ORGANISM, PSYCHE, SPIRIT - SOME CLARIFICATIONS:

TOWARD AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR WORKING WITH THE NEURO-Psycho-SCiENCES
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Context: Whatever has happened to the Soul?

Many are convinced we have lost our souls. Others hold that science has replaced them, like a motor in a machine. I'm going to side with neither. In fact, I'm going to propose a different consideration. What in us is asking the question? I propose it is our souls in search of meaning. I suggest the soul is alive and well. What we need to do is rethink what it is. The real question is what is the soul, a question not even addressed in such popular best sellers as Thomas Moore's recent Care of the Soul. Even though we believe the soul is there, we are hard pressed today to explain what it is, what it is we are talking about.

In the past philosophers told us the soul was the form of the body. We believed that when the body died, the soul lived on somehow, somewhere. It is not the intent of this paper to explore the classic Platonic or Aristotelian explanations of the human soul, but it is our task to inquire into how these ancient explanations have developed into nuanced understandings of the human being. Plato may have taught that souls pre-exist. Aristotle, adopted by Thomas Aquinas for use in his own anthropology, taught that the soul is the form of the body, and in humans that form was intelligent and capable of free choice. The question remains: What is this "form" of which we speak? What is the soul?

Today, anyone who asks what the soul is will be helped by an explanation of what the soul has to do with the human brain, with human emotions, and with human intelligence and choice? It is clear that former classical answers will no longer do. Those classical answers can be repeated, but our minds in this time of history will press further: Why is that so? How is that so? For many that it is so is no longer enough.

The question of the soul is but the beginning. Once we try to explain what we mean from the Christian perspective that is ours, other questions flow. What is distinctly human in what we discover, and what is of God? Is the soul natural or supernatural? What exactly happens when grace interpenetrates human consciousness bringing with it the array of virtues we have named theological and moral? What really is grace and virtue? What is the meaning of the grace/human interaction? The full attempt to address these questions will unfold, but as we begin it is enough to know that this where we are heading. The emphasis as we begin will be on the anthropological, but the anthropological for the Christian is not complete without addressing its relation to the divine. Why doesn't the old static concept we have had about the soul still work? Is there another way to think and speak about it? What is a more intelligible framework for understanding the human
organism, peoples, and spirit? Do we have to learn a new language to speak about what we have called the human "soul?"

_A Second Axial Shift?

We can trace the term axial shift to the German existentialist philosopher, Karl Jaspers. In his work, _The Origin and Goal of History_, Jaspers suggests there is an axis on which the whole of human history turns. Jaspers locates this shift or turn of human consciousness to the period between 800 and 200 B.C.E. The period in history prior to this shift might be called the cosmological period. In contrast to the meaning of cosmological today, this earlier use of the term refers to the early dawn of consciousness when the human perceived itself as a pawn of nature. The frequent victims of flood, windstorm, fire, and earthquake, humans worshiped these elements in some primordial sense of taking out an insurance policy. This early self-awareness is caught artistically still today in some forms of Asian art. A majestic mountain, a magnificent tree meet the viewers eye, and on closer look, a tiny insignificant coolie hat can be detected climbing the mountain. Water, air, fire, and earth—the four basic elements—play a large part in creating a sense of the self as subservient to the unrestricted power of nature.

According to Jaspers and others, this self-awareness does not come to an abrupt end with the year 800 B.C.E. The axial shift occurs gradually, like a new dawning. The shift is a new awareness, and it consists in the exciting possibility that with some thought, humans can harness the powers of nature. Science, in its most primitive form, is born. Where flooding occurs, housing is built on stilts. Fire is observed, tended, and contained. Structures are designed to withstand powerful winds. Animals are carefully observed for the warning of earthquakes.

What is interesting to note is that every major religion and philosophy takes early form during this axial shift across the globe. Confucius appears in China; Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle in Greece; the Jewish prophets arise in the Middle East; Zoroaster, precursor of Mani, appears in Persia. In India the sacrificial fire-worship of the Vedas give way to the Upanishads and the Epics, and the Buddha emerges. Formal religion and science then arise together with the shift in human consciousness to analytical thinking: the type of thought that not only seeks to describe but to explain.

Gathering momentum by 200 B.C.E., the anthropological shift places the human being and its capacity for inquiry at center stage. With each passing century the cosmic oppression recedes more and more into the background. The thinking human male becomes the measure of all things. All religions and cultures are brought gradually under human control sociologically, politically and economically. The history of the west is the record of this shift from the influence of the cosmos with its mysterious gods and God to the power of the human mind finally achieving "Enlightenment" between 1730 and 1780. Reason and science reign supreme. What cannot be observed or understood by the human mind is relegated to the realm of the myth, the inconsequential. Religion itself comes under this critical eye, and faith is considered by some as childish, the evidence of a mind not yet come of age, not yet ruggedly independent of its dependent relationship with God. The anthropological fixation becomes complete in the human being, as totally independent and self-sufficient, needing no one. For many, self-sufficiency becomes the epitome of what it means to be human.

In this self-absorption rationalism and scientism reign supreme. For some, the successes of the industrial age and the city state with its political democracy or socialism becomes all the worship one needs. New technologies so full of creativity and promise, are put into service for warfare the world had never imagined. Education aims at training minds scientifically sharp and efficient. The trained rational mind becomes the goal of state sponsored education. Psychology is born as a new discipline, moving beyond the medical field into the realms of emotion, trauma, and mental illness. In its intellectual flowering and in it isolationism, the human gradually becomes tragically fragmented. In its dignity, the human intelligence was taking its place as captain of the ship.

In the late nineteenth century the Catholic Church in particular reacted to this state of affairs both positively and negatively. On the positive side, the great social encyclicals were written, sounding the clear call for the recognition of workers' rights. Negatively, the Church regarded the shift to reason and self-sufficiency a form of idolatry and assumed a public position of entrenchment and denouncement. The extremities of anthropocentrism were grouped under the label of modernism and soundly condemned. With this condemnation both the wheat and the weeds, intertwined, came unavoidably under censure.

The twentieth century brought with it a time of shocking disenchantment. Unchecked rationalism and scientism revealed a tragic underside. To the horror of the world, the two World Wars revealed to us starkly where an unethical technology could lead. The death camps, Hiroshima and Nagasaki rose up as specters to haunt us. With instant media coverage the world saw the carnage of Vietnam up close. A growing disgust with war was born, especially in the United States. Conscientious objectors fled to Canada and draft files were burned. The ensuing years saw Communism fall and the
Berlin Wall crumble under the urgency of those seeking peace. The gift of human intelligence, distorted into the human idol of rationalism and scientism, indeed had clay feet, but there was no going back. The only way was forward.

Some, as we have noted earlier, are convinced the worship of the mind has led to the loss of the soul in a rudderless postmodern relativism. But others are sensing that humankind is moving toward still further development. This conviction has been cautiously worded so as not to suggest we are on the cusp of a second axial shift in consciousness. With the birth and unfolding of science new boundaries have been crossed. The human body has yielded its secrets. New lands have been explored and charted. Technology has made space exploration possible. The psychological sciences began to explore human consciousness. But even psychology is aware of a threshold it is not able to cross: there is a depth of mystery in the human that pragmatic testing cannot measure. The term spiritual began to have scientific significance. Attention was turned to the exploration of inner space. Writers are suggesting that the second axial shift, the shift to interiority, has begun.

This new shift is not a return to the past, to the integrated medieval world view of a unified sacred and secular. The turn is occasioned by desperation. It is prompted by the lonely howl of the human lost in the bottomless pit of its own limits. Crying for something more than human finitude, we stand like children looking in horror at our smashed God-images in a heap on the floor. The concepts of God as avenger, monarch, autocrat, were dead. Stripped of the old concepts and not fitted with new ones, many feel lost, orphaned and alienated from the religions they had known from childhood and having nothing secure to replace them. A vacuum is to be filled. If the God we knew is dead, what is there to replace this central ground, distorted as it may have been? For some the solution was obvious. What is there beside ourselves? What is there beside our own minds? Our science? Our cleverness? Our self-indulgence? The conclusion may be rash, but we cannot overlook the fact that the honest questioning holds hope of a new and vital knowledge of who the human being really is.

What Kind of Interiority?

We might ask what leads philosophers and cultural anthropologists to believe this shift is taking place and that it is global. One indicator is the interest today in spirituality even while there is a growing dissatisfaction with institutionalized religion. If book stores are a good indication, the spirituality section today covers everything from tarot card reading and the enneagram to Hildegard of Bingen, and the Zen mystics. Spirituality is a major section of interest in the store. Academically there has been the subtle shift to the consciousness philosophers, those who take the turn to the subject seriously and are showing that this turn need not result in subjectivism. Although the term interiority has a religious ring for some, the use of the term here refers to a shift to philosophic interiority.

It cannot be assumed that the human cry rising from postmodern fragmentation is consciously religious. It is, however, the cry of lostness, of disconnection. The cult of the human has become a confinement in that very human-ness. The cry is a cry from prison. The openness to the transcendent afforded in the past by religion has been lost. Where does one begin to find oneself again in this state of affairs? And more critically, how are we to re-conceptualize the divine? The way to freedom begins in the very questioning of where we find ourselves. We have been blinded by our own human accomplishments to the point of self-worship. The way out will begin with a proper reassessment of that same human — the human in relationship to all of reality: the cosmos, nature and the earth, other human beings, and the divine. This is no pouring of new wine into old skins. New skins must be prepared to hold the new wine.

The turn to interiority is a finding of oneself in truth. It is a coming home. It will require a step, a turning, a conversion many fear to take. The way has been pointed out by the precursors, the consciousness philosophers. Writers such as Gadamer, Habermas and Apel have challenged us with the task of attending to how human consciousness deals with reality. They warn us that world views will remain an eclectic smorgasbord until we have attended to how the mind processes data, how it arrives at conclusions. They wrestle with the fact that truth seeking can become infested with bias. They tell us that it must be done. They do not tell us how the mind functions in order to do it.

One group of scholars has taken steps to go into the uncharted territory. Led by the Canadian Jesuit Methodologist, Bernard Lonergan, a small band of philosophers, economists, scientists, and theologians attempt to do interiority analysis. Put in simple terms, they make the operations of their own intelligence the object of scrutiny. They offer a cognitional theory arrived at empirically through critical self-observation as underpinning for a clarified and updated epistemology. To clarify what knowing really is, they attempt to empirically chart the active intelligence in operation to determine its pattern of recurrent operations. Lonergan took his cue from his study of Aquinas. In question 84 of the Summa Aquinas states that the intelligence can be known only in its act. Learning to attend to this action enables the thinker to arrive at self-appropriation, or a heightened awareness of how authentically one is engaging the intelligence in all of its operations, or selectively omitting some
through bias. Doing interiority analysis as a community of scholars can create a communal and relational context for self-appropriation that is accountable. The underlying premise in such activity is the conviction that real objectivity is arrived at only through authentic subjectivity. Without the proper attention to the subject's operations as an empirical accountability of how intelligence is processing data, discussion of objectivity can be illusory. The real may be there, but the biased mind may never come to know it.

This shift to interiority calls for the thematic objectification of subjective operation. This shift has just begun, and many dismiss the effort as obscurantist, labeling the scholars who attempt it as elite. Categorized with Transcendental Thomists, the work of these scholars is dismissed by some philosophers, theologians, and scientists who are puzzled by this turn or intellectual conversion. Lonergan Centers have sprung up in Toronto, Santa Clara, Boston College, Ireland, Mexico City, Tokyo, Manila. Learning the method means coming to know one's own intellectual operations. Analyzing one's own intentionality requires focused attention on the empirical operation of the intellect as it functions. The understanding of this functioning then becomes the key to understanding the way the intelligence works, whether to plan a vacation or to research the human genome. If we can envision a group of scholars attending to this process together in order to verify and nuance it, we have some understanding of what Lonergan intended.

**What anthropology is needed?**

The usual categories of rational psychology will no longer be adequate to this task. Drawn from Aristotelian and Thomistic theories of human nature, and many of their insights valuable and true, theory is not the starting place. The starting place is in empirical observation of the functioning human being, and giving an account of what is going on when the human comes to know anything. Does the same thing happen again and again? Is there a pattern that repeats itself? Can the operations be recognized and named? If the answer to these questions is yes, we are on our way to grounding whatever theory of knowing we propose. In this way an empirically based cognitional theory would underpin our epistemology allowing both scientists and theologians to talk to one another. One would give and account for a theory pertaining to physics, and the other to a theology pertaining to the activity of grace in the human heart. They draw from different data, and both use their intelligence in a context of religious faith, one drawing on its revelational data, and the other not.

The process needed to do the step underneath theory is called intentionality analysis. It presupposes an accurate empirical charting of the operations of human cognition, and identifies four main levels of operation: that of experience, understanding, judgment, and decision. The human operations that pertain to each of these levels are named and a cyclic and recurrent pattern is charted. If accurate, a new meaning has been bound for the old adage: Know thyself. One way out of the sense of postmodern relativity would be to do the self-appropriation necessary for the human to become accountable personally and communally in its search for the truth. Finding the full truth about the human would also mean returning humankind to its rightful place in the cosmos. This reinstatement would imply a re-examination of the relationship the human has with nature, with other human beings, and with the divine. The truth needs to be sought without bias, but how is bias to be identified, and where does it function to block the operations of intelligence? In addition to a judgment of truth there will need to be a judgment of value, for it is value that motivates human choice. We have need of a way to address these needs. We need an anthropology that can adequately explain how we arrive at answers to these questions.

Our context too has changed. As Christians we are no longer living in a cultural or religious ghetto. The media has opened up the global village to us. To consider an adequate anthropology for the work ahead of us requires that we see that anthropology as pertaining to others as well as ourselves. What do we find when we expand our horizon to a global perspective? We find that history and cultures have had much to do with the lenses we wear to try to understand. In the past we have narrowly concluded that our lens was the only lens. Our expanding world view teaches us quickly how wrong we were. Those working with interiority analysis are convinced that cultural difference is compatible with the basic operations of human consciousness. They suggest that these operations are human and thus cross-cultural, while their outer manifestations will be distinct to the cultures in which people live. It will be important for us to establish here that from a faith perspective anthropology can never be the same after the incarnation. This mystery is the bridge reaching out to our humanness to connect us to the divine. In what follows, we will be focusing on human anthropology. Our explorations into anthropology will not depart from this connection even if this exploration does not address the divine directly. Even when we are dealing with the human perceived as totally estranged from God, the connection remains the basis for reconciliation.

If from a faith perspective we are going to do a scientific inquiry into the neuro-sciences, we are clearly addressing human anthropology. Scientifically
where are we to begin? I suggest we begin with a very scientific term, the word energy. Not a little has been written about energy as a life force as it occurs in all living things and indeed as its different forms are observed through space exploration. But I would like to begin with a specific focused energy, that unlike light, electrical, and nuclear energy, has been researched very little. What is the nature of love's energy? Since our question is about what makes humans fully human, we need to focus our sights on the most human of our energies, the energy of love.

In a recent article, The Christian Science Monitor announces just such a pursuit. No longer satisfied with the "selfish gene" theory as the bottom line, scientists are going to undertake an investigation into the nature of love and its expression. Alarmr by international violence and hate, bioethicist Stephen Post, who will head the new effort, believes we have no real alternative considering the present state of the world. Reporter Jane Lampman claims the study reveals a shift within key disciplines from focusing on the negative in human nature to taking a hard look at what makes humans thrive. Located at a prominent medical school, Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, the new Institute for Research on Unlimited Love begins its work with an initial endowment of four million dollars. The effort will engage disciplines from psychology and human development to public health and medicine, neuro-science, sociology and evolutionary science. It will also explore the links between religion, spirituality and human behavior. Why might this be of interest to us as scientists, as theologians?

Several traditions in both East and West hold that the different manifestation of love share a common ground of energy, and that this common energy is the basic life-force of the universe. Gerald May, MD proposes that the different manifestations of love are expressions of a root spiritual energy that is processed and differentiated through the human psyche. May calls this root energy agape and likens it to a base metal, "...irreducible and unadulterated." Taken as fragments of energy into the psyche, it becomes mixed with "...certain aspects of self-definition" appearing "...in conscious human experience as narcissism, erotic or filial love, or as some other emotion." Does the universe exist from and "run" on a type of created energy that is at its source unconditionally loving? What relation does this energy have to the divine? Is everything divine as some Eastern traditions suggest?

As Christians we believe that God is personified love. As hidden source God is called "Father" by us; as expression of that Godhead this mystery is "Son" or "Word," and God's active self-giving we call "Holy Spirit." We teach that Christians will be known by an agapic love manifested in their behavior toward one another, and that this charity is a theological virtue created in the human soul to enable the person to love with God's own love. Human love can become deformed as May suggests. But when human love is interpenetrated with divine charity, there is a godly influence on our human loving. Can the dynamic agapic energy May is referring to as "root" be the uncreated Spirit of God, as named by Christians, still hovering over the chaos? Does this dynamis create a human conscious energy with which to communicate and influence the wider world? Does the incarnation of the Word create a bridge for divine love to be in direct contact with the human through the sacred humanity of the Word?

In both Eastern and Western thought frames, energy of some kind is fundamental to being. Western physics sets itself to find a unified field theory that could identify all creation as energy. For Freud it is libido arising from the "biological substrata" of the id, the anatomical and physiological foundations of unconscious motivation. W.R.D. Fairbairn, in contrast, says May, holds the "object relations" theory of personality. Here the ego has its own intrinsic energy, also called libido. Behavioral psychology views psychic energy as the simple physical product of cellular oxidation. Most Western theories presuppose that psychic energy originates in and is limited to the individual human mind and body.

The East, and in particular Oriental thought, does not make a distinction between psychology and spirituality. As a result the East poses the existence of a universal energy that manifests itself mentally and spiritually in people, and also in the physical workings of the cosmos as a whole. Known as chi in China, ki in Japan, sakti or kundalini in Sanskrit, this universal energy is understood to be manifested everywhere, and is not limited to expression in human consciousness. This energy is understood as a basic universal life-force, undetermined and ambiguous in itself.

Western thought, shaped by the rational and scientific approaches of the enlightenment, identifies the human as origin of this energy. The East, its insights flowing from more contemplative traditions, maintains that whatever the physiological point of origin might be, the energy manifested in consciousness originates first as raw undifferentiated energy outside the human. The Christian suggests yet another option: that the power of God creates life in the universe, each creature manifesting an energy proper to its being. Why is it important to clarify these viewpoints? The role of the human must be given its due, and the relationship of the divine to the human and its operations must be clarified. The Christian position is a both/and not an either/or. The human functions as human and that functioning provides the data science needs. The divine relates to the human as source of life and creator of human energy. The relationship is one of an empowerment of
what is already there, not its replacement. This may be the clue we need to take a position on the functioning of the human brain.

As Christians, we hold that the parts of the human brain that seem to generate certain emotions are really acting as filters or suppressors of the psychic energy belonging innately to human beings. If this is possible, then the anatomical brain locations where emotion seems to originate are not actually the generators of the emotion, but are merely the places where emotional energy is mediated into awareness. Neurochemical processes then would not be the source of emotional energy, but act instead as custom designed filters, changing the energy's form and expression. In a respectful stance, theology and science have converged and shared insights.

Rethinking Human Anthropology

To suggest an anthropology more suited to this task it becomes essential to ask what the basic dimensions of the human might be. Can we use interiority analysis to be more precise about what humanness is? Can we attempt to chart the anatomy of the human spirit? Is the human spirit synonymous with the soul? Is the human spirit natural or supernatural? What do we mean by the psyche? These are wonderful questions begging honest answers. The description of the human in popular jargon is "body, mind, and spirit." Is this adequate? Where are the emotions in such a description? What do each of the words in the pop culture description refer to? With these questions before us we will begin our exploration.

A Revised Anthropology

Returning to our starting point with energy, we note first that the human being manifests energy in a distinctly human way. Most visible to the eye our DNA takes form in what we will call the human organism. This dimension of ourselves is not only known by its visibility but by its distinct functions. The organism consists of a complexity of systems. We can identify many of these systems: the circulatory, the respiratory, the lymphatic, the digestive, the reproductive, the neurological, etc. The wonder of human function is coming to the fore as science daily probes deeper into the intricacies of the human organism. In keeping with our conviction that the human is grounded in the heart of the triune God, the organism mediates the created energy proper to itself while held in that creative power.

An example of the application of this in classic theology is an understanding of God as the One who is. This Mystery, in which essence and existence are one, is said to bestow being on all creatures so they can be. What we are say-

ing is that the One who is uses the ovum and sperm of our parents as instrumental causes to bring us to be. Their physicality, manifesting the energy of their human love and desire, is used by the divine to cause another to be.

Human consciousness, as it emerges from childhood awareness to a more mature self-reflection, begins to attend to two sources of data. The most common data base for us is the data of sense provided through the human organism. We touch, we smell, we hear, taste and see. The second source of data is more subtle. It is the data of consciousness itself. We are aware that we are touching, smelling, hearing, tasting, and seeing.

By attentiveness we notice things. We attend to what our senses or consciousness is making us aware of. We are attentive to external data and to consciousness itself as simple experience. This primary level is the level of awe, the simple contemplative experience of wonder — at the beauty of a sunset, at the face of a child, at the mystery of God. Lest this level of operation be quickly dismissed, I propose that it opens us to that mysterious psychic energy field that is the object of the psychological sciences. The psyche is the repository of dreams, of imagining, of fantasy. It is in the hidden depths of the psyche that energy gathers to be manifested in powerful emotion.

A careful distinction needs to be made here. Psychic energy becomes conscious at this first level of experience. What this implies is that psychic energy is real but sometimes not conscious. When I refer to the first level of conscious-ness I am referring to the first level of the human spirit. The psyche is an energy field that draws data from physical functions and from the data on the human spirit in its conscious operations. The psyche is thus distinct from the human spirit but not separate from it, distinct from the organism but not separate from it. It remains for us to identify the operations that belong to all of the conscious levels of the human spirit.

The human spirit is curious. As if drawn by an unseen undercurrent, the consciousness longs to find out, it desires to understand. It moves to a new set of operations marked by inquiry. Questions emerge. Why is the sky that reddish color tonight? Why didn't my husband come home? Why was I born? This second level of the human spirit is known by its questioning for understanding. Relentless in its probing, the consciousness searches one area only to open up the questions pertaining to another. Its inquiry leads to "Aha!" moments when bits of images connect into insights, and insights fuse to form concepts, and concepts fuse to form ideas.

But again the consciousness shifts. The questions change. Are the bright ideas right ideas? Am I onto what is really so? Have I reached the truth, what
really is so? The consciousness like a laser scans all the insights gathered. If no further question pops up, a tentative conclusion is reached. "Tipped ice cube tray, puddle on the table — someone forget..." A judgment has been reached. What is critical to this point in intentionality analysis is that knowing is reached only at the point of judgment, not at the levels of experience or inquiry. Knowing consists of attentiveness to data, inquiry for understanding, and the judgment that the understanding is correct. But the human spirit is not only made for knowing. It is made for decision and action.

Again the consciousness shifts. As though choreographed by some unseen dance coach, a new form of questioning emerges. This time it is not a question of truth. (We have already reached that conclusion, and until new data should appear and the pattern sets about repeating itself, the judgment arrived at becomes our position.) The question now becomes "What difference does it make? What's it worth to you?" Knowledge is one thing. Value is another. The human spirit is moving into the level of evaluation and it is from value, from worth, that the human makes a choice. This final level of human operation, the fourth, is the level where "willing" goes on. It is the level of responsible choice, decision, and action.

What intentionality analysis offers us is a functional explanation of the operations of the human spirit. It suggests that consciousness functions differently through identifiable sets of human operations. These operations clarify what human knowing really is, and when it is reached. They clarify what human willing is and how important the truth is in the choosing. Perhaps most of all, the self-appropriation that results from intentionality analysis reveals what a developed conscience actually is — a human consciousness operating on the fourth level of operation, and aware that it is responsible for the choices it makes. We may understand better what "having full knowledge and full choice" might really mean regarding moral responsibility.

With this bare sketch, we can now sum up the approach to anthropology we have begun. The human consists of an organism made up of complex systems that are mutually interdependent. The human consists of a powerful psychic energy field, which stores images, releases those images in dreams, and releases powerful emotions when these "energy motors" are aroused through the organism or the operations of the human spirit. The human consists of a distinctly human spirit with levels of operation that can be empirically identified as experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding. From this vantage we can consider that the human organism, plus the psychic energy that pulsates within it, is what we mean by "body." We can also consider that the human spirit, with its operations of knowing and choosing, plus the psychic energy that becomes conscious in these operations, is what we can identify as "soul."

The Future: The Authentic Human as the Measure of the Culture Reconnecting with the Cosmos

In the not too distant past, the Christian researcher too quickly damned the scientific and rational viewpoint as destructive of faith. Those wiser knew better than to totally disclaim this perspective. The marvel of the human spirit and its search for the facts calls us to seek the truth — the real as known by the mind. The science of the brain must be given its full due. What does this mean? For one thing, it means that neurological and brain science must be taken seriously. For another, sound self-appropriation that reclaims the contemplative wonder in our awareness needs to be taken just as seriously. We have before us a both/and challenge. The false dichotomy between science and spirituality/religion needs to be laid to rest, and effort must be made to push the questions until they yield both scientific and theological truth. One or the other is no longer enough. The brain is not the mind. The brain is the mind's physiological infrastructure.

There is no magic "how to" to this project. Nor does it depend on some "facts out there." If the operations of the subject, the thinker, are not attended to, there remains only a potpourri of viewpoints. Truth-seeking rests squarely on the authenticity of the truth-seekers. Facts clearly in our faces can be bent to suit our agendas. The thinker can cheat. The operator of the mind needs to be held accountable for his or her findings. The thinker, in science and in theology needs to face up to bias. This human being needs to be an authentic soul-self. Such a self is the person capable of self-knowledge and accountability. Interiority analysis can be of service to provide credibility in this venture.

We have defined soul as the distinctly human psyche and the human spirit. Interiority analysis would have the operations of both named, known and accounted for. We also suggest that the organism, in this case the brain, mediates the functions of the human spirit and the powerful energy of psyche with its images. The brain mediates the operations of the operator, the human subject, to the rest of reality. With intentionality analysis we have, perhaps for the first time, a modest beginning account of what empirical functions belong properly to the human spirit, as we have had from science the continually unfolding discovery of the functions of the brain.

The attempt we have made to redefine the soul and body in terms of the functions of organism, psyche and spirit offers an empirical possibility to the sciences. To ground religious experience I pose the question of how faith
functions. The human spirit and its operations are natural and constitutive of the human being. The human is thus "spiritual" be nature. As such the question of the human in its relation to the environment and cosmos can no longer be denied, even prior to discussion of relationship to the divine. The philosophy of science can only point to the plausibility of the questions of an Ultimate Reality. If the question of God is unavoidable, the attempts to answer the question are still multiple. The discipline that deals with Ultimate Reality as that Reality is related to the human in faith is theology. The study of religion and its many forms is another matter. Religious Studies as one example does not presume a faith relationship.

For too long theology has been disconnected from cosmic moorings that anchor the human and give it its rightful role of voice and choice for the ongoing shaping of matter in the universe. The human spirit we have explained it, is the seat of the intelligence and choice that will decide our future, or more radically, determine whether we will even have one. The operative functions of the human spirit — experiencing, questioning, concluding and choosing — provide the entry point for the influence of the divine. But whether or not this influence is admitted, those functions, operating poorly or well, will determine the future of cultures. Can we afford the continued isolation of the human, bent on being accountable to no one? What are the interdisciplinary links we need?

The Relational Links

What is spirituality? Is it religion? Is it holiness? Does it have anything at all to do with science? These questions press us to clarify terms we bandy about, often unsure of what we mean by them. It is clear from our approach to the soul as a natural component of the human, distinguished from the organism by certain operations, that we are referring to something radically human, not divine. The soul is desirous in the very substance of its operations as it comes more and more under the influence of the divine. But this is going ahead of ourselves. Human relationship with the divine describes holiness, and the unfolding of how grace, virtue and the gifts of the Spirit bring that holiness about. Spirituality is the real presence of the human, in its conscious operations, mediating that presence to the rest of reality. The intentional nurturing of the human spirit can be called spiritual development in contrast to human development of which it is a part. Christian spirituality is that real presence directly influenced by the person and life of Jesus, the Christ. One has a spirituality by simply being human, no matter how deformed, reformed or transformed that presence to the world may be. One will have a spirituality and may or may not have a religion. A religion is an organized system marked by a distinct creed, code and cult. The religion can be corrupt or healthy. The role of religion is to support and nourish human spirituality so that the human can make the choices needed to move the culture forward.

If spirituality is the way one is present in the world, then what is the relationship of spirituality to morality? Morality is the outer behavioral manifestation of one's spirituality. Morality is one piece with spirituality. Touch one, and you have touched the other. The beauty of human spirituality will be known by the moral choices one makes. The struggle to make morally responsible choices, the choices of an authentic human being, reveal the beauty of one's spirituality. Spirituality may manifest or keep hidden an implicit and deep faith relationship with the divine.

A Blessed Accountability

What we have attempted here is an overview, reclaiming the human soul in a way that might be intelligible to those in the human and natural sciences. Knowing is not enough. Consciousness presses toward the "so what" questioning. What difference does it make to know how I function as an organism/psyche/spirit?

The answer summons us to be part of our own spiritual development. What we know and what we do about what we know matters. As we become more and more authentic, the culture progresses. As we are biased, so does the culture decline. Nothing is left untouched, unchanged, neutral. We are watching human culture change around us daily through the choices we make. We are poised in the humanity of our little lives to add our choices to the whole. In our science and in our theology we stand accountable. In our homes, our parishes, our communities, our nations, our cultures, our universe we will be measured. Such is our freedom. Such is our dignity. Out of these we shape the future.
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Endnotes


(4) Lonergan has his own comments on the labeling resulting from this lack of understanding. On page 13-14 of Method in Theology he distinguishes his work from that of Transcendental Thomists such as Otto Muck (The Transcendental Method, New York: Herder and Herder, 1968).

(5) For some of these reflections on the relation between, energy and east/west contrasts I am indebted to Gerald May, M.D. Will and Spirit: A Contemplative Psychology. (HarperSanFrancisco: 1982): chapter 7: 172-209.

(6) This is the image given by God to Catherine of Siena in her Dialogue. I recommend searching the index (p. 376) for the multiple uses of this powerful image. (Catherine of Siena: The Dialogue. Suzanne Noffke, OP, ed. New York: Paulist, 1980).

(7) A recent work by an assistant professor of nursing in New York poses some interesting questions. The author, writing from a scientific point of view, is convinced that a careful study of energy will bring about the convergence of science and religion. (The Enigma of Energy: Where Science and Religion Converge by Vidette Todoardo-Branceschi, RN, PhD. New York: Crossroad, 1999).


(10) May holds that even Jung in his reference to the collective unconscious understands psychic energy as originating in the human. See footnote 7, page 341.

(11) For example, the work of Candace Pert in Molecules of Emotion (New York: Scribner, 1997).
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