

LONERGAN WORKSHOP

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION JUNE 16, 1976

1. In Insight, you make use of the depth psychologies of Freud and Jung; in Method and recent articles you speak of healing from above and refer to existential, humanistic and Third Force Therapies. Could you comment on the relationship between these two basic approaches to therapy, and how they relate to your method?
2. How important a role do you see either or both of these basic approaches to therapy playing in the realization of a religious conversion and/or of what might be called a "psychic conversion"?
3. Would you say something about how the doctrine of original sin might be expressed in contemporary theological terms? How do you see the relationship between this doctrine and various forms of authentic and inauthentic guilt?
4. Would you comment generally on your understanding of the process of healing and educating human feelings?
5. Does the "Law of the Cross" take on a new meaning when personally appropriated within interiority on the psychic level?
6. Would you please briefly review for us your understanding of the relationship between religious studies and theology? Particularly, would you indicate which functional specialties are involved in each? If religious studies and theology are to come closer and closer together, will a change be required in the conception and practice of either or both -- if so, what kind of change?
7. Would you please review for us the central elements of your understanding of praxis. How is this understanding of praxis related to other significant uses of the word, e.g., in Aristotle, Marx and Habermas?
8. At the beginning of the chapter on Dialectic you give the following division of differences:

"Not all opposition is dialectical. There are differences that will be eliminated by uncovering fresh data. There are the differences we have named perspectival, and they merely witness to the complexity of historical reality. But beyond these there are fundamental conflicts..."

Last night you made much of "cultural differences." Would these best be aligned with "perspectival differences"? If so, does this constitute a significant expansion of that latter category? If so, finally, doesn't there seem to be here a growing range of mid-level differences which can be handled neither by further factual investigation, nor by dialectical techniques, but only by mutually respectful discussion?

9. Some of your comments on "faculty psychology" seem to be very critical, almost derogatory. Yet one of your very significant contributions has been to show us how to throw a bridge between the new intentionality categories and the older metaphysical ones -- for example, in the expression of Trinitarian and Christological doctrines in terms of "consciousness". Faculty psychology is of course in the metaphysical context, and is justly supplanted by the context of intentionality analysis. But is it wise to burn the bridges back to the metaphysical context? Or has that

been your intention?

*natural  
to law of, instead*

10. Yesterday you made reference to natural law in terms of the transcendental precepts. If I am correct, another interpretation of natural law would speak in terms of the givenness of the teleology of one's faculties; for example, lying is a frustration of the purpose of speech, homosexuality is a frustration of the purpose of sexual faculties. Can or should this notion of the intrinsic teleology of man's faculties be incorporated into your understanding of natural law?

11. This morning Sebastian Moore spoke of the discovery of the self carrying the discovery of self-transcendence within it. In reference to descriptions of your work as being "too heady," "too cognitive," "lacking a literary and poetic expression," could you please say something further along the lines of your discussion on "Religious Knowledge" and specifically on self-transcendence as "first of all coming from our flesh and blood that through nerves and brain have come spontaneously to live out symbolic meaning and to carry out symbolic demands"?

Workshop III, June 16, 1975, Wednesday

1. I would suggest that differences in the <sup>two types of</sup> therapies are to be understood in terms of the depth of the trouble.

Antoine Vergote has remarked that the "id" speaks only through displacement and condensation

Connect this with the fact that infants, as yet, are incapable of linguistic expression of their troubles

Again with the remark that children know what they cannot say

Again with Theodore Thass-Thienemann's suggestion that language (specifically, the unexplained relationship between disparate meanings of the same word) more than dreams is the high road to the unconscious. ie unconscious of the race, culture

What is the unconscious? The experienced needing correct understanding and expression, distorted by misunderstanding and its cumulative complications, healed by correct understanding and adequately felt expression

The deeper the trouble, the more abstruse the remedy; the higher the trouble, the less the need for deep probing  
Just what seems to me at the moment

2. Paper largely on this topic tomorrow

3. One does what one can. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

I have written not a little on the effects of ~~the~~ original sin: gartia operans, moral impotence, dialectic of sin

I never had the job of teaching originale originans, am not in a position to present an opinion as a theologian, am inclined to take seriously the opinions of those that regard the garden of Eden as a highly instructive story, find Sebastian Moore's paper highly enlightening and helpful

4. Read Rosemary Haughton, The Transformation of Man, A Study of Conversion and Community, Springfield IL: Templegate, 1967, London G Chapman 1967.

I have 17 single-spaced typed pages of notes on this book.

*Read Rosemary Haughton's paper.*

5 I would say that the Law of the Cross is an attempt to formulate what has already been personally appropriated within interiority on the psychic level and affectively responding to Without reading and hearing and meditating on the suffering and death and resurrection of Christ as for ~~me~~ us, hyper hymon, for me, the law of the cross is not a mystery but a mystification

6 Religious studies are not all of the same type

a) methods of natural science

b) Heiler, the ~~high~~ history of religions as a preparation for the cooperation of religions -- heading into praxis

Wilfred Cantwell Smith, Islam, Muslims read our books and so for other great religions, we have to write in a way that they will find themselves at home in what we are saying about them, we have to enter into an understanding of religious commitment

c) acceptance of Geisteswissenschaften but not of metaphysical question: know about symbols their resonance, but leave to theologians to say whether there is any fire behind all the smoke

d) theologians ~~x~~ confront this question

e) need religious studies to be ecumenical, to relate to non-Xtian religions, to cooperate to understand

f) my contention: in the measure that all methods listed are accepted and practiced then theologians and religious studies will tend to cooperatively cover the whole field of religion

g) the block: dialectic, dialogue, foundations; having a method of dealing with value judgements (they are personal and so the method has to be interpersonal

7 Development from below upwards: ever fuller attention to ever broader experience; ever better understanding and formulation of understanding; ever fuller verification of understanding; ever truer authenticity in one's commitment to intelligence, reasonableness, responsibility, love

Development from above ~~x~~ downwards: starts from commitment; formulates what commitment means; clarifies the formulation; transposes the formulation for every audience

The second type of development is praxis

Aristotle: theoria (speculative intellect, contemplation of the necessary), praxis and poiesis dealing with the ~~mundane~~ contingent, praxis as conduct, poiesis as producing

Static analysis of once for all time achievement

Marx: reaction against Hegel, Prussian Xtian state, bourgeois politics as conceived by Hobbes Locke Adam Smith (for personal survival and for property; egoistic), theory of revolution, proximate preparation, dictatorship of proletariat, true communism

As Hegel, dynamic; but dynamism not of Begriffe but of mode and relations of production, general theory, tactics

Habermas, cf Lamb

8 Dialectical opposition in chapter 10 regards opposition among theologians doing history of same events, interpretation of same texts, research on same materials

Cultural differences regard ~~the~~ events texts materials investigated, or the ~~the~~ history of exegesis of historiography etc

Factual investigation, dialectic (subjects as objects)  
dialogue (subjects as subjects)