

Lonergan Workshop 1978

METAPHYSICS, PSYCHOLOGY,  
AND PRAXIS

Robert M. Doran

The generalized empirical method of Bernard Lonergan and the archetypal psychology of C. G. Jung are contributions to the systematizing of a qualitative leap in the evolution of human consciousness. The leap is into a third stage of meaning, where meaning is controlled, not by practical common sense, not by theory, but by a subjectivity that has been mediated to itself by a reflexive process of self-appropriation. Through this process, one discovers in an explanatory fashion the capacities and the normative exigencies of one's intention of meaning, truth, being, and value, and one governs one's cognitional and existential praxis on the basis of this discovery. Such an understanding of the present juncture in the history of consciousness is, of course, dependent on Lonergan (1972:93-96). But Jung too contributes not only to our understanding of the new stage in conscious evolution, but also to the very emergence of this consolidating systematization of the various conscious occurrences that give rise to this stage of meaning /1/, once the Jungian maieutic of psychic energy is subjected to the dialectical method that emerges from Lonergan's intentionality analysis.

The first part of the present paper is a post-critical /2/ statement of the articulation of two complementary mediations of subjectivity, where the complementarity in question has issued from dialectic. The dialectic has already reversed counter-positions (Lonergan, 1957:387-388; 531-549) in Jung's formulations of psychic reality. The reversal is presented in the paper I delivered at this Workshop one year ago. I quote:

Jung was extremely sensitive to the transformation of energetic compositions and distributions from personal object-relations to archetypal imago-relations. But beyond the archetypal stage of energetic transformation, there is an

anagogic stage. It represents the envelopment of sensitivity by the divinely originated solution to the problem of evil. In this stage, transformed and transforming symbols are released that correspond to the unrestricted intentionality of human intelligence, human judgment, and human deliberation. Anagogic symbols simultaneously reflect and give the conversion of human sensitivity itself to participation in the divinely originated solution to the problem of evil (Doran, 1977b).

The post-critical statement incorporates the positive gains of the dialectic into a developing position on the human subject.

The second part of the paper briefly addresses the existential and political responsibility of a subject in possession of this position.

### I. The Complementarity of Lonergan and Jung

#### Energy and Human Desire

The reflexive praxis of self-appropriation issues in a semantics of the dialectic of human desire. The dialectic itself is the humanly conscious form of the tension of limitation and transcendence that qualifies all development in the universe proportionate to human experience, understanding, and judgment (Lonergan, 1957:472-475). The tension is rooted in the prime potency, energy, that grounds both limitation and finality (Lonergan, 1957:442-451). The tension of limitation and transcendence becomes conscious when energy becomes psychic (Doran, 1977b), and a matter of existential responsibility when psychic energy becomes human, i.e., when it can achieve its highest integration only by being sublated by the cognitive intention of being and the existential intention of value. The humanly conscious tension is qualitatively more pronounced than the psychic tension of limitation and transcendence in the nonhuman animal genus and species, because in its human realization psychic energy is not only an integrator of underlying material events and an operator of the subject's

spiritual development, but also and primarily a factor in the integration of the very universe of being intended in human cognitive and existential praxis (Lonergan, 1957:469). In human desire, psychic energy is sublated by the spirituality of knowledge and decision (Lonergan, 1957:514-520), and thus becomes conscripted into the intelligent and reasonable, responsible and loving intention of a universe of being to be known and to be realized through the self-transcendent exercise of human intentionality. The extent of this conscription of psychic energy by spirituality is the extent of a sensitive detachment that matches the detachment of intentionality in its pure desire to know and to love.

This sensitive detachment is the precondition of the individuated wholeness which for Jung is the objective of the conscious negotiation of psychic teleology. Jung perhaps came closest to so formulating the process and objective of individuation in a 1929 essay, "Commentary on 'The Secret of the Golden Flower'" (Jung: 1970). Ironically, the Chinese alchemical text that Jung explores in this essay sparked an interest in alchemy that was to lead him to a less comprehensive account of human development, where the tension of limitation and transcendence is displaced in favor of psychic energy as integrator, and at the expense of its function as operator. What Lonergan enables us to understand and formulate is the fact that psychic wholeness is a by-product of authentic intentionality. The higher integration of the subject and the share of the sensitive psyche in that integration are consequences of the higher integration of the universe in and through the subject's conscious intentionality of being and value. Wholeness, then, is to be understood in terms of self-transcendence, not in terms of self-containment. Such a qualification entails a quite extensive refinement of Jung's presentation of mandala symbols as par excellence symbols of individuated totality (Jung, 1969a). Mandala symbols reflect psychic

energy as integrator, but are not the best symbols of psychic energy as operator of development.

The phrase, the semantics of desire, is found in Paul Ricoeur's refined and delicate articulation of the place of Freudian psychoanalysis in the philosophy of self-appropriation that grounds a hermeneutic of culture and religion (1970:5-7). But to speak of a semantics of the dialectic of desire is to extend the meaning of the term, desire, to include not just the biological purposiveness highlighted with such single-minded intensity by Freud but also the sensitive psychological component of intentionality in the various autonomous realms of meaning specified by Lonergan (1972:81-85). The realms of meaning find their psychic components in what in Insight Lonergan calls patterns of experience (1957: 181-189). Desire thus includes even the pure, disinterested, detached orientation that in Insight is the desire to know and that in Method in Theology is extended to the intention of value. Nonetheless, Ricoeur has argued convincingly that the problems posed by Freud and by those associated with him positively or negatively must be faced by a philosopher intent on the reflective task of self-appropriation. I would extend this argument and make of psychic process in all its forms an element that must be articulated in a developing position on the human subject (Doran, 1977c: Chapters One, Two, and Three). This means that the science of depth psychology will become a constituent part of transcendental method, which I understand as a developing and potentially comprehensive science of the human subject as subject. If Lonergan's position on various autonomous realms of meaning is correct, however, then Jung's insight into various autonomous compositions and distributions of psychic energy is more satisfactory than the Freudian reductionistic theory of libido (Jung, 1960). Still, as we have seen, Jung's insight must be expanded beyond archetypal symbols, if the genuineness

of the self-appropriating subject (Lonergan, 1957:475-479) is to be promoted by depth psychological analysis.

I propose that we attempt to understand the relationship between Lonergan's science of intentionality and the science of the psyche by investigating what I would call the significance of Lonergan's work for the evolution of energy into participation in a third stage of meaning.

#### Cultural Epochs

Several converging interpretations of an axial development of human consciousness have in recent years been offered as helpful to the understanding of history. The debate that can be constructed among Karl Jaspers (1953), Eric Voegelin (1956-1974), Lewis Mumford (1956), John Cobb (1967), and Lonergan (1967) is principally concerned with details of dates and with the extent to which the epochal change admits of internal differentiations. The protagonists seem to recognize that such debates can be settled only by employing the methods of rigorous historical scholarship. Dialectical questions will, of course, emerge, on account of the different horizons from which the historical interpretations are offered. One's options regarding the significant differentiations within the axial breakthrough to rationality will depend on one's understanding of oneself and on the self that one has to understand. What seems agreed is that there is some sense in which it is legitimate to speak of an epochal breakthrough in human consciousness that occurred roughly during and beyond the first millenium before Christ, and that this breakthrough is determinative of the dialectic of history ever since the emergence of the hegemony of rational consciousness, personal freedom, and individual identity.

Lonergan's notion of the control of meaning (1967) is a most helpful guide to understanding and differentiating this breakthrough. Lonergan focuses

on the Greek variant of axial consciousness. The Greek discovery of mind in the period extending from Homer to Aristotle issued in a new control of meaning in terms of the Platonic and Aristotelian ideals of philosophy and science. The person of Socrates in the Platonic dialogues is the classic figura midwifing the theoretic control of meaning, but the classicist formulation of this maieutic is Aristotle's, and especially as he formulates an ideal of science in his Posterior Analytics. Science is contrasted with opinion, necessity with contingency, theory with praxis, wisdom with prudence. As the first members of each disjunction trumpet the new control of meaning, so the second reflect the best that the old order could hope to aspire to.

While the Aristotelian disjunctions were to be removed in principle by modern science, the classic formulations left a split in the human soul that modern science was not prepared to heal until its methodological gains could be extended to the study of the subject. From the poetic imagination of Greece during this same period, we learn the dramatic existential significance of the theoretic breakthrough. A new economy of interiority was established, a rephrasing of the interplay of spirit, psyche, and body, a new set of relationships between intentionality and energy, between the archetypal masculine and the archetypal feminine, between theory and poetry. Greek tragedy presents the drama in its sharpest terms: the price that the autonomous intelligence had to pay for stealing fire from the gods; the Oedipal failure that nonetheless brings with it a new and tragic dignity; the Aeschylean resolution in which woman as wisdom vindicates the violent breakthrough and persuades the offended Furies to take up their abode in the depths of the earth beneath the city of reasonable men, converting their nightmarish energies into the benevolent chthonic resources without which the project of the new order cannot succeed. What occurs in the order of spirit is reflected in the symbols of the psyche. An epochal differentiation

of an incarnate intentionality is also an epochal differentiation of the sensitive, symbol-making psyche.

The axial control of meaning ushers in what Lonergan calls the second stage of meaning in Western consciousness (1972:93-96). Much work remains to be done in determining the internal differentiations of axial consciousness in various localities and cultures. Principally, Christian theology must determine whether there is a specifically Christian differentiation within the axial breakthrough, and if so how that differentiation is related to the other axial advances that, in an increasingly planetized world, are becoming a relatively common heritage of humankind. But even to pose the problem in this way makes abundantly clear the need we have today of finding a common ground beyond the particularities of the various axial advances. Thus, from the foundation of a more radical control of meaning, Lonergan is able to recount how the Greek theoretic shift underwent a series of revolutionary transpositions in modern science. This more radical foundation consists for Lonergan in an insight into insight, into the kind of insight that in Greece first emerged as a recurrent operation. And as insight in the intellectual pattern of experience was axial, so too is insight into insight. In the eleventh chapter of Insight, the theoretic control of meaning gives way to another epochal differentiation of consciousness: the explanatory self-appropriation of human interiority. Many previous modern events in the history of thought provide the potency for the new form that emerges in the self-affirmation of the knower. Among them, surely, are Descartes' affirmation of the apodicticity of subjectivity as the foundation of philosophy; Kant's rendition of philosophy's questions as concerned with what the subject can know, what he ought to do, and what he can hope for; Hegel's discovery of a dialectical movement of Geist as both the absolute method of knowing and the immanent soul of its content; Kierkegaard's midnight

cry that the dialectic is the becoming of the individual; modern science's severing of the umbilical cord to imagination, highlighting the duality of knowing; and the triumph of the therapeutic announced by Freud, humanized by Jung, and relativized by Rank. In each of these developments there are positions to be promoted and counter-positions to be reversed. The principle of promotion and reversal is found in the basic positions on the subject, on being, and on objectivity. With the realization that objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity and with the progressive and cumulative clearing of the normative order of inquiry that constitutes authenticity, we have a breakthrough to a new control of meaning, to a new stage of meaning, to a new epoch in the history of human consciousness. The pivotal chapters of Insight mark the formal beginning of a new series of ranges of schemes of recurrence in the world process whose immanent intelligibility is an emergent probability that becomes intelligent intelligibility in human consciousness.

If the axial development of intentionality was accompanied by an axial differentiation of the sensitive, symbol-making psyche, we ought to expect something similar as intentionality moves into a third stage of meaning. In intellectual conversion, intentionality approximates a mediated self-transparency. And in what I have called psychic conversion, the mediation of immediacy extends to the sensitive psyche (1977a). I have found it preferable to explain what I mean by psychic conversion by engaging in dialectic with the thought of Jung. Since the elements essential to the dialectic have been presented in previous papers delivered at the Lonergan Workshop, I choose not to repeat them here, but rather to advance the articulation of a position on the subject by indicating how we can integrate what Jung disclosed with what Lonergan has uncovered, how we can interlock archetype with insight. / We know that basic method (Lonergan, 1972:20) and the elemental symbolic function are quite germane to one another, in that Jung's

discovery is as transcendental as Lonergan's, and Lonergan's as collective or universal as Jung's. Transcendental method and archetypal psychology both bear on universal humanity. They mediate the constants of the human self, the permanent features of human subjectivity. Wherever there is human subjectivity, there is a constant elemental symbolic function with constant motifs as well as the capacity to release new symbols of the economy of interiority under the dominance of a preconscious collaboration of imagination and intelligence searching for imaginal materials for conscious insight, reflection, and evaluation (Lonergan, 1957:187-206). And wherever there is human subjectivity, there is experiencing of the data of outer sense and inner consciousness; there are inquiry, insight, formulation, reflection, the commitment of affirmation, and the awful fact of existential responsibility. How can we articulate the interlocking of these two great discoveries in interiorly differentiated consciousness? If we can answer this question, we will be advancing the development of the basic position on the subject.

#### Psychology and Intentionality Analysis

Consciousness is the presence of the subject to himself or herself in all of the operations of which he or she is the subject: dreaming, sensing and perceiving, imagining, inquiry, understanding, reflecting, affirming, denying, evaluating, deliberating, deciding, acting, praying; and in the feelings that permeate all of these intentional operations. Consciousness is not knowledge. Knowledge is a matter of correct understanding. Consciousness is also and a fortiori not self-knowledge, which is a matter of the correct understanding of oneself.

Nonetheless, it is only conscious beings who experience, question, understand, formulate, reflect, and affirm--who know. Consciousness is thus the necessary condition, though not the guarantee, of fully human knowledge. And consciousness conditions self-knowledge in a further way, in that it provides

the very data that one must understand and affirm if one is to know oneself. Among these data are the operations that constitute knowing, and the states and directions of feeling. Moreover, as I may know without knowing what it is to know, so I may feel without knowing what I feel. Psychotherapy, like Lonergan's cognitional analysis, in part renders known what was already conscious.

These affirmations are almost truisms for anybody who has worked his way through Insight and Method in Theology. I express them only to highlight that in addition to consciousness there is the unconscious. With the clarifications introduced by Lonergan, we may limit the use of the term, the unconscious, to refer to energy at its physical, chemical, and biological levels, to the opaqueness of nature, which needs a higher integration by at least the sensitive consciousness of the psyche if it is to come into the light. The unconscious is all energy that is not present to itself, all energy save that which becomes psychic energy in animal and then in human consciousness. Proximately in the human subject, the unconscious is neural-physiological process in the organism. Remotely, the unconscious is the sub-animal world. From Lonergan's work, then, we are able to derive a more precise use of the terms, consciousness and the unconscious, than is found in Jung's work, where consciousness means the differentiated consciousness of the ego, and where the unconscious includes not only opaque energy but also what Lonergan prefers to refer to as what is conscious but not objectified (1972:34).

Let me now repeat some further familiar affirmations issuing from Lonergan's cognitional analysis, in order to highlight another point. The universe in which human consciousness emerges is not static but in process. This process has given rise to successive higher integrations in the form of explanatory genera and species, unities and intelligibilities, laws that unify

otherwise coincidental manifolds. Among these laws are those that govern human intelligence itself. (1957:255-257; 262-267; 437-442). The sciences arrange themselves in a pattern isomorphic to the process and emergent forms of the universe of being. Thus chemistry is an autonomous science from physics. The laws of physics are not abrogated in chemistry, feature in chemistry, but are sublated into a higher viewpoint containing other laws that systematize data that remain coincidental from the standpoint of physics. So too chemistry leaves unexplained certain phenomena in the universe of being, but not in such a way that its laws or those of physics are left behind or abrogated in the further laws known by the biological sciences. And there are data of sensitive consciousness that are purely coincidental from the standpoint of biology but that are unified in the insights of sensitive psychology, even though the laws of biology, chemistry, and physics are part of the complete scientific understanding of sensitive life. Finally, human being provides a manifold of data left unexplained by the science of sensitive consciousness. These are the data on men and women as selves and as concerned with their own self-constitution, and as knowers in whose intelligent activity the universe itself attains a higher systematization. Thus there are the data of consciousness: the operations of inquiry, insight, reflection, judgment, evaluation, decision, love, and religion; the data on the difference between being intelligent and stupid, reasonable and silly, responsible and irresponsible, loving and selfish; and the data of self-constitution that enable the discovery that it is up to me what kind of person I will be. I will never understand such data by studying physics, chemistry, biology, or even sensitive psychology. I must raise questions concerning the data of human consciousness. Such attention and inquiry will give rise to a science that accounts for data on human living

that are left unexplained by other sciences. This science is a knowledge of the human subject as human subject. It is moving toward the full position on the human subject.

The point I wish to highlight by this repetition of issues settled in Lonergan's cognitional analysis, is that the unconscious in itself, as all energy that is not present to itself, is known by the physical, chemical, and biological sciences, and not by psychology. What psychology knows are the higher integrations of psychic energy, which is by definition conscious. Energy reaches a higher integration under the dominance of sensitive, intelligent, rational, moral, and religious consciousness. Moreover, the basic form of this higher integration occurs, not in the waking consciousness of an animal or a human being, but in their dreams. In the dream, the universe known by physics, chemistry, and biology reaches toward an ulterior finality. In the dreams of a human being, the universe of proportionate being initiates something of an experiment with human intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility. It enters into subjectivity, becomes subjective. The psyche, Jung said, is at bottom world (1969b: <sup>173</sup>), but it is world-for-itself, energy rudimentarily present to itself. It is the universe become the conscious operator of its own development. It is energy reaching toward a participation in the self-transcendent activity of the intelligent, rational, moral, agapic subject. The universe can become love in human consciousness, and its entrance into this capacity, its expression of this finality, occurs in the dream.

The science of psychology, then, deals, not with the unconscious in itself, but with the higher integration of energy become psychic and therefore conscious. If such a heuristic point of view is accurate, then the science of psychology demands for its integrity the science of the human subject as

human subject. Only from the science of consciousness does the psychologist gain familiarity with the transcendental objectives of human intending, and only from these objectives does one gain perspective on the place of the sensitive psyche and its spontaneous symbols within the full structure of the normative order of inquiry. To cite an example of what I mean, Lonergan's acknowledgment that terminal values are apprehended and aspired to in intentional feelings (1972:31) grants to the sensitive psyche of intentionally ordered human subjects a transcendental significance. Feelings mediate consciousness at its fullest, for it is with feelings that existential deliberation begins. The human search for direction is in principle safeguarded by this insight from being perverted into some variant of the typically modern reduction of intentionality's order to sensitive psychological determinants. The latter rather are known to share in the order of humanity's basic and specifically differentiating quest, through which a world is mediated and constituted by meaning. The intelligibility of orientation, quite distinct from passionate motivation (Voegelin:1953), is restored in principle to modern psychology when the differentiation of the existential fount of personal value acknowledges the transcendental significance of feelings.

As with feelings, so with dreams, for a symbol is "an image of a real or imaginary object that evokes a feeling or is evoked by a feeling" (Lonergan, 1972:64). The finality of the dream is the finality of the existential consciousness that deliberates about the human good; namely, the concrete process, at once individual and social, that consists not simply in the service of humanity, but in the making of humanity, in advance in authenticity, in fulfilment of affectivity, and in the direction of human labor to particular goods and to a good of order that are truly worth while (Lonergan, 1972: 52).

Our dreams tell the story of the dialectic of existential consciousness, of willingness and refusal, openness and bias, inner freedom and alienation, self-transcendence and self-enclosure. As such, dreams are the best ciphers we have of our condition as moral and religious subjects. In the dream, images are provided to the dramatic pattern of experience: images for existential insight, for judgments of value, for decision and action.

Because the dream is a higher integration of what from the standpoint of unconscious energetic compositions and distributions remains a purely coincidental manifold of events, it is a most significant occurrence in a universe whose immanent intelligibility is constituted by the process of emergent probability (Lonergan, 1957: 115-128). But the dreams of a human subject themselves remain purely coincidental events unless they achieve their higher integration through conscious insight, reflection and judgment, decision and action. Psychic energy occupies a strictly intermediate position in the structure of the subject as subject. Through the higher integration that is imposed by the dream upon underlying manifolds of neural events, psychic energy elevates organic process to potential participation in the intentionality of the human subject. But this potential is actualized only when the subject sublates the dream into waking intentionality, by interpreting the dream, by critically reflecting on the interpretation, by settling on that interpretation that hits things off most accurately, and by acting in the existential order in accord with the self-knowledge that one has gained through the interpretation of the dream. If a subject is oblivious of the dream or rejects it as insignificant or interprets it naively or superstitiously or projectively, a blind alley or false start or even a complete breakdown and collapse has been suffered in world process. Unconscious energy depends on the intentional subject to promote its upwardly but indeterminately directed dynamism, its finality. Once it has entered into human consciousness, its future depends on what human consciousness

does with it. The physical, chemical, biological, and sensitively psychological world depends on the intelligent, rational, free subject for its higher integration, for the determination of its direction, the specification of its finality, and the execution of its immanent orientation to fuller being.

If this is an accurate representation of the metaphysical significance of psychic energy and of the dream, then we have found the key to mediating Lonergan's intentionality analysis and Jung's psychology. The psyche promotes the universe of proportionate being to the fuller realization of being that it finds in human knowledge and action. That there is a psychic component to human spiritual activity is evident from Lonergan's account of patterns of experience, i.e. of sequences of sensations, memories, images, emotions, conations, and bodily movements accompanying spiritual differentiation in various realms of meaning (1957: 181-189). This psychic component of intentional operations is released for self-appropriation when one correlates the dream with the energetic compositions and distributions that constitute the various patterns of experience. That Jung is more helpful than, say, Freud in providing an orientation to the interpreter of dreams who is already informed by Lonergan's analysis of intentionality, results from Jung's explicit recognition of the autonomy of various compositions and distributions of psychic energy, i.e. their irreducibility to primitive biological and instinctual determinants. Lonergan's notion of intentional consciousness clarifies and further differentiates Jung's basically more satisfactory notion of psychic energy by introducing into the hermeneutic framework the indispensable notion of self-transcendence. With this notion, Jung's epistemological idealism and concomitant psychological romanticism are transcended, and the psyche takes its rightful place in an objectification of cognitive, moral, and religious realism. The energetic component of the basic structure of the incarnate spirit,

of the subject as Being-in-the-world, then, is as follows:

energy's upwardly  
but indeterminately  
directed finality,  
reaching fuller being  
through successive  
higher integrations

↑  
existential consciousness (intending  
moral and religious self-transcendence)  
rational consciousness (intending truth  
and being)  
intelligent consciousness (intending  
meaning)  
empirical consciousness (attentive to  
data of outer sense and of inner  
consciousness)  
dreaming consciousness (integrating at  
the psychic or experiential level  
underlying neural manifolds)  
the unconscious (biological, chemical,  
physical compositions and distributions  
of energy)

#### Elemental Symbols and Self-Appropriation

The energetic compositions and distributions that constitute the human psyche are the point of contact between the unconscious energy of the organism and the intelligent intelligibility of human spirituality. The form of these compositions and distributions is the symbol. The symbol is the place of the conscious meeting of past and future, origin and destiny, archeology and teleology (Ricoeur), limitation and finality (Lonergan, 1957). The elemental symbols of our dreams synthesize into a tense unity the structure of human time, of the primordial time that constitutes the possibility of sensitive immediacy and that institutes its structure (Heidegger). Symbols are the rich texture in which nature and freedom, matter and spirit, commingle. They are the integrations of transcendental imagination in its function of instituting primordial human time, where the future beckons what has been into presence and thus constitutes the present.

A human ontology that would do justice to the full structure of

the human compound-in-tension, then, must insist that it is through the psyche and its elemental symbolic deliverances that human intelligence, reason, and freedom are provided the materials for achieving the conscious unity that constitutes one's life as a work of art. Martin Heidegger's analyses of the function of Einbildungskraft in instituting this unity are quite helpful, once one realizes that the transcendental imagination that constitutes Dasein's temporality as Being-in-the-world is identical with the energetic compositions and distributions that constitute the human psyche; and once one engages in a dialectic with Heidegger from the standpoint of Lonergan's detailing of the notion of being, so that the tension of the opposites in the structure of the human person is not reconciled by collapsing the notion of being that is Dasein into the boundaries of the horizon of time that are established by the structure of the human psyche. Nonetheless, the present is indeed the subject's sensitive temporality as a tense unity of the projects of freedom and the thrownness of potentiality. The dream symbol evokes, promotes, creates this unity, or in its absence calls one back to it. The projects of freedom are future and spirit, finality and transcendence; the thrownness of potentiality is past and matter, origin and limitation. Project is consciousness, thrownness the unconscious. Project is anticipation, thrownness is memory. Psychic energy is their meeting ground. The dream proposes to make of potentiality a project, and to insure that the projects of freedom remain possible for an incarnate subject.

No other project than one that is possible, no other future than that which is continuity with the potentialities of energy, no other consciousness than that which is in harmony with the unconscious, no other spirit than that which is synchronous with matter, prevails in the world of human affairs. All other projects--and they are attempted in great number--are folly, alienation, and destructiveness for the human compound of limitation and transcendence and for the social world in which that compound lives dramatically in the presence of others.

The intentionality of an incarnate spirit thus finds in psychic energy's symbolic productions a set of defensive circles safeguarding its own authenticity. Intentionality split from psyche represents a disproportion of the tension of limitation and transcendence, a schizoid condition of onesided hypertrophy that for Jung was the privileged disease of our time. No condition in the universe of proportionate being is more precarious than the self-transcendent dynamism of spiritual intentionality in union with a human body. Intentionality and the body are genuine opposites, as opposite as future and past, spirit and matter, consciousness and the unconscious, transcendence and limitation. The integration occurs through negotiating the symbolic process of dreams.

Dreaming consciousness, then, where energy becomes potency for agape, provides the conditions in the third stage of meaning for the self-appropriation of the drama of the compound-in-tension that is the human subject. The dream expresses our tense unity and intends our wholeness, the integrity of our project, the synchronicity of our intelligence and reason and freedom with a universe whose prime potency is energy. The task of intentional consciousness in bringing conscious operations as intentional to bear upon conscious operations as conscious, thus instituting the third stage of meaning, must extend to the interpretation of the dream, through which the potentiality of one's past is integrated into the projects through which one constitutes one's future being. The dream makes of matter potentiality for spirit, while incarnating spiritual intentionality in matter. It is the first instance in which the universe of proportionate being becomes conscious finality. It is the potential provided to the subject to make of one's past a story with a human future. On the other hand, radical alienation may be helpfully analyzed in terms of the failure of synchronicity between the spirituality of freedom and the materiality of the organism. The sublation of the dream into the intentionality of consciousness represents a further step in the constitution of the converted person.

## II. Metaphysics as Political Responsibility

### Contemplation and Politics

There is an at least philosophical faith that is demanded if one is to live from the conviction that only a consciousness in harmony with the unconscious energies of the universe, only a spirit that is synchronous with matter, prevails in the world of human affairs. More often than not, such a consciousness, such a spirit, seems to be a political failure. The claim that only an intelligence and reason and freedom that are synchronous with a universe whose prime potency is energy projects courses of action that are truly possible seems, on the face of things, to contradict reality itself. When politics is conceived as the art of the possible, what is meant is not the artistry of integrity that I have referred to in the previous section, but a Realpolitik that settles short-range problems with short-range solutions whose only criterion of efficacy is expediency. The criterion of decision is the particular good or the good of order, not the notion of value (Lonergan, 1972: 47-52).

If it is correct to assume that the historical-dialectical drama of our age consists in the establishment of the series of ranges of schemes of recurrence that Lonergan calls the third stage of meaning, then, the most genuine political orientation one can assume will be structured by one's commitment to such an enterprise. The pragmatic view of politics as the art of the possible, where possibility is coterminous with expediency, will be recognized as a destructive myth. It will be replaced by a view according to which, in Edward Schillebeeckx's terms, politics is rather "the more difficult art of enabling that which is necessary for human salvation" (1978:40). One's political praxis will be structured by an intelligence, a freedom, a graced subjectivity, capable of action on the level of history. Politics becomes cosmopolis, which is elevated to the level of redemptive history by the divine solution to sin.

One will become actively indifferent to the short-term successes and failures that attend one's commitment. One will, in Lonergan's terms, withdraw from practicality in order to save practicality (1957:241). One will recognize, with Gandhi, that political victory without spiritual victory is a sham (Del Vasto:110), and, still with Gandhi, that such a conviction not only does not excuse one from participation in political struggle, but urges one to it and structures one's praxis within it in a unique way. Withdrawal from practical expediency is not withdrawal from political praxis. But always one remains aware that what is at stake is not so much the outcome of one's particular intentions, but the victory of integrity even in the midst of the failure of such intentions. The political situation of Western humanity still bears a structure analogous to that which necessitated Plato's resigned realization of the fate of the lover of wisdom, the practitioner of integrity, the spirit in love with the good, in the midst of the corrupt polis. The short-range political effectiveness of the intentionality devoted to cosmopolis will always be negligible. But the historical effects of such a human spirit will never be outweighed by the social surd that results from the paralyzed minds and hearts of the politically expedient.

Only when the disclosure of the story of intentionality in dreaming consciousness was opened for me in Jungian analysis, did I really appreciate what Lonergan was saying in his pages on general bias and cosmopolis (1957: 225-244). For the detachment that can think and choose on the level of history must extend to and penetrate the sensitive consciousness of the mortal animal before it is effectively safeguarded from reversion to shortsighted practicality. Some day Insight may come to be interpreted as a book that is as much a study of universal willingness as it is a study of human understanding. But then the contexts established by religious conversion and by psychic conversion will have to be explicitated in a fashion that integrates

them with Insight's treatment of intellectual conversion and with its beginnings of an articulation of moral conversion that is significantly developed by the time of Method in Theology. The heuristic principle of this integration is the following: as it is through contemplation that the detachment of the person of integrity reaches to and penetrates sensitive consciousness in any stage of meaning, so it is through psychic conversion that this extension and penetration occur in the realm of interiorly differentiated consciousness, in the third stage of meaning.

The alienation of the social surd conditions human suicide on both the individual and collective levels. But synchronistic praxis, where alienation is transcended, is by no means a simple matter of spontaneity and uninhibited immediacy. The world to which we are immediate is itself mediated to us by meaning, and it is really the meaning to which we are immediate. But meaning can be true or false, whole or partial, genuine or distorted; and immediacy to false, partial, or distorted meaning by no means transcends alienation. Synchronistic praxis, genuine just-so-ness, is thus furthered by the discrimination of mind and heart, thought and feeling, spirit and psyche, that is the explicit and explanatory objective of the third stage of meaning. Psychic conversion intends the same disciplined spontaneity, the same tutored immediacy, as does authentic asceticism, but it intends this immediacy as mediated through an explanatory maieutic. Psychic conversion is contemplation in the third stage of meaning. As a structural determinant of cosmopolis, it is probably as necessary as is intellectual conversion if the human world is to be saved from the spiritual suicide of post-historic existence (Mumford, 1956).

Only if we focus, not on survival, but on the artistry of integrity, on the aesthetics of dramatic pattern and totality, do we move beyond the drama constituted by the possibility of irrevocable alienation to a discussion of

the role of contemplation and of psychic conversion in the aesthetic production of the dramatic form of conscious living. It is the body that, by reaching a higher integration in psychic consciousness, provides the content to which the spirit gives form. The content emerges already informed, due to the preconscious collaboration of intelligence and imagination in their selection of materials for new insight, reflection, and decision. The materials emerge primarily in our dreams. The synchronistic form of nonalienated praxis will assume the contours of a tense unity of thrownness and project, unconscious and consciousness, past and future, limitation and transcendence. Through these contours, the body lives its way into a human future. But, as we know, there are some lives without dramatic form. The present is present by content, and thus is not without materials for conscious insight, reflection, and deliberation. But the materials are relatively formless, dissociated, because of the inauthenticity of the preconscious collaboration of intelligence and imagination that has brought them to conscious attentiveness. The inauthenticity grows as the subject remains cognitively and existentially ignorant or negligent of the unformed contents that constitute the substance of his or her life. Content there is, for there has been the past, but form there is not, for the subject does not know or does not want to know what the past has been. The subject neither tells nor creates a story. Not knowing what the past has been, the subject is ignorant of what is possible. Not wanting to know what the past has been, the subject refuses what is possible. And without possibility, the subject creates no project, knows no future. Life without project, transcendence, authentic intelligence, reflection, and deliberation is formless, a massa confusa, a prima materia.

One begins to know what has been by listening to its expressions of its own story, however tragic, distorted, victimized, and sinful that story may be. When we listen to our dreams, matter becomes conscious. While we

are dreaming, of course, we have no choice but to listen. But when we awake, we are conscripted on all sides by voices claiming our powers of listening. We forget what the universe uttered when the body spoke through the psyche to intelligence and freedom. We listen to the other voices, and all we hear is noise. It makes no sense, for we have forgotten the code which would tell us what the noise means. We go about our daily business, create futile projects that were impossible from the beginning or fail to stretch our projects to the limits of their possibility; we project futures with no past or fail to transcend as we are able; we deprive consciousness of the harmony of which it is capable with the emergent process of the universe. And we have the temerity to proclaim, as one impossible project succeeds another's collapse or as successive possible projects fail to occur or recur, that it is the world that is absurd. The only absurd element in the universe consists in the failure of activity on the part of an intelligence and freedom that have forgotten what intelligence and freedom are and where they belong in the universe of proportionate being. Consciousness can displace the tension of limitation and transcendence in either direction or, in manic-depressive fashion, <sup>can</sup> oscillate from one displacement to its opposite. Intelligence is the capacity to respond with insight to the universe, as I constitute the human world and concomitantly structure myself. Any other exercise of intelligence, from the standpoint of the detachment that thinks and chooses on the level of history, is really quite stupid. But to the extent that I forget to listen to the universe, my intelligence is no response, but a bitter and resentful monodrama.

It is the contemplative spirit that retrieves and heals what has been, and in so doing projects a possible future into which a human body can move. Contemplatives, synchronistic people, alone project a destiny commensurate with

what is possible and move toward that destiny as conscious beings. The path between origin and destiny is narrow, not straight but winding, and daily. Only a heart like a stream of water can keep to it, follow it to its end, even skip and laugh and dance along the way. The lyricism of intentionality is not easily preserved in an epochal age, when attention is constantly drawn away from the long-range commitment that matters to the short-term expediencies that settle nothing. To come to this lyrical heart in our time, through the discipline of listening, is to retrieve through self-appropriation the first of the transcendental precepts: be attentive. This imperative, the one least elucidated by Lonergan, calls for contemplation, whose activity is receptivity, whose prime data are dreams, and whose function is the provision of the materials of possibility without which the projects of intelligence, reason, and freedom are folly and degradation, constitutive causes by default of the social surd.

#### Existential Responsibility in the Third Stage of Meaning

Attentiveness in any stage of meaning is for the sake of intelligent inquiry, reasonable reflection, and responsible decision in the interests of the promotion of the human good. But attentiveness in the third stage of meaning, the attentiveness of the psychically converted subject, is for the sake of the specific exigencies of intelligence, rationality, and choice that impose themselves on an epochal juncture in the history of consciousness. Those exigencies demand that one conceive, affirm, and implement the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being (Lonergan, 1957: 391), that one move to the explicit semantics of all that can be said or done that is critical metaphysics. The implementation of the heuristic structure of proportionate being constitutes the existential and indeed the political responsibility of consciousness in the third stage of meaning. This responsibility is existential in that, by exercising it, one constitutes oneself as a self-appropriating

subject. But it is also political, in that what it calls for is the reorientation of science and common sense, so that the explanation of all data and the management of all human affairs proceed in accord with the basic positions on knowing, on valuing, on transcendence, on being, on objectivity. The reorientation of common sense occurs through psychic conversion, through dramatic artistry in the third stage of meaning, through the release of the capacity to negotiate with full intentionality the dialectic of the dramatic subject and the more dominant dialectic of community (Lonergan, 1957: 218) that "gives rise to the situations that stimulate neural demands and . . . moulds the orientation of intelligence that preconsciously exercises the censorship" that selects materials for intelligent, reflective, and deliberative activity. The reorientation of science is instanced in my own attempts in this paper and elsewhere to integrate depth psychology into transcendental method. Both reorientations are politically significant, in that the theoretical and practical exercise of intelligence, rationality, and freedom alone promote the individual and social process that is the human good.

Beyond the foundational questions of Insight, then--the questions: what am I doing when I am knowing? why is doing that knowing? what do I know when I do that?--there emerges a fourth question for a consciousness that follows Lonergan in the way of self-appropriation to the point of explanatory mediation, not of knowledge, but of moral responsibility. The fourth question is: what do I do when I know all that?, i.e., when I have answered with Lonergan the three foundational questions of Insight and their existential and religious analogues. The existentially and politically responsible answer calls for the commitment of all one's energies to the implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being. If explanatory self-appropriation is indeed an epochal control of meaning, the future not only of civilized humanity but of proportionate being itself hangs in the balance of the tension that this fourth form of the foundational question introduces into one's conscious development as a human subject.

## NOTES

/1/ I understand all emergent process in the universe, including the emergence, consolidation, and survival of new forms of consciousness, according to Lonergan's understanding of emergent probability. Thus, occurrences of a potentially new kind remain purely coincidental until systematized by an emergent form at the new level. In the case of consciousness, a new stage of meaning remains potential until a systematization has emerged that can consolidate an otherwise purely coincidental manifold of occurrences. The occurrences that are potentially a third stage of meaning are conscious human operations of inquiry and understanding, reflection and judgment, that take as their object the human subject as subject. Thus, for example, the various modern philosophies involved in the turn to the subject and the psychologies that seek a scientific understanding of the energetic compositions and distributions of affectivity are instances of occurrences that potentially can be systematized into a new series of ranges of schemes of recurrence in cognitive and existential praxis, into a new control of meaning whose basic terms and relations are located in interiorly differentiated consciousness. My understanding of the third stage of meaning thus already shows the influence of Lonergan's mediation of conscious intentionality within world process. On emergent probability as immanent intelligibility of world process, see Lonergan, 1957:115-128. For its extension to conscious human operations, *ibid.*: 209-211. For its metaphysical constitution, Chapter 15. On the present as kairos for the emergence of the third stage:386.

/2/ The term, post-critical, refers to any language that is sufficiently informed by the maieutic of a third-stage control of meaning that, in the limit, it is no longer an articulation of a problematic but a formulation on the basis of an understanding of interiority that has been grasped as virtually unconditioned.

Voegelin, Eric

1953

The New Science of Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

1956-1974

Order and History. Four volumes. Louisiana State University Press

\*\*\* Heidegger, Martin

1951

Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik. Frankfurt: Klostermann