
[0.00]
• The themes of these chapters and article establish Lonergan as a thinker of the first magnitude.
• “Self and Identity”: Overview.
• Usually speak of identity in terms of membership in one or another human grouping: gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, economic class, religion, etc.
• Foundational identity involves being a knower, chooser, and lover.
• Basic, self-appropriated, transcultural identity is the standard for critiquing the other identities (ethnic, cultural, religious, etc)
• How Lonergan’s sense of identity as “unity or whole” is differs from contemporary use of the term identity.
• By identity, Lonergan means intelligible unity; in contemporary usage identity is about value.

[7:22]
• Meaning of identity in self-appropriation goes beyond the meaning in self-affirmation – adding the affirmation of the value of the activities of knowing and choosing to the affirmation of their facticity.

[9:05]
• All affirmation of identity entails alignment with groups and with the value of being a member of that group.
• Knowing, choosing, and loving also makes us parts of a community – namely, the community of being and the community of human history, of the human race.
• Self-appropriation is the standard by which we can discern the pros and cons of other identities.

[12:15]
• Identity as Knower.
• “Why is Doing That Knowing?”
• Why does knowing result from the performance of certain immanent activities?
• What does “immanent” mean here? Opposite of “transcendent.”
• Lonergan’s 3 questions:
  – What am I doing when I am knowing?
  – Why is doing that knowing?
  – What do I know when I do that?

[17:30]
• Knowing-as-Looking vs. Knowing as Self-Transcendence
• The problem of immanence vs. transcendence.
• One way of thinking about the problem is how to get from the inside of consciousness outside to the real world.
• Naïve realism thinks knowing is a single act that gives immediate access to reality.
• The idealist critiques the naïve realists’ account of knowing as immediate contact, but still retain their account of reality, and thus conclude that human knowing knows only appearances, not reality.
• Immanence and the “bridge problem”: If ‘reality is out there’ and ‘consciousness is in here,’ then they cannot connect.

[24:45]
• Lonergan’s second question, then, is actually the question about immanence and transcendence.
• How does this problem relate to Lonergan’s distinction between ‘body’ and ‘thing’?
• How the sense of an ‘in here’ versus an ‘out there’ arises:
  – from the biologically extroverted consciousness.
  – from comparing knowing to the bodily-oriented sense of looking.
• Introspection is seen as ‘taking a look’ inside oneself rather than outside at the world.
• The problem of bridging inside and outside results.
• But if we call into question the assumption that knowing must be a single activity modeled on looking, the we have a new point of departure: What, then, is knowing, really?
• Or, once again, why should the activities appropriated in the first half of Insight yield knowledge?

[32:36]
• A confusion about the distinction between internal & external experience:
• External = sensory experiences, vs. internal = experience, consciousness of one’s own activities.
• The boundary of the skin as dividing most primordial notion of external/internal experience.
• The resulting significance of touch and of the skin, both biologically and culture.
• But in Lonergan’s sense, ‘external’ is not outside the skin, but sense experiences in general.
• Experiences of body’s muscles and organs are ‘external’ despite being ‘inside your skin’.
• Lonergan’s senses of internal and external are metaphorical; acts of consciousness are not literally inside one’s skin.
• Internal experiences are of one’s own conscious or intentional acts.
• They do not involve the presence of another object; one doesn’t look at oneself as an object.
• Present, not by being attended to, but by attending; being present to ourselves in and during our experiential, intelligent, and rational activities.
• We are not present in the bio-chemical activities our bodies perform, but we are present in – have internal experience of – our conscious ones.

[43:10]
• Student question about consciousness as not ‘taking a look back’ at the dynamism, but … how else to state what consciousness is?
  – Meaning of Lonergan’s use of the opposition of non-English terms:
    Noema vs. noesis;
    intentio intenta vs. intentio intendens;
    pensée pensée vs. pensée pensante
  – Discussion of thought, not as object, but as activity; ‘thought-thinked vs. thought-thinking.’
  – Internal experience has to do with the activities, not their objects
  – Remarkable fact that there are occurrences in the world which are accompanied by and constituted by self-presence
  – Lonergan emphasizes the dynamism and openness of thinking. Discussion of human patterning experience versus biological patterning.
Lonergan would prefer “differentiate” where other 20th C. philosophers would use “deconstruct” or “destroy” in relation to object-centered, knowing-as-looking centered philosophies.

Student question: Is knowing anything more than an internal experience?
   - Discussion of why question should be phrased differently.

Question about animal knowledge; same structure but confined to biological pattern?
   - Various kinds of animal knowing are the subject matter for animal biologists;
   - Lonergan lumps many different kinds of animal under the general heading of “biological pattern of experience”;
   - In general animal knowing is the use of sensations of vibrations to detect entities located in the outer world.
   - Animal knowing probably does not have the three-leveled structure, but this is disputed
   - Animal knowing is different from dramatic, religious, philosophical, patterning of animal knowing.

Is the goal to become present in the performance of your activities?
   - You are already present to your activities
   - Discussion of above question:
      - The exercises done in this class so far have been aimed at awakening our awareness to the experience of insight we’ve always had.
      - Aimed at re-duplicating the structure – heightening the experiencing of our conscious activities on all three levels; understanding that experiencing; critically assessing, correcting, and judging our understanding of that experiencing.
      - Habermas and the end of philosophy of consciousness; there is no self-presence that is unmediated by language.
      - How language and insights into one’s experiences heightens experiences already being experienced.
      - Our intelligence always mediates our experience of what is given.
      - The aim is not to become conscious of our activities, but to better understand our consciousness, our experiencing, of those activities.