Topics unfinished from previous lecture: the tripartite structure of objectivity, and the question of whether self-affirmation is of subject-as-subject, or subject-as-object.

Review of Lonergan's notion of Objectivity.
Objective knowing amounts to the cognition of reality.
“Startling strangeness” of the realization that knowledge of reality results from this cognitional structure.
Why should knowing result from experiencing, understanding, & judging?
The counter-positions falsely attribute objectivity to one component or activity of knowing (e.g., the myth of knowing as looking).
Mistaking one act of consciousness for the whole occurs not only in epistemology, but also in ethics.
Difficulty with the counterpositions on knowing is not that what they emphasize is not a component of knowing, but that they regard it as the whole of knowing.

Knowing as looking amounts to naive realism.
Empiricism is a very consistent form of naive realism, rejecting any knowledge that isn't confirmed by taking a look.
‘Knowing as looking’ leads to the model of objectivity as the already out there now and immediately accessible.
Looking is one way of having unmediated, uncomplicated, direct access to reality.
Touching is similarly direct and perhaps more primal, as Piaget showed in his studies of integrating tactile & visual sensations.

In the counterposition, what is obvious in knowing (or in ethics) is taken for what knowing obviously is.
What would be excluded as objective knowledge – as merely subjective – on the counterposition of ‘knowing-as-looking’?
Thoughts and feelings would be regarded as merely subjective.
Discussion of the objective expression of feelings, i.e. body positions, voice changes. Can we see anger itself?

Student question about whether such expressions are being part of anger’s essence, i.e. in animals we recognize such responses.
   Discussion of socially constructed versus natural constructions of emotions. We mediate visual cues of emotions by means of concepts, but we never perceive emotions as such.
   So we can't know that animals have emotions simply by looking. On the counterposition, that means we cannot know that animals have anger.

Other things that would have to be ‘merely subjective’ on the counterposition:
   causes (Hume) and relationships.
Question whether attractions are objectively knowable.
Question of whether discrimination among sensations can be objective on the counterposition.
• Discussion of how logical positivism attempted to build up perceptions and higher concepts from objective sensations using language and logic.
• Question as to whether judgment as having a reflective meaning.
  – For the counterposition, judgment has no objective meaning.
• Meaning in general would have to be a subjective projection, if knowing were only taking a look.
• Other ‘merely subjective’ things: substances, atoms and molecules (Mach), scientific theories in general (conventionalism), evolution – since they cannot be directly observed, similarly for evolution.
• Additional ‘merely subjective’ entities include families, institutions, societies, and cultures; history, ethical principles, God.

[33:35]
• Student question about how the time frame for ‘taking a look’ is determined. When is an ‘instant’ over, and what about continuity of perceptions?
  – The problem of what counts as a perception is indeed debatable; there is the question of continuity versus the instant. For some, the entire observable duration is allowable; but when the observer falls asleep there is a problem of discontinuous perception. Although the observer reorients his new to remembered perceptions automatically, there is still an interruption.

[37:40]
• Student question whether there is objectivity in language, or it is a means of expressing what we know subjectively?
  – Different philosophers have different views. Logical positivism defined meaningful language as that which could be reconstructed from sense sensations.

[39:25]
• Whatever cannot be known by sense contact is regarded as a merely subjective projection on external reality.

[40:47]
• Student question about a blind person's ability to know objectively.
  – Discussion of sight and other paradigms of knowing in western philosophy (cf. Shubert Ogden).

[42:40]
• Question about Lonergan’s references to ‘illumination’ and other ways in which he uses metaphors of light.
  – Discussion of illumination and insight, and how the latter always presupposes a visible image upon which understanding supervenes.

[45:41]
• Any reality that is constituted by meaning, is excluded from any model of objectivity that is modeled on sensations (on knowing as ‘taking a look’)
• This is one reason why Lonergan’s account is much more inclusive – it is open to realities that are constituted by meaning.

[47:37]
• Breaking the duality in knowing is necessary to accept (appropriate) that understanding correctly is indeed knowing reality.
• Being is known in understanding correctly and judging thereupon.
• ‘Knowing-as-looking’ vs. Self-Transcendence.
• Objectivity is the result of authentic subjectivity (Method in Theology) that follows the standards of the dynamism of our self-correcting structure, of our self-transcendence.

Series of student questions:
• Question about why we trust the desire to know.
  – Many people in fact don’t trust it as the legitimate criterion for knowledge of reality.
  – Inquiry begins as spontaneous and innocent, until something prompts us to stop trusting it.
  – Self-appropriation consists in winning back this initial state. The structure of knowing and the unrestrictedness of knowing together ground its ability to produce objective knowledge.
  – Crucial questions are not about others, but about oneself: Do I perform the structured cognitional activities? Do I have and unrestricted desire giving rise to my inquiries?
  – The answers to these 2 questions are the basis for answering, why should we trust that desire.
  – Discussion of the element of desire in knowing and its unique form of manifestation.
  – We “know” this desire by letting it be, giving it free rein, by letting rational consciousness freely pursue its inquiry.
  – The unrestrictedness of desire is the precondition for arriving at the virtually unconditioned.

• Structured Objectivity: the Tripartite Structure of Cognition.
• Human knowing is a structure of several operations, not a single one, and so objectivity is a combination of distinct properties residing in several operations.
• Three-fold Objectivity consists in experiential objectivity, normative objectivity, and absolute objectivity. (The fourth objectivity, ‘principle objectivity,’ combines and goes beyond these 3).
• But not in a simplistic sense – not that 3 levels of acts automatically implies 3 kinds of objectivity.
Question about the constitution of reality versus constitution of experience.

- The present issue is how objectivity is constituted, not reality. Discussion of the role of the given in the objectivity of our knowing; and how our experience of objects is not immediate.

Normative Objectivity is not just the correlative of the second level of consciousness (intelligence), because it has to do with all questioning – questions for intelligence and questions for reflection – not just questions on the second level of consciousness.

- Normative objectivity is grounded in the unrestricted desire to know; it results from unprejudiced inquiry.
- The opposite of normative objectivity – prejudice, bias – is interference with the unrestricted desire.

Student question about whether this unrestricted desire to know allows us to connect to the third level of identifying desires and then letting them go.

- Not all desires, but the unique, unrestricted desire.
- The unrestricted desire is the desire for inquiry, and letting it have its way brings us to a knowledge of reality.

Absolute Objectivity.

- The unconditioned judgment is no longer relative to the person who articulates it, or the time or place of the judgment.
- Absolute objectivity asks “is it so?” under any conditions, after all pertinent questions have been asked.
- The publicity of objectivity results from intersubjective agreement, born of the commonly shared and unrestricted desire to know.
- Agreement, even agreement, of all human kind, does not ground objectivity (because of general bias); but absolute objectivity grounds the possibility of human agreement.

End of Part I.