to do this in INSIGHT and hence operate abstractly.
- b) Further Tracy states: "if moral and religious conversion do require prior explicitation to the question of God, how could the discussion of evil logically follow #### rather than precede the solution to the problem of God" (p. 219). Please comment.
- In INSIGHT you spoke of a universal viewpoint as proximate achievement, the upper badde of an actual method of hermeneutics. But in dialectics you speak of a comprehensive viewpoint in terms of aspiration toward a "high and distant goal". Does this signify a softening of a perhaps overly mathitious claim to a universal viewpoint, "r is there some other reason for this disgrepancy?
- 7. We are familiar with the work of researchers, interpreters, and historians. Can you point to any concrete examples of the type of work you envision in dialectics?

### QUESTIONS (II)

#### Tuesday August 10th

- (1) It seems clear enough that your eight functional specialties can be employed by any religious or ideologically criented group which possesses traditions, is in existence now and criented toward the future? It does not seem clear however that a human science such as history or psychology can employ your eight functional specialties except in an indirect and partial fashion. Are these two observations correct or not?
- (2) Is your distinction between main science and scholarship

  ministry manufactured the scholarship main science and scholarship

  a re-emergence within your method of the Aristotelian notion that
  history, as of the particular and contingent, could not be the object of properly
  scientific knowledge? Is Theology not, then, scholarship rather than science?
  Would you say your transcendental method is not scientific?
- You seem to be grounding the historicity of man within the world of common sense. On that showing, the world of theory and the world of interiority would be a- or meta-historical to the extent that they moved away for from common sense. Yet no matter how far the operations in the worlds of theory and of interiority extend beyond common sense horizons they still are operations within history. Would it not be more accurate to ground the historicity of man within the world of interiority which grounds, not only a 11 operations in the worlds of remain common sense and theory, but also grounds its own self-mediation in the ongoing discovery of mind in history?
- (4) In the section of Insight on "Method in Metaphysics" you said that self-knowledge leads to and demands a recrientation in science and in common sense. If the same is true in human studies, would you say that the immunay authors you rely on have sufficiently achieved this orientation, or might some of them need a radical re-orientation?
- (5) In "Foundations of Theology" (p 217), David Tracy asks: "What are the conditions for the possibility of religious and explicitly theological meanings?" and claims that this is the most important foundational question for a critical theology. What is your position on this question now?
- (6) a) Rahner argues that the teaching of philosophy before theology instead of thgether with theology is an error based on a mistaken understanding of the grace-nature distinction. Do you agree with this contention of Rahner and if so would you indicate briefly why you think Rahner is correct?
- b) Rahner indicates as you do that natural theology should be taught as a moment within systematic theology. Could you indicate why it is in systematics rather than foundations that the God question should be considered.

O

# 111. Tuesday, Aug. 10th.

- 1. Where does moral theology fit into subject specialization?
- 2. In <u>Insight</u> p.745 you state that "empirical human science can become practical only through theology." In what way have you attempted to show this in your Method in <u>Theology</u>?
- 3. If a science like psychology can be conceived of as involving micro subsciences and a macro science, whose correlate objects are the relevant set of conjugate forms and the concrete thing respectively, (so that, e.g., psychophysiology, neuropsychology, psychologies of perception and emotion, psychologies of intelligence and will, would be the scientific noetic correlates of conjugate forms at the abstractive, micro level, and psychology of personality would be the scientific noetic correlative of central form at the concrete macro level,)

could one begin applying to the range of sciences which constitute psychology your functional specialties, at least in the first phase and at the first three levels?

Is there a close relation between your second and third levels and your treatment of conjugate forms and thing in <a href="Insight?">Insight?</a>?

- 4. (Fr.Gutheinz,S.J.) Reflecting on 'Method in Theology' and Chinese culture with its a) refined moral consciousness, b) concrete way of thinking nourished by the script which is basically an image-script, and c) stress on praxis, (still enforced by communism), two questions come to my mind:
  - (i) How could I go about leading Chinese people to an intellectual conversion?
  - (ii) What place, if any, does praxis have in Hethod in Thology?
- David Tracy writes: "The modern scientist has largely abandoned the classical search for essences to face squarely the mode n context of pluralism and perspectivism. Perspectigism recognizes that the significance of events may change as their history unfolds. As that significance of events changes so does the "reality" once thought captured forever in the essential definitions of the classicists ... In Catholic theology the conflict of the majority and minority reports on the birth-control issue is ample evidence of the inability of the classicist to realize the shift at issue here." (The Achievement of B. Lonergan, p. 89) It seems to me, Sir, that your method in theology looks beyond to a church which accepts positively a genuine Catholic pluralism. Yet the furore over dumanae Vitae and the scant attention theologians have paid to such a revolutionary encyclical as 'Onk the Pevelopment of Seoples seem to indicate that the teaching Church will never admit a theological pluralism for fear it be not concomitant with your triple conversion. The risk is too great and the Roman atholic Church has too much to lowse. The alternative will be to recede further into Rahner's 'diaspora', to hold on tight, the storm will abate and the controversies which presently rock the ship of leter will ultimately pass; men will fall to their knees seeking God's mercy and forgiveness for their waywardness and theological and philosophical aberrations. This phenomenon has not yet come to pass because relativism within the domain of Catholic truth is not yet a major issue, but to my mind your

## 111 contd. Tues. Aug. 10th:

thinking is going to being it into shape focus before long. Would you like to comment please?

- 6. A term that occurs frequently in Insight is "the real". As this usage is not common in English, could you give some syonyms? Would "anything that is real", "everything that is real", "the whole of reality" do?
- 7. Is it possible to <u>critically</u> ground that life is worth while and that the universe is a value? If so, how does one proceed to do this?
- 6. Is it necessary first to demonstrate that the universe is valuable in order to show that being is intelligible and indeed completely intelligible, or is the obverse the case?