

D0116

Jan. 26, Board

1. Self-appropriation as operator of cultural evolution.
 2. Bias, alienation, ideology
 - dramatic bias
 - egoistic bias
 - group bias
 - general bias of common sense
-

[clarify

where we are

re: outline (syllabus)]

Announcement re: Mumford

Jan. 26, 1

Theo 143

1. Our point in the last class
was the insistence on consciousness itself as normative,
as containing its own sanctions,
as ultimate norms in human performance.

For a cs operating from a position of wholeness
is one whose decisions
are based on accurate
understanding
of experience.

I presented a map or grid of cs
based on the combined efforts
of Louergan and Jung,
and argued that to the extent
that any cs operates from
this vector of
reaching up to full human consciousness,
it will contribute to a human world
fit for human consciousness to live in.

Finally, I presented from Louergan
the transcendental imperatives
that constitute the natural law:
be receptively attentive
intelligent
reasonable
responsible.

And argued that such a notion of wholeness
is not one of self-enclosure
but one of self-transcendence,
for consciousness in various ways intends a world

Jan. 26, 2

Theo 143

that is other than itself:
intentionality.

2. A couple of points of clarification:

a. knowledge is cumulative,

so that it is not the case

that in our everyday lives

we must always explicitly go through this structure.

e.g., in meeting another person

the immediacy of response.

b. re: moral codes,

and cultural canons:

the structure doesn't rule them out,

but relativizes them.

Any organization probably needs more than
the transcendental imperatives,

mainly bec. none of us is consistently attentive

intelligent

reasonable

responsible

and so will develop codes and canons.

But the codes & canons are relative to the structure

of consciousness:

e.g., "The Sabbath was made for man,
not man for the Sabbath."

The code was made for human consciousness,
not human es for the code.

Thes 143

26, 3

~~23, 9~~

Jan. 21, 7

§. If this structure is normative,
then it ^{would} provide a handle for
evaluating
expressions of consciousness,
including religions & cultures,
or esp. for evaluating the
religion or culture, the religious & cultural forms,
in wh. we find ourselves invited to participate.

The primary normative question

is: is this expression

whole & wholemaking
or alienating, splitting, fragmenting?

The secondary normative questions are:

does this expression flow from

a responsible decision regarding a

reasonable affirmation of the

intelligibility ^{or meaning} of an

attended-to experience?

} For Erich N.,
such a question
grounds an entirely
new ethical
approach.
(DPNE).

e.g. Vatican
statement on
sexuality

BREAK - to next pg.

mg of what
is being proposed
for in cultures -
cultures.

Not prob.
of acting
out!

Philo 143

1st new

(s-a, ind'n.)

Jan ~~23~~^{26, d}, '19

3 ~~2nd~~ topic for today: Self-knowledge, as key to cultural & religious evolution.

We have seen that

world process

is continuing

in the

operations of human subjectivity,

in our making of history in culture & religion,

is not merely intelligible (e-u-j)

but potentially

intelligent, reasonable, and free.

24, 5
23 40
21 8

Jan. 19, 70

Theo 143

But ^{it is} because we can be
minute & urgent
silly

or irresponsible, selfish, clannish, etc.

in addition to being
intelligent,
reasonable,
and responsible.

it is because we can be fragmented subjects
in addition to being whole subjects,

that the process ^{at the human level} can run down blind alleys,

experience collapses and breakdowns,
and even be halted and finished
definitively:

a ~~fact~~ ^{fact} possibility now evident in ~~our~~ the
possibility that we could today
literally end it all.

Jan. ^{26, 6}~~23, 52~~

Theo 143

These capacities for perversion
on the part of humans
are a matter of what Lonergan calls bias,
and he distinguishes several forms of bias:

there is dramatic bias,

essentially the result of
the splitting of intentionality
from psyche;

egoistic bias,

the refusal of self-transcendence
in E-U-I-D

where s-t would jeopardize
personal advantage;

group bias,

the acceptance of
something other than
the transcendental imperatives

(group interests
and standards)

-- eg., one's
own culture

as normative;

and the general bias of

common sense,

which divorces theory from praxis, &
takes its stand on praxis (D),
rather than seeing both as part &
parcel of a single unfolding of es.

Jan. 26, 62

These various biases
are at the root of alienation
in its most basic form.

Alienation, most basically, is from oneself,
from the spontaneity of one's own consciousness.

It is a neglect of the transcendental imperatives,
and such neglect is at the root of all other forms of
alienation.

Alienation

is propagated
by ideology, and

Ideology in its basic form is a
doctrine that justifies neglect of
the transcendental imperatives of
consciousness,
that justifies and propagates
alienation.

26, P
~~22~~ ~~50~~
79, X

Jan. 79, X

Theo 143

loving or selfish
relatively whole or more or less fragmented,
but by attending to the data of consciousness, & asking qq-
we can know the difference about them --
between being intelligent or unintelligent, i.e., coming to
reasonable or silly, know them in an
responsible or irresponsible, explanatory fashion --
loving or selfish,
whole or fragmented,

and, knowing this difference

by appropriating ourselves as human subjects,
we can achieve or ^{at least} approximate

the intelligent spontaneity

of a second immediacy, of twice-born adults who
the condition of subjects who are not merely ^{have retrieved their espontaneity} from the
conscious subjects -- for all human ^{lostness to} subjects are by definition conscious, ^{wh. it}
^{tell victims,}

but of self-knowing subjects, of subjects
who know themselves in their subjectivity,
and who, by this knowledge,

decisively shift ~~increase~~ the probability

that ~~they~~ ^{the product of} will be intelligent,
history reasonable,
responsible,
loving,

~~and~~ whole human subjects.

8. ~~The~~ source of the conditioned guarantee of
One the further evolution, then,

Jan. 23, 57

to the extent that ~~we~~ this further evolution is an
evolution of human consciousness,
would seem to lie in

the knowledge of the human subject as human subject,
~~of which we spoke earlier.~~ the self-appropriation of the
human subject as human
subject.

Not only can we be
intelligent or unintelligent
reasonable or silly
responsible or irresponsible

Jan. 14, 72

Theo 143

The ^{self-} knowledge of the subject as subject
is, then, according to my perspective
in teaching this course,
the decisive key to the further evolution of human
consciousness.

The principal task incumbent on us
as operators of evolution,
is the imperative that human consciousness
come into possession of itself,
that the human subject
come to ^{or approximate} a second immediacy
in the operations of which he or she is subject,
so that the human subject
is not only consciously
but self-consciously & knowingly
intelligent
reasonable
responsible
loving
and integrated, "together,"
in his or her operations
as a human subject,
in his or her self-constitution
and constitution of the ^{human} world,
in his or her minute but real
contribution to that dimension of world process
that is human history.

Thes 143

26, 10 ~~23~~ 8
21 12
Jan. 14, 8

9. The substantiation & filling out
of these presuppositions
is the function of the 1st readings of this
course: Whitehead & Mumford

Whitehead & Mumford, 1-6,

where have we come from?

A broad historical sweep of human
conscious evolution

enabling us to locate ourselves
as citizens of the earth

w/ the context of

the evolution of human consciousness

But also posing the question: where ^{are} we going?

What is going forward in human consciousness?

Mumford will portray human conscious evolution
at a crossroad. He will tell us we
face an option:

a. Post-historic humanity, an
evolutionary blind alley. We will relate
this to a failure
in self-ten.

b. World cultural humanity: a
qualitative leap to a series of new
probability schemes

This qualitative leap will be ^a cross cultural
and cross-religious stretching or expansion of
human consciousness

in the interest of wholeness.

It will be the result of an insistence on

The importance of
transcendental
imperatives

Theo 143

26.11 ~~23~~ 9
21 73
Jan. No. 8

on the part of consciousness
that

while remaining in ~~the~~ ^{with} or even rediscovering
↳ continuity of its own

cultural and religious roots
it be stretched to a differentiated
totality by passing over
into other cultural and religious
expressions

so as to return to its own with new insight.
(Derrida, *Jan dhi*)

10. What, then, is culture?