

D0113

Jan. 19, 1

Theo 143

1. Review:

moving into a discussion of
culture

and of the relation of
religion & culture,

the standpoint I will be taking on this.

I started to indicate some presuppositions I will work from:

1) that religion & culture
can best be studied
for our purposes
if viewed as functions
of consciousness

2) that cs is the ^(a)arena or field
of continuing evolution, in fact
of emergent world process

Perhaps the last phrase
opens up a more satisfactory
way of phrasing

the second presupposition:

There is such a thing
as world process
in that the universe
in which we live
is not static.

There would seem to be evidence

in this process
for affirming the periodic
emergence of new forms,
new genera and species,
and in such a way that
new laws emerge to unify
what would otherwise be coincidental manifolds of data.

Thus, if we look for a moment at the principal branches of
science

known to us today,

we find, e.g.,

that chemistry is a distinct
branch of knowledge from physics --

i.e., that, in addition to the laws of physics,
which are not abrogated by chemistry,

there are distinct laws

operative in chemistry

and not in physics --

that there is a set of data in the material universe
adequately understood by physics,

but also a set of data

that from the standpoint of physics

is purely coincidental

but that can be unified

by a distinct set of laws,

the laws of chemistry.

Jan. 19, 3

Theo 143

Furthermore,

the same holds for
the relation between
chemistry and biology.

Chemistry leaves unexplained
by its own laws
certain phenomena
in the material universe,
but not in such a way that its own laws
are denied or abrogated
in the further laws that are known by biology.

So too,

biology is related
to sensitive psychology
in such a way that,
while the laws of biology
are part of the complete knowledge
of sensitive life,

there are data provided by sensitive life
that are purely coincidental
from the standpoint of biology alone,
that are united in understanding
only by sensitive psychology.

Finally, there is human science,
the science of man.

Human living provides a manifold of data
left unexplained by the other sciences,

Jan. 19, 4

Theo 143

even though these other sciences
are not abrogated in the study of man.

The laws of these other sciences obtain
whenever the data to be understood by these

sciences

are given,

and these data are given in man.

But there are other data ^{of human living} left unexplained

by

physics,

chemistry,

biology,

or sensitive psychology.

Among these data are the data of on men and women
as selves, as concerned with their own self-constitution:

the fact of insight

of judgment

of responsibility

of love;

the fact that there is a difference

between being intelligent & stupid

reasonable & silly

responsible & irresponsible

loving & selfish

And above all the fact that,

at least to a certain extent,

and within the limits provided

by the givens known by the other sciences,

Jan. 19, 5

Theo 143

it is up to me

whether I will be

intelligent or unintelligent,

reasonable or silly,

responsible or irresponsible,

loving or selfish;

the fact that, however dimly,

I am haunted by the sense

that it makes a difference;

the fact that

I can make a work of art

out of my living

if I proceed by way of insight

reasonable affirmation of evidence

commitment to what is

really worth while

and that I will fail

to make a work of art

out of my life if I don't.

But these data

of self-constitution

are left unexplained

by the other sciences

even though they don't

abrogate the laws of the other sciences.

It is simply that I will not understand

these data

by studying physics, chemistry, biology, or animal psychology,

Jan. 19, 6

Theo 143

that in order to understand them,
to unify them,
I must turn to another branch of questions,
the questions concerning the data of consciousness itself.

2. Now, I distinguished consciousness
from knowledge.

To be conscious of $E=mc^2$

I need only open my eyes and look at it.
But I will not ^{ever} know what it means
by staring at it.

I have to raise questions,
and when I come to know
what it means,

I will do so by a very different act
from that of looking,
by an act of insight.

Knowing is one of the operations I perform as a conscious
subject,

but I can also be conscious
and unknowing.

If $cs \neq kn.$,

then cs also \neq self-knowledge,

kn. of self as self,

of self as subject of certain operations.

I can be the ^{conscious} subject of these operations,
~~be~~ w/o knowing myself as subject.

Jan. 19, 7

Theo 143

Thus I can be the c's subject
of operations of knowing
w/o knowing myself as a knower.

I can have insight into the laws of physics
w/o having insight into insight.

To know myself as subject, as self,
I must focus my attention
on the data

provided by my presence to myself
in those operations of which I am the subject.

On the data of consciousness.

E.g., To know myself as a knower,
I must focus on the
data provided by the operations of knowing
anything.

Thus the knowledge of the human subject
as a human subject
is the result of attending to the operations
I am present to
by being conscious,
attending to the operations of the subject
in his or her subjectivity.

From such attention
there will arise
a department of knowledge
that accounts for data on human living
left unexplained

Jan. 19, 8

Theo 143

by physics

Chemistry

biology

animal psychology

the knowledge of the human subject as human subject.

3. Re: my 2nd presupposition,
at least 2 major thinkers
of our time,

Teilhard de Chardin

and Bernard Lonergan

have correlated

the differences between the sciences

with world process itself:

i.e., with an increasing complexification (Teilhard)
of matter

in the emergence of new unities
w/ the material universe.

The last of these new unities
known to us

is the human subject,

characterized by a complexification of consciousness

not found in other animal species,

giving rise to a capacity for certain operations of consciousness

not found in these other species:

questioning

insight

affirmation of the truth

responsible decision

Jan. 19, 9

Theo 143

and giving rise to the peculiar phenomenon
that success or failure
depends on the occurrence or non-occurrence
of these operations.

In this sense,
world process continues
in the operations of human subjectivity,
in human consciousness.

This is the mg of my 2nd presupposition:
the human subject as human subject
is involved in continuing the process of
the evolution of the universe to new forms,
new unities,
new intelligibilities:
the forms, unities, and intelligibilities
of human conscious living.

4. Thus, to the extent that world process
continues in the operations of human subjectivity,
in the ~~subjective~~ making of human history,
in the constitution of human living,
it is not merely intelligible
but intelligent:
it can be directed
by ^{human} intelligence.