## LONERGAN WORKSHOP

## Boston College

June 20 - 24, 1977

## Dialogue for Discussion

June 22, 1977

- 1. Would you please specify the meaning of "whole" and "unity" in your analysis of "thing" as a unity, identity, whole?
- 2. What is the relation between prime potency, the potency of lower levels in nature for higher forms, and potency as a mecaphysical element? Would you comment from your present perspective, on your relating in <u>Insight</u> of potency and finality?
- 3. To what extent does the notion of emergent probability provide an invariant heuristic for Theology, and in particular for ecclesiology?
- 4. In what context, and at what point, was the term "praxis" introduced into your work? What is its meaning and how should it be differentiated from the Markist use of the term?
- 5. Could you specify how your functional macro-economics relate to the praxis of moral values?
- 6. What political consequences could be heuristically anticipated from the implementation of functional macro-economics?
- 7. How would your functional macro-economics ground a criticism of present accialist centralization and capitalist monopolistic process?
- 8. What modifications of your early circulation analysis does the modern element of economic acceleration call for?
- 9. How would you relate the study of J. Collins and F. Lappe, Food First: The Myth of Scarcity, to your developing macro-economics?
- 10. You said yesterday it will take a century or more before the economic analysis you are proposing will become praxis. In the meantime, we have and are able to understand schemes of recurrence of alienation due to inadequate economic praxis. There must be some way, however incomplete, of exercising and promoting emancipatory praxis in the interval between now and the schemes of recurrence of sound economic praxis. Would you comment?
- 11. Does your appreach to economics assume the private ownership of production facilities and a market machanism or does it look to a "socialist" arrangement which emphasizes public ownership and the public planning of production and distribution?
- 12. How would your Withod in Theology relate to the various liberation theologies (e.g., Gustavo Gutlerrez's)? How should Theology contribute to the critique of de-humanizing social institutions.

- 1. Unity: (1) one in the sense of one more (man, woman, car...)
- (2) one in the sense of intelligibly one: there is an insight or series of insights that relates all parts and aspects to one another
- (3) one in the sense of one and the same; an object to which is applied the principles of identity and contradiction; this and nothing else

Hence the thing is a unity by (1) and (2)

It is an identity by (3)

It is a whole by (2) and (3).

2. Aquinas distinguishes between first and second potency: first potency is a ground of possibility, eg potency in the sense of a faculty, of intellect, will.

second potency is a form x or habit perfecting a first potency second potency is also called a first act second act arises when the faculty actually operates

So eye is first potency, sight is second potency, seeing is second act.

So in Aristotle soul is to the body as sight is to the eye: iwthout soul the body is dead, without sight the eye is blind.

Soul is the first act of an arganize body with organs

Finality is the relation of anything to what it is for: horizontal finality is from first to second act: if you cannot see, you have not got sight; there is an exigence for the second act when the first act exists.

vertical finality is from first potency to first act; you can have a blind eye, a first potency without the first act

Lower levels are in potency to higher levels as first potency to first act: they can have but need not have higher forms

Potency as a metaphysical element is potency defined by the isomorphism to potency :: form :: act ::: exp :: underst :: judgment

present perspective: human studies **kx** commonly can be treated on the basis of **x** intentionality analysis without a detour through metaphysics; the detour becomes necessary when one deals with elementary notions (unity identity whole) or precognitive realities.

3. In so far as new strucktures or new operations become possible, become probable, actually emerge

eg new theology in the minds of theologians, in the minds of those that learn from theologians

eg in the church in any part or on any level new structures new operations

4. Introduced explicitly in the paper recently read to the CTSA and to be repeated tomorow evening.

In the Aristotelian contrast between conduct and product: products pass beyond the control of their maker; the use to which they will be put depends on the choices of others conducts results from one's own choices

To this Aristotelian sense Marx adds his dialectical materialism and his analysis of Das Kapital as interpretative context.

Marx is reacting to the same thing I am reacting against, namely, the political philosophy that conceives the state and consequently the economy as a matter of technique rather than praxis.

His tool is universal revolution: which space which sale will be ducation; which simple which sale are sale and do footo engaged a technique

His tool is initially and de facto ongoingly a technique of force

My tool is a technique of persuasion.

5. The praxis maximum that brings moral values into play is a maximum properly and further willing to do whatever is needed to make it function properly, not out of fear of punishment, but because that is worth while.

Such praxis does not exist at the present time because an economics that brings to light the precepts immanent in the workings of an exchange economy xx is unknown indeed the very idea of it is beyond the grasp of practically all economists, including all our do-gooders who talk about justice

of industrial and commercial institutions and their trade unions of government departments and their pork barrels including education

7. Compare Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Random House 19:1 Pb

and the Garden Cities designed by planners which she constantly criticizes.

In the comparison note that the planners go by general concepts and ham bland maximum general notions about the good life

Jan Jacobs walks the streets finds some safe and others menacing, comes to a whole set of insights that reveal why some are safe and others are not safe

Planning is the work of conceptualistss

Free enterprise is the work of people with ideas on just what people really want and how to provide it in what quantities and then go ahead and risk their shirt on the project

Planners risk your tax money on their ideas

Capitalish monopolistic practice is just a device to avoid the diminution of profit that results when ever the ratio of M I G to GNP decreases

They avoid that diminution by by handing m all of it over to non monopolistic enterprises: the squeeze goes elsewhere

8 The analysis is perfectly general: its form is the distinction between **x** acceleration, velocity, and constant of integration.

Differentxmannentxxinxehishxkhaxeenmannyxfanetiuns
nxnxmfxkhnxakdekxafxapplihdxnakenseyxenginaakingxxkachnichl
anhanixxandxkknakinachinaxx

The relations between these three (a) in the order of goods and services and (b) in the order of monetary movements are of equal generality

The conminimum of possibility of proper functioning are of equal generality.

Their applications are multitudinous and would call for a vast research program & conducted by experts.

one of the implications of current main-line economic doctrine is that the freedom of multinational corporations is in the long run to the optimal benefit of all concerned

Its theoretical premise is mistaken.

Collins and Lappe show that its actual results are strarvation.

o conditions

 $\mathbf{c}$ 

0

0

## 10 Nyxaniyxeammanixxinxeaxahaad

No doubt, one can know when things do not work well, when their results are disastrous, etc., economically culturally politically morally religiously, when the results are recurrent and proximately why their are recurrent

My notion of promoting emancipatory praxis is doing what can be done

to understand the ideas needed for the praxis to be emantipatory to promote the godd will for the praxis to be carried out.

Both are problems of education: intellectual education and moral education.

I do not know of any short-cuts if the goal is praxis namely human acts based on human knowledge and human good will.

My estimate of 100  $\mathbf{x}$  years is perhaps pessimistic, perhaps optimistic.

But I set aside my economic MS 33 years ago because I had it read by six or seven economists none of whom could figure out what I was trying to do

At the present time things are slightly better: Kalecki has been translated by Cambridge England and has a following there are perhaps elsewherex; his work gives me now a small bridgehead: but for an xx amateur to convixnce the establishment that they have something to learn is a rather long process.

Insight was published 20 years ago; Harper and Row hope to bring it out in paperback next spring; but that does not mean that the book will be accepted by the philosophic establishment; it is not their style of thing.

Ownership is not an economic but a juridical notion. What I consider desirable is a maximum diffusion of possible initiative. What I am opposed to leaving initiative to committees politicians and generally people without relevant practical ERREXX insight into the concrete processes that exist and can be improved.

as Gustavo Gutierrez I was in the same small gramp discussion group at the Notre Dame meeting. He volunteered to us the remark that the weakness of the S A liberation theologies was their ignorance of economics. He insisted that basically they were Christians appalled by the social situation in their countries and working to the best of their ability at improving the situation.

Basically through interdisciplinary activty with social cultural political philosophers and scientists. High quality at Notre Dame.