

Do 165

160, Oct. 6, Intro

We are discussing what keeps the process of development going, and in Monday's class I emphasized two things:

a. that character, the willingness to transcend oneself, is basic to development;

b. that development in the world mediated by meaning is a function of keeping one's questions going, of keeping the spirit of inquiry alive.

Obviously, then, character and questions are related, and today we have to see why. First, though, I want to review the three kinds of questions, in order to see why they can promote self-transcendence.

I said they do so,

because questions themselves
are self-transcending.

160,
Oct. 6,
1

1. In Monday's class
we saw the relationship between questions and development.
Personal Development in the world mediated by meaning
occurs through raising and answering questions.
He saw the three kinds of questions that are asked:
questions for intelligence,
" " reflection,
" " deliberation, decision, action.

2. But we have also seen ^{the saw the importance of the latter. They promote character, wh. is needed for the dev. of personality.}
(Friday, Oct. 1)

that there are people who do not develop,
who do not move forward beyond the self as it is
to a more differentiated and integrated self,
because they either cannot
or are unwilling to
take the needed steps.

But now we know that the needed steps,
the principal promoters of development,
are questions.

start here → 4. Therapy, conversion, and questions
Thus we can say that development does not occur
when people either cannot
or are unwilling to
face the questions they must face
if they are to grow.

160,
Oct. 6,
2

When are people able?

3. People are able to face the needed questions for development if they have been able to integrate the results of previous differentiations into the total context of their selves.

As we have seen,

this integration or non-integration expresses itself in the consistent non-intentional feelings at the base of our psychological and spiritual being.

The integrated person

is the person who is fundamentally at peace with himself or herself, even in the midst of new learning, new situations,

new efforts at differentiation, even in the midst of difficulties.

The nonintegrated person

is the person who is affectively divided, perhaps crippled by anxiety, anger, fear, depression, a sense of emotional deprivation.

The emotionally crippled person

will be hampered from self-transcendence to the extent his fears and anxieties keep him unable to allow the questioning spirit to have its free rein in his life.

160,
Oct. 6,
3

Therapy, then,

the remedy for the incapacity of s-t,
will free the questioning spirit
to be intelligent,

reasonable,

responsible.

If the basic orientation toward s-t
is present,

therapy would be all that is needed.

If it is not, if one is both unable & unwilling
conversion is required as well as therapy.

What, then, is conversion, and why is it more radical ^{than} ~~from~~ therapy?

As a first approximation to answering this question,
let us consider two kinds of evil,

the evil of psychological suffering
and the evil of sin.

160,
Oct. 6,
4

Frequently, ~~then~~ as we have seen,
therapy is the freeing of one's capacity
to be what one already wants to be but can't.

Conversion, however,
is the shift in what one wants to be.

And in many instances,
perhaps even in most, (bec. the second possibility flows
over into 2nd & 4th)
conversion is needed if therapy is to be achieved.

For one's inability to grow
can lead to a refusal even of the
basic willingness to grow.
Then the problem becomes compounded:
not only is one unable to grow in a direction
one wants to adopt,
but one is unwilling to follow that direction any longer.

160,
Oct. 6,
1945

One's unwillingness, one's refusal,
leads to a far more radical truncation
of one's being,
for not only is one now unable effectively
to move harmoniously beyond the self as it is
to the self as it could be;
one is now not even reaching for self-transcendence,
not willing for it,
one has refused to acknowledge that to be human
is to be on the move toward a richer and fuller self.

1. Not only one's personality, one's effective freedom
but also one's character, one's essential freedom
is basically impaired.

Two kinds of
will

Effective freedom is impaired when one cannot follow through
on what one wants to be.

This impairment is a result of non-integration.

Essential freedom is impaired

when one no longer wants to be a self-transcending
person,

when one refuses to transcend oneself.

2.

This refusal, ^{involuntary} we will call basic sin.

Basic sin is a non-orientation ^{of any sort} to the good.

Basic
sin

It is a "No," the no in one's non-orientation to the
good.

It can be ~~rather~~ conditioned by

the impairment of effective freedom,

or it can be uttered by a person

quite capable of self-transcendence.

In the second case, the sin is greater.

But in either case, the refusal ~~is~~ ^{involves} basic sin.

160,
Oct. 6
786

If this analysis bears some resemblance to the facts,
then not every failure in self-transcendence ^{involves} ~~is~~ sin on the part
Self-transcendence is what characterizes the authentic person, ^{of the one} who fails.
the genuine person,
but not every effective failure in authenticity
or genuineness

^{involves} ~~is~~ sin in the one who fails.
Only those failures which are also refusals,
which diminish character,
^{involve} ~~are~~ sin in the one who fails.

One may acknowledge the good and value it and want it,
but be unable to move effectively toward it.

In the sense in which I am using the term, sin,
that would not be sin. It is an evil but it is not sin.

^{involves} ~~is~~ the acknowledgment of the good of self-transcendence
and the refusal to transcend oneself;
but sin itself it is the ^{nothingness inherent in} ~~non-event~~ of the ~~transcendence~~ act of refusal,
the negation of the good that is involved in

the refusal, the negation of the real, of being,
The refusal is itself an act, has reality, ^{of the good, by the negation} of s-t.
but it is an act that ought not to be.

But Basic sin is the absence of fullness in that act,
the privation of the self-transcendence that ^{could be +} ought to be,
the privation of the good, ^{the absence of reasons,} of the truth.

The refusal itself is a sinful act,
but the sin lies not in the act
but in what is not part of the act.