ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AFRICA

an analysis of bias, decline, and conversion based on
the works of bernard lonergan   by CYRIL ORJI

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AFRICA

CYRIL ORJI

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AFRICA

AN ANALYSIS OF BIAS, DECLINE, AND CONVERSION BASED ON THE WORKS OF BERNARD LONERGAN

MARQUETTE STUDIES IN THEOLOGY
NO. 59
ANDREW TALLON, SERIES EDITOR

© 2008 Marquette University Press
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201-3141
All rights reserved.
www.marquette.edu/mupress/

FOUNDED 1916

COVER DESIGNER & ILLUSTRATOR COCO CONNOLLY

Association of American
University Presses

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESS
MILWAUKEE

The Association of Jesuit University Presses

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Africa has often been perceived as a confluence of tension and conflict and the recent upheavals in Sub-Saharan Africa have done little to help this perception. The waves of ethnic and religious violence continue to drain the continent of its material and human resources, leading to what Bernard Lonergan would call a state of "cumulative decline." Intolerance, and tribal and inter-ethnic conflict, seem commonplace. Muslim-Christian relations in some countries are currently at their lowest ebb. The carnage that accompanies this ethnic and religious tension begs for urgent attention. The world still remembers the Hutu-Tutsi conflict that led to savage massacres in Rwanda and warlord politics in Somalia of the 1990s. Even in the case of Nigeria, the most populous black nation, since its formation in 1914 ethnic conflicts have pitted the north against the south, leading to the polarization of Hausa and Ibo, Hausa and Yoruba, and Yoruba and Ibo.

Followers of the three main religions in Africa: African Traditional Religion (ATR), Islam, and Christianity are perceived to be at odds with one another and sometimes take extreme measures in their quest to seek relevance and assert themselves as a dominant religious force. The continuous rise and influence of Islam in many African states has become a source of increasing concern, especially to Christian groups. The official introduction of Sharia law (Islamic legal code) in countries like Nigeria and Sudan is perceived to be an instance of the prevailing religious prejudice that has further compounded the problem, aggravating religious division among an already ethnically polarized people. The Sharia law has, however, been met with stiff resistance from Christian groups who consider it a breach of their fundamental human rights and right to religious liberty. The resistance has led to an upsurge in religious violence, further exacerbating the carnage.

In most parts of Africa, ethnic and religious issues are inseparably intertwined. In Nigeria for instance, it is not uncommon to be a Hausa and a Muslim or an Ibo and a Christian. Ethnic identity and religious affiliation go hand in hand. Ethnic tension sometimes takes a religious twist. People are killed and maimed on the basis of their religion. Even

among people of the same faith tradition ethnic tension often exists, further complicating the situation. The situation in Nigeria is a microcosm of the ethnic and religious dilemma facing Sub-Saharan Africa.

National and regional Episcopal conferences in Africa have, at various times, taken steps to address the situation. In an open letter of May 23, 1991, for instance, the Catholic Bishops of Senegal made an overture to Muslims in Senegal and appealed for an open dialogue that promotes the good of the country. Such regional appeals for dialogue are very common but they rarely ever address specifically the root causes of tribal/ethnic conflict. They seem to address ethnic conflict only when it relates to religious conflict. To date the strongest condemnation of ethnic conflict by African bishops has come from the 1994 Synod which condemned the "envy, jealousy, and the deceit of the devil [that] have driven the human Family to racism, to ethnic exclusivism, and to hidden violence of all forms" (Message Of The Synod, no. 25). The Synod lamented that Africa has, for some years, been "the theater of fratricidal wars which are decimating populations and destroying their natural riches. These wars are caused, among other reasons, by tribalism, nepotism, racism, religious intolerance, and the thirst for power reinforced by totalitarian regimes which trample with impunity the rights and dignity of the person" (Proposition, 45a). The bishops identified ATR and Islam as their two key dialogue partners and called for "dialogue within the Church and among religions." They called ATR "the guarantors of our cultural values" and called for a dialogue that is "structured" around this cultural heritage (Message of the Synod, no. 21). The bishops, drawing from the Pope's encyclical, *Redemptoris Missio*, urged Christians to dialogue with Muslims and "join hands in working for human progress and development…while at the same time assuring reciprocal respect for the religious liberty of individual persons and that of communities" (Message of the Synod, 23, quoting *Redemptoris Missio*, 39). Pope John Paul II, in his post-Synodal exhortation, concurred with the African bishops, observing that "within the borders left behind by colonial powers, the co-existence of ethnic groups with different traditions, language, and even religions often meets obstacles arising from serious mutual hostility" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 49). The Pope acknowledged that these tribal oppositions endanger not only peace but also the pursuit of the common good. He therefore reiterated the need for healing

through "honest dialogue," and charged the African bishops with the responsibility of healing these divisions.

The synod document on ecumenical collaboration and inter-religious dialogue has since become a reference point, especially for regional and national Episcopal conferences, on matters concerning ethnic and religious conflict in Africa. In a communiqué issued at the end of the First Plenary Meeting of the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria (2001), for instance, the Nigerian bishops, in line with the spirit of the synod, condemned the imposition of Sharia as "grossly irresponsible and unacceptable." They objected to any discrimination based on gender, ethnic origin, religion or cultural prejudice and called for a "conversion on the personal level, a spiritual revolution in our behavior and attitude to life." African Christian theologians are also addressing the conflict and looking for ways to dialogue with Islam and the countless number of growing independent Churches in Africa.

The truth is that African Bishops have always spoken out against regional conflicts and have even called for a "spiritual revolution" and dialogue. However, while the bishops have been consistent in their condemnation of violence in all its forms, they have fallen short in three critical ways. (i) They have not adequately addressed ethnicism/tribalism specifically, the bane of African society. (ii) Where they have commented on ethnic conflict as it relates to religious conflict, they have not explored the root of the conflict in the human person and society. (iii) In their call for conversion and dialogue, they have not been able to address the constitutive ingredients in the process of conversion, nor have they offered an analysis of the direction of the dialogue.

The Canadian Jesuit theologian, Bernard Lonergan (1904-1984) offers an analysis of bias that addresses a root cause of conflict in the human person and society, an analysis that can contribute to a deeper understanding of ethnic and religious conflict in Africa and that also offers resources for overcoming them. His work addresses the "oversights," "unreasonableness," and "irresponsibility" inherent in human conflicts that lead to a cumulative decline in both the human person and society. On the level of solution, his call for personal and social conversion illumines the ingredients needed to achieve the "spiritual revolution" that can help emancipate (ethnically and religiously) the African. In Lonergan's perspective, spiritual (religious) revolution cannot be attained without conversion. Dialogue and dialectic provide the necessary condition for personal and social conversion. Religious con-

version for Lonergan is moral and intellectual. It is also aesthetic and especially affective. I shall argue in this work that Lonergan provides a valuable resource for analyzing these African conflicts and a vehicle for meaningful social change by appropriating his method for addressing bias through conversion and dialogue.

There has been little research into why and how Lonergan uses the word 'bias.' Though scholars agree that Lonergan's use of the word is different from the common usage, not much has been done by way of genetic study and there is dearth of literature on the subject. The most elucidating work on this matter comes from Kenneth Melchin in his work, *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the work of Bernard Lonergan* (1987) in which he argued that Lonergan's use of the word 'bias' was occasioned by his need to respond to the proponents of the liberal thesis of automatic progress. According to Melchin, Lonergan, in the seventh chapter of *Insight*, enters into a conversation with Thomas Hobbes, Immanuel Kant, G.F. Hegel, Karl Marx, and other proponents of the liberal thesis of automatic progress and speculative philosophy of history. Thus Lonergan, like those he tried to refute, has as his goal the identification of the structural elements and processes on which to build a theory of society and history and overall patterns of historical change. Melchin argues that Lonergan, in his unique style, does not reconstruct the history of the theories of the authors with whom he is conversing, and that this sometimes makes it difficult to understand why he raises the issues he does. Melchin's focus was on the genesis of Lonergan's position. Drawing from Melchin's analysis, I wish to analyze the substance of Lonergan's position and explore its applicability to the African situation. I will support this by exploring Robert Doran's analysis of the various levels of conversion in Lonergan and its relationship to the dynamics of history as treated in *Theology and Dialectics of History* (1990).

There has been no analysis of how African bishops and theologians have addressed the twin issues of ethnic and religious conflict, nor has anyone attempted an appropriation of Lonergan's work on bias in relation to the ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa. Matthew Lamb, however, in his work *Solidarity With Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation* (1982) relied on Lonergan's work on bias in his analysis of the social sins of economic oppression, racism, ecological pollution, and sexism. His analysis of social sin did not really focus on the situation in Africa, although attention was drawn to the racist

policy of South Africa (not the ethnic and religious conflict in sub-Saharan Africa). The work of Shawn Copeland, *A Genetic Study of the Idea of the Human Good in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan* (1991), provides an important resource for exploring Lonergan's contribution to envisioning the common good in African society. Moreover, Copeland has also utilized Lonergan's work in her discussions of feminism, sexism, and racism (social sin) in North America. In an article in which she used Lonergan's work on bias, "Women and the Country of Knowing," published in *Women of Spirit 2* (April 24, 1998), Copeland showed how a clear understanding of the meaning and pattern of human knowing is vital to ethics (justice) in both church and society. Though her analysis of bias touched on issues of ethnocentrism, her overall thrust was toward racism, especially as it impinges on feminism and the African-American situation. Thus one sees in Lamb's and Copeland's work a conscious effort to engage Lonergan in discussion on matters relating to social sin (bias), but their analyses center on the North American and European situation, not sub-Saharan Africa. The importance of this work lies in its effort to use Lonergan's work to analyze and seek solutions to specific problems (ethnic and religious conflict) that have for centuries bedeviled Africa. Equally significant is the relationship I will establish, on an analytic level, between Lonergan's discussion of the various levels of bias and his treatment of the different kinds of conversion and their impact on the social order (progress and decline).

This project will begin with an analysis and critical assessment of what African Catholic bishops (and some theologians) have said about ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa. I will then analyze Lonergan's treatment of bias and the cycle of decline and explore their interconnection with processes of conversion, dialogue and dialectic, as these contribute to overcoming bias and promoting an enlarged vision of the human good. Based on my interpretation of Lonergan's work, I will explore and evaluate its applicability to the ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa. I shall begin by looking at the ethnic and inter-religious conflict in Africa in light of official Catholic teaching and as treated by the 1994 African synod and the post-Synodal statements of Pope John Paul II. I will assess these texts in terms of their analyses of the problem and explore their solutions.

In the second chapter I will explore Lonergan's treatment of bias and the cycle of decline especially as treated in *Insight: a study of Human*

Understanding (1957, 1997) and *Method in Theology* (1972, 1996). Lonergan enumerated four kinds of bias: dramatic bias, individual bias, group bias, and the general bias of common sense. Dramatic bias is the blind spot, scotoma, which clouds one's understanding and which eventually leads to the rejection of truth. The general bias of common sense often combines with group bias to exclude some fruitful ideas and mutilate others by compromise. Given that Lonergan's use of the term bias is different from the common usage, I will engage the work of Kenneth Melchin to better understand the origin and development of the term and why Lonergan discussed bias in the context of the cognitional process he delineates. I shall conclude the chapter with a critical analysis of the significance of Lonergan's work on bias vis-à-vis the cycle of decline for the problem of ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa. It should be pointed out that Lonergan's book *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* was originally published by Longmans, Green & Co., London in 1957. A second corrected students edition was published in 1958, followed by a third edition in 1970 by Philosophical Library, New York, and a fourth paperback edition by Harper & Row in 1978. The fifth edition is a revised, critical edition prepared by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, which appeared as volume three of the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan published by the University of Toronto Press in 1992. In this study I will use the third edition, which will be referred to as *Insight*, and the fifth edition, which will be cited as *Insight: CW*.

In the third chapter, I will discuss overcoming bias as a component in self-transcendence. The world mediated by meaning, says Lonergan, can be shown to be the real world only if one can show that the process of experiencing, understanding and judging is a process of self-transcendence. The four levels of conscious intentionality: experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding are one and the same process. The lower levels complement the higher and the higher sublates the lower. In *Method* Lonergan describes conversion as a change in direction and "a change for the better." By the process of conversion one frees oneself from inauthenticity and grows in authenticity. Harmful misleading satisfactions are dropped and values that have previously been overlooked are embraced. When scales of preferences shift, ideologies are dismantled and one leaves oneself open to authentic new ideas. That is why Lonergan says there is the need for conversion in the subject. He describes different types of conversion: religious,

moral, and intellectual. I will discuss the work of the Robert Doran to better understand the origin and development of Lonergan's work on self-transcendence vis-à-vis conversion. I will conclude the chapter with a critical appraisal of how Lonergan's work on conversion can be used in solving ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa.

In the fourth chapter I will discuss overcoming bias as a component in social processes. The chapter will begin with an examination of the role of dialogue and dialectic in Lonergan's theological method and its implication for social theory and practice. Lonergan makes a distinction between judgments of fact and judgments of value vis-à-vis "objective values" or "cultural relativism." Judgment of fact purports to state either what is or what is not. Judgment of value purports to state what is truly good or not truly good. Thus the difference between judgments of fact and judgments of value lie in their content and structure. But the advantage judgment of value has over and above judgment of fact is that it goes beyond intentional self-transcendence and is not merely concerned with knowing but doing. In the moral order, therefore, judgment of value is a reality. For by it the subject moves beyond mere knowing and shows himself/herself as capable of moral self-transcendence. I will bring Shawn Copeland's work on the vision of the human good into the discussion, to better understand how overcoming bias is a component in social processes of clarifying and promoting the common good. I will conclude the chapter by suggesting ways Lonergan's treatment of dialogue, dialectic, and the common good can be used as a solution in Africa.

In the fifth chapter, I will give a brief summary of the project. Drawing on Lonergan's work, I will develop a revision of the African Synod statement on ethnic and inter-religious conflict. I will close by evaluating the assets and limitations of Lonergan's contributions to this project.

CHAPTER I

HARSH REALITY AND CONFLICTING WORLDVIEWS: THE CASE OF WEST AFRICA

Racial tension and struggle for ethnic identity and recognition is not a new phenomenon (Sithole 1995, 122). In the modern quest for democracy and an open market economy, pluralism is considered an asset and diversity a thing to be celebrated. But history is replete with examples of cultures and civilizations that have spurned diversity in their quest to enthrone a monolithic culture. Such repression continues even to this day. Examples abound of violent ethnic conflicts the world over, particularly among nations in the process of nation-building. Africa is particularly notorious for group conflicts: racial, ethnic, tribal, and religious conflicts. In Sudan there is warfare between the Arab Muslim and black African Muslim and black African Christians, and in South Africa seething discontent characterizes the relationships between white South Africans and their black counterparts (Hunt and Walker 1974, 4). While South Africa is notorious for racial conflict, ethnic/tribal and religious conflicts are the hallmarks of the rest of sub-Saharan Africa.

Who is an African? Is it the skin color that makes one an African? What distinguishes an African? Can one legitimately speak of an African identity or African identities? (Mwikamba 1989, 96). David Robinson has observed that from "the perspective of the West and the Mediterranean, Africa is 'black' and coincides with the part of the continent below the Sahara Desert- sub-Saharan Africa. Outside of the continent most scholars, students, and otherwise-informed people do not think of Africa and Africans under these definitions" (Robinson 2004, xvii). The question of what makes one an African is still problematic. But regardless of how one defines an African, many Africans today see their Africanness in their ethnic and cultural roots, i.e. they

see themselves as Ibo, Yoruba, Akan, Ashanti, Hausa, Kikuyu, and Ganda (Mwikamba 1989, 96). This African way of conceptualizing their identity renders futile an attempt at a general definition. Suffice it to say an attempt to define an African often proves abortive. As Bolaji Idowu rightly observed, "we have in Africa a continent of a multitude of nations, myriads of peoples, countless languages or dialects, and peoples of various levels of culture" (Idowu 1973, 82). One cannot in fairness speak of Africa as if it were a homogenous whole. However, since an identity of a particular group implies their sharing of a culture (Mwikamba 1989, 96), in spite of the differences in language and ethnicity, there are still sufficient affinities and similarities to speak of an African culture and identity (ibid. 97).

Reference to Africa here is mainly to Africa south of the Sahara. I have used the words 'ethnic' and 'tribal' interchangeably because in sub-Saharan Africa ethnic and tribal designations are sometimes used synonymously. I will however, begin by attempting a definition of the terms 'tribe' and 'ethnicity,' since the two terms do not necessarily mean the same thing. For as Masipula Sithole correctly notes, in many African societies, ethnicity and tribal affiliation have a great potential for danger. Yet it is doubtful that ethnicity can be eliminated altogether, in Africa or anywhere else (Sithole 1995, 122).

I shall attempt an analysis of ethnic conflicts, as well as an analysis of religious conflicts in sub-Saharan African countries. What is at the root of these conflicts? How far back can we trace them? I will embark on a historical investigation in an attempt to get at the root of the problem. The kind of historical investigation I shall embark on is that which seeks historical knowledge, which Lonergan says, "is an instance of knowledge" (Lonergan 1971, 175), of which a few people are in possession. I have used Nigeria as a case study because of the firm conviction that Nigeria, with its volatile ethnic and religious groups, provides a good sample that can effectively capture the nature of tribal and religious tension that continues to engulf sub-Saharan Africa. My goal in this historical investigation is to highlight (as Lonergan says) history as that which is "concerned with the drama of life, with what results through the characters, their decisions, their actions, and not only because of them but also because of their defects, their oversights, their failures to act" (ibid. 179).

Since these ethnic conflicts have ramifications (political, social, and religious) in all aspects of life in Africa and beyond, I will briefly high-

light the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace's and the African Synod of Bishops' analyses of the problem. I shall also attempt an analysis of solutions to these conflicts. I shall take a look at the solutions proffered by the African Synod of bishops and John Paul II's Post-Synodal response to these solutions. I will conclude the chapter with a critical appraisal of the analyses offered by the African synod and John Paul II in his Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation.

NIGERIA AS A CASE STUDY

Historical investigations are not always joyful, especially if the memories are not pleasant. But, if as Lonergan rightly asserts, historical knowledge is an instance of knowledge (ibid. 175), and in historical investigations "whether slow and broad or rapid and short, the psychological present reaches into its past by memories and into its future by anticipations" (ibid. 177), then it becomes necessary to embark on such a venture in a work like this.

   Much of Africa's political landscape began to take shape after the 1885 Berlin Conference, which took place with no Africans present (Schreiter 1992, 9). The Berlin Conference was held in Berlin from November 15, 1884 to January 31, 1885, under the leadership of Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany. The Conference was attended by every western power at the time, with the exception of the United States and Switzerland. Not a single African state or representative was invited. Adu Boahen has argued that the Conference was convoked with a view to formulating rules of conduct, "particularly to avoid any armed confrontations among the imperial powers" (Boahen 1987, 133). In Boahen's analysis, the Berlin Conference did not start the Scramble for Africa but "merely accelerated a race that was already in progress." The map of Africa stemming from the Conference took no account of the ethnic complexity of the various peoples of Africa. As a result of this, political boundaries, as they exist today, are merely artificial, cutting through ethnic groups and in some cases dividing ethnic groups and lumping them with other groups with whom they have no affiliation whatsoever. The results have been tragic, with ethnic rivalries boiling over to civil wars.

> The civil wars represent one of the three tragic ways that Africa has been depleted of its human resources and thus had its development hindered. The first was the European and American slave trade

from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries. The second is this perduring state of interethnic warfare. And the third is the spread of the AIDS epidemic across Central Africa.

In Southern Africa another word was added to the vocabulary of societal conflict: apartheid. While there is hope that the legislation that supported the ideology of racial separation is coming to an end, the conditions that make it possible and that sustain it in fact if not in law remain firmly in place (Schreiter 1992, 9-10).

Most African countries, since independence, have been faced with the problem of going beyond ethnic affiliations and weaving together its diverse peoples who have little or no sense of a common destiny (Hunt and Walker 1974, 264). Nigeria, the most populous African nation, has had to grapple with this situation and to this day is still struggling to weld together its diverse peoples. British contact with the area now known as Nigeria began around 1553 when the British explorers engaged the natives in commerce, mainly slave trade and agriculture. The steps towards the creation of Nigeria did not begin until the annexation of Lagos in 1861, when Lagos, inhabited by the Yoruba-speaking people of the southwest, was declared a British protectorate. In the 19th century contacts were established with the Ibo-speaking people of the southeast and later extended to the Hausa-speaking people of the north. In 1914, these three regions were merged together and given the name Nigeria, a name derived from the river Niger, which runs from the south end of the country to the north. Of the three regions, none was homogenous. Although the Hausa-Fulani dominate the north, about a third of their population does not speak Hausa. Other autonomous ethnic groups also live in the region: including the Nupe, Tiv, Igala, and Idoma people. In the west where the Yorubas are in the majority there are other autonomous ethnic groups like the Ijaw, Bini, Ishan, etc. The southeast where the Ibos are in the majority also have other ethnic groups like the Efik, Calabar, Ikwerre and Ogoni, etc.

Today Nigeria has an estimated population of over one hundred million (compared to the US, for example, which has an estimated population of 250 million). Geographically, Nigeria is about twice the size of California, with a total area of about 923, 768 sq km. The country also has about two hundred and fifty languages and countless number of dialects spoken by distinct ethnic groups. Though the Yoruba, Ibo, and Hausa, the three main ethnic groups, contend for influ-

ence and power, other ethnic groups spread across the three regions also see themselves as distinct peoples and also contend for power. Even before the 1914 amalgamation of Nigeria, warfare had been a common feature of life among the different clans that lived side by side. Reasons for this warfare, among other causes, were commerce and politics (of which differences in ethnicity was a part). The British colonial policy heightened the existing tensions among the different ethnic groups it brought under its protectorate. The British did not care about the ethnic complexities of the different people they unified under their rule. The British policy itself, which severely limited Christian missionary contacts with the north, had its own adverse effects on the region. One can make the argument that such a policy deprived (for better or worse) the north of Western style of education. "The core of Hausa-Fulani society was only lightly touched by westernization" (ibid. 271), though Muslim-Arab based education prevailed in the region. The situation was however different in the south. The Ibos and the Yorubas who had contact with the Christian missionaries embraced a Western lifestyle and education. The result of this was that the south was became economically buoyant and more modernized than the north. Since the Yorubas and Ibos were more educated by Western standards, they controlled the country's civil service and commerce. Even in northern Nigeria, the more affluent Yorubas and Ibos dominated the civil service and commerce, a situation that was highly resented by their northern neighbors. They were "regarded by the northerners as somewhat exploitative outsiders" (ibid. 273). A culmination of this animosity and other subsequent political tensions (especially the refusal of the northern representatives to endorse the request that the British grant Nigeria independence in 1956) led to such riots as the Kano riot of 1953 and the ethnic massacre of 1966 where countless number of southerners in the north, especially Ibos, were massacred by the Hausas.

Nigeria has not been able to forge a national identity since independence in 1960. Many reasons can be adduced for this, one of these being the realization that the creation of Nigeria had been much more the result of British effort than of Nigeria's. The former Director of Operations at the Center for Advanced Social Science (CASS), Port Harcourt, and political science scholar, Dr. Ekeng Anam-Ndu, in an interview published 25 November, 2003 in Daily Independent Newspaper, advanced the view that since 1966 it has not been easy to define

the Nigerian state outside a small corps of retired military generals. Dr. Anam-Ndu traced the root cause of the nation's problems back to the colonial period. "At colonial exit," he asserted, "Nigeria was internally crippled with ethno-regional imbalance: socially mobilized Eastern and Western Regions, and politically advantaged Northern Region by virtue of its population advantage and the winner-takes all electoral practice of the erstwhile parliamentary system." The situation, according to Dr. Anam-Ndu, has made the Nigerian state, forty-three years after independence, still retain the "same complexion of a colonial state except that it became internally colonized by heirs to the colonial administration. The problem of access to power, which was the core issue, is yet to be addressed."

The renowned nationalist and revered politician, Chief Obafemi Awolowo, once called Nigeria a "mere geographical expression" (Awolowo 1947, 47-8). Nigeria is still polarized along tribal and religious lines. Nigeria leads Africa and the world in religious beliefs. A survey of people's religious beliefs carried out in 2004 by ICM poll for BBC program revealed that Nigeria is the most religious nation in the world. Over ninety percent of Nigerians, according to the poll, claim they pray regularly and would die for their belief. Among the countries polled were the US, UK, Israel, India, South Korea, Indonesia, Russia, Mexico, and Lebanon. Over eighty percent of those polled from these countries believe in a God or a higher power. Nigeria was a hundred percent. But this religious fervor has come with some negative consequences. The Hausa-Fulani of the north remain predominantly Muslim, the Ibos of the southeast predominantly Christian, and Yorubas of the southwest largely Christian with a significant Muslim population. This cultural divide has been compounded by economic, educational, and political disparity. "The north is characterized by economic underdevelopment but political dominance, while the southern part of the country is economically advantaged and developed" (Mmoma 1995, 314). The problem between the ethnic groups transcends regional division. The competing identities of the Muslim and Christian cultures have helped fuel the tension (ibid. 316). The Christian-Muslim tension is not unrelated to the manipulation of the populace by the elite class. As Dr. Anam-Ndu rightly cautioned in his 25 November, 2003 interview with Daily Independent newspaper, "We should be reminded that the struggle to end colonialism in Nigeria was not waged by some national-oriented nationalists. This is a fact which has

affected the fortunes of our nation building ever since." Anam-Ndu continued:

> with the coming to power of the military in 1966, itself a reflection of the imbalance, its massive capital accumulation, domination of oil, finance and shipping sectors and control of the political machine in the country, the Nigerian state can hardly be defined outside a small corps of retired generals …. as the experience in the 1998/99 and 2003 elections has largely shown nationwide, it is they (retired generals) that can decide who should be what, where and why.

There have always been elements of distrust between Muslims and Christians in Nigeria over each other's political agenda (Hackett 1999, 252). This mutual distrust is not unconnected with the way the country has been partitioned in the wake of the discovery of oil and the scramble for national wealth: Muslim north and Christian south. It would seem that Christians in particular live in morbid fear of the Muslim north, alleging that the latter would do anything to turn the country into a Muslim nation. "Many Christians would rather single out two paradigmatic events- -the acrimonious national debates in Nigeria over the attempt by revivalist Muslims to establish a federal Sharia court of appeal in 1979 during the drawing up of the constitution, and the decision of the Babangida government to join the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) in 1986" (ibid.). These incidents further compounded theories of Muslim domination and manipulation and politicization of religion by government. They were followed by violent skirmishes between Muslims and Christians. A study produced in 1986, regarding Muslim-Christian violence in Nigeria, by the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies at Kuru, alludes to the long-standing uneasy relationship between Christians and some Muslim groups as the remote cause of the conflict. While Christians living in predominantly Muslim areas, on the one hand, feel that their constitutional rights are being violated by the latter's denial of their religious freedom, the Muslims, on the other hand, feel that Christian churches and institutions are mushrooming in predominantly Muslim areas and feel the need to curb that development (ibid. 253).

The Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria

The Catholic bishops of Nigeria have at various times responded to the myriads of problems facing the country. The bishops, under the

umbrella of the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria (CBCN) have consistently spoken out against the state of affairs. They admit that all is not well with the country and lament the government's inability "to ensure safety of life and property of its citizenry" (Communiqué March 2001). Crime waves continue to rise unabated. "Armed robbery, assassinations, cultism, drug peddling, bank fraud, rape, are common occurrences" (Schineller 2003, 39). In 2002 the bishops condemned the "cloudy and turbulent" political climate. They contended that Nigeria was witnessing a disturbing rate of assassinations, and the use of paid thugs to settle political scores. They urged the government to urgently address this "culture of violence, scheming, plotting, betraying, and lying to the people."

> Recent tragic events have brought to light again the unresolved **Nigerian factor**: why do people feel insecure outside their native homes in times of crisis? The massive exodus of people during the past few weeks has exposed the fragility of the unity we talk so much about. This situation will continue for as long as Nigerians are made to feel as foreigners in any part of our nation. How we have been handling issues like State of Origin and Quota System calls for honest and serious appraisal (ibid. 42-3).

The bishops also decried the religious tension engulfing the country. Nigeria is a multi-religious society and as such no state religion exists, neither can a religious group arrogate to itself the exclusive right of marking state occasions according to its own particular form of religious worship. In a communiqué issued at the end of their first plenary meeting for the year 2003, the CBCN emphatically stated: "Religious intolerance and inter-religious violence have continued to threaten the peace, unity and stability of our nation." The bishops referred to the imposition of Sharia Law in some states as a threat to the country's peace and called such imposition "grossly irresponsible and unacceptable." The only acceptable religion of the state, the bishops contended, is that religious freedom enshrined in the country's constitution, which guarantees everyone the right and duty to worship God as they please (Schineller 2003, 45). The Sharia (Arabic *shari'a*) is the traditional Islamic law that regulates the religious and secular life of the Muslim. Since Islam does not make a distinction between the secular and the religious, the Sharia governs the every day life of the Muslim. Sharia law is based on the *Qur'an* (Muslim scripture), the *Sunnah* (literally means "the Way," i.e. the way Prophet Muhammad lived his life,

and the *Hadith* (a collection of the sayings and deeds of Prophet Muhammad). In theory, the nature of the Sharia is such that it provides and caters for the spiritual and physical well-being of the Muslim. But some would contend that the theory and practice of the law have been diametrically opposed. Some people in Nigeria have had their hands or some of their limbs amputated by Sharia courts in northern Nigeria. D. Robinson has done a fine work on the historical origin and development of the Sharia. According to his historical study, after the death of the holy prophet, Mohammed, the new Muslim community, which he founded, under the leadership of Caliph Uthman and other close associates of the Prophet, embarked on a task of developing a scripture. They established the text of the Quran, within the first generation after the holy Prophet's death. "A second sequence, working out rights and responsibilities that would govern Muslim conduct, took about two centuries; its product was Islamic law or Sharia. The main laboratories for this development were schools of 'lawyers' who lived in the key cities and worked under the patronage of the ruling classes" (Robinson 2004, 11).Robinson describes the Sharia as "a 'portable' version of Islam that could be carried into the various times and situations of Africa and other parts of the world. It could be referred to in courts of law, palaces, or private settings to remind people of their obligations or adjudicate disputes. It is in the Sharia as well as in the Quran that we find the five fundamental obligations that Muslims follow" (ibid. 15).

In a communiqué issued at the end of their Second Plenary Meeting in September 2003, the CBCN declared:

> In recent times Nigeria has negative international attention over the imposition of the Sharia as criminal law in some parts of the country. Although there are as yet no precedents of death by stoning as prescribed by the Sharia, it is odious to hear that such sentence is currently looming over the head of a citizen of this country, Amina Lawal. We have persistently called for a decisive position on the part of the government on the issue of Sharia law that is consistent with the Constitution of this country. We sincerely hope that government is not waiting for yet another orgy of violence before taking appropriate action.

In that communiqué, the bishops regretted the wanton destruction of lives and property that have resulted from the spate of ethnic and tribal division. They notably condemned the intrusion of this ethnic

division in the church. "Within the Church, the 'son of the soil' syndrome with regard to ecclesiastical appointments and in other spheres of the Church's life is a source of serious concern." The phrase "son of the soil" is a common phrase used in Nigeria to denote undue or unwarranted favor bestowed on a particular individual or a group of people with regard to political appointments simply because the person or persons concerned are original natives of the particular region in which the political appointment is taking place. The policy is often divisive because it discriminates against other well-qualified (sometimes better qualified) individuals who are not natives of the region. Unfortunately this "son of the soil" syndrome or policy is sometimes used in regard to ecclesiastical appointments. The Pontifical Commission *Iustitia et Pax* also acknowledged this debilitating effect of tribal opposition regarding ecclesiastical appointments when it noted that these tribal oppositions not only endanger the common good but also create difficulties for the life of the Churches, especially pertaining to the acceptance of pastors from other ethnic groups (Pontifical Commission 1988, 21).

Several factors, according to the findings of CBCN, are responsible for the Nigerian crisis. Some, they believe, "go back to the historical foundations of the nation, and others have arisen more recently" (CBCN Communiqué March 2001). The bishops condemned those politicians who exploit the country's "religious differences, as well as ethnic divisions for selfish ends." These ethnic and religious tensions, the bishops contended, severely threaten the peace and unity of the nation. The bishops called for a truce and urged that all work towards the attainment of peace. "There is a very close link between peace, justice and development. Peace is only possible where there is justice, and where there is peace and justice it is possible to have authentic development." The bishops echoed the words of Pope Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio* that the new name for peace is development. Peace, they continued, is also to be understood as mercy, forgiveness, compassion, and love. As a step to attaining this peace, the bishops called for dialogue. They also insisted on the need for a National Conference that will examine the sources of conflict and propose measures to heal the divisions of in the country.

This "culture of violence" has been a threat to the very fabric of our existence as a country since independence in 1960. In Nigeria, like in most African countries, ethnicity and religion are often linked and

often constitute the source of violence. The Nigerian Catholic bishops have never hidden their dismay for this trend. Seeing no reason why all should not be equal before the law, the bishops, in the same March 2001 communiqué, condemned "all forms of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, etc. In our country all discrimination based on ethnic groups (tribalism) should find no place in our social life." As a solution, the bishops reiterated the need for ecumenical collaboration and mutual respect for one another's belief (not theological disputes) in differences of faith. They listed the following ecumenical collaboration as on-going efforts in the search for peace:

> Worthy of mention are the National Institute for Training in Moral Education (popularly known as Project TIME) located in Lagos; the Christian Health Association of Nigeria (CHAN) with its pharmaceutical adjunct (CHANPHARM); and the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), established to embrace all the Christian denominations in Nigeria.

> Project TIME was established in 1971 as an Institute where students of all faiths including Muslims are trained as teachers of religion in primary and post-primary institutions. It is recognized by the Federal Government, sponsored by the University of Ibadan, and is jointly owned and run by the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria and the Protestant Christian Council of Nigeria.

> The CHAN coordinates all the medical activities of the Christian Churches while CAN was officially launched nationally in February 1980, can act as a prophetic voice of the entire Christian Churches in Nigeria. CAN's aim is "to serve as a basis of response to the unity of the Church, to act as a liaison committee for consultation and common action, to be a watch-dog of the spiritual and moral welfare of the nation; to promote understanding among the various peoples and strata of society in Nigeria, and above all, to propagate the Gospel."

ETHNIC AND TRIBAL CONFLICTS

African theologians, aware of the myriads of problems that confront African Christians, have written in large part to address these issues. But their theologizing seem to center mostly on issues of inculturation and development which, without doubt, are as urgent as most problems confronting the African, and even more so more if the African

church is to rid itself of what has been perceived as "undue western influence." But some have also addressed, at least implicitly, the twin issues of ethnic and religious conflict in sub-Saharan Africa and have called for dialogue as a means of solution. (Uzukwu 1996). Some have even written on the issue of racism and violation of human rights in South Africa (Okolo 1982). Benezet Bujo (1998), one of the prominent figures whose work address injustices and violation of human rights in Africa, has drawn attention to the issues of globalization and modern technology, which he argued, create a "monoculture" that negatively impacts Black Africa. Bujo calls for an "African ethic" that is based on both inculturation and dialogue (Bujo 1982). But these issues, as valuable as they might be, do not address directly the hot issue of ethnic and religious conflict.

How were tribes formed? Or put differently, how do people gain tribal or ethnic identity? There is still no agreement as to what constitutes ethnic or tribal identity and attempts to define these terms are still elusive. Many agree, however, that ethnic and tribal differences "are socially constructed and historically situated, that is, selectively chosen and interpreted modes of human representation" (Hinze 1998, 163). The usage of tribal designation is sometimes controversial, since tribal groups vary in size, ranging from a few hundred people to several million. "Some of them have at one time been masters of fair-sized empires with elaborate administrative structures, with a written history which recounts the glorious deeds of their ancestors. Others are small groups … whose time perspective is limited to the oral tradition conveyed by the elders" (Hunt and Walker 1974, 264).

The term "tribe" should not be confused with "tribalism." A tribe has traits and unique attributes like language (in some cases dialects), custom, religion, and unique dress pattern that distinguish it from other groups. While "tribe" may have a positive connotation, "tribalism" is a negative phenomenon that is rooted in pride and prejudices of a group, both as the group perceives itself and as others perceive the group. James Coleman, speaking of tribes as used by the British colonial administration in Nigeria, described it as a clan descended from one legendary ancestor, speaking one language, though not the same dialect (ibid.). Missionaries, anthropologists and the colonial rulers referred to "any group of clans under recognized chiefs" as tribes (Sithole 1995, 125).

Richard Jenkins (1977) has traced the origin of the word 'ethnicity' to the Greek, "ethnos" and has found that it was used in reference to a wide range of situations in which a collectivity of humans lived and acted together. In today's usage ethnicity is considered central in the politics of group differentiation in culturally diverse democracies. Jenkins cites Max Weber as propounding the view that an ethnic group is that which is based on belief shared by people of common descent. For Jenkins, then, ethnicity is about cultural differentiation. "Ethnicity as a social identity is collective and individual, externalized in social interaction and internalized in personal self-identification" (Jenkins, 1997, 9-14).

Ethnicity is "a matter of ascription that is functionally continuous with kinship claiming a unique geographical origin." At the heart of ethnicity are the factors of language, history, culture, religion, and the perception of physical appearance, which fosters identity, solidarity, a sense of close relationship, and loyalty among group members (Mmoma 1995, 313). Put differently, ethnicity is the consciousness among people who share the same cultural, linguistic, kinship, and religious roots (Muigai 1995, 161). In sub-Saharan Africa, ethnic groups are distinguished more by communal characteristics of shared language and common boundary (psycho-social dimension) more than by physical appearance. Ethnic groups are not homogenous for there are sub-ethnic groups within a given ethnic group (Sithole 1995, 124). There is therefore no substantial difference in the terms 'tribe' and 'ethnicity' as used in the African context. For, as Masipula Sithole rightly observed, "there is no substantive difference in the psychological make up of the "nationality man" and the "ethnic" or "tribal man" … A nationality is thus a tribe writ large. Ethnicism or tribalism is, therefore, nationalism writ small" (Ibid. 126).

Africa is a diverse continent, blessed with great human potential, rich in cultural values, and natural resources. About thirty to forty years ago when many African countries gained independence, a sense of optimism was ushered in especially regarding political, economic, social, and cultural development. Many years after independence, Africa still remains economically poor and politically unstable. Many destructive forces have robbed, and continue to threaten, the integral development of the peoples and nations of Africa (USCCB 2001, 11). "Africa is full of problems … there is abject poverty, tragic mismanagement of available scarce resources, political instability and social disorienta-

tion" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 40). Most of Africa may be at peace, but some of the world's deadliest conflicts continue to rage on the continent. Tribal affiliation, language, and religion constitute key axes of ethnic conflict in Africa. The war in Zaire, now Democratic Republic of Congo, which resulted in about 3 million deaths in three years (1998-2001) alone, is a war fought out of an ethnic/tribal motive. "The near-genocidal war in Sudan, which has raged on for eighteen years and is fueled by a systematic campaign of Islamization and Arabization, has resulted in 2 million dead and twice that many displaced" (USCCB 2001, 15). The civil wars in Sierra-Leone and Liberia and the gory amputation of arms and legs that accompany it, and "the depopulation of large areas in Angola, and fierce fighting in Burundi further illustrate a legacy of death and destruction that has set back efforts to promote poverty eradication and long-term development" (ibid.).

Before the advent of European explorers in the African continent there were instances of sporadic ethnic skirmishes among the various ethnic groups in the continent, as there were among ethnic groups the world over. Ethnic tension and tribal conflicts in Africa were further fuelled by colonialism. The legacy of colonialism has contributed to the conflict, disorder, and animosity among the different ethnic groups especially in sub-Saharan Africa. "Conflict and instability in Sudan, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and elsewhere can be traced to colonial programs of alienation, discrimination, social exclusion, and manipulation of ethnic identity intended to ensure domination and control over vast geographical areas and tremendous human and natural resources" (ibid. 12). Boundaries of most national states were artificially constructed and made to reflect the political or economic concerns of the ruling colonial powers rather than reflect the existing African ethnic distinctions. This fact was acknowledged by the Pontifical Commission *Iustitia Et Pax*, "Within the artificial borders left behind by the colonial powers, cohabitation by the ethnic groups with different traditions, languages, cultures and even religions, often runs up against obstacles of mutual hostilities that can be characterized racist" (Pontifical Commission 1988, 21). The effect of such artificially constructed boundaries lingers on to this day. "The disappearance of colonial regimes or situations of racial discrimination has therefore not always meant the end of racism in States which have become independent in Africa and Asia" (ibid. 20-21). Africa is

still beleaguered by a "gross lack of correlation between political and ethnic boundary lines" (Hunt and Walker 1995, 18). Several ethnic groups are separated by artificial national boundaries. The Ewe speaking people of Ghana, for instance, are not confined to Ghana but are also scattered in parts of Togo and Cote D'Ivoire, the Bantu people of Rwanda are found in several East African countries. The Hausa and the Yoruba people of Nigeria are also found in several West African countries, to mention a few. In post-colonial Africa, the ruling class, mainly politicians and military leaders, often employ the same colonial methods to harness resources for their own narrow ends (USCCB 2001, 12).

Pre-colonial Africa had federated states and kingdoms (like the Mali empire, Songhai empire, Yoruba kingdom, and the Hausa kingdoms, etc) that were ethnically based. But the colonial powers paid little or no consideration to this and developed "a network of territories with little relation to indigenous African ethnicity" (Hunt and Walker 1995, 19). In the wake of the nationalist movements of the 1950s and 1960s, African rulers, at independence, accepted the artificial boundaries created by the colonial powers. Adu Boahen has rightly observed that the states established by the imperial colonial powers have proved to be more of a liability that an asset to the present independent African nations. He reasoned that had the boundaries of these states been laid down in accordance with any well-defined, rational criteria and in full cognizance of the ethno-cultural, geographical, and ecological realities of Africa, the outcome would have been wholesome. But unfortunately many of the boundaries were arbitrarily drawn on African maps in the chancelleries of the imperial powers in Europe. The result has been that most of these states are artificial creations, and this very artificiality has created very serious problems, many of which have still not been solved (Boahen 1987, 95-6).

The result of this was that practically every country in Africa contained a number of ethnic groups, practicing different customs, speaking different languages, and following different religions (Hunt and Walker 1995, 19). Or as Adu Boahen succinctly puts it, "Because of the artificiality of these boundaries, each independent African state is made up of a whole host of different ethno-cultural groups and nations having different historical traditions and cultures and speaking different languages" (Boahen 1987, 96). The net result of this has been a divided loyalty, lack of national identity, and revolt from ethnic groups

that found themselves in a minority among other ethnic groups. Boahen has argued that the artificial boundaries created by the imperial powers have not only created multi-ethnic states, but worse still run across preexisting nations, ethnicities, states, kingdoms, and empires. "The Bakongo, for instance, are divided by the boundaries of the Congo, Zaire, Angola, and Gabon. Some of the Ewes live in Ghana, some in Togo, and others in Benin, while the Akan are found in the Ivory Coast and Ghana. The Somali are shared among Ethiopia, Kenya, and Somalia. The Senufo now live in Mali, the Ivory Coast, and Burkina Faso. Is it surprising, then, that there have been boundary disputes among Ghana and the Ivory Coast, Ghana and Togo, Burkina Faso and Mali, Nigeria and Cameroons, Somalia and Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia, Sudan and Uganda?" (ibid.).

The Hausa- speaking people of Niger republic, for instance, often identify with the Hausa-speaking people of Nigeria and the Yoruba-speaking people of Benin Republic would rather identify with the Yoruba-speaking people of Nigeria than identify with the other non-Yoruba-speaking ethnic groups of Benin Republic. This brings to the fore the issue of land reform. Both the colonial land agreements and the post-colonial reform programs have been based on "unjust expropriation, and have perpetuated and deepened poverty and underdevelopment" (USCCB 2001, 12). The Southern African Catholic Bishops Conference has been very vocal in this regard, lamenting the idea of concentrating an overwhelming proportion of the productive land in South Africa in the hands of the minority, who historically obtained the land by unjust means. "Zimbabwe is a most egregious example of where violence, instability, the suspension of the rule of law, and corruption has marred attempts by African governments to address land reform (USCCB 2001, 12).

Ethnic cleavages sometimes take the form of clan conflicts. Though the Somali people share a common language, religion (Sunni Islam), physical characteristics, and oral traditions, clan conflicts have become part and parcel of the society such that the conflicts have "been recorded in Somali classical poetry and other forms of oral folklore" (Adam 1995, 197). Clan conflict is fueled by clan prejudices and struggles for control of the available meager resources. Rather than seek the good of all, each one seeks the good of their clan. Even proverbs in Somalia are "analyzed in terms of clan consciousness" (ibid. 199). Adam lists, as causes of clan warfare in Somalia, elite manipulation, struggle for

social justice and equality, historical memories, and environmental pressures. Thus clan warfare has its "basis in historical, sociocultural dynamics" (ibid. 203).

Attempts by African leaders to emphasize national consciousness and build a post-independent nation that transcends ethnic loyalties has not been very successful. Several reasons can be adduced. One was what Hunt and Walker described as the "differential assimilation of European culture" by the different ethnic groups during the colonial period. While some ethnic groups were exposed to a western lifestyle (education and technology especially), others were either not exposed to it or were not receptive to the idea in the first place. In Nigeria, for instance, while the Yoruba of the south-west and the Ibo people of the south-east were exposed to western education and lifestyle, the Hausa people of the north maintained their traditional way of life and were not allowed access to western ideas because of the British colonial policy under Lord Lugaard. The civil war of 1966-1970 was as a result of the competition between the highly educated Ibo and Yoruba of the South and the traditional oriented Hausa of the North. Another reason why post-colonial African countries have not been able to build national consciousness and foster national identity is corruption and bad governance. The Catholic bishops of Cameroon, in a September 3, 2000 Pastoral letter, spoke of corruption as having "attained suicidal level in our society. It is accepted as a normal way of life, so much so that those who practice it no longer feel the slightest guilt." Social and cultural factors within Africa contribute to this corruption and some of the practices of multilateral lending institutions and bilateral humanitarian assistance programs meant to eradicate poverty have inadvertently contributed to the deepening of corruption. These institutions and programs "have at times been blind to corruption and bad governance in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Kenya, Cameroon, and elsewhere, in the name of democracy and development" (USCCB 2001, 12). The resultant effect of corruption and bad governance is illiteracy, unemployment, lack of good health care, and friction among the different ethnic groups.

> Children are one of the groups most affected by poverty. Many die from hunger or lack of adequate health care. Millions face illiteracy, short life expectancies, and lack of family support. Others are forcibly conscripted into military service or co-opted by rebel militias. The number of orphans, street children, and child-headed house-

holds is in the tens of millions, as parents fall victim to disease or conflicts. African women also bear a disproportionate burden of poverty, lack of health care, and little political empowerment. The result is a self-reinforcing circle of poverty, death, the breakdown of family and other traditional support systems, loss of social identity, and deprivation (ibid. 13).

In the minds of pre-colonial Africans, colonialism and Christian evangelization were almost synonymous, since the missionaries came about the same time the colonial powers landed in Africa. The spread of Christianity or evangelization of Africa has been divided into three phases: (1) In the first phase, which goes back to the middle of the first century A.D., Christian missionaries took the Gospel to places like Egypt, Nubia (southern Egypt and northern Sudan), Ethiopia, and parts of North Africa. Pope Paul VI, speaking of the origin of Christianity in Africa, said its origins "go back to the times of the Apostles and are traditionally associated with the name and teaching of Mark the Evangelist." The pope recalled "the countless Saints, Martyrs, Confessors, and Virgins" the African church produced from the second to the fourth centuries A.D. He mentioned names of "great doctors and writers" like Origen, St. Athanasius, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine as some of the luminous sons of the African Church, not to mention the growth of the theological center in Alexandria. There were also some holy women like St. Monica, Saints Perpetua and Felicitas, and St. Thecla, to mention a few. The pope also paid homage to the contributions of Anthony of Egypt and Pachomius, founders of the monastic life, through whose example the monastic ideal spread to the East and West. (2) In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Portuguese missionaries began evangelizing the present day Benin, Sao Tome, Angola, Mozambique, Madagascar and other Sub-Saharan African regions. It was during this period, about 1622 A.D., that Pope Gregory XV "permanently erected the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* for the purpose of better organizing and expanding the missions. This second phase of evangelization of Africa came to an end in the 18th century because of "various difficulties" and "practically all the missions south of the Sahara" disappeared. (3) The third phase began in the mid-18th century to World War II with the establishment of the church in West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, and Southern Africa. Some of the countries evangelized at this period were Nigeria, Sierra-Leone, Ghana, Benin, South Africa,

Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia, Uganda, Sudan, Tanzania, Rwanda, and Burundi (USCCB 2001, 6).

Christian missionaries often worked side by side with their colonial counterparts. The colonial policy willy-nilly polarized the ethnic groups along religious lines. In Nigeria, for instance, while the Portuguese and Irish Christian missionaries were allowed to evangelize the Ibos and Yorubas of the south, they were allowed little or no contact with the Hausa-speaking people of the north. The colonial rulers at the time did not want to upset the traditional system already in place in northern Nigeria. They knew that Christian evangelization of the north would mean an introduction of western education and lifestyle, something the colonial administrator Lord Lugaard, for political and other reasons, feared most. While the south was Christian, the north remained, by and large, Muslim. It could be argued that the colonial policy introduced into the political landscape of Nigeria a religious dichotomy, making the north Muslim and the south Christian, thereby creating a religious divide. The numbers of people embracing Islamic tenets and principles continued to grow by leaps and bounds in the North. In the ensuing Islamic revolution that followed the rapid expansion of Islam from the Middle East to sub-Saharan Africa, the north essentially became Muslim. The difference in religion between the north and south created a new twist in the existing tension between northern and southern Nigeria. The same is true of many sub-Saharan African countries. As Michael Banton rightly observed, religious institutions often provide an outlet for the expression of sentiments that are of a secular character (Banton 1966, 46). Differences in religious beliefs and attitudes, as can be attested from several conflicts around the world, have historically led to conflicts among groups. These differences in religious beliefs can either be the primary source of conflict or exacerbate a conflict that arises from other conditions (Landis and Boucher 1986, 23).

Though conflict in Africa takes many forms, it manifests itself mainly in ethnic and religious tension. In many parts of Africa ethnicity and religion are linked. The policies adopted by the colonial rulers almost ensued religious homogeneity for people of the same clan or tribe. The colonial policy insured that one becomes, for instance, an Ibo and a Christian, and a Hausa and a Muslim. This link between ethnicity (culture) and religion has sadly been manipulated by the political elites to gain and consolidate political, economic, and social

control. "Situations in Southern Sudan, Burundi, and Rwanda testify to the ways that ethnic and cultural identity can be employed to cultivate a culture of deep suspicion and hatred between different ethnic groups, which can lead to genocide" (USCCB 2001, 15). About half a million ethnic Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda, in 1994 (about 8 percent of this mainly Catholic nation) were massacred in just three months.

> The use of religious identity—for example, the pitting of Muslims against Christians and Christians against Muslims- represents a   particularly disturbing development. The Sudanese government's systematic denial of religious liberty, human rights abuses, bombing of civilian populations, and enslavement of women and children demonstrate how religious and cultural identity can be manipulated to serve political and economic ends. This perversion of religion for political ends poisons areas of Africa and deprives many Africans of their lives and human rights (ibid. 16-7).

OFFICIAL CATHOLIC ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM OF ETHNIC AND TRIBAL CONFLICTS

The Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace

The Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace addresses the global issue of ethnic conflict within the larger framework of racial prejudice. The commission acknowledges that racial prejudice is at the heart of troubled relations between human groups in society, and rightly traces the history of ethnic conflict to the time of colonialism and slavery (Pontifical Commission 1988, 7). Cognizant of the fact that people, especially in the developing nations, do not necessarily differentiate between the exploits of the colonial powers and the missionary explorers, the commission sets out to clarify the Church's attitude towards the colonized people and to urge that people not confuse the work of evangelization and colonial imperialism. The Sacred Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, was created in 1622 in the spirit of evangelization. In 1659 the Congregation gave the following instruction to the Apostolic Vicars departing for the Chinese Kingdoms of Tankin Cochinchine, an instruction that clarified the Church's attitude to the missions, « Do not put any pressure on or bring forth any arguments to convince these peoples to change their rites, their customs and habits unless

they are obviously contrary to religion and morality. What could be more absurd than transporting France, Spain, Italy or any other European country to the Chinese. Do not present our countries to them but rather the faith … Do not try to substitute European customs for those of these peoples and be most careful to adapt yourself to them » (Pontifical Commission 1987, 12).

Referring to the racist ideology of the National-socialist Totalitarian Party of Germany, the commission makes it clear that the Church has always condemned racism, especially the racist ideology of the 18th century that tried to use science to affirm that the difference in skin color and physical characteristics supports the view that certain people belong to an inferior race. The offshoot of this racist ideology, the commission continues, are the "phenomena of exclusion or aggressivity" by which certain groups are alienated by the dominant group because of their physical appearance or ethnic, cultural or religious characteristic, as evidenced in the institutionalized racism (apartheid) of South Africa (ibid. 17). The commission regrets that the ushering in of independence after colonialism has not abated tribal hostilities. The commission also regrets that political boundaries of countries in some parts of the globe, developing nations especially, rarely coincide with those of its peoples, but at the same time urge that the rights of minorities be respected. A violation of these rights creates "ethnic conflicts and … tribal reflexes" (ibid. 20). These tribal conflicts not only endanger peace and the pursuit of the common good but also lead to "bloody conflicts which leave lasting impressions" (ibid. 21). The commission condemns all forms of ethnic prejudice and warns against cultural annihilation (ethnocide).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) also specifically addresses the African situation. Conflict in Africa, they argue, take many forms. "While most of Africa is at peace, some of the world's deadliest conflicts continue to rage on the continent. The near-genocidal war in Sudan, which has raged on for eighteen years and is fueled by a systematic campaign of Islamization and Arabization, has resulted in 2 million dead and twice that many displaced. The world cannot ignore this horrible abuse of power carried out by the Sudanese government. The war in the Democratic Republic of Congo has resulted in 3 million deaths in the past three years alone. Widespread amputation of arms and legs in Sierra-Leone, the depopulation of large areas in Angola, and fierce fighting in Burundi further

illustrate a legacy of death and destruction that set back efforts to promote poverty eradication and long-term development." The bishops further deplore the "manipulation of cultural and religious identity to gain and consolidate political, economic, and social control." They also condemn the situations in Sudan, Burundi, and Rwanda, etc, where ethnic and cultural identities are manipulated to "cultivate a culture of deep suspicion and hatred between different ethnic groups, which can lead to genocide" (USCCB 2001, 15).

African Synod of Bishops

The African synod of bishops, like the pontifical commission on Justice and Peace, deplores the division that characterizes the human community. Speaking in general terms, the 1994 synod of bishops condemned the inordinate lust for power and wealth that have led to wars and conflicts in human society. This inordinate lust for power, the bishops contend, has led to the division of the human race into first, second, third, and fourth worlds, and to the placing of more value on wealth than on life (Message of the Synod, 25).[1] At the root of this is "envy, jealousy, and the deceit of the devil [that] have driven the human Family to racism, to ethnic exclusivism, and to hidden violence of all forms" (ibid.).

Addressing the situation in Africa, the bishops acknowledged the "gross violations of human dignity and rights . . . . being perpetrated in many countries of Africa" (Proposition 46) and painfully admitted that Africa has, for some years been, "the theater of fratricidal wars" (Proposition 45a). At the 12th Plenary Assembly (October 2001) of the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM), the bishops noted, "Africa is faced with excess of conflicts, whose immediate effects are hate and division, rancor and revenge, a turning to force, violence and war." The bishops identified the years leading to the First World War, when the effort to establish universal peace on the basis of League of Nations failed, as remote factors leading to the conflict. "It was from the endless upheavals that led to the Second World War that independent Africa emerged." They blamed

---

1 Citation of the Synod's statement and John Paul II's Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation have been taken from Brown M. 1996. *The African Synod: Documents, Reflections, Perspectives* compiled and edited by the Africa Faith & Justice Network. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

the African conflict on "structures put in place by powers external to Africa during colonialism and the Cold War."

In the assessment of the 12th Plenary Assembly of SECAM, these ethnic tensions are largely derived from "antagonisms within states constituted artificially and at variance with basic social structures." They maintained that the African idea of tribe or ethnic identity has an inescapable value not only because it provided identification for an individual, but also because of the cohesion and social harmony it ensured. "The map of Africa stemming from the Berlin Conference took no account of historical, geographical, socio-cultural factors or of ethnic frontiers (Boahen 1987, 33). It led to the "balkanization of Africa," by which they mean the arbitrary division of Africa's political landscape. The seed of conflict, ethnic, regional, or religious, the bishops emphasized, was already sown in the "balkanization of Africa." In 1964 the Organization of African Unity's (OAU) summit in Cairo adopted a "principle of inviolability" in which the member states agreed not to redistrict the existing national boundaries of independent African States. The 12th Plenary Assembly of SECAM sees in OAU a paradox because it serves on one hand as an organization for unity, while on the other preserving the continent's causes of division by adopting the so called principle of inviolability. SECAM maintained that there still exists in Africa today "wars by proxy." They outlined two kinds of wars in Africa: wars waged by Africans on their own account and wars fought at the instigation of foreign powers (e.g. Angola and Democratic Republic of Congo). The latter they called "wars by proxy."

The bishops, far from putting all the blame on foreign powers, also blamed Africans for the immediate cause of the conflict. The root cause of African problems, they contend, is ethnic antagonism and rivalry, which predominate. The 1994 African synod traced the cause of the conflict to tribalism, nepotism, racism, religious intolerance, and thirst for power, by totalitarian regimes, which with impunity, infringe on the rights and dignities of innocent people (Proposition 45a). These totalitarian regimes, with their chambers of torture, are found in many African countries, this the bishops found unacceptable (Proposition 45b). They denounced inordinate thirst for power "as well as the idolatry of ethnicity which leads to fratricidal wars" (Message of the Synod 36). They lament the fact that, these ethnic conflicts and the wars that accompany them now make Africa seem like a continent where the greatest number of refugees and displaced persons are found (Message

of the Synod 36). The synod showed sympathy for the plight of refugees and displaced persons in war-torn countries like Rwanda, Sudan, Angola, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia and parts of Central Africa (Message of the Synod 37). The 12th Plenary Assembly of SECAM reiterated the same point, that "these bloody and unending African conflicts have effected the complete breakdown of precarious state structures and led rapidly to wide-ranging human tragedies: famines, huge displacement of populations, endless wars as in Southern Sudan and Somalia" (SECAM 2001).

John Paul II, Post-Synodal Exhortation

In his post-synodal exhortation, Pope John Paul II regrets the fact that the sense of optimism that Africans felt at independence has yet to materialize because of internal crisis and violence in many African countries. Africa is still "menaced on all sides by outbreaks of hatred and violence, by conflicts and wars" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation 57). The Pontiff laments the various forms of divisions in Africa, and painfully acknowledged that "within the borders left behind by the colonial powers, the co-existence of ethnic groups with different traditions, languages, and even religions often meet obstacles arising from serious mutual hostility" (ibid. 49). Tribal oppositions are not only detrimental to the common good, but endanger peace as well. This, in the mind of the pontiff, explains why so many African countries are "still in the grip of famine, war, racial and… political instability" (ibid. 51).

INTER-RELIGIOUS CONFLICTS

Religion plays a major role in African society. Africans are extremely religious and religion permeates all aspects of life (Mbiti 1969, 1). Yet much of the suffering inflicted on the poor masses is done in the name of religion. Farid Esack, writing about his experiences as a Muslim minority in South Africa, notes that much of the suffering inflicted on the people of South Africa in the hey-days of apartheid, was "committed in the name of, and sometimes with, the scriptural support of a religious tradition, more specifically, that of Christianity " (Esack 1997, 6).

Africa is a playground, not only of ethnic and tribal conflict, but also a place where men and women have been "wounded in their dignity

by the scourges of the colonial past, oppressed by wars, disturbed by so many sects … and victims of ideologies alien to their own cultures" (Proposition 2). In denouncing the "structural violence" prevalent in Africa, African bishops speak of violence as comprising "racism in all its forms, genocide, apartheid, assassinations performed in the name of religious fundamentalism" (SECAM 2001). Bishop Joseph Gasi Abangite of Tombura-Yambio (Sudan), speaking of the religious tension in Sudan described it as a "culture of hatred and violence." In a statement issued on August 6, 1999, the Catholic Bishops of East Africa reiterated the fact that Sudan has been going through a protracted civil war for close to two decades, a war the Catholic Bishops of East Africa described as having "assumed savage, fratricidal, and genocidal dimensions." Christians and members of African Traditional Religion have been the worst victims of this "fratricidal genocide." Cardinal Bernard Law who at the time was the Cardinal Archbishop of Boston and chairperson for International Policy Committee of the USCCB and who by virtue of his office was involved in peace mediation in Sudan, in a March 28, 2000 statement on Sudan, noted with regret, "people are losing their lives and denied their rights in part because of their faith." Similarly, in a communiqué issued at the end of the annual study session of the Association of Episcopal Conferences of Anglophone West Africa (AECAWA 2003), the bishops of Anglophone West Africa spoke of the gravity of religious intolerance in their sub-region and resolved not to allow religion "to be the reason for hatred, violence and conflict" in their sub-region.

OFFICIAL CATHOLIC ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM OF INTER-RELIGIOUS CONFLICTS

Pontifical Councils

The Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue recognizes the reality of religious conflict, especially in countries where Christians live side by side with their Muslim neighbors, or where Christians are in the minority. The council notes with regret that, differences in religion, race, ethnic group, social class, and gender, as valuable as they are to nation building, have been used to exacerbate frictions and social fragmentation in society. Of all the differentiating factors (class, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, etc) in a society, religious affiliation, since

it touches on deep emotions and inner convictions, has the greatest potential to create dissension and strife (Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue 1994, 55).

The Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace also acknowledged the tensions and conflicts that come with living in a multi-religious society but condemned discriminatory practices against "religious minorities which are generally of different ethnic group" (Pontifical Commission 1988, 20). As if addressing the African situation, the commission condemned the imposition of Sharia Laws on some religious (ethnic) minorities and the denial of social amenities to such groups because of their ethnicity and religion (Pontifical Commission 1988, 20). The USCCB (2001) who also spoke on this issue condemned the use of religious identity in Africa to pit Muslims against Christians and Christians against Muslims. They drew particular attention to the Sudanese government's systematic denial of religious liberty, human right abuses, and enslavement of women and children for political and economic ends. This perversion of religion for political ends, they argued, deprives Africans of their dignity and human rights.

The African Synod of Bishops

The African synod condemned religious conflict together with ethnic conflict, and chided the political and religious leaders behind the conflict as provoking "interminable conflicts and wars for the purpose of gaining and maintaining power and for self-enrichment" (Message of the Synod 25). The synod particularly paid attention to the conflict between Christians and Muslims, and rejected such conflicts as contrary to God's will for "God does not want to be an idol in whose name one X would kill other people" (ibid. 23). The bishops also admitted that these wars are not just fought out of religious convictions, but are fuelled by certain political leaders whose "lust for hegemony … sows the seeds of division and hate which give rise to wars … [and] acts of violence against the lives of innocent people" (ibid. 35). The synod claimed that many African Christians are confronted with the dangers "which come from certain forms of militant Islamic fundamentalism," their unfair policies and practices and denial of religious freedom (Proposition 41). Unfair policies arising from religious intolerance lead to tensions and violence, which threatens peace. The synod then went on to condemn those religious leaders and their political cronies whose thirst for power lead them to "trample with impunity

the rights and dignity of the person" (ibid. 45a). They also condemned foreign leaders, political and religious, who connive with the local leaders to marginalize their people and pillage their natural resources (ibid. 45d).

John Paul II, Post-Synodal Exhortation

Pope John Paul II, in his Post-synodal apostolic exhortation acknowledged the many divisions in African society, especially those divisions that lead to hostility and endanger the common good. The pontiff particularly acknowledged Muslim-Christian conflict and noted that God is "far from wishing to be the one in whose name a person would kill other people" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 66). The Pope called on Muslims and Christians to avoid false irenicism or militant fundamentalism, and urged them to raise their voices against unfair policies and practices, especially in matters of religious freedom. The Holy Father blamed the problem on lack of good government and rule of law. "I must note with great sadness that many African nations still labor under authoritarian and oppressive regimes which deny their subjects personal freedom and fundamental human rights, especially the freedom of association and of political expression" (ibid. 112).

Summary/Comparative Analysis

The various levels of authority, the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria, The Pontifical Commission of Justice and Peace, The Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, African Synod of Bishops, and Pope John Paul II, all agree that Africa is a "theater" of ethnic and religious conflict. They also agree on a two-fold cause of the conflict: one remote and the other immediate. The remote cause of the conflict goes back to the historical foundations of the different countries in Africa, i.e. the colonial period, when the colonial rulers, in the aftermath of the 1884 Berlin Conference, in the scramble for partition and struggle for Africa, heaped together various peoples in a given geographical region to constitute a nation, without any regard for their ethnic make-up or composition. The immediate cause of the conflict is a by-product of the colonial regime, whereby politicians and military rulers manipulate the ethnic and religious differences in their respective countries to foster their selfish political and economic ends. While these various levels of authority seem to agree on the remote cause

(although no deeper analysis was given), their analyses of the imme-
diate cause differ considerably. With regard to ethnic conflict, what
the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria and the African Synod of
Bishops rightly identified as "tribalism," the Pontifical Commission on
Justice and Peace calls "social racism" and "new forms of slavery," for the
reason that "there is no great difference between those who consider
others their inferiors because of their race, and those who treat their
fellow citizens as inferiors by exploiting them as a work force" (Pontifi-
cal Commission 1988, 22).

The term "social racism" may capture the phenomenon of exclusion
and exploitation of a group of people by the opposing dominant pow-
erful group. However, it falls short when applied to the African situa-
tion. While the term may be appropriate for the situations in Europe,
a model from which the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace
operates, it may be slightly a misnomer for Africa. It would seem that
the African bishops, operating from an African model (based mainly
on their experiences of tribalism, not racism), have taken the discus-
sion beyond the realm reached by the Pontifical Council on Justice
and Peace, and their analyses of tribalism go to the root of the prob-
lem. But neither the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria, nor the
African Synod of Bishops, nor the Pontifical Council on Justice and
Peace, nor Pope John Paul II, addressed the issue of why the human
person is prone to acts of prejudice, or in this case, tribalism. What is
it in the human person that makes her or him act in a prejudicial man-
ner? Why is bias or prejudice a phenomenon that consumes the hu-
man person individually and as a group? This is the kind of question
not addressed by these various levels of authority, but which Lonergan
takes up in a dramatic fashion.

With regard to religious conflict, these various levels of authority re-
gret the use of religion to exacerbate ethnic and political tension. They
all agree, and commendably too, that the problem is not so much dif-
ferences in religion as "manipulation" of religion for selfish purposes.
They all agree that in Africa, ethnicity and religion are related such
that ethnic prejudice can be an outlet for religious bigotry. But none of
their discussions delved into why the one is an instance of the other,
a phenomenon Lonergan's discussion of the different types of biases
highlights. Secondly, most of the analyses of these various levels of
authority concentrated on the present crisis, the Muslim-Christian
conflict, and the conflict among different Christian groups. Not much

attention was given to other minority religious groups in Africa. Only the African Synod of Bishops paid little attention to African Traditional Religion (ATR). Even where the synod paid attention to ATR it treated it more like an appendage and did it give it the kind of treatment or attention it gave dialogue with Muslims.

According to the 2000 Vatican Statistical Yearbook, there are about 800 million people living in the fifty-four countries of Africa, about 350 million are Christians and of which 116 million are Catholics (ibid. 7). Though the Muslim group dominates the rest of the population, there are also sizeable numbers of practioners of ATR, Judaism, Buddhism, etc. Granted that other minority religious groups in Africa have really not been part of the problem, as the conflict has for the most part been Christian-Muslim conflict, and some intra-Christian squabbles, any discussion of religious pluralism and co-existence that does not take the experience of other minority religious groups into account falls short of the spirit of religious co-existence being debated. In the section that follows, I shall attempt an analysis of the proposed solutions to the problems of ethnic and religious conflicts by these various levels of authority and offer a critique of the various positions, with a view to highlighting wherein Lonergan's work becomes a useful tool in the discussion.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
OFFICIAL CATHOLIC RESPONSE TO ETHNIC
AND TRIBAL CONFLICTS IN AFRICA

Response of African Bishops

African bishops see the need to work for peace. Peace, they maintain, cannot be achieved without justice and justice cannot be attained without the rule of law. The rule of law, they hold, is best achieved in a democratic society. They therefore urge the Christian faithful to join in the "promotion of the rule of law everywhere in Africa" by participating in the democratic process. Since democracy cannot succeed if the people are not educated about the process the synod calls for a program of "education towards the common good as well as toward a respect for pluralism" (Message of the Synod, 34). The synod also makes an appeal to political leaders to desist from sowing the "seeds of division and hate, which give rise to wars" (ibid. 35). They believe

one of the keys to solving these African problems lies in the rise of "African saintly politicians and saintly heads of state … who love their people to the end, and who wish to serve rather than be served" (ibid.). They therefore call on politicians to uphold the rule of law, and that tensions or conflicts be resolved by "brotherly dialogue," not the use of arms (ibid. 36).

The synod proposes, as a practical way of promoting peace, "to form the laity for life in society, to a Christian vision of politics and economics." They reject the idea that separates faith from politics. Using the language of Vatican II (*Lumen Gentium*, 33), the bishops call this vision "sanctification of the temporal order." This kind of vision, they contend, should not only mark the secular vocation of the laity but also ensure that the Church remain faithful to its prophetic role (ibid. 34).

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2001) came up with a proposal in which they called on multinational corporations and the international community to play a more constructive role in peacemaking in Africa. They proposed several concrete ways to protect and promote the rights, dignity, and social development of the peoples and nations in Africa:

> • That the United States play a more central role in the search for a just and lasting peace in the Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Sierra Leone and other troubled parts of Africa; and that bringing a lasting peace to these countries should be a priority for U.S. foreign policy.

> • That the United States give a more robust financial, logistical, and political support for U.N. and regional African peacekeeping efforts.

> • That the United States support international control of arms transfers, especially small arms that continue to fuel, expand, and prolong conflict in Africa.

> • That the United States sign the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty.

> • That transnational corporations adopt codes of conduct that reinforce their social responsibilities, direct their activities toward the common good, and adopt transparency in operations and financial accountability, and that the international community penalize abusive companies.

John Paul II

John Paul II agreed with the African bishops that peace can be achieved if the Church continues to exercise her prophetic role by being "the voice of the voiceless," so that the dignity of individuals is acknowledged. The Pope contends that anything that debases the human person is contrary to the spirit of evangelization. Governments must promote the "development and ennoblement of individuals in their spiritual and material existence … the development of the whole person not only individually but also and especially in the context of the common good" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 70).

John Paul II sees a link between evangelization and human advancement, development and liberation, and the anthropological order and theological order: "Anthropological order, because the man who is to be evangelized is not an abstract being but is subject to social and economic questions. They also include links in the theological order, since one can not dissociate the plan of creation from the plan of redemption" (ibid. 68). Injustice, the pope argues, has to be combated, because one cannot promote evangelization without promoting justice and peace, authentic human advancement.

OFFICIAL CATHOLIC RESPONSE TO INTER-RELIGIOUS CONFLICTS IN AFRICA

Response of African Bishops

In their response to the on-going religious crisis that has engulfed Nigeria, the Catholic Bishops of Nigeria, in a March 2001 communiqué, call on the people of Nigeria to build a "kingdom of Justice and Peace" based on the mandate of Jesus. To achieve this they call for "conversion on the personal level, a spiritual revolution in our behavior and attitude to life." In many and varied ways, the African synod of bishops responded to the inter-religious conflict in Africa. The synod called on African Christians to see themselves as witnesses of the Gospel of Christ. To be a witness, according to the synod, the one who spreads the Gospel of Christ "evangelizes the cultural roots of his person and of his community and takes up the socio-economic and political challenges in order to be able to express the message in his own words and in a new dynamic of life which transforms the culture and the society" (Message of the Synod, 17). The synod called the Christian church a

"family" whose origin is in the Blessed Trinity and appealed for dialogue "within the Church and among religions," as a way of addressing the existing inter-religious conflict.

The synod singled out three particular groups with whom the Catholic faithful ought to engage in dialogue: dialogue with Traditional African religions, dialogue with Christian brethren, and dialogue with Muslims. The synod, in a landmark decision, singled out African Traditional Religions (ATR) as "guarantors" of African cultural values and strongly recommended a dialogue that is "structured around the cultural heritage" (ibid. 21). It would seem that the bishops, as it were, rightly assumed that by entering into dialogue with ATR, African Christians would be coming to terms with their cultural heritage thereby enhancing the much needed inculturation of Christianity in Africa.

Following the lead of the Second Vatican Council, the Synod of Bishops appealed for "the intensification of dialogue and ecumenical collaboration" among the churches, especially with the African churches of Egypt and Ethiopia. They outlined four tiers of dialogue in the Church: (i) dialogue between particular churches and the Apostolic See (ii) between particular churches on the continent itself and those of other continents (iii) between the bishop, the presbyterate, consecrated persons, pastoral agents and the faithful and (iv) among various rites within the church (Proposition 39). They recommended that SECAM, regional association of bishops' conferences and national Episcopal conferences and dioceses be responsible for developing structures and means of this dialogue. The bishops again used the image of the "family" to describe the whole Christian church, arguing that as a family, the Christian churches ought to show love among its members, in addition to being a place of human and spiritual growth for all who profess faith in Jesus Christ (ibid. 14). It is in the Church-as-Family that God travels with each person to throw light on their traditions and customs and reveal to them "that these are a prefiguration, distant but certain, of Him, the New Adam, the Elder of the Multitude of Brothers which we are" (Message of the Synod, 24). The synod appealed to the African sense of family, calling on the Christian churches to see themselves as an "extended African family" and "to bring to the heart of this extended family a witness which transforms from the inside our vision of the world" (ibid. 27).

The bishops urged Christians to also dialogue with Muslims and cooperate with them in working for peace and justice. Using the language of Vatican II (*Nostra Aetate*, 3), the bishops acknowledged the common faith in Abraham and the belief in one God which Christians and Muslims share. Drawing from the Pope's encyclical (*Redemptoris Missio*, 39) they called the human community "one great human family" whose origin in this one God who wants all to "witness to him through our respect for the faith, religious values, and traditions of each person" (Message of the Synod, 23). They urged Catholics in particular to engage Muslims in "a dialogue of life in the family, at work, at school, and in the public life, of a kind which will bring about the realization of a just society where a veritable pluralism guarantees all freedoms, and especially religious freedom" (Proposition 41). The bishops called on their Muslim counterparts "to join hands in working for human progress and development" and also to work for "reciprocal respect for the religious liberty of individual persons" lest God becomes "an idol in whose name one person would kill other people" (Message of the Synod, 23). While calling for structures that promote positive inter-religious dialogue, the bishops however, cautioned against "dangers which come from certain forms of militant Islamic fundamentalism," vowed to become more vocal in exposing their "unfair policies and practices, as well as their lack of reciprocity regarding freedoms of religion" (Proposition, 41).

John Paul II

In his Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, John Paul II continued the theme of the Church as "family of God in Africa," exhorting the Africans that in spite of the numerous problems they face, the difficulties can be overcome. For God's redeeming love embraces the whole of humanity, all the peoples of Africa: every race, tribe and nation (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 27). The pope lauded the synod's use of the image of the church in Africa as the family of God. For the image expresses the church's nature appropriate for Africa, and also "emphasizes care for others, solidarity, warmth in human relationship, acceptance, dialogue and trust" (ibid. 63). The pontiff recommends a new evangelization with a sole aim of building up the Church as Family, an evangelization that avoids "all ethnocentrism and excessive particularism, trying instead to encourage reconciliation and true communion between different ethnic groups, favoring solidarity and the

sharing of personnel among the particular churches, without undue ethnic considerations" (ibid.).

John Paul II reiterates the synod's statement that openness to dialogue is a Christian attitude and urged that dialogue be practiced within the family of the Church at all levels and with non-Christians, Muslim in particular. He urged that particular care be taken to ensure that this Christian-Muslim dialogue respects the principle of religious freedom and called on Christians and Muslims to "commit themselves to promoting a dialogue free from the risks of false irenicism or militant fundamentalism" (ibid. 66). The pontiff also called for "a serene and prudent dialogue" with ATR, urging that its adherents be treated with great respect and all "inaccurate and disrespectful language" be avoided.

Summary/Comparative Analysis

In denouncing ethnic and religious violence, the African synod of bishops and Pope John Paul II stressed the need for all the sides involved in the conflict to recognize and celebrate diversity, show mutual respect, and treat each other as equals. After all "civil society" goes beyond familial and tribal ties to another basis for social unity- equality before the law. Three key words, based on the Christian teaching of morality, aptly summarize the solutions they offered. These words are: respect for differences, fraternity/sorority, and solidarity (family or oneness). Equality of treatment implies certain recognition of differences and mutual respect. The exercise of mutual respect implies certain recognition of fraternity/sorority. To achieve fraternity/sorority one must recognize the need for solidarity. The African synod of bishops appealed to the African sense of "family," which is based on the principle of love and respect for life. John Paul II picked up on this theme: "In African culture and tradition the role of the family is everywhere held to be fundamental. Open to this sense of the family, of love and respect for life, the African loves children, who are joyfully welcomed as gifts of God. It is precisely this love for life that leads them to give such great importance to the veneration of their ancestors" (Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, 43). The pontiff also appealed to the "profound religious sense" of Africans, stressing that the reality of sin in its individual and social form is present in the consciousness of the African, so also the need for rites of purification and expiation. The pope, as it were, reiterates the Catholic teaching that harboring racist thoughts

and attitudes is against the new law of Christ "for whom one's 'neighbor' is not only a person from my tribe, my milieu, my religion or my nation: it is every person that I meet along the way" (Pontifical Commission 1988, 34).

Both the pontiff and the African synod of bishops are in agreement that the principal responsibility for resolving these conflicts lies with Africans themselves: political, military, and religious leaders. They call for conversion, perhaps because to overcome unjust discrimination towards one's neighbor one must "interiorize the values that inspire just laws and live out, in day-to-day life, the conviction of the equal dignity of all" (ibid.). They therefore called for dialogue, ecumenical and inter-religious dialogue, as a way of resolving the conflict. They did not, however, state (1) the nature of this conversion (2) how this conversion aids dialogue and (3) how dialogue and conversion help to promote the common good. Lonergan discusses the nature of conversion. Conversion, which for him is intellectual, religious, moral, and affective, is useful in overcoming bias and a useful tool for promoting the common good.

CHAPTER 2

BIAS AND THE
CYCLE OF DECLINE

In the preceding chapter we examined the issue of ethnic and religious conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa and attempted an analysis of the cause of these conflicts. We used Nigeria, the most populous country in Africa, as a case study, in order to determine the extent of the problem. We appealed to the various levels of authority that have offered an analysis of the problem and attempted a solution. We examined respectable authorities like the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria, the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace, the Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, the African synod of bishops, and Pope John Paul II. These various levels of authority all agree that the problem of ethnic and religious conflicts in sub-Saharan African is very pervasive. They adduced two reasons for the cause of these conflicts, one remote, and the other immediate. The remote cause, they all agreed, goes back to the historical foundations of the respective countries in question, to the colonial period when the colonial masters disregarded the ethnic mix of the African people and lumped together people of different races and ethnicities. The immediate cause, a by-product of the remote cause, provides a situation where modern African politicians and military rulers tap into the ethnic and religious differences among their people and use them for selfish ends. While the various levels of authority we examined seemed to agree with each other's analysis of the remote cause of the conflict, they differ significantly in their treatments of immediate cause of the conflict. More significantly, they offer no analysis on why the human person is prone to acts of prejudice (or bias as Lonergan calls it) that make the human person prone to behave in a manner that is not only detrimental to himself or herself, but also to his or her peoples. Lonergan supplies this missing link. He provides an analysis of why the human person is prone to acts of prejudice, or as he calls it, bias.

Prejudice is a fact. John La Farge demonstrated that personal prejudice is a fact and his argument was recognized by Pope Pius XI and became a basic element in Catholic social teaching in the 20th century (La Farge 1945, 270). La Farge, S.J. was an American Jesuit priest and editor of the Jesuit magazine *America* whose work on race relations, especially of Blacks and Whites in America drew the attention of Pope Pius XI. When La Farge visited Rome in 1938, on one of his trips to Europe during the Nazi persecution, the pope invited him to his private study and gave him the mandate to draft an encyclical condemning anti-Semitism and the racial policies of Nazi Germany. The pope apparently had read and was impressed by a book written by La Farge on race relations in the U.S. in which La Farge used Catholic theology to show how racial division is contrary to natural and revealed truth (see La Farge 1937). The pope asked him to work with two men, Gustave Desbuquois of France and Gustav Gundlach of Germany, on the draft of this encyclical. Pius XI was eighty-one years old at this time and died a year later. The encyclical was never published. Speculations abound as to why the encyclical was never published. While some contend that the encyclical was sabotaged, others contend that the pope must have changed his mind shortly after commissioning La Farge to write the draft copy; still others contend that the pope was old at the time and did not have enough time to carry through such a bold initiative. Regardless of what his reasons were, the fact was that the encyclical was never published. In a series of articles in December 1972 and January 1973, the *National Catholic Reporter* published in Kansas City, Missouri, raised the issue of an "unpublished encyclical of Pius XI attacking anti-Semitism." This publication led to a series of investigations, investigations that eventually confirmed the existence of the draft copy of this "unpublished encyclical." This "unpublished encyclical" has now been published in a book (see Passelecq G. and Suchcky B. 1997).

Tunisian psychologist and social philosopher, Albert Memmi, has also argued that racial and ethnic prejudices are a "social fact." Memmi says nearly everyone is an unconscious racist, or a semi-conscious, or even a conscious racist. "The degrees range from the man who starts out, 'I don't have any prejudice against any race, but . . .' to the one who claims the black man has a peculiar smell or the Jew a 'concentration camp' look" (Memmi 1968, 197). Later twentieth century US Catholic bishops have spoken of racism as a social sin. Prejudice is a

reflection of the influence of cultural or personal knowledge. Memmi speaks of the family circle as "an extraordinary culture medium for prejudices, fears and resentments from which few children emerge wholly uncontaminated" (ibid. 198). Hans-George Gadamer underscores this when he states that "understanding" inevitably involves some prejudice. The concept of prejudice, according to Gadamer, did not acquire a negative connotation until the Enlightenment. Due to the influence of the Latin *Praejudicium*, originally prejudice did not necessarily imply a false judgment. Rather, it was part of an idea that could have either a positive or negative value. Even in French there is such thing as *prejuges legitimes*. But the English 'prejudice' "and even more than the French *prejuge*, seems to have been limited in its meaning by the Enlightenment critique of religion simply to the sense of an "unfounded judgment"" Gadamer points out that the Enlightenment doctrine of prejudice makes the distinction between prejudice that is due to human authority and prejudice that is due to over-hastiness. This distinction is based on the origin of prejudice in the persons that have them: either the respect we have for others and their authority leads us to err, or we are led to error due to over hastiness in ourselves (Gadamer 1999, 270-1).

All human beings are prone to acts of prejudice and sometimes are oblivious of that fact. One possible reason why people are sometimes unaware of their prejudices is that prejudicial acts are sometimes disguised under noble principles. Memmi, speaking of the evil of racism, argued that racism is so varied, so extensive, so deep, and so general that it socially pre-exists, inevitably imposing itself on the individual. "Before taking root in the individual, racism has taken root in the institutions and ideologies all around him, in the education he receives and the culture he acquires" (Memmi 1968, 197). What Memmi said of racism is equally true of ethnicity (or tribalism), and religious prejudice. As Memmi rightly states, "Religions themselves are not sinless in this respect" (ibid. 198). Thomas Aquinas described *patria* (duty to one's country, which in today's lexicon can be called nationalism or patriotism) and religion as among the principal parts of the virtue of justice. Nationalism and religious duty, as noble as they are, can sometimes be misappropriated and used as weapons of exclusion and oppression. After all, the greatest wars humanity has ever known have been fought in the name of religion and national/ethnic pride. It would seem that "systems of belief and action that ex-

press humanity's longing for relation with the Ultimate also embody or direct their most extreme hatred and violence toward those who are different" (Oppenheim 1995, 93). Simply put, religion and ethnicity are sometimes loaded with prejudicial undertones. Acts born out of prejudice have ramifications in the social order. Bad social situations do not merely arise from blind mechanical forces, but from actions of men and women (La Farge 1945, 270).

Drawing from the works of Gadamer and Albert Memmi, one can argue that human persons, in the process of socialization, stand in dia-lectical relationship to prejudice, i.e. prejudice that has positive or neg-ative value. To describe this complex phenomenon of prejudice in its individual and social aspects, Bernard Lonergan, aware that prejudicial acts greatly impact the social order and rank among the chief causes of the human person's alienation from oneself and society, chooses the cognitive term bias (Lonergan 1971, 55). The way Lonergan explains it, bias inhibits human understanding and distorts one's conscious performance. In this chapter, I shall explore Lonergan's definition of bias in the context of his cognitional theory. I shall also attempt a ge-netic understanding of his use of the term by engaging the work of the Lonergan scholar, Kenneth Melchin. Thereafter I shall attempt an analysis of how bias affects the social process leading to cycles of progress and decline. Finally I shall show the significance of Loner-gan's analysis of bias for the problem of ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa. I shall argue in this chapter that the wanton loss of lives and destruction of property and natural resources that accompany every instance of religious and ethnic conflict in many African countries are not mere collateral damage that comes from the conviction to fight the good fight of nationalism or faith. Rather, at the root of the ethnic and religious conflicts are blind spots and deep-seated scotoma that lead to ethnic exclusivism and religious bigotry, which leaves a harmful and lasting impression on the social order.

WHAT IS BIAS?
GENERAL DEFINITION OF BIAS IN RELATION TO COGNITIONAL STRUCTURE

Bernard Lonergan understands bias in terms of his own views on cog-nitional structure. What does Lonergan mean by cognitional struc-ture? Three basic questions are at the root of his cognitional process:

What acts do I experience myself performing when I am doing what I label knowing? What are the characteristic features of my noetic operations? And why is doing that knowing? (Vertin 1994, 54). For Lonergan, cognitional process begins on the level of empirical consciousness, i.e. consciousness of the data of outer or inner experience (Arndt 1991, 65: 45-6). Lonergan begins *Insight* with "the ideal detective story [in which] the reader is given all the clues yet fails to spot the criminal" (Lonergan 1970, ix). With this, he invites the reader to search with him, not for a criminal, but one's own dynamic power of inquiry (Gregson 1998, 16). The quest to spot a criminal or attain a given goal is not attained by rote memory or by any "recondite intuition" but by a "distinct activity of organizing intelligence that places the full set of clues in a unique explanatory perspective" (Lonergan 1970, ix). In seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching one has outer experience. But one has inner experience, not of objects, but of conscious acts, including the empirical conscious acts of sensing, perceiving and imagining; the intellectual conscious acts of inquiring, understanding, and formulating, and the rationally conscious acts of reflecting, marshalling and weighing evidence, and judging (Arndt 1991, 65:46).

Knowing is a complex human activity. From the very beginning, western philosophers have been concerned with the act of understanding and the object that is understood. While the Socratic emphasis on self knowledge, on the one hand, was complemented by the Augustinian stress on introspection, the Cartesian quest for method, on the other hand, was complemented by the Kantian search for a science that determines apriori the possibilities and extent of human knowing (Barden and McShane 1969, 12). Whether in Socrates, Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes, or Kant, or in modern existentialists like Kierkegaard or Heidegger, one sees an appreciation for the quest for knowledge. But none of these philosophers elevated introspective understanding into a scientific technique until Jean-Jacques Rousseau who developed the notion that moral salvation comes only from recovering the authentic voice of nature within us (Rousseau 1959, 1:1047). Such perceived shortcoming, however, is not necessarily a criticism. Barden and McShane relate the effort to understand human knowing to evolution in the history of philosophy and the quest for wisdom. "Every science has its history, its period of confusion and myth, its eventual emergence as a definite science. Before chemistry, there was alchemy,

before astronomy there was astrology. So in philosophy" (Barden and McShane 1969, 13).

Lonergan's cognitional theory elevates introspective understanding into a scientific inquiry. The cognitional structure he delineated serves as a kind of transition between the aforementioned philosophers and critical thinkers of our time, a transition aptly described by Lonergan's appreciate critics as analogous to the transition from alchemy to chemistry (ibid.). One of the goals of Lonergan's cognitional method is self-appropriation and rational self-consciousness. The question for him is not whether knowledge exists but what precisely is its nature. The goal of this is not to set forth a list of abstract properties of human knowledge but to help the knower effect a "personal appropriation of the concrete dynamic structure immanent and recurrently operative in his own cognitional activities," i.e. appropriation of one's own intellectual and rational self consciousness (Lonergan 1997, 11).

How does one really know that one knows? Lonergan's primary concern is not the known but the structure of knowing and the knower. The known is extensive, incomplete, and subject to revision. But knowing is a recurrent structure that can be sufficiently investigated in a series of strategically chosen instances; the knower is a source of future additions and revisions (ibid. 12). Lonergan makes an important distinction between animal and human knowing. Animals know, not merely phenomena, but things: dogs know their masters, bones, other dogs, and not merely the appearance of those things (Lonergan 1967, 224). But certainly 'know' here cannot mean the same thing as human knowing. 'Know' as applied to animals would be different when applied to humans. L.S. Vygotsky (1981) made a similar distinction between 'lower, natural mental behavior' and 'higher, cultural mental behavior.' Human beings share lower biological forms of mental behavior, like elementary perception, memory and attention with animals. But higher forms of mental functions, like logical memory, selective attention, decision making, and comprehension of language, are products of mediated activity that are specific to homo sapiens. Vygotsky called the process by which natural forms of behavior are transformed into higher, cultural forms, unique to humans, "semiotic mediation" (Dixon-Krauss 1996, 9).

Lonergan distinguishes between animal, human, angelic and divine knowing and investigates what in each case is necessary and sufficient for an instance of knowing (Lonergan 1967, 224). A dog, for instance,

'knows' when she is accidentally bumped by the owner and when she is deliberately kicked as a punishment. All domesticated dogs possess this kind of 'knowledge.' However, "what is sufficient for an instance of animal knowing is not sufficient for an instance of human knowing.... The sensible integration of sensible data which is central to the animal knowing…occurs also in men, but in men it is not knowing, it is a component of knowing" (Barden and McShane1969, 49). A visitor to the zoo, for instance, may get a certain kind of gratification in being able to name the animals. But knowing the names of animals and being able to describe them is a far cry from understanding (ibid. 22-3).

Knowing, for Lonergan, involves distinct and irreducible activities: seeing, hearing, smelling, touching, tasting, inquiring, imagining, understanding, conceiving, reflecting, and judging. No single one of these activities by itself constitutes knowing. Knowing is not experience alone, not understanding alone, and not judgment alone. At the same time it is not something apart from experience, understanding, and judgment. Lonergan uses the analogy of a whole to explain knowledge. A whole, he says, is a dynamic structure. While a whole is related to each of its parts, each part is what it is by virtue of its functional relations to other parts. A whole possesses certain inevitability in its unity such that, while the removal of any part destroys its unity, the addition of any further part becomes superfluous. "As merely seeing is not human knowing, so for the same reason merely hearing, merely smelling, merely touching, merely tasting may be parts, potential components of human knowing, but they are not human knowing itself" (Lonergan 1967, 222). Human knowing is not this or that operations but a whole whose parts are operations. It is a materially dynamic structure. It is also formally dynamic. It is self-assembling, self-constituting, one part summoning the next. Experience stimulates inquiry and breeds imagination that leads to insight. Inquiry is intelligence bringing itself to act. This, according to Lonergan, is the dynamic structure of human knowing.

Bias as a Principle that Undermines Human Knowledge

Sometimes extraneous, negative principles militate against human knowing. Lonergan calls this negative principle bias. Though bias can sometimes be understood in the sense of prejudice, in the sections that follow, I shall attempt a genetic study of Lonergan's understanding and use of the word), Lonergan does not mean 'prejudice' in Hans-

George Gadamer's sense and use of the word. Gadamer had held that the prejudices of the individual, more than their judgments, constitute the historical and communal reality of their being. He went further to argue that to do justice to the human person's finite, historical mode of being, it is necessary to rehabilitate the concept of prejudice and acknowledge the fact that there are legitimate prejudices (Gadamer 1999, 277). Gadamer's theory of "legitimate prejudices," however reasonable, still leaves open the question of criteria for determining such legitimacy. This is one of Jurgen Habermas' many questions to Gadamer. Habermas, not too pleased that Gadamer has used "hermeneutical insight into the prejudicial structure of understanding to rehabilitate prejudice" writes a "reply" to Gadamer, not in a polemical way, but as part of Habermas' dialogue on the extent to which hermeneutics play an important part in Habermas' conception of the social sciences (Habermas 1985, 293-319). Gadamer was attempting to give a positive value to a concept, i.e. prejudice, he thought was denigrated by the Enlightenment, whose supposition that the 'methodically disciplined' use of reason can safeguard one from error led them to make a division of prejudice into that of "authority" and that of "over hastiness." In defense of his position, Gadamer pointed out that over hastiness "is the source of all errors that arise in the use of one's own reason. Authority, however, is responsible for one's not using one's own reason at all. Thus the division is based on a mutually exclusive antithesis between authority and reason" (Gadamer 1999, 277). But bias, for Lonergan, is fundamentally a cognitive issue. In *Insight* he calls it "the infantile beginning of psychic trouble" (Lonergan 1997, 223). In the way Lonergan explains it, bias can interfere with the process of human knowing and undermine the transcendental precepts such that attentiveness, intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility are substituted for blindness, dullness, rationalization, and inaction (Kidder 1994, 43). The transcendentals, deriving from the transcendental precepts be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable and be responsible, are the radical intending that moves one from ignorance to knowledge. "Arising at the interstices between psyche and spirit, between ego and community, between intersubjectivity and the good of order, and between common sense and detached intelligence, in a host of ways bias skews the drive to understand and thus undercuts the exercise of freedom that, for Lonergan, is the principle of genuine human, historical progress" (Loewe 1994, ix).

All human beings are subject to bias. Bias is a "block or distortion of intellectual development" (Lonergan 1996, 231). It is a refusal to ask the relevant questions when one suspects that the answers to these questions might not work in one's favor (Crysdale 1992, 53: 251). Bias is an aberration of understanding, a blind spot, scotosis. Fundamentally, scotosis is an unconscious process that arises, not in conscious acts, "but in the censorship that governs the emergence of psychic contents" (Lonergan 1970, 191). Scotosis is the spontaneous exclusion of unwanted insights that inevitably leads to the emergence of contrary insights. Scotosis not only scuttles understanding, but also censors it. "Just as wanting an insight penetrates below the surface to bring forth schematic images that give rise to the insight, so not wanting an insight has the opposite effect of repressing from consciousness a scheme that would suggest insight" (ibid. 192). Lonergan's point is this, that as noble and desirable as insight and self-knowledge are, they can be unwanted and refused. To refuse an insight is to refuse or exclude the further questions that might arise from such insight, the result of which fosters misunderstanding both in ourselves and in others (Copeland 1998, 2:11).

Bias is a flight from understanding. It can "rob individual living of its zestful drama when it enwraps people in the repetitive banalities of neurosis" (Loewe 1994, ix). According to Lonergan, there is in the human person a tendency "to quieting an uneasy conscience by ignoring, belittling, denying, rejecting higher values" (Lonergan 1996, 40). It blocks the insight, which concrete situations demand, and makes intelligence seem irrelevant to practical living. From this follows unintelligent policies and an inept courses of action that severely distort social and cultural goals, or what Lonergan calls "incarnated values." Scales of preference and morals become distorted "so one may come to hate the truly good, and love the really evil." This kind of 'calamity' is not limited to individuals. "It can happen to groups, to nations, to blocks of nations, to mankind. It can take different, opposed, belligerent forms to divide mankind and to menace civilization with destruction" (Lonergan 1996, 40). Lonergan's contention is that one is "alienated from oneself and from the possibility of union with others and ultimately with God to the extent that one fails to realize one's eros toward knowledge and value" (Ring 1981, 256). When one separates oneself from one's fundamental orientation, i.e. when one engages actively or passively in the flight from understanding, one is summarily

alienated. Thus bias is constituted when one, exercising one's freedom, deprives oneself of the possibility of realizing oneself in self-transcendence (ibid.).

The Origins and Development of Lonergan's Work on Bias: Engaging Kenneth Melchin's Work

Bernard Lonergan's dedication to "the turn to the subject," locates him in that school of thought that has been appropriately identified as transcendental Thomism.

Transcendental Thomism's quest for "the turn to the subject" is similar to the Socratic quest for self-knowledge, "Know Thyself." Transcendental Thomism emerged from the work of some neo-scholastics or neo-Thomists who, through the influence of Mareschal and Blondel, challenged some of the conclusions of Immanuel Kant. Karl Rahner is another notable Transcendental Thomist. Transcendental Thomism is not without its own critics. Avery Dulles gives a note of caution: "Transcendental Thomism is perhaps the most auspicious of recent attempts to modernize Catholic Theology. Insofar as it retains its Thomistic inspiration, it is unquestionably viable. But to the extent that it borrows from transcendental idealism, it remains contestable" (Dulles 1992, 133). In his 1977 article on "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods" Lonergan wrote, "the more human studies turn away from abstract universals and attend to concrete human beings, the more evident it becomes that the scientific age of innocence has come to an end: human authenticity can no longer be taken for granted."

The "turn to the subject," according to Matthew Lamb, has two major phases: the transcendental idealist phase (Kant, Hegel, and right wing Hegelians) and the dialectical materialist phase (Marx and the left wing Hegelians). Lamb explains, "Common to both phases was a concern to promote the responsible freedom of humankind in the face of the increasing cognitive, social, and cultural domination of the natural sciences with their emipirico-mathematical techniques of observation, verification and industrial application" (Lamb 1981, 55). Lonergan, in his earlier works, responded to the biases he found latent in the transcendental idealist presuppositions. In his later works Lonergan, especially in *Insight* and *Method in Theology*, responded to the biases in the presuppositions of the dialectical materialists. In fact, as Lamb concisely puts it, Lonergan's work from *Method in Theology* to

his work in macroeconomics "can be viewed as a creative and critical response to the challenge of the dialectical-materialist phase of the 'turn to the subject'" (ibid. 61).

Carrying this line of inquiry further, Kenneth Melchin has offered a genetic study of Lonergan's work on bias. According to Melchin, in the seventh chapter of *Insight*, Lonergan enters into a conversation with Hobbes, Kant, Hegel, Marx and other proponents of the liberal thesis of automatic progress with a view to identifying the cognitive structural elements and processes on which to build a theory of society and history and to chart overall patterns of historical change. When he poses questions and offers some answers, it is sometimes difficult to understand why Lonergan raises and answers the questions as he does because he does not begin by reconstructing the theories of the authors with whom he is engaging in conversation. He, no doubt, sometimes leaves clues indicating the name of the thinker with whom his conclusions are allied (Melchin 1987, 209). Robert Doran lent credence to Melchin's interpretation, asserting, "Lonergan's discussion of dramatic bias enables him to point the way to a reorientation of psychoanalysis, and his treatment of the other three biases constitutes in effect a fairly sustained dialogue and dialectic with the Marxists and liberal theories of society and history" (Doran 1990, 34).

The works of two thinkers, Thomas Hobbes and Karl Marx, have particularly influenced Lonergan's theory of history vis-à-vis individual responsibility. His work on the good of order, on the one hand, was written in response to Hobbes, while his analysis of group bias, general bias, and the cycles of progress and decline, on the other hand, was written in response to Marx. Hobbes, in his *Leviathan*, had described the human condition as a permanent state of war of all against all. Hobbes began his treatment of the social state of man in the thirteenth chapter of *Leviathan*, detailing how the human person, on his own, would achieve limited success in securing happiness (see Hobbes 1957). Placed in the company of others, the social life becomes a permanent state of struggle or war for the same scarce objects of desire. Humankind's deliverance from this all-out war of all against all comes only in transferring individuals' rights to the 'commonwealth' who will enforce each one's commitment to his or her contracted restrictions. Hobbes thus conceived the social order as "the necessary constraint upon each individual's free pursuit of his or her own desires, in the

interest of securing the basic conditions for any pursuit of personal happiness" (Melchin 1987, 210).

The impact of Hobbes' theory of social order has been influential and his idea of society as "a constraint upon the individual's exercise of his natural rights and freedoms has prevailed in a line of social and political theory that continues to this day" (ibid.). Lonergan recognized the truth of Hobbes' claim that society is not all about cooperation and collaboration. There is competition, struggle, bitter rivalry, constraint, and coercion. But Lonergan took some exceptions to Hobbes. "While Hobbes' principle datum was the fact of competition for scarce goods, Lonergan's central datum was the fact of collaboration towards hitherto unknown goods" (ibid. 213). Lonergan does not see the social process as solely based on the one or the other, for such an account would lead to distortion in one's understanding of society. While Lonergan concedes that Hobbes well articulated the spontaneous orientation of the subject, he still believes that the human phenomenon that Hobbes describes whereby each one pursues his or her selfish goals should be conceived as a form of bias. According to Melchin, what Hobbes expressed in his *Leviathan* was the spontaneous orientation of the subject to pursue his or own individual desires, and the dialectical tension that ensues between this individual pursuit and the emergent common good. Melchin suggests that Lonergan's account of "the good of order" was cast as a response to Hobbes' view "which conceived the struggle for power as the central, defining foundation for an analysis of social and political structure" (ibid. 212). Thus Melchin suggests, and rightly so, that Lonergan took the account of the human phenomena which Hobbes described in *Leviathan* as an earlier stage in an ongoing personal and social development, or as one or another form of 'bias.'

While Marx focused on economic structures as a condition that limits the human person's intelligent and responsible acts, Lonergan in his discussion of individual and group bias acknowledged the import of Marx's intent but concludes with an even more pessimistic analysis of the current situation than Marx himself would have envisioned (ibid. 210-11). His diatribe against Marx led to the discussion of group bias, general bias, and their corresponding cycle of decline. Lonergan, like Marx, understands the integral relationship between an account of human nature and a theory of social and historical process. But Lonergan differs from Marx in recognizing that what is most significant for

a proper study of human nature and history is the concrete, historical performance of the acts of practical intelligence by human subjects.

Melchin singles out the notion of alienation as that which is at the center of Marx's account of the historical process. In Marx's analysis of the historical process, the conditions that affect the forces of production and the modes of distribution of the fruits of the workers' labor are not set by the worker, and consequently diminish the workers' well being. This, Marx contended, leads to alienation on two fronts: the human person is alienated from oneself and from others. Marx saw the conditions that surround "the acts of production of any age are the result of dialectical interplay between the acts of production of the previous age and the negations in social life which the effects of such acts generate" (ibid. 224). According to Melchin, while Marx urged people to assume responsibility for history, his explanation for the determinants of his history does not emphasize "the degree to which subjective agency authors these determinants." In offering a corrective to Marx, Lonergan's account of group bias, the dialectic of the community and the cycle of decline seek "to understand the human exercise of practical responsibility as conditioned, significantly, by dialectically operating determinants." While Marx looked forward to a final resolution of the problem of the human condition and an end to human misery, Lonergan does not envisage such a resolution. In Lonergan's view, "the acceleration of the shorter cycle only exacerbates a greater and more fundamental problem in the human situation, the general bias" (ibid. 225). Both the cycle of decline and general bias will be analyzed shortly.

Doran's account again supports Melchin's position. Doran alludes to a 1935 letter Lonergan wrote to his provincial in which Lonergan appealed to Leo XIII's mandate *vetera novis augere et perficere*, in order to explain his "excursion into the metaphysics of history" (Doran 1988, 8). Lonergan admitted to the enormous influence of Hegel and Marx on his position on history, maintaining however, that his position would go beyond theirs. Lonergan locates the social dialectic, not in the forces and relations of production as Marx did, but "between practical commonsense as it erects technological, economic, and political structures, on the one hand, and vital intersubjectivity, on the other hand" (ibid. 9). Unlike Marx who located the political dimension of society in the superstructure, Lonergan locates the political dimension of society in the infrastructure. "The superstructure is constituted by

the reflective, objectifying dimension of culture that steps back from everyday practicality and exercises critical, dialectical, and normative judgment on the workings of practical common sense" (ibid.). It is in this context that Lonergan examined individual bias, group bias, and general bias as forces that militate against a harmonious or integral dialectic between practicality and intersubjectivity.

Modern political theorists and sociologists have supported Lonergan's critique of Marx. Modern political theorists such as Iris Marion Young take issue with Marx's concept of exploitation, which they find too narrow and inadequate to capture the many forms of domination and oppression that afflict people in society. "The Marxist concept of class leaves important phenomena of sexual and racial oppression unexplained. Does that mean that sexual and racial oppressions are non-exploitative, and that we should reserve wholly distinct categories for these oppressions?" (Young 1990, 50). Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis contend that Marx lacked the theoretical vocabulary to represent the conditions of choice, individual liberty, and dignity and hence could not fully address the problem of despotism, and that in the Marxian lexicon, the terms "domination," "exploitation," and "class" are virtually interchangeable, the one entailing the other. "The effect is to hide non-class and non-economic forms of domination—whether of the state, of white over black, of nation over nation, or of men over women—as surely as liberal discourse serves as protective cover for the power of capital" (Bowles and Gintins 1986, 18). Although one must in fairness admit that Marx's analysis of economic exploitation and other forms of exploitation has to some extent advanced democratic understanding of these terms, Bowles and Gintis contend that his tendency to treat distinct aspects of social life as theoretically indistinguishable is also manifested in his collapse of the terms domination, exploitation, and class to a single usage. "The result is to force the most diverse forms of domination—imperialism, violence against women, state despotism, racism, religious intolerance, oppression of homosexuals, and more—either into obscurity or into the mold of class analysis" (ibid. 19).

Raymond Murphy has also advanced the view that although exploitation is central to Marx's theory, his conception of exploitation is fundamentally flawed. The Marxian conception of exploitation does not capture many of the extreme forms of domination and oppression. "The chronically unemployed suffer, not exploitation in the Marxian

sense of the creation of surplus- value through the appropriation of their unpaid labor, but rather exclusion from the process of wage labor through which exploitation in this sense occurs" (Murphy 1985, 19:2, 233). Marx's theory of exploitation would not be able to address, for instance, the situation of African Americans and blacks in Britain who historically suffer by their exclusion from high-paying jobs that generate so much surplus for the white working class.

In sum: from these political theorists and the landmark work of Melchin, supported by the contributions of Lamb and Doran, we can conclude that Lonergan's analysis of bias serves as a corrective to Marx, Hobbes, and other modern theorists of society. Lonergan's work on bias is important because it shows (1) that exploitation, contrary to Marx's notion, does not depend only on domination of the means of production by a privileged few, the bourgeois (2) that the concept "exploitation" does not capture the essence of domination or exclusion that is rampant in modern day society and (3) that Marx's theory leaves unresolved such issues as racial exploitation, ethnic domination, sexual exploitation, and religious exploitation. Lonergan provides an analysis that better accommodates all these.

KINDS OF BIAS

Lonergan undertakes a lengthy and systematic discussion of bias in the sixth and seventh chapter of *Insight* and often makes references to these in other works, especially *Method*. He enumerates four principal ways by which distortion of intellectual development can occur. There is dramatic bias or the bias of unconscious motivation, the bias of individual egoism, group egoism, and the general bias of common sense (Lonergan 1996, 231). "To the degree that one actively reinforces or passively accepts one's relationship to these elements of distortion, one alienates oneself which, in Lonergan's schema, insures alienation from others as well as from one's destiny" (Ring 1981, 256). All four forms of bias are rooted in the flight from understanding and reflect distortions of reality on various levels (ibid.).

Dramatic Bias

The first kind of bias Lonergan treats in *Insight* he calls dramatic bias. Dramatic bias has been termed neurotic bias precisely because Lonergan refers to it in *Method* as the "bias of unconscious motivation" that

has been brought to light by depth psychology (Lonergan 1996, 231). Interestingly, nowhere in *Method*, written years after *Insight*, does he refer to "bias of unconscious motivation" as dramatic bias. This is understandable since Lonergan's aim in *Method* was not to have an elaborate discussion on bias. He only makes cursory references to it, and whenever he makes references to it he refers the reader to *Insight* where he has an extended discussion on the subject. Though in *Insight*, Lonergan does not specifically term dramatic bias neurotic bias, he does imply it. While discussing dramatic bias he goes on at length to discuss the scotosis that affects the "neural patterns and processes" (Lonergan 1997, 215-6).

Dramatic bias is due to psychological conditioning and is often beyond the person's control (Doran 1990, 34). It arises from the psychological depths and is often at times marked by sexual overtones. Dramatic bias or neurotic bias, as Lonergan sometimes calls it, is caused by a major trauma to one's physiological or psychological constitution (Gregson 1988, 31). The trauma is so emotionally sensitive that one always avoids facing up to it. The consequence can be devastating especially if no step is taken to heal the trauma.

One of the consequences of unattended neurotic bias is that certain experiences are left unattended, leads that should be pursued are not pursued, and truth is left hidden or buried. It is plain that just as insight can be desired, so also can it be unwanted, analogous to the way, in some cases, one can love light and in others darkness (Lonergan 1997, 214). This is why this bias is "responsible for an orientation of the dramatic pattern of our everyday lives against the emergence into consciousness of images that would be material for insights we do not want" (Doran 1990, 34). Dramatic bias, as Copeland (1998) once suggested, takes the form of denial of painful affect in the day-to-day living of one's life, thereby displaying some of the features Freud highlighted in his notion of the repressive censor (Doran 1990, 34). It is the refusal to seek knowledge, refusal to understand and act according to the dictates of that knowledge. "To exclude an insight is also to exclude the further questions that would arise from it, and the complementary insights that would carry it towards a rounded and balanced viewpoint" (Lonergan 1997, 214). This aberration of understanding creates in the mind a scotosis, a resulting blind spot. "As the scotosis becomes fixed or established, it prevents the proper development of affective attitudes and behavior" (Copeland 1998, 2:11). Many blind

spots, whether in oneself or another, by and large have to do with neu-rotic bias (Gregson 1988, 31).

Dramatic bias sometimes plays out in gender differentiations. There is some validity to the claim that gender impacts action, i.e. gender significantly affects the way we do things. Carol Gilligan in her pace-setting and debated work, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (1982), argues that men and women manifest basic differences in their approach to the moral life (see Patrick 1998, 2: 21). Whether this is a fact is debatable. Gilligan's work, meant as a critique of Kohlberg's theory of moral development, proposes that there are two ways of attending to moral problems, two ways of de-scribing relationship between the self and other, one masculine, one feminine. Kohlberg developed six stages of moral development based on an experiment he carried out among young boys (there was no girl in the experiment). Gilligan, whose work has been highly praised and highly critiqued, sees this theory as fundamentally flawed because it did not take into consideration feminine experience.

Gilligan's point has been corroborated, albeit inadvertently, by the feminist scholar Elizabeth Spelman who argued that "just as male thinkers can be faulted for writing about everyone in the "generic mas-culine" and thus making claims about humanity as if females did not exist, so also white feminists have often been guilty of generalizing about "women's experience" as if differences of race, class, ethnicity, and other particularities were not involved" (Patrick 1998, 2: 21). The literary scholar Carolyn Heilbrun has also made the memorable claim that men and women are socialized differently in a patriarchal cul-ture.

Gilligan's research work is not without its controversy. Some have been supportive of her work, others have not. Even some who con-sider her research work limited still find it a useful starting point for reflection on how gender impacts moral decision. Carolyn Heilbrun (1983, 1988, 1999, and 2002), shortly after Gilligan's work, remarked on the differences in the socialization process of men and women in patriarchal cultures. Heilbrun who has also written other works under the pseudonym Amanda Cross (1981and 2002) sometimes like Gil-ligan tends to exaggerate the differences in the socialization process of women and men. The import of their work, however, is that they tend to generate useful discussion on the subjects they raise (see Belenky et.al 1986).

The import of this is the allusion that gender inevitably affects our outlook to life, invariable affecting our moral actions. This is not necessarily to claim "innate" differences between male and female moral knowing.

Dramatic bias is the least conscious of the four biases and consequently can be the most devastating, in that the subject refuses to admit to consciousness images necessary for insight (Ring 1981, 256). The findings of Rosenthal and Jacobson illustrate this point. Rosenthal and Jacobsen selected at random a group of students who were by no means exceptional. But they informed certain elementary school teachers that these identified students were "late bloomers," and that the students were expected to show some sudden and dramatic increases in IQ over the course of the school year. When researchers at the end of the school year measured the IQ of these "late bloomers," they found that the "late bloomers" had gained more IQ than the other students, when in actual fact there was nothing special or exceptional about the "late bloomers" (Rosenthal and Jacobsen 1966, 19: 115-8.). Social psychologists have used this experiment to show that the teachers' expectations about their students influenced how they behaved toward them, and this helped make their expectations come true (Stangor 2000, 15).

Rosenthal and Jacobson's study exemplifies how one can have dramatic bias and not be conscious of it. Dramatic bias is caused by our unconscious desire to avoid pain (Gregson 1988, 31). By so doing, one makes decisions that are nothing but a reinforcement of one's spontaneous, unexamined fears and desires (Ring 1981, 256). As Lonergan noted in *Insight*:

> To exclude an insight is also to exclude the further questions that would arise from it and the complementary insights that would carry it towards a rounded and balanced viewpoint. To lack that fuller view results in behavior that generates misunderstanding both in ourselves and in others. To suffer such incomprehension favors a withdrawal from the outer drama of human living into the inner drama of phantasy (Lonergan 1970, 191).

An individual subjected to this kind of neurotic bias often has distorted values. When values are distorted, one displays aberrations in perception, understanding, judgment, and decision-making, thereby leading to what Lonergan calls individual decline (Gregson 1988, 31).

Decline, as Lonergan explains it, is an "alienation," or path to "self-destruction" one attains by one's conscious refusal to seek self-transcendence. It is produced by "the absurdities that proceed from inattention, oversight, unreasonableness and irresponsibility" and the "disregard of the transcendental precepts, be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible" (Lonergan 1996, 55). It is not only individuals that can suffer decline. It can happen to a community, a society, or even a whole civilization. For as Lonergan asserts, "a civilization in decline digs its own grave with a relentless consistency" (ibid.). As we will explore in more detail below, an individual consumed with intense tribal hatred would be a good example of neurotic bias. It can consume an individual as well as it can consume a group.

Individual Bias

There is also individual or egoistic bias, more subject to conscious control than is dramatic bias (Doran 1990, 34). Individual bias, like general bias and group bias, is a conscious flight from understanding. In individual bias, like in general bias and group bias, "self-interest, fear, and intersubjectivity are dynamically interrelated. Egoism results in self deception and alienation in that it consistently disregards the realm of intersubjective feelings such as co-operation and compassion in order to promote personal self-interest" (Ring 1981, 257).

In *Insight*, Lonergan begins his analysis of individual bias with an acknowledgement of "notable obscurity in the meaning of the terms 'egoism' and 'altruism.'" When a carnivorous animal kills its prey, it is not properly speaking egoistic but securing its biological end to maintain its survival. When a female animal fosters its young, it cannot be said to be altruistic but rather following its biological end. If animal spontaneity is neither egoistic nor altruistic, "the same must be said of human spontaneity; men are led by their intersubjectivity both to satisfy their own appetites and to help others in the attainment of their satisfactions, but neither type of activity is necessarily either egoistic or altruistic" (Lonergan 1997, 244). For human beings are social animals and the primordial basis of their community is spontaneous intersubjectivity, i.e. the innate drive to develop oneself and seek happiness. Lonergan believes primitive community is intersubjective as evidenced in the bond of mother and child, man and wife, father and son. Even after civilization intersubjective community survives in the family with its circle of friends, in customs and folkways, in basic arts and

crafts, skills, language, song, and dance. There is, however a sense in which egoism is always wrong and altruism its proper corrective. Egoism is an incomplete development of intelligence, an incompleteness that excludes correct understanding (ibid. 245). Individual bias finds expression in egoism. It is a distortion in the development of a person's intelligence as well as affective and experiential orientation that leads to selfish pursuit of personal desires at the expense of human relations and the common good (Copeland 1998, 2: 12). "It consists in an interference of self-centered spontaneity both with intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility and with normal intersubjective spontaneity" (Doran 1990, 34). This egoism is not to be confused with a person's desire to develop oneself in virtue. This is why Lonergan characterized egoism as being in conflict with the good of order, cause the good of order to deteriorate. "When we act from this bias, we use our intelligence to ferret out solutions to problems which will serve us and our concerns; and we turn away from the further questions of how or if those solutions will help or harm others" (Gregson 1988, 32).

The common good or good of order is conceived as a dialectically structured drive towards the unification of two principles: the operative principle of intelligence and the principle of mutuality. Individual bias manifestly contradicts both principles. Individual bias is a deformation of intelligence in that it contradicts the drive of intelligence to pose and seek answers to further relevant questions and consequently distorts the experiential orientation of the whole subject (Melchin 1987, 214). The refusal to raise and answer appropriate questions results in distortions in the horizon within which intelligence operates and in the experiential and intersubjective routines of the whole person. Since these experiential routines constitute the basis for the human person's practical interrelations with his or her environment, they become more and more distorted and the distorted experience becomes the foundation for a distorted understanding thereby setting the subject on an accelerating course of decline (ibid. 215).

Individual bias often works simultaneously with group bias. There is a structural parallel between individual bias and group bias. "Raising egoism to an art form, it animates the often sophisticated and ingenious schemes of the criminal element within society" (Loewe 1994, ix). Albert Memmi alluded to this relationship between individual prejudice and group prejudice when he maintained that the latter preexists and imposes itself on the former. Speaking of racism (which

would be an instance of Lonergan's group bias), Memmi argued that the family circle "is an extraordinary culture medium for prejudices, fears and resentments from which few children emerge wholly uncontaminated" (Memmi 1968, 198). He went further to say that racism, first and foremost, "is as intimate a part of the child's familial and social upbringing as the milk he sucks in infancy" (ibid.). Memmi's claim seems to have some merit. A study of race prejudice in children carried out by Maurice A. Sheehy of the Catholic University of America showed that children tend to develop certain types of racial prejudice when they discover that such prejudices win approval from their parents or older acquaintances. La Farge also cites the case of Northerners striving to make their way socially into the aristocratic South often manifesting prejudice to the surprise of the Southern friends, on the supposition that this must be the typically Southern attitude (La Farge 1945, 177-8).

Group Bias

Group bias, like individual bias, interferes with the development of practical common sense. Lonergan, in *Insight*, contrasts group bias with individual bias. "While individual bias has to overcome normal intersubjective feeling, group bias finds itself supported by such feeling. Again, while individual bias leads to attitudes that conflict with ordinary common sense, group bias operates in the very genesis of commonsense views" (Lonergan 1997, 247). In *Method in* Theology, Lonergan calls group bias the "more powerful and blinder bias" probably because, as Shawn Copeland (1998) rightly interprets it, group bias finds expression in social class division, ethnocentrism, racial conflicts, and gender-based societal and religious conflicts between groups. When Lonergan speaks of group bias, he does not speak in terms of ethnic grouping, or gender groups, or even religious groups. He speaks mainly in terms of "classes" that become distinguished by social function and social success. One can legitimately connect what Lonergan means by "classes" to ethnicity, race, gender and religious differentiation, in so far as they in time become, to use Lonergan's words, "a grotesquely distorted reality." No wonder Lonergan calls group bias "secret and almost unconscious" sin (Lonergan 1997, 249-50).

Group bias often finds expression in ideologies that prevent the group to which one belongs from bringing about meaningful social change (Ring 1981, 257). Joseph Komonchak describes it as a kind of

collective selfishness by which the needs and interests of a group within a larger society constitute the primary criterion for its actions and intelligence deflected from the service of the common good to serve local and particular interest (Komonchak 1988, 224). "Just as the individual egoist puts further questions up to a point, but desists before reaching conclusions incompatible with his egoism, so also the group is prone to have a blind spot for the insights that reveal its well-being to be excessive or its usefulness at an end" (Lonergan 1997, 248). One who belongs to a group whose ideologies rule always fears that any meaningful social change would *ipso facto* diminish the group's power and the group would therefore do everything in its power to scuttle change. In group bias one chooses the group's interest when it conflicts with the good of society. Lonergan explains the metamorphosis of group bias into ideology this way:

> To ignorance and incompetence there are added alienation and ideology. Egoists find loopholes in social arrangements, and they exploit them to enlarge their own share and diminish the share of others in current instances of the particular good. Groups exaggerate the magnitude and importance of their contribution to society. They provide a market for the ideological façade that would justify their ways before the bar of public opinion. If they succeed in their deception, the social process is distorted. What is good for this or that group, is mistakenly thought to be good for the country or for mankind, while what is good for the country or mankind is postponed or mutilated. There emerge the richer classes and the poorer classes, and the richer become even richer, while the poorer sink into misery and squalor (Lonergan 1996, 360).

Ideological bias sometimes immerses itself in culture. In a series of lectures he gave between 1966 and 1969 that culminated in the publication of *Method in Theology*, Lonergan repeatedly characterized the challenge that must be faced by the contemporary person as that posed by the transition from classicist to modern culture. Womanist theologians have expanded Lonergan's position to argue that, in order to move from classicist to modern culture, one must become mindful of and eliminate the triple oppression of race, class, and gender bias in mainstream theology. Paulette Kidder has called for an extension of Lonergan's analysis of bias to androcentrism, contending, "the patriarchal bias towards women and the feminine can be easily added to the examples of what Lonergan calls bias of the group" (Kidder

1994, 43). Group bias is "bolstered by intersubjective spontaneity to acknowledge only the practical insights that are to the advantage of one's group or class or nation, and to render other genuinely practical insights inoperative" (Doran 1990, 34).

> In its group form bias can lock entire societies into a relatively short cycle of alternating power shifts among competing vested interests, while its general form establishes a vortex that can suck whole civilizations into a downward spiral of meaninglessness. If, for Lonergan, freedom is the root of progress, bias is the enemy (Loewe 1994, ix).

Group bias only seeks to protect the interest of a particular ethnic, racial, or social group and excludes the interest of other groups in the polity. It not only directs the resources of the polity to its own aggrandizement, but also provides doctrines and theories that justify its actions, while at the same time making the misfortune of other groups to be due to their depravity (Lonergan 1996, 54). Group bias can manifest itself in customs and stereotypical ways of thinking and acting. In many African countries, proverbs and songs are composed to show the superiority of one clan over another. Hussein M. Adam relates the negative aspect of clan solidarity in Somali society in the proverb *Tuug ha la dilee, yaa reerkoodi mari* ("As you shout 'kill the thief' remember you risk revenge from his clan,") a proverb used to foster clan warfare (Adam 1995, 199). No wonder Lonergan says of this bias that it involves a distortion, for the reason that "the advantage of one group commonly is disadvantageous to another, and so some part of the energies of all groups is diverted to the supererogatory activity of devising and implementing offensive and defensive mechanisms" (Lonergan 1997, 249).

Group bias derails authentic human development by promoting a culture of intolerance. The dominant group ceases to be concerned with the plight of the repressed group. Dominant group members repress ideas that threaten their group interest, and are out to seek their group interest, not the common good. "The conditions for generating new intelligent insights and taking practical responsible action to meet and reverse the deteriorating decline in the larger society are disrupted" (Copeland 1998, 2: 12). Racial prejudice is an instance of group bias. In its grave form, racial prejudice is the passing of judgment of criminality or essential inferiority upon all the members of a

racial or ethnic group, with no sufficient intellectual motive for such a judgment (La Farge 1945, 176).

Group bias leads to conflict in the social order. The attitude of the dominant group determines the attitude of repressed groups. The leverage the dominant group has over other groups in the society is used in a way that is disadvantageous to these groups, and because of this classes become distinguished. Among the repressed classes, "the new differentiation finds expression not only in conceptual labels but also in deep feelings of frustration, resentment, bitterness, and hatred" (Lonergan 1997, 249). Instead of working to contribute to the common good, the repressed groups divert their energies to seeking relevance and defending themselves, sometimes expressing their sentiments in militant fashion. In truth, racial or ethnic prejudice is not entirely confined to the dominant group Since every social tendency produces a reaction, it would follow that the prejudice of a dominant ethnic group would be followed by prejudice in the repressed group (La Farge 1945, 183). In the ensuing conflict, according to Lonergan, the dominant group can be reactionary or progressive. If reactionary, they stifle any corrective to their group bias by any means necessary, in which case the situation becomes violent and more chaotic. If they choose to be progressive they try to correct the existing distortions and find means of preventing any future occurrence, in which case violence yields to dialogue. There will be a general agreement about the pace of change and the mode of its execution (Lonergan 1997, 250). "If societal progress is groups working together, attentively, intelligently, reasonably and responsibly, then decline is the cumulative results of groups working against one another, and trying to keep both from themselves and from the public forum whatever might call into question their own particular status" (Gregson 1988, 32-3).

General Bias of Common Sense

There is, besides the bias of unconscious motivation (dramatic bias), individual bias and group bias, a further bias to which all human beings are prone, general bias of common sense. Lonergan explains that it is the tendency in the human person to seek short-term immediate solutions even to complex problems. It is the common-sense quick fix solution to problems. Gregson explains it thus:

> If there is a difficulty, solve it now with the means at hand. That is precisely the common sense solution. But common sense doesn't ask further questions. Will solving it this way cause more problems down the road? What is the cause of the problem? Will certain structural changes in the manufacturing process, or in the institution, or in society keep this type of problem from occurring in the first place? …. These are the questions that common sense doesn't ask. It stays with the short term, at hand solutions rather than raising the long term, often complex, theoretical and scientific questions which could provide truly adequate and ultimately satisfying solutions (ibid.).

Robert Doran says of this bias that it is "a general bias of practical intelligence itself against theoretical questions, long-range consequences, higher integrations, and ultimate issues" (Doran 1990, 34). General bias is the tendency to avoid asking critical, theoretical questions in any form and also shunning inquiry that has no immediate practical results (Crysdale 1992, 53: 251). Granted human beings are rational animals, a full development of their animality is more rapid than full development of their intelligence or reasonableness. This deficiency or "lag of intellectual development," has a serious consequence for common sense (Lonergan 1997, 250-1). Thus general bias of common sense is a specialization of intelligence in a particular field that results in the feeling of the self being omni-competent (Lonergan 1996, 231). This is a bias in which one rationalizes limitations, a bias that particularly afflicts specialists when they fail to recognize and appreciate other fields. This bias severely distorts insight, exaggerates its limited competence and restricts intelligence to immediate and short-term goals, while ignoring long-term consequences (Copeland 1998, 2: 12). This is shortsightedness that pays attention only to what is immediately attainable. No wonder Doran (1990) calls this bias "the most radical source of social disintegration."

General bias, like the other biases, is not merely an exclusion of complete insight, but involves the subject in a dialectical tension with the exigencies of one's intersubjective experience. The distortion involved in general bias is more serious than the other three biases, for insufficiently developed intelligence with its limited horizon, sees no need for growth. "And as ever narrower points of view gain wider and wider acceptance, insufficiently developed intelligence pronounces theoretical issues to be irrelevant. The result is that common sense not only

finds itself insufficiently developed, it also judges further development to be impossible or irrelevant" (Melchin 1987, 235).

When combined with group bias, the general bias of common sense produces a distorted community. "To the extent that it reflects the dominance of one or other principle, or the subordination of one to the other – for general bias can conscript groups by appealing to group bias – the situation falls short of intelligibility, goodness, and justice" (Doran 1990, 372). This explains why dominant groups tend to exclude others and muzzle new ideas to promote their own selfish goals. John LaFarge tells the story of a boy ploughing in a field. A stranger came and engaged him in a conversation; pointing to a near-by Catholic church, the stranger remarked that the basement of that church is full of rifles that the Pope keeps there with which to shoot Protestants. The boy in all simplicity believed him, forming a rash judgment there and then as to the Catholics who frequented that church, without asking further questions as to what Catholics were or did (La Farge 1945, 175-6).

In conclusion, in his two major works, *Insight* and *Method*, Lonergan makes a good connection between dramatic bias, individual bias, group bias, and bias of common sense. There is a connection between these biases such that it is possible for one person to possess all four at the same time. Lonergan makes this connection clearly in *Method*, "Evaluations may be biased by an egoistic disregard of others, by a loyalty to one's group matched by hostility to other groups, by concentrating on short-term benefits and overlooking long-term costs" (Lonergan 1996, 53). He makes this connection clearly again in *Method* while discussing history and the historian. He says of the historian, "I am not suggesting that he cannot overcome individual, group, or general bias," a point that suggests that one can have, at the same time, individual, group, and general bias, in addition to dramatic bias.

Lonergan's in-depth analysis of general bias and the cycles of decline that result from it lend credence to the premium he places on the distortion that this bias yields. From Lonergan's analysis, it is clear that general bias can afflict an individual in much same way it afflicts a group or society. Whether or not general bias is a specific form of individual or group bias is a question Lonergan leaves unresolved. But he seems to suggest that general bias cannot manifest itself except in the individual, social class, or group. In *Method* he speaks of the "aberrations" and "distortions" that result from general bias to be due to egois-

tic disregard for others, by a loyalty to one's group matched by hostility to other groups (ibid.). It would also seem, from Lonergan's analysis, that general bias is a more distorting form of individual and group bias, for the fact that general bias concentrates on short-term benefits and overlooks long-term costs. More so because the aberrations general bias produces are "easy to maintain and difficult to correct." This, according to Lonergan, is because "egoists do not turn into altruists overnight. Hostile groups do not easily forget their grievances, drop their resentments, overcome their fears and suspicions" (ibid.). Lonergan argues that since common sense feels itself omni-competent in practical affairs, it is commonly blind to long-term consequences of policies and courses of action, in addition to being commonly unaware of the admixture of common nonsense in its more cherished convictions and slogans.

One can make the argument, and with justification, that Lonergan, in *Insight*, discusses bias with an intellectualist approach. His approach is based mainly on a cognitive, intellectualist approach and his examples manifest the same trend. In *Method* where he paid more attention and devoted more time to feelings and affections, he did not take up any elaborate discussion of bias, thereby leaving his treatment of bias devoid of systematic treatment of the role of the affect. Perhaps his elaborate discussion of conversion in *Method* is intended to provide the missing affectivity in the whole discussion of bias. After all it is in conversion that errors, rationalizations, ideologies fall and shatter and leave one open to the way he or she should be (i.e. a self-transcendent human being who is attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible), and fulfills his or her affectivity (ibid. 52). Be that as it may, Lonergan cannot fully escape some pertinent criticism. It is apt to point out that Lonergan lived at a time when the race question was a hot issue, especially in North America, where he lived, and South Africa, which was notorious for its apartheid policy. Lonergan's discussion of group bias captures the block, scotosis, or distortion that makes one group despise another and lord it over them. He explains this as an egoistic disregard of others, by a loyalty to one's own group matched by hostility to other groups. Though he sometimes mentions the situation in Germany and the events leading to World War II, as instances of bias, one would have expected more poignant examples, like the plight of blacks in the Americas or the apartheid policy of South Africa. On these issues Lonergan was astonishingly silent.

Lonergan's Work on Bias in Light of More Recent Theories

Lonergan's view that all human beings are subject to bias is one that finds support in both philosophy and social theory. Social psychologists allude to social categorization as an integral part of human life, and from social categorization emerge stereotyping and prejudice. Charles Stangor argues that there is no topic that has so engaged the interest of social psychologists as that of stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination. Stangor defines stereotypes as beliefs about the characteristics of groups of individuals; an example would be the popular belief that women are emotional and college professors are absent minded. He also defined prejudice as a negative feeling or attitude toward members of a group. Social psychologists are intensely interested in these topics mainly because stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination can have negative outcomes not only for the individuals who are their target, but also for the society at large (Stangor 2000, 1). Gordon Allport has done a remarkable work on the nature of social categorization, stereotyping, and prejudice. Although the examples Allport uses seem outdated in light of modern day theories or discussions of prejudices, his definition of prejudice resonates what Lonergan means by bias. Prejudice, for Allport, which is thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant, is irrational in that it is not only inaccurate but also erroneous (Allport 1954, 23).

Speaking of prejudice, Hans-Georg Gadamer introduces the idea of "legitimate prejudices" and also speaks positively of the pre-understanding and pre-judgments that are involved in being part of a tradition. (Gadamer 1999, 277). Gadamer, influenced by his teacher Martin Heidegger, contends that historians' own prejudices constitute necessary conditions for historical understanding, and hermeneutics therefore involves the analysis of such prejudices, i.e. how they evolve and are constituted through language. This is why the renowned French philosopher, Paul Ricoeur (1970), in elaborating his hermeneutic of suspicion, speaks of hermeneutic as being animated by double motivation: "willingness to suspect, willingness to listen." Commenting on Ricoeur's hermeneutic of suspicion, Thiesleton argued that its task is that of "doing away with idols," i.e. that we become aware of when we project into the text our own wishes and constructs (Thisleton 1992, 27).

Lonergan, aware of the "prejudices" Heidegger, Gadamer, and Ricoeur, and their disciples speak about, prefers to talk in terms of individual and group bias. While the concept of individual, as Lonergan uses it, may have been helped by research in anthropology, his concept of group is still very problematic. When Lonergan speaks of group bias, what does he mean by group? Though ordinary discourse differentiates people according to social groups, such as women and men, age groups, racial and ethnic groups, and religious groups, etc, groups are an expression of social relations (Young 1990, 42-3). Social theory does not, as yet, have a clear and developed concept of social group. Still social group is not just a collection of people but intertwined with the identities of people described as belonging to them. "A social group is a collection of persons differentiated from at least one other group by cultural forms, practices, or way of life. Members of a group have a specific affinity with one another more than with those not identified with the group, or in a different way" (ibid.). Political theorists also distinguish between social groups, aggregates, and associations. An aggregate is a classification of people according to some attributes, e.g. eye color, emotional ability, etc. Associations are formal organizations or institutions, e.g. clubs, church, political party, and college.

Classification of people into social groups, aggregates, and associations, using the findings of social scientists, is a useful venture. It is the misuse of such classification that becomes problematic. Such misuse often translates into what Lonergan calls bias. On the misuse of classification, Albert Memmi rightly notes, "making use of the differences is an essential step in the racist process: but it is not the difference which entails racism; it is racism which makes use of the difference" (Memmi 1968, 187). Social psychologists believe that stereotypes and prejudice are the result of social categorization, i.e. instead of thinking about another individual as a unique individual we think of the person as member of a group, based on their physical characteristics like gender, age, or skin color, or other categories (Stangor 2000, 2). One of the key elements of the racist's process, according to Memmi, is the assigning of values, intended to prove two things: the inferiority of the victim and the superiority of the racist. Memmi gives four essential elements of racists' attitude: (i) they stress the real or imagined differences between them (racist) and their victim (ii) assign values to these differences, to the advantage of the racist and the detriment of the victim (iii) trying to make absolutes by generalizing from them and

claiming that they are final and (iv) justifying any present or possible aggression or privilege. Racists, by so doing, justify their own privileges and aggressions only at the expense of their victims (Memmi 1968, 185). Tribalists use a similar method as racists, feeding on bias that has been created and developed over time. Charles Taylor (1994) captures the debilitating effect of bias (he calls it the mis-recognition of our identity by others), by rightly noting how a person or a group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Such mis-recognition not only inflicts harm on the victim but also reduces their mode of being. Some feminist thinkers, for instance, point out that women in patriarchal societies are induced to adopt a depreciatory image of themselves and to internalize a picture of their own inferiority, thereby suffering low self-esteem in a way analogous to how blacks in white dominated society adopt a demeaning image of themselves projected to them by the dominant society (Taylor 1994, 25-6). A Similar point can be made of any repressed or subjugated ethnic or religious group.

In sum, one of the reasons why Lonergan took pains to explain the four different kinds of bias is to lay bare the morbid effect of bias so that individuals and groups may look for ways to overcome them and affirm the rights of all to exist in a pluralistic society. Drawing from the insights of social psychology, Charles Taylor has done a remarkable work on the basis on which different cultural groups are to be recognized and respected in their own rights. To this end Taylor developed what he has termed the politics of recognition, the politics of difference, and multiculturalism, to show that all cultures deserve equal recognition. One of the lessons which Lonergan has brought to our attention, which has been supported by the findings of social psychology, and which Taylor highlights, is that differences do exist and that people different from us are not, by the fact of their differences, our enemies. Rather, they demand our respect, for they are what George Herbert Mead (1934) has aptly described as our "significant others."

BIAS AND THE CYCLE OF DECLINE AND THE
POSSIBILITY OF AUTHENTIC PROGRESS

Cycles of Decline and Progress

Lonergan used the term cycle of decline, which can be used to understand the impact of bias. But why did he speak of decline (and progress) as a cycle? What is a cycle? Any one familiar with Israeli-Palestinian conflict often hears the phrase "cycle of violence," a phrase used to describe the conflict between these two neighbors. The wanton destruction of lives and property and the seemingly unending reprisals from both sides that accompany the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (and others like it) has made the description "cycle of violence" apt. This may well be a modern example of what Lonergan means by cycle of decline.

In *Insight*, Lonergan, in his critique of Marx's economic order and that of the liberal theorists whose economic order he finds totally deficient, discusses the meaning of "cycle" in the context of general bias. He makes a distinction between "the shorter cycle, due to group bias, and the longer cycle, originated by the general bias of common sense." Frederick Lawrence has identified Machiavelli as a prime example or principal figure in the history of the shift toward the "short cycle" of decline (Lawrence 1978, 11: 239-243).

Melchin attempts an explanation of what Lonergan means by "longer cycle" of decline. He says, "the historical consequence of the operation of the general bias is the emergence of a dynamic trend that stands in opposition to the drive of finality towards successively higher emergent integrations" (Melchin 1987, 234). Lonergan explains the difference between the shorter cycle and the longer cycle:

> The shorter cycle turns upon ideas that are neglected by dominant groups only to be championed later by depressed groups. The longer   cycle is characterized by the neglect of ideas to which all groups are   rendered indifferent by the general bias of common sense. Still, this account of the longer cycle is mainly negative; to grasp its nature and its   implications, we must turn to fundamental notions (Lonergan 1997, 252).

Thus Lonergan locates the shorter cycle in group bias, and the longer cycle in general bias. When general bias combines with group bias

there is distortion, and "the social situation deteriorates cumulatively," as the dynamic of progress is replaced with stagnation and sluggish-ness. The further consequence of this, according to Lonergan, is that "culture retreats into an ivory tower. Religion becomes an inward af-fair of the heart," and people begin to act in ways that are contrary to the dictates of right reason. Commenting on this, Melchin explains that, though one could only speculate on the names, dates, places and events to which Lonergan alludes, it is clear that Lonergan mounts a technical restatement of the elements of the longer cycle, through the history of the growing irrelevance of religion and philosophy to the barbarism of Hitler's Germany. Melchin vividly explains this distor-tion further:

> Like other biases, the general bias is not merely negative. It is not only an exclusion of complete insights. Rather, like other biases the general bias involves the subject in a dialectical tension with the exi-gencies of his or her intersubjective experience. The partial insights of common sense result in a distortion of the subject's experiential manifold. And so subsequent insights and practical decisions be-gin conforming more and more to the distorted experiential base. But the general bias involves its own peculiar form of distortion, a distortion that is more serious than those of the other biases. For insufficiently developed intelligence with its shrunken or delimited horizons does not grasp the need for growth (Melchin 1987, 235). Lonergan calls this situation a "social surd." Although the develop-ment of western civilization has witnessed an extraordinary flower-ing of human intelligence in all spheres of life, this progress has not been along a smooth and mounting curve, not without its own so-cial surd. "It has taken place through the oscillations of the shorter cycle, in which social groups become factions, in which nations go to war, in which the hegemony passes from one center to another to leave its former holders with proud memories and impotent dreams" (Lonergan 1997, 254).

Lonergan argues that it is possible to reverse bias and its short and longer cycle. To this end he proposes the much-needed "higher view-point." The higher viewpoint, as he explains it, is "the discovery, the logical expansion, and the recognition of the principle that intelligence contains its own immanent norms and that these norms are equipped with sanctions which man does not have to invent or impose" (Lon-ergan 1997, 259). Shawn Copeland explains that "higher viewpoints"

stem from further questions. Implicit in the idea of higher viewpoint is the possibility of indefinite progress. Lonergan uses different examples to illustrate transition from a lower viewpoint to a higher viewpoint. One example is the transition from arithmetic to algebra. Another example drawn from Lonergan's early works is that of the relationship of the supernatural to the temporal. The supernatural is at a higher viewpoint in relation to things historical, social, political, or economical (Copeland 1991, 48-9).

The most essential feature of this higher viewpoint is the realization that intelligently mediated operations play a major role in the constitution of history and culture. Melchin rightly explains this to mean that, in Lonergan's analysis, since intelligence contains its own immanent norms, progress can be cultivated and realized, not just by the transformation of the social and economic conditions, but mainly through the growth of the whole human person. (Melchin 1987, 240). Cultivating the whole person requires freedom to develop one's practical intelligence. This is why Lonergan explains that the principle of progress is liberty. "There is progress, because practical intelligence grasps ideas in data, guides activity by the ideas, and reaches fuller and more accurate ideas through the situations produced by the activity" (Lonergan 1997, 259).

Lonergan calls on cultures to embrace this higher viewpoint. The role of culture is to embrace and reflect this higher viewpoint on human life and human history and to critique any deformation in common sense intelligence in the interest of its liberation from short-term practicality (Melchin 1987, 240). Lonergan's point is that since it is in the context of one's culture that one, by one's biases, generates decline, then it is also in the context of one's culture that one, by one's intelligence, can reverse decline and generate progress. "As the dialectic in the individual and in society reveals, man is a compound-in-tension of intelligence and intersubjectivity, and it is only through the parallel compound of a culture that his tendencies to aberration can be offset proximately and effectively" (Lonergan 1997, 261-2).

In *Insight*, Lonergan introduces another concept, cosmopolis, which he designates for this higher viewpoint, which all cultures must embrace. Cosmopolis is not concerned with the incidental or residual but with the fundamental issue of the historical process. Its aim is to "prevent practicality from being shortsightedly practical and so destroying itself" (ibid. 263-4). Melchin points out that it is not precisely clear

what Lonergan intends by cosmopolis, a point that Copeland (1991) clearly supports, though one can make the argument that Copeland's position is as a result of her dependence on the work of Melchin which she cites at a great length. One may agree with Melchin and Copeland that while Lonergan leaves one in doubt as to what precisely he means by cosmopolis he, nevertheless, attempts an explanation.

Lonergan gives five properties of cosmopolis. First, cosmopolis is not a police force, nor is political entity (like the United Nations) what is meant by cosmopolis. Rather, cosmopolis is above politics. Second, the task of cosmopolis is to break the vicious circle of an illusion and make operative the ideas that, in the light of the general bias of common sense, are inoperative. Third, cosmopolis is supremely practical in that it does not waste its time and energy condemning individual egoism that is in revolt against society and already condemned by society. It does not waste its time on group egoism that in the short run generates the principles that involves its reversal. Rather, it is geared towards preventing dominant groups from deluding humankind by the rationalization of their sins. "If the sins of dominant groups are bad enough, still the erection of their sinning into universal principles is indefinitely worse; it is the universalization of the sin by rationalization that contributes to the longer cycle of decline; it is the rationalization that cosmopolis has to ridicule, explode, destroy" (Lonergan 1997, 264). Fourth, since cosmopolis has to protect one against rationalization of abuses and the creation of myths, so it must itself be purged of the rationalizations and myths that became part of human heritage before it came to the scene. The reasoning behind this is simple. As Lonergan explains, "if the analyst suffers from scotoma, he will communicate it to the analysand; similarly, if cosmopolis itself suffers from the general bias of common sense in any of its manifestations, then the blind will be leading the blind and both will head for a ditch" (ibid.). Finally, since every scotosis puts forth a plausible, ingenious, adaptive, and untiring resistance, it is by engaging in dialectical analysis that cosmopolis can "discover and expose both the series of past refusals and the tactics of contemporary resistance to enlightenment" (ibid. 265-7).

In a nutshell, as Lonergan conceives it, cosmopolis is the very thing that bias of common sense precludes, and therefore it serves as the foundation of the possibility for the reversal of decline. Cosmopolis is at the very heart of Lonergan's work. It deals with developed under-

standing of those operations that distinguish human life as self-regulating and self-constituting (Melchin 1987, 241). As Copeland rightly asserts, cosmopolis is a development of intelligence beyond common sense. It stands as a higher viewpoint on common sense, and calls for a higher integration of human living (Copeland 1991, 129).

Authentic Self Appropriation and Bias

Dr. Wald of Harvard University and a Nobel laureate, in an unpublished lecture given at St. Mary's University in 1980, once noted that the one thing that escapes science is consciousness, that while science may have a great deal to say about the theory of sight, it can not say anything about the fact of seeing. While eyes can be observed as a conscious act, seeing cannot. Though one may not be able to see 'seeing,' one may still be conscious of the act of seeing (Stewart 1996, 48). Lonergan's analysis of self-appropriation is in the context of knowledge. He describes *Insight* "as a set of exercises in which one attains self-appropriation" (Lonergan 1980, 1). The pursuit of knowledge is the pursuit of the unknown. For if we already knew what we were looking for when seeking knowledge, we would not have to look for it, for we would have had it already. The pursuit of knowledge is a conscious, deliberate, intelligent, rational, and methodical act. Self-appropriation does not permit of uncritical inquiry. It requires that the one who seeks knowledge be intelligent in the sense that one asks the right questions, has insights in the sense that one is able to form concepts and weigh evidence, in the sense that one is able to judge. Self-appropriation is presence of oneself to oneself and to others (ibid. 14-5). Lonergan gives three types of material presence. In the first kind of 'presence,' if chairs are arranged in a room, one can say chairs are present in the room, but one cannot say chairs are present to the room or that the room is present to the chairs. In the second kind of 'presence,' a dog that sees another dog on the other side of the street, the dog is present to him but not in the sense of the chair present to the room. In the third kind of 'presence,' Lonergan says you could not be present to me unless I was somehow present to myself. One has to be present to oneself before others can be present to one. This is the kind of presence that is of interest in self-appropriation. Self-appropriation is empirical consciousness as it is intelligent consciousness, intellectual consciousness and rational consciousness. Shawn Copeland (1998)

describes it as an 'uncomfortable' and 'unsettling' process because it is not about getting at some 'thing' but about getting at ourselves.

Self-appropriation is rational self-consciousness in the sense of being a rational reflection about oneself. It is a kind of conscience, asking the question: am I doing the right thing? (Lonergan 1980, 16). This means self-appropriation is also moral consciousness. It is "highlighted by the manifestation of the human person's creative drive toward self-transcendence in the form of an exigence for consistency between one's knowing and one's doing, for conformity of one's decisions to one's reasonable, objective judgments" (Conn 1979, 7: 185). As a kind of conscience, self-appropriation is concerned about decisions we make for ourselves as individuals and members of a society. It demands responsible, authentic decisions and actions. Our actions as adults, as decision makers, as human beings, are mediated by values (Bronowski 1973, 436). The Lonergan scholar, Walter E. Conn, in quoting J. Bronowski's *The Ascent of Man*, shows how "the ascent of man is always teetering in the balance. There is always a sense of uncertainty, whether when man lifts his foot for the next step it is really going to come down pointing ahead" (Conn 1978, 39: 313). This shows that there is a question of the moral ascent of the human person, of a person's ability and willingness through knowledgeable, responsible decisions to take deliberate control of his/her life in a fully human way. It is in the context of human ability to take deliberate, knowledgeable and responsible decision that Lonergan discusses authenticity and the possibility of progress and decline. He constructs a theory of human history and identifies its generating principles: human history is the story of progress, decline and recovery, its principles intelligence, sin and grace (Komonchak 1988, 223).

In *Method*, Lonergan locates authenticity in self-transcendence. The human person achieves authenticity in self-transcendence. Self-transcendence is cognitive if it remains in the order not of doing, but of knowing. Lonergan explains that it is when one asks questions whether what one is doing is worthwhile, whether what one is doing is truly good (not just apparently good), and one is inquiring, not about pleasure or pain, not about sensitive spontaneity, not about individual or group advantage, but about objective value, and it is only then that one can effect in one's living a moral transcendence. Lonergan explains moral transcendence as "the possibility of benevolence and beneficence, of honest collaboration and of true love, of swinging completely out of

the habitat of an animal and of becoming a person in a human society"
(Lonergan 1996, 104). Thus in *Method*, Lonergan identifies religious
experience as the fulfillment of human self-transcendence: "Religious
effort towards authenticity through prayer and penance and religious
love of all men shown in good deeds become an apostolate, for 'you will
recognize them by their fruits'" (ibid. 119). He also notes the dialecti-
cal nature of this religious experience. Human authenticity is not some
pure and serene secure possession because self-transcendence involves
tension between the self as transcending and the self as transcended.
In *Insight*, human authenticity is the same as self-appropriation, self-
consciousness. Lonergan says in *Insight* that the human person is not
just a knower but also a doer. "The same intelligent and rational con-
sciousness grounds the doing as well as the knowing; and from that
identity of consciousness there springs inevitably an exigence for self-
consistency in knowing and doing" (Lonergan 1997, 622).

Self-transcendence, for Lonergan, "primarily refers to the three-fold
achievement of "moving beyond one's own self" that is realized in ev-
ery instance of correct understanding (cognitive), responsible decision
(moral), and genuine love (affective)" (Conn 1978, 39: 314). Self-
transcendence is effected through sensitive and creative understand-
ing, critical judgment, responsible decision, loyal commitment and
genuine love. Since the human person is not just a knower, but also
a doer, "the same intelligent and rational consciousness grounds the
doing as well as the knowing; and from that identity of consciousness
there springs inevitably an exigence for self-consistency in knowing
and doing" (Lonergan 1997, 622). An individual becomes an authen-
tic or inauthentic subject by one's actions in an intersubjective and a
social-historical world with other human beings and in relationship to
concrete social and historical structures and movements (Tracy 1981,
35-6).

Authenticity leads to progress in the human person and society. One
of the principles of human history is the exercise of intelligence and
freedom. "The exercise of intelligence at once fulfils the person and
generates historical progress, and were intelligence always in act and
freedom always faithful to the demands of intelligence, human history
would be the story of a gradual and cumulative progress" (Komon-
chak 1988, 223). Progress is attained by being true to the transcen-
dental precepts: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable and be re-
sponsible. One is attentive when one pays attention to human affairs.

One is intelligent when one grasps hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities. One is reasonable when one rejects what probably would not work and acknowledges what works. One is responsible when one bases one's decisions and choices on an unbiased evaluation of short-term and long-term costs that benefits, not only oneself or one's group, but other groups as well. Faithfulness to the transcendental precepts "spots the inadequacies and repercussions of the previous venture to improve what is good and remedy what is defective" (Lonergan 1996, 53).

Progress is not a single improvement but a continuous flow of improvements. "Individuals, societies or cultures do not advance in straight lines; development is always precarious and achievement fragile" (Komonchak 1988, 224). Adherence to the transcendental precepts is not a one-time activity. For the precepts, as conceived by Lonergan, are to be exercised, not only with respect to the existing situation but also with respect to the subsequent, changed situation. Faithfulness to the transcendental precepts ensures that change begets change and makes cumulative change an instance of progress.

Decline is as much a fact of human history as is progress. "Lonergan traces the root of decline to the deflection of human consciousness from its intrinsic and ideal norms: intelligence, reason, and responsibility" (Komonchak 1988, 224). Decline comes from the violation of the transcendental precepts, which may be prompted by "an egoistic disregard of others, by loyalty to one's own group matched by hostility to other groups, by concentrating on short-term benefits and overlooking long-term costs" (Lonergan 1996, 53). Just as insight into insight brings to light the cumulative process of progress, insight into oversight reveals the cumulative process of decline. For flight from understanding (bias) inhibits insights that concrete situations may demand. From this then may follow unintelligent policies and inept courses of action (Morelli and Morelli 1997, 39). Lonergan calls the disregard for transcendental precepts alienation. As self-transcendence promotes progress, the refusal of self-transcendence turns progress into a cumulative decline. It compromises and distorts progress. "Not only do inattention, obtuseness, unreasonableness, irresponsibility produce objectively absurd situations. Not only do ideologies corrupt minds. But compromise and distortion discredit progress" (Lonergan 1996, 55).

At the root of the violation of the transcendental precepts is bias or egoism. Egoism of the individual conflicts with the good of order and cause it to deteriorate. Group egoism misappropriates development. "Development guided by group egoism is bound to be one-sided. It divides the body social not merely into those that have and those that have not but also makes the former the representatives of the cultural flower of the age to leave the latter apparent survivals from a forgotten era" (ibid. 54). For in the measure that a group accepts and encourages an ideology to rationalize its own behavior, in the same measure it will be blind to the real situation and contrary ideologies.

The Dramatic Dialectics of Self-Appropriation and Bias

Self-appropriation, as we have seen from Lonergan's analysis, is a presence of oneself to oneself and to others, and as such can be said to be a rational reflection about oneself and about one's values, a form of conscience. One's actions are constantly being evaluated. Such evaluation is the function of dialectics. Dialectics is the analysis and evaluation of the past, others' actions and postures, in the light of one's own values (Gregson 1981, 150). It is a concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change. Lonergan traces the origin of the word 'dialectic' and its varied meanings. In Plato it denoted the art of philosophic dialogue. In Aristotle it denoted an effort to discover clues to the truth by reviewing and scrutinizing different opinions. For the scholastics it was the application of logical rules to public disputation. In Hegel it denoted the triadic process from the concept of being to the Absolute Idea. Marx inverted Hegel and used it in material process. From this then Lonergan inferred dialectic as denoting a combination of the concrete, the dynamic and the contradictory, a combination to be found in dialogue, history of ideas and in historical process (Lonergan 1970, 217). There will be a dialectic if:

(i) there is an aggregate of events of a determinate character,
(ii) the events may be traced to either or both of two principles,
(iii) the principles are opposed yet bound together and
(iv) they are modified by the changes that successively result from them (ibid.).

Lonergan notes that in the dramatic pattern of common sense intelligence, there is operative "a dialectical interaction between the spontaneous demands of neural patterns and processes, and the selection,

integration and repression of such neural demand functions by the psyche through the conscious operations in the 'basic pattern of experience.'" The dialectical nature of knowledge demands that questions of intelligence, not only be met with incorrect answers, but that such answers be invited and encouraged "when the subject's projects and anticipations do not correspond to the demands of experience." In dramatic bias (incorrect development of intelligence), the subject not only stops short of correct answers, but also rejects correct insights in favor of incorrect ones Melchin 1987, 179).

Dialectics should be viewed, not so much as a critique of the past, as a valuing of the past. One must evaluate to clarify one's own values in relation to the wisdom and foolishness which is one's own inheritance. "Dialectics is e-valuating, it is co-valuating, letting the values of the past reveal themselves and in the process letting one's own values come to light" (Gregson 1981, 150).

> Positions and counter-positions are not just contradictory abstractions. They are to be understood concretely as opposed moments in ongoing process. They are to be apprehended in their proper dialectical character. Human authenticity is not some pure quality, some serene freedom from all oversights, all misunderstanding, all mistakes, all sins. Rather itconsists in a withdrawal from unathenticity, and the withdrawal is never a permanent achievement. It is ever precarious, ever to be achieved afresh, ever in great part a matter of uncovering still more oversights, acknowledging still further failures to understand, correcting still more mistakes, repenting more and more deeply hidden sins. Human development, in brief, is largely through the resolution of conflicts and, within the realm of intentional consciousness, the basic conflicts are defined by the opposition of positions andcounter-positions (Lonergan 1996, 252).

Consciousness can be differentiated in so many ways. While there may be scientific, artistic, scholarly and religious differentiations, self-appropriation yields a further differentiation that Lonergan calls interiorly differentiated consciousness. "The person of interiorly differentiated consciousness has developed a habitual understanding of the operations and states of his or her consciousness in their relations with one another" (Doran 1990, 43). Self-appropriation is the key to grasping Lonergan's transcendental method. The transcendental method is "the radical intending that moves us from ignorance to knowledge…go beyond what we know to seek to what we do not know yet" (Lonergan

1996, 11). Lonergan makes it clear that self-appropriation is not introspection, in the sense of inward inspection. Rather, self-appropriation is a heightening of consciousness. Everyone must engage pragmatically in the effort of self-appropriation. While reading and instruction, for example, may help us learn how to drive an automobile, one must ultimately get behind the wheel to start driving, for we do not learn to drive by proxy (Stewart 1996, 53). In the same way, one must go beyond theoretical knowledge to appropriate one's learning and consciousness for oneself.

Self-appropriation is dialectical and dialogical. It is not just an ideal to be discovered, but a virtue one acquires by interacting with other people. It demands constant negotiations and dialogue. Dialectics is best understood then as dialogue, for the past is always in need of critique (Gregson 1981, 150). "The more you talk with one another and throw things out, the more you probe, and the more you express yourself spontaneously, simply and frankly, not holding back in fear of making mistakes, the more quickly you arrive at the point where you get the thing cleared up" (Lonergan 1980, 18). Lonergan's treatment of self-appropriation as dialectical and dialogical is very important for the argument I shall advance later: that the key to resolving the ethnic and religious conflicts in Africa lies in a good understanding of the notion of dialogue. For as Lonergan points out, in dialogue one discovers values that have not yet been discovered or uncovers values that have been uncritically accepted. To appropriate means one must learn how to discriminate between the various operations of one's consciousness. "The kind of ideal you have at the present time is a function of your past experience, your past study, your past teachers…Insofar as there is a struggle about agreeing with insight or disagreeing with it, that struggle arises on a very fundamental existential level (ibid.).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LONERGAN'S ANALYSIS OF BIAS AND THE CYCLE OF DECLINE FOR THE PROBLEM OF ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AFRICA

Lonergan has much to say on the role of human intelligence in history and society as well as the relation of intelligence to social and cultural progress and decline (Doran 1988, 8). The analysis Lonergan offers of the relation of intelligence to social and cultural progress and decline is particularly applicable to Africa where years of political, economic, and social stagnation in different parts of the continent underscore the short and long cycles of decline Lonergan warns will take place if steps are not taken to eliminate the different kinds of bias that cause them. At the root of these political, economic, and social upheavals that plague Africa can be found, individual, group, dramatic, and general bias of common sense.

Africa is also notorious for religious upheavals. Ethnic and religious violence have almost become synonymous with the continent. For many in Africa, the destruction of lives and property in the name of religion, and the destruction that comes from tribal infighting, are almost a daily routine. As John O'Donohue rightly observed, religion seems to be an ambiguous phenomenon in human life in that, on the one hand, it gives people a sense of fulfillment and peace of mind by inspiring them to philanthropic works, while on the other hand, it obstructs material progress by inducing people to accept false solutions to life's problems and upsetting the social order by setting people against each other (O'Donohue 1988, 30: 233). But if men and women use religion to obstruct material progress and upset the social order by turning people against each other, can that be said to be the nature of religion in itself? Could these not be some of the abuses that have crept into religion because of peoples' biases and prejudices? If one answers these questions in the affirmative then Lonergan's analysis of bias and the cycle of decline become relevant, since his analysis helps us to understand the nature of this bias and its effect on the social order. This analysis is particularly relevant to the African situation where ethnic and religious conflict and violence are commonplace. Lonergan's first approximation is that human beings tend to do what is intelligent and reasonable, and its implication is an ever-increasing progress. His

second approximation is a flip of the first, the radical inverse insight that human beings can be biased, and so unintelligent and unreasonable in their choices and decisions, which leads to chaos and decline in the social order. Both of these shed light on the obstacles and possibilities for social improvement in the African continent today.

The terms of exclusion and inclusion are intrinsic to all religions and are usually ethically loaded (Esack 1997, 114). But exclusivity does not necessarily imply intolerance. Emmanuel Levinas once spoke of Jewish exclusivity in a positive way when he described Judaism as "a religion of tolerance that did not lose its exclusivity" (Oppenheim 1995, 107). Tolerance needs to become ingrained in all religious traditions in Africa. Though different religions have always co-existed in Africa, this is yet to translate into a conscious religious pluralism that affirms the humanity and right of existence of the other. The three main religious groups in Africa: Christianity, Islam, and ATR, can legitimately exist as exclusive religions, in the way Levinas has described, without practicing what Charles Davis has described as "parochial exclusiveness" (Davis 1986, 2). No religious tradition is justified in affirming that it and only it possesses the truth (and therefore deserves to exist alone) because there is a developing common religious consciousness or identity that supersedes such affirmation (Oppenheim 1995, 96). Such an erroneous affirmation that only one's culture or religion has the right to exist because it alone is normative is a manifestation of what Lonergan calls classicism.

Classicism, according to Lonergan, is the mistaken view of conceiving of culture normatively and of concluding that there is just one human culture. "The modern fact is that culture has to be conceived empirically, that there are many cultures, and that the new distinctions are legitimate when the reasons for them are explained and the older truths are retained" (Lonergan 1996, 124). It does violence to individuals and groups as well.

In this context then, drawing from Lonergan and the works of social psychologists, I wish to define ethnic prejudice as unwarranted or irrational despising of others based on blind spots that condition or determine our view of them. This irrational spite may be directed toward a group or to an individual simply because he or she belongs to the group. As it plays out in Africa, there is no theoretical or empirical reason to suggest that peoples' generalizations or misconceptions about ethnic groups different from theirs is radically different from

their generalizations or misconceptions of religious groups different from theirs. In this vein then, I define religious prejudice as morbid paranoia and despising (hatred or antipathy), based on absence of personal knowledge of another, that people have of religious groups different from theirs, because of the scotoma that conditions their perceptions of those religious groups. This morbid fear may be extended to an individual who is despised simply because he or she is a member of that religious group.

There is a pressing need in today's society for the fostering of an acceptance and appreciation for persons who are different from us (Oppenheim 1995, 93). Thomas Turner (1877-1978), the African American professor of biology, once said of racism that is it not simply an error to be corrected but a sin to be challenged (Hinze 1998, 168). Similarly, tribalism (which I have defined as irrational despising of others because they are linguistically and culturally different), to the extent that it feeds on pride and prejudice, becomes not just an error to be corrected but sin to be challenged. Ethnocentrism or tribalism, as an instance of what Lonergan calls group bias, fuels conflicts between different African groups. Among different ethnic and tribal groups in Africa, it is not uncommon to witness group frustration, bitterness, resentment, and hatred for the other. The decline in social order in many African communities is by and large the net result of this group bias. As long as appointments to political offices and upward movement in the social ladder are based, not on competence, but on favoritism or exclusion according to ethnic or tribal identity (what the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria described as "son of the soil syndrome"), the social order will continue to crumble because intelligent, rational, responsible decisions that lead to the common good are sacrificed for narrower group interest.

Religious prejudice, as long as it conspires and aligns itself with tribalism, becomes another instance of what Lonergan describes as general bias of common sense conspiring with group bias to produce a distorted community. In Nigeria, for instance, one is either a Hausa and a Muslim or an Ibo and a Christian. In Zaire ethnic identity is quite fluid and overlaps with national, religious, and class identities, so that one may see oneself as a Mukongo, a Zairian, a Catholic, and a proletariat (Clark 1995, 353). Ethnic identity and religious affiliation, because of the accident of colonialism and the then missionary policies, go hand in hand. Ethnic suspicion then follows religious suspicion. Ethnically

polarized persons or groups are further religiously polarized and the hatred and bitterness is further enlarged. John O'Donohue, it seems to me, is right when he asserts that though religion is about the worship of God, it "can be perverted by a magical mentality into an illusory instrument of health and wealth…by social and psychological uncertainty, into nothing more than an instrument of group identity" (O'Donohue 1988, 30: 237). Religious prejudice aligning with ethnic pride is the general bias of common sense conspiring with group bias and this accounts for the tendency of the dominant group or privileged groups to exclude from their consideration any fruitful ideas from the less influential groups, and thereby to distort the good ideas of these groups by selfish and expedient compromise (Copeland 1998, 2: 13). The net result of this is the kind of decline Lonergan talks about. Keep in mind that decline, as Lonergan explains it, is rarely, if ever chosen. It is instead the cumulative result of inattentiveness, wrong judgments and bad choices.

The many peoples of Africa need an examination of conscience. Lonergan's rational self-consciousness can serve as a useful starting point. For Lonergan, conscience is a form of consciousness, rational self-consciousness. Conscience is the dynamic thrust towards self-transcendence, requiring that a person make a responsible decision that is in accord with reasonable judgment (Conn 1979, 7: 185). A rational self is always self-critical, always seeking the common good. I am suggesting that Africans weigh their actions not in terms of whether they accord with what they have been taught by their tribes or religion, but examine if their actions can be said to be actions of a morally converted person, critically appropriated and affectively applied. As Memmi correctly observed, "a choice must be made between an attitude and a type of behavior which crush and humiliate certain men in order to exalt others, and an attitude and behavior which originate in the belief that all men are of equal dignity" (Memmi 1968, 205). Conscience then should be understood as the dynamic reality of that person who has committed, dedicated, and surrendered him or herself to the radical demands of the human spirit: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable and be responsible (Conn 1979, 7: 187).

A rational conscience overcomes bias because it becomes authentic. Authenticity, Lonergan says, is achieved in self-transcendence. Authenticity has no room for self-aggrandizement or selfish pursuit that benefits only a particular group. Self-transcendence is effected through

sensitive and creative understanding, critical judgment, responsible decision, loyal commitment, and genuine love. Self-transcendence is achieved by moving beyond one's own selfish pursuit and is realized in every instance of correct understanding (cognitive), responsible decision (moral) and genuine love, affective (Conn 1978, 39: 314). If ethnic groups take steps to understand the other, take responsible decisions, especially decisions affecting the other, and show genuine love towards the other, conflicts and violence, if they do not become a thing of the past, would be reduced significantly. In this way the progress that Lonergan envisioned would be realized.

CHAPTER 3

OVERCOMING BIAS AS A COMPONENT IN SELF-TRANSCENDENCE

In the last chapter, we examined Lonergan's cognitional theory and saw how bias, which Lonergan calls a flight from understanding, skews, not only the human drive to understand, but also one's intellectual development. Lonergan outlines four principal ways by which this distortion of intellectual development occurs: dramatic bias, bias of individual egoism, group bias, and the more pervasive general bias of common sense. These distortions (bias), when left unchecked, lead to cycles of decline in both the human person and society. But Lonergan explains that it is possible to reverse bias and the cycles of decline that follow it. To do this one must embrace a "higher viewpoint," which requires the development of the whole person. When one does this, one will be on the path to progress. But the development of the whole person, which reverses bias and its cycles of decline, is attained by an arduous process. Lonergan calls this process conversion.

Conversion is fundamental to religion (Lonergan 1978, 14). It is also at the very core of Christianity (McKnight 2000, 1). The fact of conversion is an implicit acknowledgment that human beings are by nature prone to sin. Conversion can refer to "an enormously wide range of realities--from the rather routine joining of a church to the emotionally charged sense of being 'born again'" (ibid.). This may explain why Scot McKnight advanced the argument that while belief in conversion tends to unite all Christians, the experience of conversion divides the same Christians into myriad of groups. The reality of conversion is open to different interpretations. In many African societies, where religion is fast becoming the primal factor in the life of the community, membership in a church or mosque is assumed to be a sign that one has effected a fundamental change in one's lifestyle, i.e. one is converted. It is not uncommon to hear such phrases like, "I have

accepted Jesus as my personal Lord and savior," or "I am born again." People who use such phrases use them to show their birth to new life, their transmutation from this worldliness to other worldliness, their transcendence, in essence their conversion. But what really is conversion?

Does membership in a church or mosque or synagogue constitute conversion? Is professing faith in a religious belief system a guarantee that one is actually converted? Is conversion a sudden phenomenon that happens when one decides to profess a given religious faith and hence a once for all event, or is it a continuously gradual process and thus a life long event? Is conversion a personal or communal event or both? Is there any relationship between personal conversion and transformation of unjust social structures? Scot McKnight suggests that there are, in abstract terms, three orientations to conversion: socialization (many become Christians by being nurtured under the sacred umbrella of a particular church of which their mother and father were members), liturgical acts (socialization into the faith focuses on some key moments and sacramental rituals that are performed by ordained ministers empowered to dispense grace), and personal decision. Each form is aligned with a major component of the Church (Roman Catholics, Evangelicals, Lutherans, etc), and each appears to be allergic to the others. Evangelicals worry about Roman Catholic conversion, Roman Catholics worry about Evangelical conversion, and mainline denominations are uncomfortable with both (ibid.). Something similar can be said about Christians and Muslims. Christians worry about Muslim conversion, and Muslims worry about Christian conversion. Because each one fosters a specific approach to conversion, they sometimes squabble and feud. Lonergan provides some useful information on the nature of conversion and its effect on the life of the believer. Using Lonergan's analysis, I shall argue that a key to solving ethnic and religious bias that contribute to conflicts in Africa lies in the proper understanding of the meaning of conversion.

Conversion
Definition of Conversion in Terms of Transcendence

Conversion is basic to Christian living and cognate to the Christian gospel (Lonergan 1996, 130). Lonergan acknowledges the fact of conversion in the life of every believer. He is keenly aware that conversion

and faith do not come pure and unmixed but always linked with a be-
lief system (Quesnell 1981, 173). Commitment to a religion or belief
system, however, does not necessarily imply self-transcendence, just
as a non-commitment to specific belief system does not necessarily
mean the absence of such religious self-transcendence (Gregson 1981,
148). Central to Lonergan's notion of conversion is self-transcendence.
Conversion, he says, is the transformation of the subject and his or her
world. When properly understood, self-transcendence is the "criterion
of both authentic self-realization and the gospel's call to loving ser-
vice of the neighbor" (Conn 1998, 113). Underneath the idea of self-
transcendence is the paradox that authentic self-realization comes, not
from an attempt to satisfy one's personal desires, but in the attempt to
seek and bring about the good of the other. Vernon Gregson has inter-
preted this to mean that for Lonergan, conversion is the long process
of overcoming one's biases: intellectual, moral, affective, and religious;
and "to be unconverted means to be operating out of one's biases, and
most probably out of unacknowledged biases" Gregson 1981, 148).
Lonergan explains that when conversion is viewed as an ongoing pro-
cess, it at once becomes personal, communal and historical, while at
the same time coinciding with living religion. Religion itself is a sort
of conversion, or at least ought to be. "For religion is conversion in its
preparation, in its occurrence, in its development, in its consequents"
(Lonergan 1974, 67).

   In explicating his idea of conversion, Lonergan finds very helpful
the distinction made by the philosopher, Joseph de Finance, between
a horizontal and a vertical exercise of freedom. According to this dis-
tinction, a horizontal exercise of freedom is a "decision or choice that
occurs within an established horizon," while a vertical exercise of free-
dom is "the set of judgments and decisions by which we move from
one horizon to another." Speaking of movement into a new horizon,
Lonergan says "it is possible that the movement into a new horizon
involves an about-face; it comes out of the old by repudiating charac-
teristic features; it begins with a new sequence that can keep revealing
ever greater depth and breadth and wealth" (Lonergan 1996, 237-8).
This new beginning and such an about-face is what Lonergan means
by conversion. It would seem that Lonergan sometimes varies his no-
tion of conversion depending on the inquiry he is pursuing. In his ear-
lier writings, while working with the Leonine mandate, to revive the
study of Thomism (Leo's 1879 encyclical *Aeterni Patris* had called for

the revival of scholasticism and gave support to the study of Thomism as the best means of realizing this scholastic thought), Lonergan conceives of conversion in a way similar to the Thomistic notion of how God operates in His creation and in the human will. He contends that conversion is "but a single instance of *gratia operans* but also involves that good performance is but one instance of *gratia cooperans*" (Lonergan 1971, 137). In his later writings, especially in *Insight*, when he was concerned with the problem of human cognition and its relevance to human advancement, Lonergan makes a shift from the sensory world of the individual to the intellectual world (mind). Here conversion transforms the subject and brings him into harmony with the objective good of order (Lonergan 1980, 234).

Conversion, for Lonergan, is an individual event, a resultant change of course and direction. It is not just a change but "a radical transformation on which follows, on all levels of living, an interlocked series of changes and developments. What hitherto was unnoticed becomes vivid and present. What had been of no concern becomes a matter of high import" (Lonergan 1978, 13). Conversion is multi-dimensional in that a changed relation to God brings with it changes that are personal, social, moral and intellectual. Conversion is also ontic in that the one converted apprehends differently, values differently and relates differently because of the ontic change. It is not so much new values as the transvaluation of values. In the words of Gregson, "to be unconverted does not mean that one's procedures are unsophisticated but that one's ability to acknowledge the data, to interpret it with understanding, and to evaluate it accurately can be sorely askew" (Gregson 1981, 148).

Though conversion is an individual event and personal, it is not so private as to be solitary. It is within social groups to which they belong that individuals contribute meaningfully to elements of horizon, it is within the social groups that the elements accumulate and within the social group with its traditions that meaningful development occurs. Conversion then entails more than a change of horizon. "It can mean that one begins to belong to a different social group or, if one's group remains the same, that one begins to belong to it in a new way" (Lonergan 1996, 269). Lonergan explains the communal dimension of conversion in this way:

> It can happen to many and they can form a community to sustain one another in self-transformation, and to help one another in working out the implications, and in fulfilling the promise of their new life. Finally what can become communal can become historical. It can pass from generation to generation. It can spread from one cultural milieu to another. It can adapt to changing circumstance, confront new situations, survive into a different age; flourish in another period or epoch (Lonergan 1978, 13-4).

Conversion, for Lonergan, is an ongoing process, intensely personal and utterly intimate, concrete and dynamic. It is not just private but also communal in the sense that it "can happen to many, and they can form a community to sustain one another in their self-transformation and to help one another in working out the implications and fulfilling the promise of their new life" (Lonergan 1996, 130). Such communally based conversion becomes historical for the reason that it can pass from generation to generation, spread from one cultural milieu to another and adapt to changing circumstances. In a nutshell, conversion is a change from unauthenticity to authenticity, a total surrender to the demands of the human spirit: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible, be in love. Conversion (intellectual) rarely occurs in the marketplace. It is rather a process that is occasioned by scientific inquiry. It occurs when one discovers what is inauthentic in oneself and turns away from it and embrace with one's whole being the fullness of human authenticity.

Horizon and Conversion

Horizon is a key category in Lonergan's analysis of conversion and holds the key to understanding his four levels of conversion. Each of us, Lonergan argues, in a sense lives in his or her own world, i.e. a bounded world with its fixed range of interests and knowledge. The extent of our knowledge and the reach of our interest fix a horizon and within that horizon we are confined. This confinement, aside from some philosophical factors, may be as a result of the historical tradition within which we are born, from the limited social milieu in which we were raised, and from our individual psychological aptitudes, efforts, and misadventures. This is why conversion has to do with a radical change or shift in horizon.

Perhaps it is pertinent to point out that Lonergan's use of the word 'horizon' is similar to Hans-Georg Gadamer's use of the word. Just as

essential to Lonergan's notion of conversion is the concept of horizon, so is the concept of hermeneutical situation essential to Gadamer's concept of horizon. What Gadamer says about "situation" and "horizon" sheds light on why horizon is a key category for Lonergan. Gadamer says of "situation" that it "represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision," and horizon "is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point" (Gadamer 1999, 302). Gadamer observes that the phenomenon of horizon is of crucial importance for Husserl's phenomenological work and that since Nietzsche and Husserl the word 'horizon' has been used in philosophy to characterize the way in which thought is tied to its finite determinacy, and the way one's range of vision is gradually expanded.

When applied to the thinking mind, Gadamer continues, "We speak of narrowness of horizon, of the possible expansion of horizon, of the opening up of new horizons, and so forth" (ibid.). Gadamer's explanation, it seems to me, elucidates Lonergan's point. For Lonergan would agree with Gadamer that a person with no horizon does not see far enough and hence over values what is nearest to him or her. If as Gadamer argues that to have a horizon means not being limited to what is nearby but being able to see beyond it, then both Gadamer and Lonergan aim at helping the human person acquire "the right horizon of inquiry." Gadamer explains the concept of horizon further, "The concept of horizon suggests itself because it expresses the superior breadth of vision that the person who is trying to understand must have. To acquire a horizon means that one learns to look beyond what is close at hand- not in order to look away from it but to see it better, within a larger whole and in truer proportion" (ibid. 305).

In *Method*, Lonergan takes up a discussion of horizon while dealing with the fourth functional specialty, dialectic. Dialectics deals with conflicts. Lonergan notes that there are conflicts in Christian churches, conflicts in the Christian movements of the past, and there are conflicts in the interpretation of these movements. The aim of dialectic is to address these conflicts in a methodical way and, in light of conversion, discover the roots of these conflicts. Since horizon is germane to conversion, Lonergan says of horizon:

> In its literal sense the word, horizon, denotes the bounding circle, the line at which earth and sky appear to meet. This line is the limit of one's field of vision. As one moves about, it recedes in front and

closes in behind so that, for different standpoints, there are differ-
ent horizons. Moreover, for each different standpoint and horizon,
there are different divisions of the totality of visible objects. Beyond
the horizon lie the objects that, at least for the moment, cannot be
seen. Within the horizon lie the objects that can now be seen (Lon-
ergan 1996, 235-6).

Lonergan's point is that we are limited by our horizons. For the scope
of our knowledge and the range of our interests vary with the time in
which we live, our social background and milieu, our education and
personal development. In *Insight*, he notes that even though the hu-
man desire to know is unrestricted, this desire is still limited by our
horizon. He alludes to bias as one of the factors that limit our scope of
knowledge. "Might not my desire to understand correctly suffer from
some immanent and hidden restriction and bias, so that there could
be real things that lay quite beyond its utmost horizon?" he asks (Lon-
ergan 1997, 662). In *Collection*, he makes the point that horizon is
specified by two poles, one objective and the other subjective, the one
conditioning the other.

   In *Method*, Lonergan notes that differences in horizon may be
complementary, genetic or dialectical. To show that horizons may be
complementary, Lonergan uses the example of workers: technicians,
lawyers, doctors, professors, managers, etc, who though may have dif-
ferent interests and may be living in different worlds, still know about
each other's expertise and recognize the need for the them. Their many
horizons in some measure include one another and by so doing com-
plement one another. "Singly they are not self-sufficient, and together
they represent the motivations and the knowledge needed for the
functioning of a communal world. Such horizons are complementary"
(Lonergan 1996, 236). Horizons may also differ genetically. "They are
related as successive stages in some process of development. Each later
stage presupposes earlier stages, partly to include them, and partly to
transform them. Precisely because the stages are earlier and later, no
two are simultaneous" (ibid.). Horizons may also be opposed dialecti-
cally. Lonergan explains that what in one person may be considered
intelligible may in another be considered unintelligible, what for one
is true may for another be false, and what for one is good may for an-
other be evil. "For the other's horizon, at least in part, is attributed to
wishful thinking, to an acceptance of myth, to ignorance or fallacy, to

blindness or illusion, to backwardness or immaturity, to infidelity, to bad will, to a refusal of God's grace" (ibid. 236-7).

Although our horizons limit us, Lonergan maintains that all human knowing occurs within a context, horizon, a total view, an all-encompassing framework, a *Weltanschauung*. Without horizon knowledge ceases to make sense, and loses its significance and meaning. Yet, conversion, or being in love with God, as Lonergan describes it, takes place within a horizon.

> Further, the sweep of one's horizon is proportionate to one's self-transcendence: it narrows as one fails to transcend oneself; it advances in breadth and height and depth, as one succeeds in transcending oneself. Being in love with God is the existential stance opening on the horizon in which Christian doctrines are intelligible, powerful, meaningful (Lonergan 1974, 162).

Being in love with God opens us to a different horizon and gives the human person a different kind of fulfillment that is not the product of knowledge and choice. Being in love with God "dismantles and abolishes the horizon within which our knowing and choosing went on, and it sets up a new horizon within which the love of God transvalues our values and the eyes of that love transform our knowing" (ibid. 172).

> But human knowing is not just experiencing. Human knowing includes experiencing but adds to it attention, scrutiny, inquiry, insight, conception, naming, reflecting, checking, judging. The whole problem of cognitional theory is to effect the transition from operations as experienced to operations as known. A great part of psychiatry is helping people make the transition from conscious feelings to known feelings. In like manner the gift of God's love ordinarily is not objectified in knowledge, but remains within the subjectivity as a dynamic vector, a mysterious undertow, a fateful call to dreaded holiness (ibid).

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF LONERGAN'S WORK ON CONVERSION: ENGAGING ROBERT M. DORAN AND MICHAEL RENDE

The notion of the human subject, according to Robert Doran, constitutes both the central and the foundational position in Lonergan's work (Doran 1990, 19). Doran identifies four stages in the development of Lonergan's position on human subject: knowing, existentiel and historical agency, love, and the notion of two complementary vectors in consciousness. The four stages unfold over several decades beginning in the 1950s when Lonergan began working on *Insight* culminating in a 1975 lecture, "Healing and Creating in History." Lonergan's notions of bias and conversion intersect all of the stages and unify them (ibid. 20). The four varieties of bias, which Lonergan discussed fully in the sixth and seventh chapters of *Insight*, were occasioned by two factors: the discussion of dramatic bias was occasioned by Lonergan's desire to "point the way to reorientation of psychoanalysis, and his treatment of the other three biases constitutes in effect a fairly sustained dialogue and dialectic with the Marxist and liberal theories of society and history" (ibid. 34). Regarding his reorientation of psychoanalysis, Lonergan insists that psychic process is proximately oriented to insight such that a repression would constitute an exclusion of those images that would give rise to insights one does not want. Against Marx and liberal theorists, Lonergan insists that the "human person does not live an authentically intelligent, reasonable, and responsible existence that promotes progress, except to the extent that he or she is converted from the biased orientations that interfere with and distort the operations of the creative vector" (ibid. 35).

Doran points out that conversion, for Lonergan, is not a single-event but a process that involves a radical about-face in which one repudiates characteristic features of one's previous horizon. Conversion usually works in the life of a conscious subject and is a movement "from above downwards" (ibid. 36). Lonergan, in his earlier views, discusses conversion as religious, moral and intellectual, and in his later works speaks of an affective conversion that is closely connected with religious conversion.

According to Doran, intellectual conversion, which Lonergan usually discusses first, is philosophically rooted in the self-affirmation of the knower. It eliminates the myth that full human knowing is to be conceived on an analogy with seeing, and replaces it with an affirmation of a self that knows simply because he/she understands correctly. Moral conversion is a process that involves "uncovering and rooting out individual, group, and general bias; developing one's knowledge of human reality and potentiality in the concrete situations of one's life; keeping distinct the elements of progress and those of decline… and remaining ready to learn from others" (ibid.). In essence, moral conversion is a shift in one's decisions and choices from that of mere satisfaction to one of value. Religious conversion is falling in love with God. There is a kind of transcendence that marks the consciousness of a person of integrity, affective self-transcendence. Affective self-transcendence accompanies the self-transcendence of our operations of knowing and deciding and is further strengthened by authentic performance of these operations. Doran points out that, for Lonergan, one reaches affective self-transcendence when one falls in love, i.e. "when the isolation of the individual was broken and he spontaneously functioned not just for himself but for others as well" (ibid. 51). This habitual desire to love is what Lonergan calls affective conversion. A person who is affectively converted moves away from a "habitual lovelessness" to a "new way of life in which one's sensitive desires begin to reach out toward a condition in which they will match and support the self-transcendence of the pure desire that is the spirit of inquiring consciousness itself" (ibid. 52).

Michael L. Rende (1989) has also done an interpretive investigation on the origin and development of Lonergan's thought on conversion. Rende, like many Lonergan scholars, makes a sharp distinction between Lonergan's early theological works and his later works, a distinction Lonergan himself sometimes suggests (Gregson 1988, vii). Rende contends that the notion of conversion is, for Lonergan, the foundation of a contemporary theological method. He distinguishes three major periods in Lonergan's intellectual career: the first period is concerned with the realm of Thomist theory, the second period with the realm of cognitional interiority, and the third period concerned with method. While each period is important because of the specific material it treats and the dynamism, which leads from one period to the next, it is within the third period that Lonergan's notion of conver-

sion reveals its foundational significance (Rende 1989, x). I shall now attempt to recapitulate Rende's treatment of each period.

The Early Period

The first period deals with the early years of Lonergan's intellectual career, when he was concerned with Thomism and the systematic exigence, part of the Catholic historical retrieval of Aquinas. Lonergan was committed to honoring Leo XIII's charge in *Aerteni Patris* for the revival of Thomism: *vetera novis augere et percifere*, to augment and complete the old with the new. Lonergan alludes to the pope's mandate in a letter (January 22, 1935) to his then provincial, Henry Keane, S.J. A copy of the letter is still in the archive at Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto. He also alludes to the pontiff's mandate in *verbum* articles and also at the beginning and end of *Insight*. In Lonergan's first two major works, *Grace and Freedom* and *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, "the notion of conversion is, for the most part, implicit and even where it is explicitly discussed, it is a secondary consideration" (Rende 1989, 2). Rende alludes to three versions of Lonergan's development of Aquinas' theology of Grace. The first was Lonergan's doctoral dissertation, "Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," written under the guidance of Rev. Charles Boyer, S.J. at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome (1940). In the second version, the thesis was re-written and appeared in a series of four journal articles in *Theological Studies* 2 (1941): 289-324; *Theological Studies* 3 (1942): 69-88, 375-402 and 533-78. In the third phase, these materials were published as a book under the title *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas* (1971). Rende also makes reference to two versions of Word and Idea in Aquinas. The first material appeared in a series of articles titled "The Concept of Verbum in the Writing of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Theological Studies* (1946) 7: 349-92; *Theological Studies* (1947) 8: 35-79, 404-44; *Theological Studies* (1949) 10: 2-40, 359-93. These articles later published into a book, under the title, *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas* (1968). *Grace and Freedom* traces the development of Aquinas view on operative grace, of which conversion is an instance of this grace, and thus pertains to Lonergan's idea of religious conversion. While dealing with the nature of human reflectivity, *Verbum* shows the development of Lonergan's later idea of intellectual conversion. Rende points out that whenever Lonergan explicitly uses the word

'conversion,' he is referring to the intellect's conversion to phantasm, an idea that only indirectly relates to intellectual conversion.

According to Rende, *Grace and Freedom* is a historical work in its resources, method, and goal. In its resources: Lonergan utilized the excellent research of an earlier generation of historians to determine the significance of the theological and philosophical developments prior to Aquinas. In his method, Lonergan was careful to avoid two extremes. The first extreme was the conceptualist approach that tends to read the categories and conceptions of the present into the past and the second extreme was to avoid a positivist approach to historical research that tends to deny the relevance of any type of apriori factor. *Grace and Freedom*'s goal was to describe the development of Aquinas' theology of grace. "Its immediate consequence was that such a description made available a higher viewpoint between the impasse created by the controversy between the Molinists and Banezians. Lonergan achieved this higher viewpoint precisely by appealing to the historical context and development of Aquinas' thought" (ibid. 5-6).

In the final chapter of *Grace and Freedom*, on actual grace, Lonergan discusses Aquinas' view on religious conversion. To understand Aquinas' notion of conversion, one must distinguish three types of movement towards God: first, there is a general, all-pervasive movement of the totality of creation back to the Creator, second, within this general movement, each creature moves according to its own nature and mode of operation and third, God moves some people to seek Him in special ways. Conversion then for Aquinas, must be understood in the third category. Lonergan in clarifying this position, states that grace "moves the will to God not by adding "potency" in the sense of limitation and contraction, but by being a further actuation, and so giving expansion and enlargement" (ibid. 14). Conversion then is a movement that presupposes the general movement of creature according to its nature and goes beyond this by adding a movement towards God vivified by charity.

Lonergan refers to the *Pars Tertia* of the *Summa Theologiae* where Thomas discussed conversion in terms of justification of the sinner and distinguished six acts within the process of conversion. The first act, according to Aquinas, is God's operation converting the heart (operative grace), the second act is the movement of faith, the third is the movement of servile fear by which the person withdraws from sin by fear of punishment, the fourth is a movement of hope by which the

person makes a firm purpose of amendment in the hope of obtaining pardon, the fifth is the movement of charity, whereby sin itself is displeasing (and not in view of punishment) and the sixth act is the movement of the filial fear whereby a person freely offers amendment to God out of reverence for Him (Summa Theologiae 3, q.85, a.5.) Lonergan comments that the first act in Aquinas' six acts, i.e. God's operation converting the heart, may be actual grace since it occurs prior to justification. The fifth act is the infusion of habitual grace, is the response of the free will of the justified person towards God. The act of charity implants itself in the person to the extent that it becomes the habit of charity. Therefore by both operative and cooperative grace, God converts the sinner to Himself (Rende 1989, 15).

Before enumerating the six acts of conversion in the *Pars Tertia*, Aquinas had distinguished three types of conversion: (i) a preparatory conversion that initiates us into the spiritual life (ii) a meritorious conversion that enables one to persevere on the road to perfection and (iii) perfect conversion, which is the possession of the souls of the blessed in the presence of God in heaven. He termed every movement of the will toward God a conversion (*Summa Theologiae*, 1, q.62, a.2, ad3m.). Lonergan, according to Rende, studied the development of Thomas' thought on operative grace in *Grace and Freedom*, a work that showed his initial conception of the notion of religious conversion.

Lonergan's disappointment that some Thomists, and even so prominent a Thomist as Cardinal Billot, had overlooked a central theme of Aquinas' account of intellectual processions, which has great significance for Trinitarian theology, led him to set this straight in *Verbum* (Rende 1989, 6). In *Summa Theologiae* 1, q.27, a.1. Aquinas described the general nature of intellectual procession as intelligible emanation. Lonergan comments on three factors that distinguish the procession of an intelligible emanation from a natural procession: (i) natural procession is passive, intelligible but not intelligent (ii) natural procession manifests the intelligibility of some specific law but never reveals the intelligibility of the law itself and (iii) natural procession proceeds intelligibly because of some law imposed from without. Paramount in these *Verbum* articles is the contrast between natural and intellectual procession. Lonergan, following Aquinas, distinguishes two elements within the act of understanding: there is the element of determination and the element of light. The element of determination shows that hu-

man understanding is never simply pure act, while the element of light actualizes the element of understanding (ibid. 18-27).

According to Rende, in *Grace and Freedom* we see the beginning of Lonergan's thought on religious conversion and in the *Verbum* articles his conception of intellectual conversion begins to emerge. Rende argues that intellectual conversion is everywhere implied in Lonergan's treatment of the Thomist conception of science. The origin of his "notion of intellectual conversion can be found in the reflective character of intelligible procession, in the act whereby understanding grasps its own nature" (ibid. 40). In the span of years between *Grace and Freedom* and *Verbum*, Lonergan's thought underwent considerable development. Lonergan's doctoral dissertation was published in 1940 and the *Verbum* articles appeared in 1949. Lonergan's thought underwent significant development within the near decade of the interval. Placed in the context of Lonergan's writings at this early period, conversion was, for him, the result of God's grace acting on the will (ibid. 38). In *Grace and Freedom*, conversion was one of the material elements of Lonergan's discussion; in *Verbum*, though conversion was not explicitly discussed, it was in every way implied. At the end of *Insight*, Lonergan made this wonderful remark regarding his retrieval of Thomistic thought:

> After spending years reaching up to the mind of Aquinas, I came to a two-fold conclusion. On the one hand, that reaching had changed me profoundly. On the other hand, that change was the essential benefit. For not only did it make me capable of grasping what, in the light of my conclusions, the *vetera* really were, but also it opened challenging vistas on what *nova* could be (Lonergan 1970, 748).

The Middle Period

Michael Rende locates the middle period of Lonergan's career in years between 1949 and 1964; a period during which Lonergan was concerned with the problem of integration and the critical exigence. It was in this period that Lonergan wrote *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (1957), and various articles, which later came to be published under the name *Collection*. These articles, especially "Theology and Understanding," show Lonergan's transition from the Thomist concerns of the early period to the modern methodological issues of the middle period.

The concept of intellectual conversion, according to Rende, appeared in Lonergan's work several years after *Insight*. Though closely related to the principle of self-appropriation, it "added an existential dimension to *Insight*'s discussion of the terms "self-appropriation" and "self-affirmation" (Rende 1989, 89). Lonergan's first use of the idea of conversion was in an intellectual context, in a 1958 article, "Insight: Preface to a Discussion," in which Lonergan distinguished between two worlds: one's private real world and the universe of being. He defined one's private real world as one's interests and concerns and the universe of being as "what is to be known by the totality of true judgments and not without true judgments" (ibid. 91). As an example of one's private real world, Rende cites reading a newspaper. In reading a newspaper, one sometimes carefully reads through an entire section of the paper while skipping over others, perhaps because the ignored areas are beyond the scope of one's interest. He says of one's private real world that it is limited by one's ability to grow and develop, as well as one's success in dealing with dread and anxiety. Intellectual conversion is then a matter of shifting one's criterion of reality, i.e. a shift in the principle around which one organizes one's world. As long as there is a lifelong task of learning and self-correction, intellectual conversion then is a shift from private concerns to the pure desire to know, a shift from the person who is immersed in the sensible to one whose mindset is ascendant. In his Halifax lectures, Lonergan related the notion of intellectual conversion to the finality of the subject and pointed out the need for intellectual conversion in a 1964 article, "Cognitional Structure." Rende believes that the phrase "finality of the subject," refers to the same reality that *Verbum* referred to as the potential infinity of the intellect, which *Insight* referred to as the pure desire to know. Intellectual conversion being the realization that our desire to know is a desire to know being, overcomes the forgetfulness of being by affirming the standard of truth over the standard of intuition (ibid. 94).

In the same Halifax lectures Lonergan introduced the notion of moral conversion. Lonergan speaks of self-appropriation of one's cognitional self (experiencing, understanding and judging) and self-appropriation of one's moral self (intelligent and rational self-consciousness). In these Halifax lectures, Lonergan speaks of moral conversion as a shift in the criterion of one's choices, for it is in one's choices that one makes oneself a morally good or bad person. Rende suggests, and rightly too, that in this middle period, Lonergan's articulation of moral conversion

was still in its infancy. His notion of moral conversion closely paralleled his notion of intellectual conversion. "As intellectual conversion implies a kind of self-abnegation in which one demotes one's private concerns from their absolute status, so too moral conversion implies a transcendence of the self as individual towards a universal willingness parallel to the pure desire to know" (ibid. 95).

The Later Period

Rende rightly locates the later period of Lonergan's intellectual career in the period between 1964 to the time of Lonergan's death in 1984. Rende chose 1964 as a starting point of this period because of what he called "a shift in Lonergan's thought evident at that time." Ryan and Tyrell in the introduction to *A Second Collection* (1974) locate this shift in the appearance of two articles by Lonergan: "Existenz and Aggiornamento" (1964) and "Dimensions of Meaning," (1965). These articles have been published in *Collection* (1967). The single most important work of this period was the publication of *Method in Theology* in 1972, where he specifically discusses religious, moral and intellectual conversions. This period is very important because it was a period in which Lonergan began devoting, at least in a more explicit way, attention to the affective part of the human person.

Lonergan's treatment of intellectual conversion in the latter period is somewhat consistent with his discussion of intellectual conversion in the middle period, except for difference of emphasis. While the middle period discussion emphasized the personal nature of intellectual conversion (*Insight* stresses immanently generated knowledge), the latter period discussion emphasized the communal and historical features of intellectual conversion, where it is understood in terms of human community and human history. Here intellectual conversion is understood as a discovery of the self-transcendence proper to knowing (Rende 1989, 123). Unlike in *Insight* where we come to know through the process of experiencing, understanding, and judging, Lonergan adds another feature of cognitional operations: they are both immediate and mediate, for we live in a world mediated by meaning. A child lives in a world of immediacy, i.e. his world is limited to what can be perceived or sensed. But an adult lives in a world mediated by meaning, i.e. his world is made up of communal beliefs, memories, investigation of scientists, reflections of historians, philosophers, theologians, etc. Belief is connected to intellectual conversion because one's judgments

necessarily take account of communal knowledge and knowledge from previous generations.

Before explaining moral conversion, Lonergan makes a distinction between judgments of fact (criterion) and judgments of value (meaning), the latter differing in content, not in structure, from the former. This distinction is in essence a distinction between criterion and meaning. "The criterion for a judgment of value is the self-transcendence of the subject. It is the transcendental notion of value which accounts for the moral subject's ability to achieve self-transcendence" (ibid. 129). Moral conversion then is a decision for the transcendental notion of value. It consists in choosing the truly good. The transcendental notion of value has a four fold function: (i) In asking the question: is it worthwhile? Is it truly or only apparently good? It lifts the subject to the existential level of consciousness. (ii) In asking responsible questions, it directs the subject to his/her goals. (iii) It provides the criteria needed to reach one's goals and (iv) helps the subject to achieve absolute good (ibid. 135).

Rende points out that Lonergan subsumes a wealth of materials under his discussion of religious conversion in *Method in Theology*, integrating elements from the realms of common sense, theory, interiority and transcendence. Religious conversion is here understood as the response of God's gift of love flooding our hearts. Rende comments that love is simple enough to be appreciated by an infant and complex enough to evade intellectual analysis. Lonergan's notion of religious conversion here is different from that of *Grace and Freedom* where religious conversion, studied in the medieval theoretical context, was a gift from the supernatural order (grace) that perfects and sanctifies nature. In *Summa Theologiae* 1-2, q.9, a.6. ad.3m Aquinas had advanced the argument that God moves man's will as the Universal Mover, to the universal object of the will, which is good. Rende comments on this that for Aquinas, conversion is a special case because an operative grace initiates a special movement towards God as a special end, i.e. conversion, as a special movement, requires prevenient grace to prepare the soul and the subsequent graces to help the soul persevere. This was why Lonergan wrote in *Method in Theology* "Operative grace is religious conversion. Cooperative grace is the effectiveness of conversion, the gradual movement towards full and complete transformation of the whole of one's living and feeling, one's thoughts, words, deeds and omissions." Lonergan interpreted religious conversion as a

transformation, a transcendence that initiates one into the realm in which God is known and loved.

In *Method in Theology*, Lonergan explicitly discussed conversion under the functional specialties Dialectic and Foundations. Dialectic is the fourth functional specialty. While focusing on conflicts, dialectics seeks to methodically address these conflicts and to discover their roots in the light of conversion. Conversion occurs on the fourth level of conscious intentionality, the existential level. The fifth functional specialty, Foundations, is the objectification of conversion that is basic to theological method. According to Rende, Lonergan in the middle period shifted his attention from cognitional self-appropriation to the fuller context of conversion. He set intellectual conversion alongside moral conversion and religious conversion. All three conversions are related to one another in terms of sublation (ibid. 162). Walter Conn makes an important point regarding Lonergan's meaning of the term 'sublation.' He argues that following Rahner's understanding of the term (Rahner 1963, 40), Lonergan takes sublation to mean that what sublates "goes beyond what is sublated, introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with the sublated or destroying it, on the contrary needs it, preserves all its proper features and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization with a richer context" (Conn 1981, 186).

The periodization of Lonergan's work by Rende might seem somewhat arbitrary. Nonetheless, in my judgment the three major periods of Lonergan's work, which he distinguished, are very important for a good understanding of Lonergan's thought and work. A summary of the development of Lonergan's notion of conversion from his early years till his death in 1984 reveals a significant shift and amendments in his thoughts on conversion. Lonergan in the early period was concerned with the Leonine mandate, reaching up to the mind of Aquinas. In the middle period he was concerned with modern critical epistemological problem, i.e. how is knowledge attained? In the course of his epistemological investigation, in *Grace and Freedom* he introduced the notion of religious conversion and in *Verbum* introduced the notion of intellectual conversion. In the latter period, in *Insight* and *Method in Theology* he differentiated between intellectual, religious, moral conversions and affective conversions.

Significantly, neither Rende nor Doran correlates their treatment of conversion with Lonergan's discussions of bias and the cycles of de-

cline. Interpreters of Lonergan often neglect the relationship between bias, the cycles of decline, and conversion. Yet their connection is everywhere implied in Lonergan's work. The relationship between the different levels of conversion and the levels of bias is a subject I shall take up later, when we shall see that for Lonergan, the different levels of conversion are dynamically related to the levels of bias, with the former serving as a corrective to the latter.

Kinds of Conversion

Lonergan identifies four basic "perspectives or horizons which characterize a person who really desires truth and value." He refers to each of these perspectives as 'conversion,' (i.e. a major change in viewpoint) simply because it involves "a change in the person, either from an erroneous perspective to a correct one, or at least from a less adequate perspective to a more adequate one" (Gregson 1988b, 93). These conversion processes are intellectual (cognitive), religious, moral, and affective. Intellectual conversion is the discovery of oneself as a knower, moral conversion the choice of value as a criterion for decision, religious conversion the falling in love with God that establishes in a person the dynamic principle of benevolence and beneficence, and affective conversion the falling in love that reorients the dynamic thrust of one's life towards others (Conn 1998, 116). All four conversion processes, in the words of Bernard Tyrell, are truly forms of conversion—analogously understood. These conversion processes involve two basic stages: radical conversion and ongoing conversion. In radical conversion, as Tyrell explains it, there is a "turning from" a fundamentally destructive form of living and a "turning toward" a constructive, life-creating and fulfilling way of life. Ongoing conversion entails a confirmation of the "turning from," or radical conversion, when one exhibits a rejection of destructive tendencies (Tyrell 1981, 13). All four conversion processes are related yet distinct in themselves. While speaking of the relations among intellectual, moral, and religious conversion, Lonergan makes it clear that while each of the three is connected with the other two, "still each is a different type of event and has to be considered in itself before being related to the others" (Lonergan 1996, 238). According to Walter E. Conn, these conversions, in developmental terms, can be situated within the psychological analyses of Jean Piaget on cognition, James Kohlberg on moral reasoning, Eric Erickson on psycho-social affectivity and James Fowler on religious faith (Conn 1998, 116).

Kohlberg does not really discuss forms of conversion. But the different levels of development, which he outlined, can be regarded as a form of conversion. He identified three levels of moral development, specifying two stages within each level. (I) Level I: Preconventional. Stage A: Obedience and Punishment Orientation. Stage B: Instrumental-Relativist Orientation. (II) Level II: Conventional. Stage A: Interpersonal Concordance. Stage B: Authority and Social Order Maintaining Orientation . (III) Level III: Post conventional. Stage A: Social Contract, Legalist Orientation. Stage B: Self-Chosen Universal Ethical Principle Orientation (Kohlberg 1973, 70: 631-2).

As forms of transcendence, all four forms of conversion, when found within one person's consciousness, may be understood as related, like the different self-transcending operations of the different levels of consciousness, in terms of sublation (Conn 1981, 186). Lonergan points out that though religious conversion sublates moral, and moral conversion sublates intellectual, one should not infer that intellectual comes first, then followed by moral and finally religious. On the contrary there is religious conversion, followed by moral conversion and then, in some cases, followed by intellectual conversion.

> From a causal viewpoint, one would say that first there is God's gift of love. Next, the eye of this love reveals values in their splendor, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion. Finally, among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths taught by the religious tradition, and such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion (Lonergan 1996, 243).

Conn notes that Lonergan's order of occurrence, which has religious conversion preceding moral, and moral preceding intellectual is not without its difficulties. In successive levels of consciousness, higher levels need lower levels because each level functions only in relation to the sublated lower level. Conn does not understand how Lonergan can claim religious conversion precedes moral and moral preceding intellectual while at the same time claiming that "as sublating, religious conversion needs the sublated moral and intellectual conversions, and as sublating, moral conversion needs the sublated intellectual conversion" (Conn 1981, 189). Lonergan insists that these different kinds of conversion are not a set of propositions uttered by a theologian but a momentous and fundamental change in the human reality (O'Callaghan

1981, 131). Conversion requires a living human community for the simple reason that one's understanding of others is affected by one's understanding of oneself, "and the converted have a self to understand that is quite different from the self that the unconverted have to understand" (Lonergan 1996, 271).

Lonergan has no systematic presentation of these four conversion processes in the sense that nowhere in his works does he set out to discuss these four kinds of conversion per se. Even in *Method* he discusses them under the functional specialties. He gives no clear guidelines of the order in which they are to be presented. But if the goal of *Insight*, as I shall argue later, is intellectual conversion, then it makes sense to begin the discussion of these various kinds of conversion with intellectual conversion, since *Insight* precedes *Method* where Lonergan discusses the other three kinds of conversion: religious, moral, and affective. Indeed, one can also make the argument that since in Lonergan's first two major works, *Grace and Freedom* and *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, the notion of religious conversion was at least implicitly discussed, so that the order of discussion should be religious conversion, then followed by intellectual, moral, and affective conversion. As reasonable as this might seem, *Verbum* also contains what Rende has rightly termed a development of Lonergan's later idea of intellectual conversion. It is no wonder that Doran agrees that Lonergan always discusses intellectual conversion first (Doran 1990, 36). Even in *Method*, where Lonergan discusses at great length religious, moral, and affective conversion, he introduces these with a lengthy discussion of intellectual conversion by distinguishing the different levels of consciousness and intentionality (Lonergan 1996, 9). There are four levels of consciousness and intentionality: (1) empirical level on which we sense, perceive, imagine, feel, speak, move, etc (2) intellectual level: on which we inquire, understand, express what has been understood, work out presuppositions, etc (3) rational level on which we reflect, weigh evidence, pass judgment on the truth or falsity of a statement, etc and (4) responsible level on which we are concerned with ourselves, our own operations, our goals, evaluate them and make decisions. Conversion is grounded on the fourth level.

My discussion of the four kinds of conversion follows Lonergan's order in *Method*.

Intellectual Conversion

Cognitive development, which Piaget traces from the infant's ego-centrism to the adult dialectical realism, is fundamental both to self-understanding and one's understanding of the world. Beyond cognitive development, there is also the possibility of cognitive conversion, i.e. the critical awareness of the constitutive and normative role of a person's judgment in knowing reality and in one's value (Conn 1998, 123). The recognition that the dynamic structure of human knowing and choosing comprises a compound set of operations; experiencing, understanding, and judging is what Lonergan refers to as intellectual conversion (Gregson 1998, 27). He chooses the pious term conversion because he wants to set straight the misconceptions about knowing. Lonergan defines intellectual conversion as "a radical clarification and, consequently, the elimination of an exceedingly stubborn and misleading myth concerning reality, objectivity, and human knowledge" (Lonergan 1996, 238). The myth that Lonergan talks about is the myth that knowing is like looking, a myth that overlooks the distinction between the world of immediacy and the world mediated by meaning. The world of immediacy is the world of sensory perception of the infant: seeing, touching, smelling, tasting, feeling, hearing, etc. The world mediated by meaning is not known by an individual's sense experience but by the continuously checked and re-checked experience of the community. In the world mediated by meaning, knowing is not just seeing, but experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding (ibid.). If knowing is like looking then all one has to do is open one's eyes and one would not only see but know as well. Under the sway of this ocular myth, what is seen becomes the most important reality thereby negating objectivity and promoting subjectivity (Gregson 1988, 26). In truth, the world of immediacy is but a fragment of the world mediated by meaning. Lonergan further buttressed this point,

> For philosophic issues are universal in scope, and some form of naïve realism seems to appear utterly unquestionable to very many. As soon as they begin to speak of knowing, of objectivity, of reality, there crops up the assumption that all knowing must be something like looking. To be liberated from that blunder, to discover the self-transcendence proper to the human process of coming to know, is to break often long-ingrained habits of thought and speech. It is to acquire the mastery in one's own house that is to be had only when one knows precisely what one is doing when one is knowing. It is a

> conversion, a new beginning, a fresh start. It opens the way to ever
> further clarifications and developments (Lonergan 1996, 239-40).

While one may not be able to see, in the physical sense, such noble
qualities as kindness, beneficence and mercy, one can recognize these
qualities by a process of understanding and judgment. Knowing then
involves, not just first level of consciousness (experience), but also the
second (understanding), third (judgment), and fourth level (decision).
If knowing is just like looking then the whole social order vanishes
(Gregson 1988, 27). If knowing is like looking then the existence of
the Other becomes meaningless in a pluralistic society. One sees only
a tribe, a person, an ethnic group and not a human person with equal
rights and dignity. Intellectual conversion helps the subject renounce
myriads of false philosophies and ideas (Lonergan 1996, 270).

The goal of *Insight* is intellectual conversion or appropriation of
one's intellectual and rational self-consciousness. In introduction to
Insight Lonergan writes:

> The crucial issue is an experimental issue, and the experiment will
> be performed not publicly but privately. It will consist in one's own
> rational self-consciousness clearly and distinctly taking possession
> of itself as rational self-consciousness. No one else, no matter what
> his knowledge or his eloquence, no matter what his logical rigor or
> hispersuasiveness, can do it for you (Lonergan 1970, xviii).

Intellectual conversion is something one does for oneself. It is one's own
intelligent inquiry and insights, one's own critical reflection and judg-
ing and deciding. This is the "personal decisive act" Lonergan speaks
of as the goal of *Insight*. Intellectual conversion is all about appropria-
tion, "to discover, to identify, to become familiar with the activities of
one's own intelligence; the point is to become able to discriminate with
ease and from personal conviction between one's purely intellectual ac-
tivities and the manifold of other, 'existential' concerns that invade and
mix and blend with the operations of intellect to render it ambivalent
and its pronouncement ambiguous" (ibid. xix). The appropriation of
one's rational self-consciousness, however, is not an end in itself but
a beginning.

> The beginning, then, not only is self-knowledge and self-appro-
> priation but also a criterion of the real. If to convince oneself that
> knowing is understanding, one ascertains that knowing mathemat-
> ics is understanding and knowing science is understanding and the

knowledge of common sense is understanding, one ends up not
only with a detailed account of understanding but also with a plan
of what there is to be known (ibid.xxviii-xxix).

Lonergan concretizes intellectual conversion in the affirmation of the
knower according to the basic patterns of cognitional operations. By
self-affirmation of the knower Lonergan means that the person "as
affirmed is characterized by such occurrences as sensing, perceiving,
imagining, inquiring, understanding, formulating, reflecting, grasping
the unconditioned, and affirming" (Lonergan 1970, 319). Self-affirma-
tion, as a concrete form of intellectual conversion, is a judgment of fact
in that the subject affirms that he or she performs certain operations
within a definite pattern of knowing (Conn 1981, 163). David Tracy,
in shedding light on this self-affirmation of the knower, advanced the
argument that philosophical meaning and truth is irreducibly ground-
ed in the intellectual conversion of an attentive, intelligent, rational,
and responsible self-appropriating thinker (Tracy 1981, 38).

Religious Conversion

Religious conversion, like intellectual and moral conversions, is a spe-
cial modality, a crucial instance of self-transcendence (Conn 1981,
186). Self-transcendence and the gift of God's love constitute the cor-
nerstone of Lonergan's discussion of religious experience. Both meet
because we experience God's love in an unrestricted manner. "What
the Spirit poured forth in our hearts prompts by way of response is a
love that is unwilling to set limits" (Carmody 1988, 61). Religious con-
version is "other-worldly falling in love," the grasp of ultimate concern,
and the "total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qual-
ifications, reservations" (Lonergan 1996, 240). Lonergan points out
that the human capacity for self-transcendence becomes achievement
when one falls in love. Being in love is the first principle of a person's
horizon and the efficacious ground of all self-transcendence. Being in
love transforms one's horizon, one's world, one's very being, transforms
all one's discoveries, decisions, and deeds. Lonergan acknowledges that
"being-in-love" is of different kinds, like the love of intimacy between
a husband and wife, love of parents for their children, love of country,
etc. But while all love is self-surrender, being in love with God is to be
understood as being in love in an unrestricted fashion, without lim-
its, without qualifications, without conditions or reservations (Conn

1981, 187). The love of God does not occur in isolation from our intellectual and emotional concerns and changes our entire existence. This unrestricted love is the heartbeat of a genuine religion, sets up a new horizon, resets our values and alters our knowing (Carmody 1988, 61). In the common understanding of conversion, it is religious conversion that provides the paradigm in the light of which all the other conversions are to be analogously understood (Tyrell 1981, 15).

Religious conversion is God's gift of grace. Lonergan acknowledges the distinction that has been made, since the time of Augustine, between operative and cooperative grace. Operative grace is religious conversion. Cooperative grace is the human attempt to respond to God's grace by way of good works. It is the "effectiveness of conversion, the gradual movement towards a full and complete transformation of the whole of one's living and feeling, one's thoughts, words, deeds, and omissions" (Lonergan 1996, 241). One's capacity for self-transcendence "meets joyful fulfillment when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love" (Conn 1998,126).

Religious conversion is not simply a process of becoming, say a Muslim or a Christian, but a total radical reorientation of one's life to God (not religion). A religiously converted person surrenders, not just oneself or one's personal moral autonomy but one's unadmitted deepest pretense to absolute personal autonomy (ibid. 128).

> Religious conversion goes beyond moral. Questions for intelligence, for reflection, for deliberation reveal the eros of the human spirit, its capacity and its desire for self-transcendence. But that capacity meets fulfillment, that desire turns to joy, when religious conversion transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and an other-worldly   love. Then there is a new basis for all valuing and all doing good(Lonergan 1978, 19).

Religious conversion opens our hearts to embrace whatever is good, true, noble and truly humanizing. It is a yes to the mystery of God that finds practical expression in the love of one's neighbor (Carmody 1988, 62-3). The import of religious conversion lies in the fact that it ensures that we love unconditionally the way the Lord would have us love.

Moral Conversion

Religious conversion and moral conversion are clearly interrelated. Lonergan argues that it is the occurrence of radical and ongoing religious conversion that makes moral conversion possible (Conn 1998, 23). Moral conversion, for Lonergan, changes the criterion of one's decisions and choices from satisfactions to values. "It consists in opting for the truly good, even for value against satisfaction when value and satisfaction conflict" (Lonergan 1996, 240). It is a matter of deciding to act responsibly and inculcating a value-laden ethics in which one is governed by the criterion of what is truly good instead of apparent good that merely satisfies one's immediate demands for self-gratification (Tyrell 1981, 22).

Moral conversion reverses personal bias (Ring 1981, 261), and keeps the subject free of individual, group and general bias. It means opting for that which is a true value instead of mere subjective satisfaction. When one is morally converted, one begins to uncover and eliminate one's individual, group and general bias, scrutinizes one intentional responses to values and their implicit scale of preference (Lonergan 1996, 240). "Within the exigence of God's love, value rather than ego-satisfaction is established as a directing principle in one's relations with others" (Ring 1981, 261). Lonergan explains the argument this way:

> As children or minors we are persuaded, cajoled, ordered, compelled to do what is right. As our knowledge of human reality increases, as our responses to human values are strengthened and refined, our mentors more and more leave us to ourselves so that our freedom may exercise its ever advancing thrust toward authenticity. So we move to the existentialmoment when we discover for ourselves that our choosing affects ourselves no less than the chosen or rejected objects, and that is up to each of us todecide for himself what he is to make of himself (Lonergan 1978, 17).

Moral conversion elevates the subject from cognitional to moral self-transcendence, setting him or her on a new existential level of consciousness. "But this in no way interferes with or weakens his devotion to truth. He still needs truth, for he must apprehend reality and real potentiality before he can deliberately respond to value" (ibid. 19). The subject needs truth that is in accord with the exigencies of rational consciousness. This kind of truth shields the subject, protecting the subject from any kind of bias.

Affective Conversion

Lonergan usually speaks of intellectual, moral, and religious conversion. Though he shows advertence for another kind of conversion, affective conversion, it is not very explicit in his major works. Copeland (1998) has rightly observed that Walter E. Conn has been credited with the effort to make explicit what Lonergan means by affective conversion. Other Lonergan scholars have also made attempts to extend Lonergan's notion of conversion. Robert Doran (1977 and 1990) has developed and written extensively on 'psychic conversion. Bernard Tyrell (1981) developed the notion of 'psychological' conversion, while Donald Gelpi (1978) has put forward a theory of "affective conversion" that is rooted in the psychologies of Jung and Carl Rogers.

Although Lonergan does not explicitly speak of affective conversion, his work, *Method* in particular, as Conn, Doran and Tyrell have shown, calls for the development of this category. I shall use this category as a necessary outgrowth of Lonergan's position, especially in *Method* where his shift to affectivity became more pronounced. Doran who, extrapolating from Lonergan's work, developed the notion of psychic conversion, argues for a two-sense meaning of psychic conversion. First, psychic conversion can have the sense of intellectual conversion, he argues. "In its primordial state, it is the insistence on intelligent and responsible attention to the energic rhythms that constitute the experience of the movement of life in which direction is found by intelligent, rational, and deliberative inquiry: that is, to feelings, images, dreams, sensations, spontaneous intersubjective responses" (Doran 1990, 549-50). Second, psychic conversion can have a self-appropriating sense in that it enables "the weaving of the explanatory narrative of our lives through which existential self-appropriation takes place" (ibid. 550). Although Doran explains that, in either of the two senses of psychic conversion, the objective remains that of attuning the individual to their spiritual state, psychic conversion still, in my judgment, does not capture the role Lonergan gave to feelings and affectivity in his later works. 'Psychic' conversion gives the impression of a conversion that remains purely on the rational, cognitive level. I have shown preference for the category affective conversion simply because it captures the shift in Lonergan's thought, a movement from a rational, cognitive conversion to one that considers the totality of the

human person, mind, feelings, or what has often been spoken of in terms of the metaphor "heart."

In *Method*, Lonergan, in discussing feelings and intentional responses, uses the work of Max Scheler to distinguish between community of feeling, fellow-feeling, psychic contagion and emotional identification. While both community of feeling and fellow feeling are intentional responses that presuppose the apprehension of the objects that arouse feeling, psychic contagion and emotional identification have vital rather than intentional basis:

> Psychic contagion is a matter of sharing another's emotion without adverting to the object of the emotion. One grins when others are laughing although one does not know what they find funny. One becomes sorrowful when others are weeping although one does not know the cause of their grief. An on-looker, without undergoing another's ills, is caught up in the feeling of extreme pain expressed in the face of the sufferer. Such contagion seems to be the mechanism of mass-excitement in panics, revolutions, revolts, demonstrations, strikes, where in general there is a disappearance of personal responsibility, a domination of drives over thinking, a decrease of the intelligent level, and a readiness for submission to a leader (Lonergan 1996, 28).

Such contagion, Lonergan argues, can easily be provoked, built up, and exploited by political activists, entertainment industry, and religious leaders, especially pseudo religious leaders. The Hutu Tutsi conflict of the 1990s illustrates how the contagion Lonergan talks about can be built up and exploited by political leaders. When their Hutu neighbors massacred some Tutsis, the Tutsi political class built and exploited the anger of their people and called for reprisals. In the same way, when their Tutsi neighbors massacred Hutus, the Hutu political class built and exploited the anger of their people and manipulated the situation.

Affective conversion is a corrective to dramatic bias. Lonergan in his writings displays a long-standing interest in affectivity. His doctoral thesis and some of his essays, especially essays in which he attempts a systematic treatment of the Thomistic theory of love, lend credence to this (Mooney 1992, 34). He pays attention to the reality of being in love. "A man or woman that falls in love is engaged in loving not only when attending to the beloved but at all times. Besides particular acts of loving, there is the prior state of being in love, and that prior state is,

as it were, the fount of all one's actions" (Lonergan 1996, 32-3). Love is transformatory. It transforms the individual from an "I" consciousness to a "We" consciousness that he/she begins to think, attend, imagine, plan, feel, speak, and act in concern for the other. In *Method* Lonergan speaks of faith and love in the same context, faith being knowledge born of religious love. Love has to do with feelings that are intentional responses to values. "Besides the factual knowledge reached by experiencing, understanding, and verifying, there is another kind of knowledge reached through discernment of value and the judgments of value of a person in love" (ibid. 115). Affective conversion concerns the development and refinement of human feelings (Copeland 1998, 2: 15). Shawn Copeland suggests that human feelings are spontaneous, because feelings may be easily aroused and just as easily be diminished. There are also feelings that one may repress but they instigate pathological behavior.

> By attending to what we feel and the objects that evoke those feelings, we can discern a good deal about ourselves. Indeed, feelings, their development and refinement, play a crucial role in the religious, cognitive, moral development of the person. Indeed, such powerful feelings as joy and sorrow, love and hatred, hope and fear, esteem and contempt, dynamically orient us in the world (ibid).

Intentional feelings, in Lonergan's analysis, help the subject respond to values, in accordance with one's scale of preferences. For "without faith, without the eye of love, the world is too evil for God to be good, for a good God to exist" (Lonergan 1996, 117).

By affective conversion Lonergan means falling in love, that part of love that is concerned with ultimate meanings and what is ultimately worthwhile (Dunne 1994, 123). Affective conversion is "the concrete possibility of overcoming moral impotence, of not only being able to make a decision to commit oneself to a course of action or direction of life judged worthwhile or personally appropriate, but of being able to execute that decision over the long haul against serious obstacles" (Conn 1998, 121). Lonergan suggests that a person is affectively converted or self-transcendent "when the isolation of the individual is broken and he or she spontaneously acts not just for self but for others as well" (ibid.). In this way one's orientation shifts from self-absorption to concern for the good of the other. Only an affectively converted

consciousness can truly be morally effective (Conn 1981, 188). Tad Dunne explains Lonergan's view this way:

> For Lonergan, love for life's ultimates is the peak of other human loves- love of self, friends, family, and country. Like an engine, it drives and energizes these more tangible loves. It facilitates a more faithful obedience to the precept 'Be in love.' The eye of love sees goodness and possibilities where the eye of ethics sees only rights and duties. It is because love reveals values overlooked by logic and reason that affective conversion is an essential element in discriminating between authentic and unauthentic doctrines (Dunne 1994, 124).

Faith born out of religious love has the power to undo decline (Lonergan 1996, 117). Lonergan speaks of love as a basic form of appetition, which grounds a union between persons both in their progress to a common goal and their attainment of that end (Mooney 1992, 34).

> Decline disrupts a culture with conflicting ideologies. It inflicts on individuals the social, economic, and psychological pressures that for human frailty amount to determinism. It multiplies and heaps up the abuses and absurdities that breed resentment, hatred, anger, violence. It is not propaganda and it is not argument but religious faith that will liberate human reasonableness from its ideological prisons. It is not the promises of men but religious hope that can enablemen to resist the vast pressures of social decay (Lonergan 1996, 117).

Lonergan, acknowledging his indebtedness to Dietrich Von Hildebrand, outlines those feelings that relate to an object, feelings that bear intentional responses to values. "In the measure that that summit is reached, then the supreme value is God, and other values are God's expression of his love in this world, in its aspirations, and in its goal" (ibid. 39).

The Levels of Conversion and Their Relationship to the Levels of Bias

In the last chapter (Chapter II) we focused on bias and the cycle of decline and a general definition of bias was offered. One will recall that in the way Lonergan uses it, bias denotes an aberration of understanding, a blind spot or scotosis. Lonergan says that fundamentally the scotosis is an unconscious process and "arises, not in conscious acts, but in the

censorship that governs the emergence of psychic contents" (Lonergan 1997, 215). Bias is a flight from understanding and that is why the scotosis is an aberration, not only of the understanding, but also of censorship. "Just as wanting an insight penetrates below the surface to bring forth schematic images that give rise to the insight. So not wanting insight has the opposite effect of repressing from consciousness a scheme that would suggest the insight" (ibid.). Put differently, bias is the deliberate and conscious refusal to live and act attentively, intelligently, rationally, and responsibly. Although bias is a conscious refusal to act attentively, intelligently, rationally, and responsibly, it can also be acquired unconsciously, especially in the process of socialization. Lonergan identifies four principal ways this scotoma may creep its way into the human person and destroy the fabric of society. These principal ways he identified as the four kinds of bias: dramatic bias or bias of unconscious motivation, individual bias, group bias, and the general bias of common sense. Bias of unconscious motivation, brought to light by depth psychology, is that painful and unfortunate "love of darkness" rather than "love of light," which favors withdrawal from the outer drama of human living into the inner drama of fantasy (ibid. 214). Individual bias is an egoism that results from an in incomplete development of intelligence, incomplete development that necessarily involves deliberate exclusion of correct understanding (ibid. 246). Group bias is a "more powerful and blinder bias," which leads to attitudes that not only conflict with ordinary common sense but also conflicts with the generative principle of developing social order. General bias of common sense is the specialization of intelligence in the particular and concrete and by which common sense deems itself omni-competent (Lonergan 1996, 231).

Lonergan argues that all human beings are subject to dramatic bias, individual bias, group bias, and the general bias of common sense, mainly because as rational animals, a full development of human person's animality is both more common and more rapid than a full development of the person's intelligence and reasonableness. But just as all humans are subject to these different levels of bias mainly since "to err is human, and common sense is very human," they can also overcome them, because of the gift of God's grace flooding our hearts, i.e. conversion (Lonergan 1997 250). Thus, though Lonergan does not explicitly show how the various levels of conversion are related to the levels of bias, the relationship is everywhere implicit in his works. While there

are four kinds of bias and these bias are interconnected and related, there are also four levels of conversion, and these levels of conversion are connected, the one implying the other.

Intellectual conversion, in so far as it is that radical clarification and elimination of an exceedingly stubborn and misleading myth concerning reality, objectivity, and human knowledge, is a corrective to individual bias. For as Lonergan maintains in *Method*, in intellectual conversion, knowing is not just seeing in the ocular sense, but it is experiencing, understanding, judging, and believing. The criteria of objectivity ceases to be just the criteria of ocular vision but the compounded criteria of experiencing, of understanding, of judging, and of believing. "The reality known is not just looked at; it is given in experience, organized and extrapolated by understanding, posited by judgment and belief" (Lonergan 1996, 238). Intellectual conversion liberates one from the blunder or myth that knowing is like looking generated by individual, dramatic, and general bias of common sense, and helps one discover the self-transcendence proper to the human process of coming to know, opens the way to further clarifications and developments and helps one develop mastery of one's acts (ibid. 239-40).

An analysis of Lonergan's discussion of group bias suggests that group bias finds expression in social class which when distinguished by social function and social success, as Lonergan himself argues in *Insight*, "finds expression not only in conceptual labels but also in deep feelings of frustration, resentment, bitterness, and hatred" (Lonergan 1997, 249). Group bias also finds expression in racial conflicts, like the development of apartheid in South Africa or the white supremacy groups (e.g. Ku Klux Klan) of the Americas, in tribalism or ethnic prejudice as found in Sub-Saharan Africa, in religious bigotry and prejudice as found in the Middle East and in some Sub-Saharan African countries, and in other societal groups that infringe on the rights of less privileged, whether it be gender-based or class-based minorities. "Apartheid," as practiced in South Africa, literally means "separateness." In the 1940s and 1950s the National Party Government in South Africa introduced a series of laws that established a clear-cut racist system that was to guarantee permanent white domination in South Africa. The system, which was called apartheid, was designed to make blacks not only 'foreigners' in their own country, but also to restrict them to the poverty-stricken and over crowded "reserves" (lat-

er called "homelands"). The cornerstone of the apartheid system were these three laws: (i) The Population Registration Act (1950) which classified people according to race, i.e. whites and non-whites (ii) The Group Areas Act (1950) which determined the places where the various races could live and (iii) the Bantu Education Act (1953) which "forced blacks into government schools to study syllabuses which were designed to emphasize ethnic differences and to teach them only the bare skills needed to work for whites" (Shillington 1989, 404-5).

Moral conversion is in a sense, a corrective to group bias, in addition to individual and general bias, in so far as it changes the criterion of one's decisions and choices from satisfactions to values and attempts to "uncover and root out one's individual, group, and general bias" (Lonergan 1996, 240). For as Lonergan explains it, in moral conversion one exercises vertical freedom which advances one towards authenticity and opts for the truly good, i.e. good of value, even when such good is in conflict with the good of satisfaction. In addition to making the individual opt for that which is truly good, moral conversion also arms the individual with truth, promotes the individual from cognitional to moral self-transcendence, and sets the individual on a new existential level of consciousness. The truth Lonergan speaks of is that truth which is attained in accord with the exigencies of rational consciousness, a pursuit which is "all the more secure because he has been armed against bias, and it is all the more meaningful and significant because it occurs within, and plays an essential role in, the far richer context of the pursuit of all values" (ibid. 242).

Lonergan's analysis of the different kinds of bias shows that that the four levels of bias are dynamically interrelated, just as the four kinds of conversion are dynamically interrelated. It is possible for one and the same person to suffer from the scotosis of dramatic bias and the general bias of common sense, in addition to his or her own individual and group bias. In Sub-Saharan African countries, for instance, (as we showed in Chapter I) membership in the community is primarily determined by one's tribal affiliation. Each tribe has its own mores, values, and culture, and even prejudices which often leads to spite or hatred of people outside of the tribe. An individual belonging to any one of the tribes, say Ibo or Yoruba, or Hausa tribe, who suffers a distortion in the development of his or her own experiential and affective orientation provides a good example of the relation between individual and group bias. To undo this one needs intellectual, moral, and

religious (and even affective) conversion. In the African context we can conceive of affective conversion as "friendship" across tribal lines. This is why Lonergan argues that it is possible for the different kinds of conversion to occur within a single consciousness (ibid. 241).. When all three occur within a single consciousness, Lonergan conceives of the relation in terms of sublation. He uses sublation, not in the Hegelian sense, but in Karl Rahner's sense (Rahner 1963, 40). In the way Lonergan explains it, what sublates goes beyond what is sublated, but rather than destroying it, preserves all its proper features and properties, carries them forward and introduces something new and distinct, thereby putting everything on a new basis, and carries them forward to fuller realization within a richer context (Lonergan 1996, 241).

Religious conversion can uncover or undo dramatic bias, general bias of common sense, individual, and group bias, especially when one and the same person has all these. This is why Lonergan in *Method* says religious conversion goes beyond moral conversion. For religious conversion "transforms the existential subject into a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so an other-worldly love." This is why religious conversion is without conditions, qualifications, and reservations, but that "other-worldly fulfillment, joy, peace, bliss" (ibid.).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LONERGAN'S NOTION OF CONVERSION FOR THE SOLUTION TO THE ETHNIC & RELIGIOUS CONFLICTS IN AFRICA

As Africans we do not identify ourselves solely on the basis of national origin. We do not just see ourselves as, say, Nigerians, Togolese, Ghanaians, Kenyans, Congolese, Cameroonians, South Africans. For whatever reason, Africans are ethnically particular. We see ourselves as Yorubas, Ibos, Hausas, Akans, Tutsis, Hutus. Add religion to the brew, and you see another dimension of our identity, both rich and complex. African political leaders have sought, with little or no success, different ways of addressing the problem posed by ethnic rivalry and religious zealotry. Different countries have attempted different solutions. In the 1970s for instance, Zimbabwe nationalist leaders adopted policies of "ethnic arithmetic" and "ethnic or regional balance" as a solution for their ethnic problems (Sithole 1995, 156). Nigeria has at various times tried the policy of regional balance and "quota system," all to no

avail. Okwudiba Nnoli, who has written on the subject, has remarked that the persistence of ethnic conflicts in various African countries attests to the unsuccessfulness of remedies that have been applied to the problem (Nnoli 1989, 5). Meanwhile the too often culture of hatred and violence continues unabated in a continent where its people are extremely "religious." Most people agree that there is need for change, a change in orientation and attitude, a kind of conversion, so to speak, even though they may disagree on the nature of this change or conversion process. Like all other human beings, Africans are cultural and ethnic beings. Since, from experience, we know that ethnic and cultural patterns wrap themselves tightly into religious expression, it is safe to assume that it is within this same ethnic and cultural framework that conversion will be experienced (McKnight 2002, 6).

Christian churches, the Catholic Church especially, have, at the global and regional level, taken steps to address and seek solutions to the ethnic and religious conflicts ravaging the continent. In its response to conflicts among Christians and their non-Christian neighbors the world over, the Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue (PCID), speaking in general terms, exhorts Christians to engage in dialogue with other religions, examine the roots of tension and conflicts, seek areas of cooperation, and take a stand on those matters "which touch their lives as people for whom God is real and meaningful presence in the world" (Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue 1994, 70). Even before the PCID exhortation, the Vatican II document, *Nostra aetate*, recommended dialogue with non-Christian religions, because there are in these religions some light of truth. In response to this challenge, in Africa, various national and regional Episcopal conferences have taken steps to promote good relations with Muslims and adherents of African Traditional Religions (ATR).

Perhaps partly due to the influence of Pope Paul VI who, in his 1969 visit to Kampala, Uganda, encouraged Africans to Africanize Christianity, the Christian dialogue with ATR has achieved more success (in terms of reducing skirmishes between adherents of the two religions) than the Christian dialogue with Muslims. Encouraged by Paul VI's mandate, African bishops and theologians have set in motion means of inculturating Christianity in Africa. They see dialogue and cooperation with ATR as a necessary means of achieving this objective. Tanzania, for instance, in the 1970s created a National Committee for Cultural Research for study of ATR, and Zaire (now Congo) years

before that, created the Catholique Faculte de Theologie, a theological center for research in ATR. The fruit of research that comes from these institutes have helped to increase cultural sensitivities between Christianity and ATR and help foster a better mutual relationship.

The Christian-Muslim dialogue has not been as successful. For more than twenty-five years the Francophone West African Regional Episcopal Conference (CERAO) has engaged their Muslim neighbors in dialogue. In 1991, a commission similar to CERAO, Association of Episcopal Conferences in Anglophone West Africa (AECAWA) was created, not only to engage Muslims in dialogue, but also to help in the production of books to be used in the teaching of Islamic studies in theological faculties and religious houses (ibid. 129). In addition, the Ecumenical Association of Third-World Theologians (EATWOT) was formed in 1976, and a sub-section, Association Oecumenique des Theologiens Africains (AOTA) was formed a year later in Accra, Ghana (Mushete 1989, 19). The goal of EATWOT and AOTA is to engage in inter-religious dialogue and ecumenical dialogue in Africa and beyond. Among Protestants, Muslim-Christian dialogue is also on going. Service des Relations Islamo-Chretiennes en Afrique (SRI-CA) and Project for Christian-Muslim Relations in Africa (PROC-MURA) are two examples of projects created to foster this dialogue. Although these regional efforts have yielded some meaningful results and have brought some warring Christian and Muslim leaders to the dialogue table, still more needs to be done.

These regional efforts have not been able to bring an end to the carnage and wanton destruction of lives and property that continues as if there is no remedy in sight. Most sub-Saharan African countries understand the inadequacies of these regional efforts and have taken steps to address the situation on the local level. The Sudanese Catholic Bishops Conference (SCBC) has consistently made it known that the only way out of the present Sudanese crisis is a negotiated solution. In a communiqué issued at the end of their Annual Plenary Assembly (2000) in Pesaro Italy, in anticipation of the canonization of the first Sudanese saint, Blessed Josephine Bakhita, the SCBC threw its weight behind the peace process sponsored by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). The IGAD coordinates dialogue between the different warring factions in Sudan in an effort to resolve the civil war and bring end to the inhuman condition of suffering for the people of Sudan. The IGAD has adopted a Declaration Of Prin-

ciples (DOP) that addresses key issues concerning the attainment of peace in Sudan, which the Sudanese Bishops fully support. In spite of these efforts, peace is still a long shot in Sudan. In Nigeria the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), an umbrella of Christian groups in Nigeria formed for the purpose of engaging their Muslim counterparts in inter-religious dialogue, in the effort to bring an end to sectarian violence, engages the Jamatu'ul Nasir Islam (JNI) in peace talks. Despite the effort to bring warring parties to the dialogue table, the relationship between these two groups, i.e. CAN and their Muslim dialogue counterparts, continues to be based more on mutual distrust and suspicion than on cooperation.

Lonergan offers us a tool for effecting this change. His cognitional theory makes it imperative for us as Africans to be conscious of those stereotypes we have formed of people who are different from us. It would seem that our ethnic and religious orientations have been interlocked with some kinds of pre-conceived opinion and stereotypes, personal and social/communal stereotypes. The reason why we have ethnic skirmishes and religious violence on a regular basis is not unconnected with the fact that bias controls our existential situation, our worldview, and the way we perceive the other. Lonergan's analysis brings to our awareness that our patterns of experience, as Africans, are in certain ways the result of arbitrary conditioning. His conversion process offers us tools we can appropriate in the on-going effort to liberate ourselves from our frequent and constant communal flight from understanding. Resort to arms and war, which is very frequent in many African communities, can not always be a justifiable means of settling conflicts. Lonergan's theory brings to us the awareness of the need to break with the aspects of basic patterns of our experience, in so far as that pattern of experience does not promote the common good. It becomes pertinent to ask proper questions (intellectual conversion) in order to break with this pattern of experience that is in conflict with the good of order. Affective conversion, the theoretical inference from Lonergan's work, in my view, is a significant invention for the fact that our pursuit of peace will not be fully achieved unless we address it from the heart, the seat of love. Affective conversion invites us to develop "friendship" that cuts across tribal and religious lines.

What Lonergan adds to the African experience, to use the words of Robert Doran, is a "heightened recognition that the constitution of consciousness in its capacity for insight and reasonable judgment

has a liberating potential…to be deprived of this power by cultural conditioning and determinism is to be deprived of a constituent of the humanum" (Doran 1990, 40). Against religious bigotry or zealotry, Lonergan reminds us that one can lay claim to an authentic, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible existence only in so far as that person has been converted from his or her biased orientations that are inimical to the existence of the other. What, in my view, Africans need to combat the present crisis is not necessarily the growth of churches or mosques, not an added number of religiously professed members but an intellectually, morally, religiously, and affectively converted populace. No one can dispute the fact that the concept of transcendence and the place of deity is enshrined in African cultures and traditions. The growth of churches and mosques attests to the religiosity of the modern day African. The successful competition among the different Christian denominations for African converts is a living testimony to African religiosity. But conversion, as Lonergan reminds us, can be authentic or unauthentic. Conversion goes beyond the mere embrace of a faith tradition. The ritual cleansing of baptism and "I am born again" pronouncement may be a step in the process of conversion but not necessarily conversion itself. There may be different Christian or Muslim horizons but not all of them represent authentic conversion (Lonergan 1996, 131-2). In light of Lonergan's understanding of the full process of conversion, one cannot lay claim to conversion and at the same time destroy another person's house of worship just on the basis of religious disagreement. Nor can one claim to be converted when one's actions are in disharmony with the objective good of the other.

Lonergan reminds us that conversion is not a single event, but a process that involves a radical about-face in which one repudiates a lifestyle that does not promote the good of order. This is why conversion has to be intellectual (we repent of our refusal to seek true knowledge), religious (repent of our refusal to be unrestricted in love), moral (repent of our refusal to seek the transcendent good of the other) and affective (repent of our refusal to God as God loves us). Intellectual conversion is necessary because it helps one to understand correctly and think objectively. It is imperative that the intellectually converted subject be morally converted because moral conversion helps the subject to make a shift in the criterion of one's decisions and choices from satisfaction to values. In this way, as Lonergan suggests, one begins to uncover and

eliminate all biases, whether individual (personal stereotypes), group (tribalism) or general bias (religious bigotry and zealotry) and shun anything that inhibits progress. In this way, one is transformed from an "I" orientation to a "We-Thou" orientation and not confined by socio-cultural boundaries, enters the world of the other and identifies with their struggles. This is the kind of transformation Lonergan envisions in moral conversion that brings the subject in harmony with the good of order. When one is thus morally converted, then one can lay claim to religious conversion because one has totally surrendered one's life to God and is completely in love with God. Affective conversion becomes necessary because it is an offshoot of religious conversion in which one loves one's neighbor as one loves God, whether or not that neighbor shares one's religious beliefs or ethnic affiliation.

In summary, Lonergan offers a challenge to how the orientations to conversion are to be understood. Scott McKnight has argued, and rightly so, that faith develops in correlation with personal development (McKnight 2002, 185). Our psychosocial development goes through stages (Eric Erickson), so do our cognitive (J. Piaget) and moral developments (L. Kohlberg). Psychologists and social scientists have uncovered through myriad studies that conversion takes place in dimensions and that faith develops in stages. James Fowler has synthesized Eric Erickson's psychosocial development, J. Piaget's cognitive development, and L. Kohlberg's moral development and integrated them into stages of faith. Stephen Happel and James J. Walter (1986) have also alluded to the developmental stages of faith and conversion. Walter E. Conn (1986) and LeRoy Aden (1992) have also synthesized Erickson's and Kohlberg's stages of development to show how faith develops in stages. They help us see how faith development is cognitive, spiritual, moral, and psychosocial (ibid. 188), a view that lends credence to Lonergan's position that conversion is developmental in that it is intellectual, moral, religious, and affective. Conversion, as Lonergan argued, is a personal act. But it is also about the development of faith in the lives and hearts of many kinds of people. It is a self-awakening, the revival of the self God has made us to be. Lonergan would readily agree with Scott McKnight that conversion is complex as each person is complex. "Our theories of conversion ought to reflect this complexity, and in so reflecting it, we can become sensitive to the integrity of others and learn to appreciate each of the stories we see written on the tapestries of our neighbors" (ibid. 190). How do we, in

manifesting our conversion, show sensitivity to the integrity of others? Lonergan says we can do this by means of dialogue, a discussion that will be taken up in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

OVERCOMING BIAS AS A COMPONENT IN A SOCIAL PROCESS

In the last chapter we saw how conversion can serve as a means of overcoming bias. We noted that central to Lonergan's notion of conversion is self-transcendence, the benchmark for knowing when one has authentically realized the gospel's call to love one's neighbor as oneself. Conversion, Lonergan argues, is multi-dimensional. It transforms the subject and his or her world such that "a changed relation to God brings or follows changes that are personal, social, moral and intellectual" (Lonergan 1974, 66). Conversion, Lonergan continues, is also ontic, for the reason that "the convert apprehends differently, values differently, relates differently because he has become different." He explains this as the "transvaluation of values" inherent in the conversion process, and of which Paul spoke: "So whoever is in Christ is a new creation: the old things have passed away; behold new things have come" (2Cor. 5:17).

We also noted that Lonergan identifies three basic kinds of conversion: intellectual, religious, and moral; and that from his work another kind of conversion, affective conversion, has been implied. Intellectual conversion is the radical clarification and the consequent elimination of an exceedingly stubborn and misleading myth about reality, objectivity, and human knowledge (Lonergan 1996, 238). Religious conversion is God's gift of grace, the "other-worldly falling in love," the grasp of ultimate concern, and the total and permanent self-surrender that is without conditions, without qualifications, and without reservations. Moral conversion changes the criterion of one's decisions and choices, and makes one to opt for that which is truly good, as against seeking an apparent good. Affective conversion, like religious conversion, is that "other-worldly falling in love" that considers the totality of the hu-

man person, and has been spoken of in terms of the metaphor "heart." It is that falling in love that is concerned with ultimate meanings.

In enumerating the different kinds of conversion, Lonergan, at least implicitly, shows that there is a dynamic inter-relationship between them and that the four kinds of conversion and the four kinds of bias (discussed in chapter II) are also related. In the measure that all human beings are subject to bias, these four kinds of conversion act as corrective to the different levels of bias, and can also be conceived as means of overcoming bias. In so far as it aims at eliminating exceedingly stubborn and misleading myth concerning reality, intellectual conversion is a corrective to individual bias in that it liberates one from the blunder that knowing is like looking, and helps one discover the self-transcendence proper to the process of acquiring knowledge. Religious conversion tries to undo the error of dramatic bias, general bias of common sense, and even individual and group bias, by transforming the subject into "a subject in love, a subject held, grasped, possessed, owned through a total and so on other-worldly love" (ibid. 241). When one is religiously, intellectually, morally, and affectively converted then one overcomes bias in the process of self-transcendence.

As last chapter dealt with issue of overcoming bias as a component in self-transcendence, this chapter considers the issue of overcoming bias as a component in a social process. Lonergan is very clear about the fact that, although conversion is intensely personal and utterly intimate, it is not so private as to be solitary. "It can happen to many and they can form a community to sustain one another in their self-transformation, and to help one another in their self-transformation, and to help one another in working out the implications, and in fulfilling the promise of their new life" (Lonergan 1974, 66) In other words, overcoming bias is not just what one does individually but also what one does as a group or community. To suggest that bias can be overcome as a group or community is to suggest that the process of overcoming bias is done through a social process. Lonergan argues that what can become communal can become historical, implying that the social process of overcoming bias can be ingrained in a group's history, which in turn can be passed from generation to generation, from one cultural milieu to another, and can also be adapted to changing circumstances while confronting new situations.

What Lonergan says about the social process of overcoming bias finds concrete expression in the works of peace activists. Scott Ap-

pleby, the eminent professor of history and director of the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame and chair of the advisory council of the newly formed Catholic Peace Building Network, once posed the question: How do societies ravaged by conflict move toward stability based on respect for human rights, social justice and the rule of law? (Appleby 2003, 12). Put in the African context: how do African societies, ravaged by years of ethnic conflict and religious violence, move toward peace and the establishment of the rule of law that respects the rights and dignity of everyone in society, regardless of race, ethnicity, or religion? What is the best way of bringing about a peaceful and just society? Regardless of how one may answer these questions, the universal Church and the international community no doubt have something to contribute to the debate (ibid.). The issue, however, belongs specifically to Africans, since political self-determination and its rule of law can not serve its intended purpose if imposed from outside. African leaders, both political and religious, have suggested the use of dialogue as a move toward peace and the establishment of the rule of law that respects the rights and dignity of everyone in society. The 1994 African synod of bishops have suggested that dialogue can be used as a means of enthroning the rule of law and achieving political self-determination that is not imposed from above, or outside, but from within. Moreover, people interested in cross-cultural understanding seem to have come to the realization that inter-religious dialogue is not a frill but a requisite (Carmody and Carmody 1988, 1).

Lonergan also has a lot to say about dialogue. He considers it a necessary process in the quest to overcome bias. He grounds the theological justification of Catholic dialogue with all Christians and non-Christians on "the grace that God offers all men, that underpins what is good in the religions of mankind, that explains how those that never heard the gospel can be saved" (Lonergan 1996, 278). In Africa dialogue among Christians, Muslims, and adherents of African Traditional Religion constitutes an important religious phenomenon in this quest for social transformation. The Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria (NCCB), for instance, in their September 1998 meeting, saw dialogue as a pathway to "genuine reconciliation" (Schineller 2003, 49). They argued that it could be used as a means of ameliorating the "numerous hurts arising from injustices of the past," and called on the Nigerian government to widen the scope of dialogue already initiated

among the different political groups "to include the religious, ethical, social, and economic spheres of our national life." In March 2000 they continued this theme and proclaimed, "authentic democracy entails a culture of dialogue." They further proposed that dialogue be used as a means of "collaboration, harmony, solidarity, and unity" (ibid.).

What the Nigerian bishops and the 1994 African synod of bishops have said about the role of dialogue in the process of social transformation is in line with what Lonergan says of dialogue and how dialogue can be used as a means of overcoming bias in the social process. It must be said that there are as many definitions of dialogue as there are scholars. For the purpose of this discussion, I favor the view of dialogue as "an approach in relating with other people that assumes the freedom and legitimacy of these people to be themselves and that promotes understanding and respect for them, including their faith situation" (Ukpong 1996, 37). The goal of dialogue in this respect is not to coerce the dialogue partner or seek undue advantage, but to seek mutual ways of overcoming blind spots or scotosis. Both the *Lineamenta* to the African synod and the synod itself acknowledged the role of dialogue as a means redressing imbalance and a means of social justice. The synod's belief in the role of dialogue as a means of combating ethnic and religious prejudice was underscored when it recommended "that the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM), the regional associations of bishops' conferences, and national Episcopal conferences and dioceses, have structures and means which guarantee an exercise of this dialogue" (Proposition 39). While the synod document has been hailed as a landmark document, it is not without its critics. Justin Ukpong has criticized the document on two grounds: (i) it does not offer a working definition of dialogue and (ii) it fails to answer the question "Dialogue for what?" These shortcomings, he argued, renders the synod's treatment of dialogue inadequate. Arguing further, Ukpong had this to say:

> Another criticism I offer is that the text is based on the institutional model of dialogue rather than the people-of-God model. The institutional model conceives of dialogue primarily—thoughnot exclusively— in terms of relations between institutions, while the people-of-God model conceives of dialogue primarily in terms of the interactions between people belonging to these institutions…. Also the text consistently speaks of the "church" being in dialogue, and there is no doubt that the institutional church is meant. Fur-

thermore, the "concentric circle" approach to identifying dialogue
partners, whereby the Coptic and Ethiopic Orthodox churches are
seen as the closest neighbors, is meaningful only in the institutional
framework (Ukpong 1996, 38-9).

In light of Ukpong's criticism, Lonergan's analysis becomes helpful.

I shall begin by laying out Lonergan's argument on the social process of overcoming bias. Then I shall consider the role of dialogue and dialectic in overcoming bias and the role of dialogue and dialectic in promoting the common good. Thereafter, I shall engage the work of Shawn Copeland in analyzing Lonergan's vision of the human good. I shall also attempt a discussion on the need to conceive of a multiethnic and a multi-religious common good. Finally, I shall address the issues raised by critics of the synod document by highlighting the significance of Lonergan's treatment of dialogue, dialectic and the common good as it relates to the African situation and possibly show how the concrete work of Caritas International and National Inter-Religious Council (NIREC) provide a positive example of how bias can be overcome in the social process.

The Role of Dialogue and Dialectic in Overcoming Bias

Before examining Lonergan's position on dialogue and dialectic and their role in overcoming bias, I wish to briefly examine his position on human belief, the extent of belief in human knowledge, and its relation to bias. This is essential for a proper understanding of his position on dialogue and dialectic. For in both *Insight* and *Method*, Lonergan undertakes a lengthy discussion of the social and historical character of human knowledge and argues to the effect that belief constitutes an essential component of human knowledge. The progress in knowledge, say from primitives to moderns, he argues, is only because successive generations are eager to begin from where there predecessors left off, and they could do this only because they were ready to believe. "Without belief, relying solely on their own individual experience, their own insights, their own judgment, they would have ever been beginning afresh, and either the attainments of primitives would never be surpassed or, if they were, then the benefits would not be transmitted" (Lonergan 1996, 43). What Lonergan says about role of belief in human knowledge is very significant for two main reasons: (1) before one can engage in dialogue one has to identify what the issues are, i.e.

what one wants to dialogue about. In most cases the issues at stake are tied to age-old strongly-held beliefs, be they ideological, political, or religious beliefs and (2) What Lonergan says about belief is very significant for Africa mainly because the causes of conflicts in Africa (ethnic, religious, or political) are inevitably tied to strongly-held beliefs. Before dialogue parties can come to terms with issues on which they disagree there is the need to initiate the process of verification of their beliefs. For in every instance where there is a false belief, there is, as Lonergan, says, a false believer. The ground for dialogue then would be to look "into the manner in which one happened to have accepted erroneous beliefs and one has to try to discover and correct the carelessness, the credulity, the bias that led one to mistake the false for the true" (ibid. 44). In this way bias can be overcome.

The Role of Belief in Human Knowledge

In *Insight* where he discusses extensively the issue of bias, Lonergan sometimes discusses it within the larger framework of the problem of evil (theodicy). "There remains," he says, "the concrete fact of evil and the practical problem of determining what one is to do about it." When Lonergan speaks of the problem of evil, he uses the term "problem" in a technical sense because, as he puts it, "it is meaningless to speak of a problem for which no solution exists." He puts a positive spin to this 'problem,' which he views in light of the goodness of God. "If God is good, then there is not only a problem of evil, but also a solution" (Lonergan 1970, 694). The relationship between bias and the problem of evil is evident in Lonergan's treatment of common sense, the dialectic of community, and the more pernicious scotosis of the dramatic subject: individual, group, and general bias of common sense, and its corresponding cycles of decline. Lonergan recognizes the fact of evil and attempts a solution. The first solution he proposes is the fact of the existence of God. "Since God is the first agent of every event and emergence and development, the question really is what God is or has been doing about the fact of evil" (ibid). What God is doing to combat evil he calls special transcendent knowledge.

> Nonetheless, there is a problem of evil, for besides men there is also God. The order of this universe in all its aspects and details has been shown to be the product of unrestricted understanding, of unlimited power, of complete goodness. Because God is omniscient,

he knows man's plight. Because he is omnipotent, he can remedy it.
Because he is good, he wills to do so (ibid. 694).

The way Lonergan lays out the argument, there is a link between the
fact of evil and the notion of belief. He argues that there exists between
them a dialectical relationship. "Were there not a problem of evil, there
would exist neither the mass of erroneous beliefs nor the consequent
errors about the nature of belief" (ibid. 687). Among the many evils
that afflict the human person, he argues, there is none graver than the
erroneous belief that distorts one's mind and makes aberrations of
one's conduct. The basic problem, he argues, is not in the mistaken
beliefs, but in the mistaken believer: "Until his fault is corrected, until
his bias is attacked and extirpated, he will have little heart in applying
an efficacious method" (ibid. 717). Lonergan argues that if mistaken
beliefs are to be eliminated, the first process is to know what belief
is. The reason for this is because when one inquires into the grounds
of any strongly held belief, one soon discovers that the strongly held
belief depends on, say, ten other beliefs; each of the ten, in turn, de-
pending on ten others. Lonergan then suggests, "there is a method to
be followed in eliminating mistaken beliefs. For if one fails to hit upon
the right method, one gets no where" (ibid. 716).

In *Method*, where he discusses the fundamental issue of human good
(which we shall discuss later), Lonergan again takes up the subject of
belief. The appropriation of one's social, cultural, and religious heri-
tage, he contends, is largely a matter of belief. Though one sometimes
discovers things by oneself, what one discovers for oneself is but a frac-
tion of what is to be known. One's immediate experience is constituted
by the findings and reports of others. One's "understanding rests not
only on his own but also on the experience of others, and its devel-
opment owes little indeed to his personal originality, much to his re-
peating in himself the acts of understanding first made by others, and
most of all to presuppositions that he has taken for granted because
they are commonly assumed" (Lonergan 1996, 41) Even judgments by
which one assents to truth of fact and value Lonergan says, rarely de-
pend exclusively on one's immanently generated knowledge, "for such
knowledge stands not by itself in some separate compartment but in
symbiotic fusion with a larger context of beliefs" (ibid. 42).

Lonergan is far from suggesting that belief has no real value. His
critical procedure is not an attack on belief in general. His critical pro-

cedure "does not ask you to believe that your beliefs are mistaken; it takes its start from a belief you have discovered to be mistaken and it proceeds along the lines that link beliefs together to determine how far the contagion has spread" (ibid. 47). Far from attacking belief, in *Method* Lonergan speaks highly of the role of belief in human life. Human knowledge, he says, "is not some individual possession but rather a common fund from which each may draw by believing, to which each may contribute in the measure that he performs his cognitional operations and reports their results accurately" (ibid. 43). Lonergan is simply making the point that there are positive and negative values to human belief. Lonergan, in my judgment, is right to point out the negative aspects of human belief, because sometimes beliefs that people hold on to tenaciously do really suffer from blind spots, oversights, errors, and bias. Lonergan underscores the positive and negative values of belief this way:

> Despite its potentialities for evil, belief is inevitable in human collaboration, and the policy of believing nothing is as illusory as the Cartesian programme of doubting everything that can be doubted. So we are compelled to determine just what is the necessity of belief, what precisely occurs when one believes, and what one can do to free oneself from false beliefs (Lonergan 1970, 687).

What Lonergan is suggesting is that erroneous beliefs distort of reality, and becomes an instance of bias. "The cult of progress has suffered an eclipse" because of such distortions. Lonergan clarifies what he means by the thesis of progress. He makes it clear that the thesis of progress by no means places the human person on the pinnacle of perfection. Rather, it reveals to the human person that one's knowledge is incomplete, that one's willingness is imperfect, that one's sensitivity and intersubjectivity are still in need of adaptation. For knowledge comes from a laborious process of teaching and learning, reading and writing. No one can lay claim to authentic living "until he has learnt, until he has become willing, until his sensitivity has been adapted" (ibid. 689).

But can the distortion of the cult of progress be reversed? In other words, can this distortion or bias be overcome? Lonergan answers in the affirmative. He suggests a reaffirmation of the thesis of progress as a starting point of dialogue. He suggests contrasting the decline of the past with the progress that is envisaged. People's decisions and judg-

ments are but a reflection of either their ignorance, or bad will, or their ineffectual self-control that results in the social surd. The social surd is a proof of aberration, evidence in favor of error. Human inadequacy, moreover, is manifested in 'the surd of sin," i.e. the lack of intelligibility due to scotosis. "To understand his concrete situation, man has to invoke not only the direct insights that grasp intelligibility, but also the inverse insights that acknowledge the absence of intelligibility" (ibid. 689). The human person, Lonergan argues, is dynamic. "His knowing and willing rest on inquiry, and inquiry is unrestricted. His knowing consists in understanding, and every act of understanding not only raises further questions but also opens the way to further answers" (ibid. 688).

Lonergan distinguishes between different levels of consciousness, germane to the process of overcoming bias: empirical, intelligent, rational, and rational self-consciousness. One is empirically conscious when one is aware of the data into which one inquires, intelligently conscious when one inquires, understands, formulates, and raises further questions, rationally conscious when one puts questions for reflection, grasps the unconditioned, and passes judgment, and rationally self conscious when one "adverts to the self-affirming unity, grasps the different courses of action it can pursue, reflects upon their value, utility, or agreeableness, and proceeds to a free and responsible decision" (ibid. 704). Having earlier advanced the argument that prejudicial judgments and bias often come as a result of long held suppositions and beliefs, Lonergan here proceeds to show that there is also a mutually interdependent relationship between rational self-consciousness, personal knowledge and belief. The human mind, he argues, develops by a self-correcting process of learning, and therefore there exists an "unrelenting symbiosis" between personal knowledge and belief. Lonergan explains this "unrelenting symbiosis" this way:

> The broadening of the individual experience includes hearing the opinions and the convictions of others. The deepening of individual understanding includes the exploration of many viewpoints. The formation of individual judgment is a process of differentiation, clarification, and revision, in which the shock of contradictory judgments is as relevant as one's own observation and memory, one's own intelligent inquiry and critical reflection. So each of us advances from the nescience of infancy to the fixed mentality of old age and, however large and indeterminate the contributions of belief to

the shaping of our minds, still every belief and all its implications have been submitted to the endlessly repeated, if unnoticed test of fresh experiences, of further questions and new insights, of clarifying and qualifying revisions of judgment (ibid. 706).

Lonergan's point is that the process of attaining and disseminating knowledge in the social sphere should be by process of "collaboration," which leads to the "symbiosis of knowledge and belief." For, to shun this symbiotic relationship is to regress to primitive ignorance. For this reason, Lonergan suggests that in order to overcome bias a "higher integration" is needed. He locates higher integration in living a life of self-sacrificing love, a life in which all work collaboratively because their "unrestricted desire to understand correctly heads towards an unrestricted act of understanding, towards God" (ibid.). The "higher integration" that Lonergan suggests here is similar to the "higher viewpoint" he suggested earlier as a solution to the scotosis of the dramatic subject and its threefold bias: individual, group, and the general bias of common sense, which we have discussed in the second chapter. Recall that to achieve "higher viewpoint" Lonergan introduced the idea of *Cosmopolis*, a term that has many features. One of its features is to make "manifest the inadequacy of common sense to deal with the issue, on a deeper level it makes manifest the inadequacy of man" (ibid. 690).

Dialogue and Dialectic

Dialogue can serve as a means of attaining a life of "higher integration" to which Lonergan calls the whole human family. Lonergan does not have an elaborate discussion of dialogue in any of his works, though he often makes cursory references to it. He does, however, have a lengthy discussion of dialectics in *Insight* and *Method*. Though he rarely speaks of dialogue, in his observation concerning dialectic, there are clarifications he makes of dialogue. Moreover, we can draw certain implications about dialogue from what he says about dialectic and its relation to foundations.

In *Method* Lonergan discusses the need for Catholic dialogue with other Christians and non-Christians under the functional specialty *foundations*. Here Lonergan says of grace that it could be the finding that grounds our seeking God through natural reason and through positive religion. It could be the touchstone by which we judge whether

it is really God that natural reason reaches or positive religion preaches. It could be the grace that God offers to everyone that underpins what is good in the religions of all peoples that explains how those that never heard the gospel can be saved and it is in such grace that can be found the theological justification of Catholic dialogue with all Christians, with non-Christians, and even with atheists who may love God in their hearts while not knowing him with their heads" (Lonergan 1996, 278.) Lonergan also makes reference to dialogue (ecumenical dialogue) while discussing the functional specialty *communications*. I shall discuss Lonergan's argument later with other examples from his works.

In *Method*, Lonergan also discusses dialogue under the fourth functional specialty dialectic. The eight Functional Specialties (research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematic, and communications) are part of Lonergan's effort to put method in theology and conceive it as a set of related and recurrent operations cumulatively advancing towards an ideal goal. It would seem that for him, dialogue and dialectic are related. Dialectic deals with conflicts, overt or latent. Its aim is to bring to light conflicts as well as provide techniques that objectify differences and promote conversion. In every human undertaking, there are different views, different standpoints, and different horizons. The difference in standpoints, Lonergan argues, may be due to "the coloring that arises from individuality," or "inadequacy" or perhaps "gross differences" of opposed horizon endeavoring to make intelligible the same sequence of events. Dialectic is concerned with gross differences simply because "the cause of gross difference is a gross difference of horizon, and the proportionate remedy is nothing less than a conversion" (ibid. 248). While treating the fifth functional specialty, foundations, Lonergan returns to the subject of dialectic and remarks that dialectic "does reveal the polymorphism of human consciousness—the deep and irreconcilable oppositions on religious, moral, and intellectual issues" (ibid. 268).

In *Insight*, Lonergan methodically explains the different meanings of dialectic and how different philosophers have appropriated it. He notes that in Plato dialectic denoted the art of philosophic dialogue, in Aristotle the effort to discover clues to truth by reviewing and scrutinizing the opinions of others, for the scholastics the application of logical rules to public disputation. In Hegel it was used in reference to his triadic process from the concept of being to absolute idea, and

in Marx, who inverted Hegel, it was used in a non-mechanical material process (Lonergan 1970, 217). What Lonergan calls scholastic dialectic Gadamer calls "medieval dialectic" that lists pro and contra, makes its own decision, and then sets out the arguments. In *Truth And Method*, Gadamer comments that this medieval dialectic is not just the consequence of an educational system emphasizing disputation, but something that depends on the inner connection between knowledge and dialectic, i.e. between question and answer (Gadamer 1999, 364).

Lonergan synthesizes these views and conceives of dialectic as "a concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change." It denotes a combination of that which is concrete, dynamic, and contradictory, a combination that may be found in dialogue, in the history of philosophic opinions, or in historical process in general. Just like in *Insight*, Lonergan in *Method*, uses the same methodical step to clarify what he means by dialectic:

> Our fourth functional specialty is dialectic. While that name has been employed in many ways, the sense we intend is simple enough. Dialectic has to do with the concrete, the dynamic, and the contradictory, and so it finds abundant materials in the history of Christian movements. For all movements are at once concrete and dynamic, while Christian movements have been marked with external and internal conflict, whether one considers Christianity as a whole or even this or that larger church or communion.
>
> The materials of dialectic, then are primarily the conflicts centering in Christian movements. But to these must be added the secondary conflicts in historical accounts and theological interpretations of the movements.   Besides the materials of dialectic, there is its aim. This is high and distant. As empirical science aims at a complete explanation of all phenomena, so dialectic aims at a comprehensive viewpoint. It seeks one single base from which it can proceed to an understanding of the character, the oppositions, and the relations of the many viewpoints exhibited in conflicting Christian movements, their conflicting histories, and their conflicting interpretations (Lonergan 1996, 128-9).

Lonergan points out that in fields such as mathematics and science, where human investigators agree, objective knowledge is attainable. But in fields such as philosophy, ethics, religion, etc, agreement is always lacking, perhaps due to the subjectivity of philosophers, moralists, and religious people. Subjectivity may not only be mistaken, but

wrong and evil. There is then the need to distinguish between authentic and unauthentic subjectivity. Even here, Lonergan argues, one would have to agree that clarification of subjectivity, however authentic, is not objective knowledge. Herein lies the reason for dialogue, to clarify viewpoints. As Lonergan puts it, "in the world mediated by meaning and motivated by value, objectivity is simply the consequence of authentic subjectivity, of genuine attention, genuine intelligence, genuine reasonableness, genuine responsibility" (ibid. 265).

In *Insight* Lonergan makes a sharp distinction between the dialectic of the dramatic subject and the dialectic of community and argues that they differ significantly. The former is concerned with the "biography of the individual," and the latter deals with the history of human relationships. Though these two principles differ, they are also linked. But it is their opposition that accounts for tension in human community. Perhaps this explains why dialectic denotes a combination of the concrete, the dynamic, and the contradictory that may be found also in dialogue (Lonergan 1970, 217). In *Method*, Lonergan contrasts dialectic with the empirical sciences and argues that dialectic moves beyond the realm of ordinary empirical science. Dialectics "meets persons. It acknowledges the values they represent. It deprecates their short-comings. It scrutinizes their intellectual, moral, and religious assumptions. It picks out significant figures, compares their basic views, discerns processes of development and aberration" (Lonergan 1996, 252). Thus Lonergan views dialectic as an on-going process:

> Human authenticity is not some pure quality, some serene freedom from all oversights, all misunderstanding, all mistakes, all sins. Rather it consists in a withdrawal from unathenticity, and the withdrawal is never a permanent achievement. It is ever precarious, ever to be achieved afresh, ever in great part a matter of uncovering still more oversights, acknowledging still further failures to understand, correcting still more mistakes, repenting more and more deeply hidden sins. Human development, in brief, is largely through the resolution of conflicts and, within the realm of intentional consciousness, the basic conflicts are defined by the oppositions of positions and counter-positions (ibid.).

Lonergan views dialogue and dialectic as related, the former occasioning the latter. They both aim at "decreasing darkness and increasing light." Lonergan acknowledges that there are all kinds of misunderstanding in the social sphere. "Just as there are conflicting interpretations, con-

flicting histories, conflicting foundations, conflicting doctrines, so too one is to expect an array of conflicting systems" (ibid. 237). Lonergan argues that to deal with such multiplicity of misunderstandings there is the need to appeal to dialectic. Dialectic helps one to ascertain differences and reduce these differences to their grounds: social, cultural, or historical context, which in turn reveals the presence or lack thereof of intellectual, religious, or moral conversion. The import of dialectic lies in the fact that it can be used as an instrument for analyzing social process and the social situation. In social situations where agreements are rare, dialectic helps one to assemble differences, classifies them, traces their roots, "and pushes them to extremes by developing alleged positions while reversing alleged counter-positions" (ibid. 365).

Dialogue and dialectic serve as curative to bias, ensuring that in intellectual conversion one renounces the myriads of false philosophies, in moral conversion one keeps oneself free of individual, group, and general bias, and in religious conversion one loves one's neighbor as one loves God. It is no wonder that Lonergan speaks of dialectic as a "generalized apologetic conducted in an ecumenical spirit, aiming ultimately at a comprehensive viewpoint, and proceeding towards that goal by acknowledging differences, seeking their grounds real and apparent, and eliminating superfluous oppositions" (ibid. 130).

When Lonergan discusses the twin issues of dialectic and dialogue, he discusses them with a view to helping the human person attain conversion. The reason for this is simple; dialogue makes possible shifts in horizon. "The presence and absence of intellectual, moral, or religious conversion not only give rise to opposed horizons but also, with the advent of sophistication, generate opposed philosophies, theologies, methods, to justify and defend the various horizons" (ibid. 253). Lonergan further explains it this way:

> But one's interpretation of others is affected by one's understanding of oneself, and the converted have a self to understand that is quite different from the self that the unconverted have to understand. Again the history one writes depends on the horizon within which one is attempting to understand the past; the converted and the unconverted have radically different horizons; and so they will write different histories. Such different histories, different interpretations, and their underlying different styles in research become the center of attention in dialectic (ibid. 271).

It is the role of dialectic to reveal this multiplicity of horizons, these deep and sometimes irreconcilable differences. The attempt to reconcile the multiplicity of horizons by means of dialogue, Lonergan argues, has to be done in a social setting. This is because, conversion, which is the goal of dialogue and dialectic, though intensely personal, is not purely private. "While individuals contribute elements to horizons, it is only within the social group that the elements accumulate and it is only with century-old traditions that notable developments occur" (ibid. 269). This explains why Lonergan believes that conversion is not just a change in horizon, but that by it one begins to belong to a different social group, or, if one remains with one's previous group that one begins to belong to it in a new way.

Lonergan explains that conversion is an antidote to bias. To buttress this point he distinguishes four realms of meaning: the realm of common sense, the realm of theory, the realm of interiority, and the realm of transcendence. Differentiation of consciousness, which Lonergan lauds, operates only in the realm of commonsense, since every normal adult operates in the realm of commonsense. Conversion manifests itself in words and deeds, and this manifestation varies in each person, depending upon the presence, or lack thereof, of differentiation of consciousness. Lonergan laments that vast majority of people suffer from lack of differentiation of consciousness, a situation that makes dialogue imperative. As ground for dialogue, Lonergan posits the gift of God's grace. He examines this gift, which he says, orients the human subject to the transcendent, within the realm of religious differentiation of consciousness. A religiously differentiated consciousness critically assesses the following:

+ God's grace that grounds the age long human search for God through natural reason and positive religion.
+ God's grace as the touchstone by which we judge whether it is really God that natural reason reaches or positive religion preaches.
+ The grace that God offers to all people that underpins what is good in every religion and
+ Grace, which "enables the simple faithful to pray to their heavenly Father in secret even though their religious apprehensions are faulty" (ibid 278).

Lonergan locates in God's grace, the theological justification of dialogue with all Christian religions and non-Christians, "and even with atheists who may love God in their hearts while not knowing him with

their heads." Lonergan's point is that an examination of God's grace should provide the ground for dialogue, since every religion is oriented to the transcendent only by means of God's grace. For if Christian mysticism is a "silent and all-absorbing self-surrender" in response to God's gift of grace, there are also besides Christian mystics, mystics of Judaism, Islam, India, and the Far East, for mystical attainment is manifold. At the end of *Method*, where he treats the last functional specialty, communications, Lonergan again returns to the subject of God's gift of love as the basis of Christian dialogue with all religions:

> The ideal basis of society is community, and the community may take its stand on a moral, a religious, or a Christian principle. The moral principle is that men individually are responsible for what they make of themselves, but collectively they are responsible for the world in which they live. Such is the basis of universal dialogue. The religious principle is God's gift of his love, and it forms the basis of dialogue between all representatives of religion. The Christian principle conjoins the inner gift of God's love with its outer manifestation in Christ Jesus and in those that follow him. Such is the basis of Christian ecumenism (ibid. 360).

Lonergan says of conversion that it "does not occur in the marketplace." Rather, it is a process that may be occasioned by scientific inquiry. Though he does not specifically state that dialogue is a process that may be occasioned by scientific inquiry, one can infer from his works that he views dialogue in this light. For the conversion that occurs only inasmuch as one discovers what is inauthentic in oneself and turns away from it, the conversion that occurs inasmuch as one discovers what the fullness of human authenticity can be and embraces it with one's whole being, occurs in the social process, and only by the dialogue process.

Lonergan's Work on Dialogue and Dialectic as Means of Overcoming Bias in Light of Other Theories

Lonergan's view of dialectic, especially the view that dialectic is the concrete unfolding of linked but opposed principles of change, is similar to that of Gadamer, whose view on the subject and whose work Lonergan cites considerably (Lonergan 1970, 217). Dialectic, for Gadamer, proceeds by way of question and answer. "The openness of what is in question consists in the fact that the answer is not settled. It must still

be undetermined, awaiting a decisive answer. The significance of questioning consists in revealing the questionability of what is questioned. It has to be brought into this state of indeterminacy, so that there is an equilibrium between pro and contra" (Gadamer 1999, 363).

Gadamer interprets Aristotle (Metaphysics) as contending that dialectic is the power to investigate contraries independent of the object. He argues that Aristotle's view is similar to that rendered by Plato in *Parmenides*. From this Gadamer infers that knowledge is dialectical, and that knowledge means considering opposites. Only the person who has questions (questions include the antithesis of yes and no) can have knowledge. The superiority of knowledge over preconceived opinion lies in the fact that it "is able to conceive of possibilities as possibilities." Gadamer underscores that value of dialectic this way:

> The art of dialectic is not the art of being able to win every argument. On the contrary, it is possible that someone practicing the art of dialectic—i.e. the art of questioning and of seeking truth—comes off worse in the argument in the eyes of those listening to it. As the art of asking questions, dialectic proves its value because only the person who knows how to ask questions is able to persist in his questioning, which involves being able to preserve his orientation toward openness (ibid 367).

Gadamer, like Lonergan, contends that the Socratic-Platonic dialectic raises the art of questioning to a conscious art. "The art of questioning is not the art of resisting the pressure of opinion; it already presupposes this freedom. It is not an art in the sense that the Greeks speak of *techne*, not a craft that can be taught or by means of which we could master the discovery of truth" (ibid. 366). For this reason, Gadamer contends that dialectic, the art of thinking and questioning, is called dialectic because it is the art of conducting a real dialogue. In acknowledging the link between dialogue and dialectic, Gadamer argues that dialectic not only helps one preserve the much-needed orientation toward openness, but also helps one in the art of conducting real dialogue. For dialogue necessarily has the structure of question and answer and requires first of all that the partners do not talk at cross purposes.

> For we have seen that to question means to lay open, to place in the open. As against the fixity of opinions, questioning makes the object and all its possibilities fluid. A person skilled in the "art" of

questioning is a person who can prevent questions from being suppressed by the dominant opinion. A person who possesses this art will himself search for everything in favor of an opinion. Dialectic consists not in trying to discover the weakness of what is said, but in bringing out its real strength. It is not the art of arguing (which can make a strong case out of a weak one) but the art of thinking (which can strengthen objections by referring to the subject matter) (ibid).

In Gadamer's view, dialogue and dialectic entail openness to the other and also entail the ability to ask the right questions. He examines the logical structure of openness that characterizes hermeneutical consciousness and concludes that among the greatest insights Plato's account of Socrates affords us is that, contrary to general opinion, it is more difficult to ask questions than to answer them. When the partners in the Socratic dialogue are unable to answer Socrates' awkward questions and try to turn the tables by assuming what they suppose is the preferable role of the questioner, they come to grief Using this "comic motif," as he calls it, in the Platonic dialogues, Gadamer concludes that there is a clear distinction between authentic and inauthentic dialogue. "To someone who engages in dialogue only to prove himself right and not to gain insight, asking questions will indeed seem easier than answering them" (ibid 263). Thus, following Plato, Gadamer gives recognition to the "priority of question" in every discourse and dialogue. In order to ask the right question, one must desire to know, and the desire to know must come with the recognition that one does not know. For Gadamer, every question requires an openness. This openness, however, is not boundless. Rather it is limited by the horizon of the question. A question that lacks horizon is merely 'floating.' "Hence a question can be asked rightly or wrongly, according as it reaches into the sphere of the truly open or fails to do so. We say that a question has been put wrongly when it does not reach the state of openness but precludes reaching it by retaining false presuppositions. It pretends to be an openness and susceptibility to decision that it does not have. But if what is in question is not foregrounded, or not correctly foregrounded, from those presuppositions that are really held, then it is not brought into the open and nothing can be decided" (ibid. 363-4).

There is a preponderance of evidence to suggest that Gadamer and Lonergan agree on the meaning of dialectic and its relation to dialogue.

They both view dialectic, the art of thinking, as a useful tool in the art of conducting dialogue. Gadamer says of dialogue that it rids us of "horizons of the present," i.e. prejudices we bring with us and our fixed set of opinions. Gadamer's appreciation for dialogue, which brings about "fusions of horizons" is consistent with Lonergan's notion of conversion, which can be conceived of as "a shift in horizon." Speaking about "fusion of horizons," Gadamer says "in the process of understanding, a real fusion of horizons occurs—which means that as the historical horizon is projected, it is simultaneously superseded. To bring about this fusion in a regulated way is the task of what we call historically effected consciousness" (ibid. 307). However, Lonergan's goal in delving into the analysis of dialectic is different from that of Gadamer. While Gadamer's analysis is geared towards recognizing "historically effected consciousness," Lonergan's analysis is geared towards achieving conversion: intellectual, religious, and moral. In *Method*, Lonergan advances the argument that to achieve this conversion, there are needed, in the world today, individuals and groups, or even organizations, that work to lead people to intellectual, moral, and religious conversion and work systematically to undo the mischief brought about by alienation and ideology (Lonergan 1996, 361). Among such bodies, according to Lonergan, is the Christian Church. While discussing the eight functional specialty, communications, Lonergan points out that theology by itself is incomplete; it needs dialogue with other human studies to get the best possible picture of a society. There is need then for dialogue with non-theological scholars about ethnic (and religious) conflicts.

Ever before Lonergan made this clarion call, the Christian church has labored, though not always with success, "to undo the mischief brought about by alienation and ideology." The Catholic church, at least fairly recently, has been particularly concerned with Muslim-Christian relations and Christian relations with other religions. The Second Vatican Council urged that sincere "effort be made to achieve mutual understanding …. to preserve and promote peace, liberty, social justice and moral values" (Nostra Aetate, 3). Paul VI's *Ecclesiam Suam* (August 1964) also reiterates the church's commitment to meet and listen to people of other faith traditions, especially Jews and Muslims. The document provides a theological and pastoral basis for dialogue with these religions. Following Paul VI, John Paul II's *Redemptor Hominis* gives guidelines on how Christians are to relate with

adherents of other religions. John Paul II encouraged Christians to have a predisposition for understanding every person, analyzing every system and recognizing what is right while at the same time not losing certitude about one's own faith. With efforts like this, Muslim-Christian encounters became more frequent in the 1970s, though mostly at the initiative of the World Council of Churches (WCC), which by 1971 had created "the Dialogue Sub-Unit as an indication of the commitment of member churches of the Orthodox and Reformation traditions to carry on dialogue with the followers of other religions" (Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue 1994, 9).

The Catholic Church encourages and fosters inter-religious dialogue not only between her and other religious traditions, but also even among these religious traditions themselves. The Pontifical Council for Inter-religious Dialogue enumerates four different kinds of inter-religious dialogue: (1) *The dialogue of life*, where people strive to live in an open and neighborly spirit, sharing together their human preoccupations, and their joys and sorrows. (2) *The dialogue of action*, in which Christians collaborate with other non-Christians for the integral development and liberation of people. (3) *The dialogue of theological exchange*, "where specialists seek to deepen their understanding of their respective religious heritages and appreciate each other's spiritual values, always bearing in mind the need to search for the ultimate truth." (4) *The dialogue of religious experience*, "where persons rooted in their own religious traditions, share their spiritual richness, for instance with regard to prayer and contemplation, faith and ways of searching for God or the Absolute" (Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue 1999, 127).

Efforts of the Christian church and that of some notable individuals and groups, to promote peace by inter-religious dialogue, one could argue, provides a concrete application of Lonergan's theory of dialogue and dialectic as they bear upon overcoming bias. In his foreword to Cardinal Arinze's book, *Religions for Peace: A Call for Solidarity to the Religions of the World*, the president of the Pontifical Council for Culture, Cardinal Paul Poupard, notes with regret that fanatics and fundamentalists have given religion a bad name and that politicians with hidden agendas sometimes exploits religion to fan flames of intolerance and violence (Arinze 2002, 10). This is as true in Africa as it is the world over. In the 1980s for example, most of the disasters that relief agencies attended to were natural catastrophes caused either by

earthquakes, hurricanes, or storms. Today the numbers of disasters re-
lief agencies attend to have increased fivefold and are "nearly all of hu-
man fabrication" (Schreiter 1998, 4). It used to be, as Robert Schreiter
notes, that relief work meant the alleviation of physical human misery.
Not so today. Now it must tend also to healing of societies ravaged by
violence and hatred. Efforts are constantly being made to reverse the
violence and enthrone a culture of peace. However, peace cannot be
achieved without reconciliation and healing. Schreiter notes:

> The reconciliation called for presents two faces. One face is social.
> It has to do with providing structures and processes whereby a frac-
> tured society can be reconstructed as truthful and just. It has to do
> with coming to terms with the past, punishing wrong doers, and
> providing some measure of reparation to victims. It must create a
> secure space and an atmosphere of trust that makes civil society
> possible. The other face is spiritual. It has to do with rebuilding
> shattered lives so that social reconciliation becomes a reality. The
> state can set up commissions to examine the wrongdoing of the
> past, but it cannot legislate the healing of memories. The state can
> offer amnesty or mete out punishment to wrongdoers, but it cannot
> guarantee forgiveness (ibid).

Events in Eastern Europe, Latin America, South Africa, Rwanda and
Somalia, during the 1990s, lent credence to the need for healing and
reconciliation. Reconciliation, as a pathway to peace, is an intensively
sought but elusive goal (Schreiter 1992, 1). The quest for reconcilia-
tion is an enormous task. It requires both the healing of memories and
the changing of structures that led to the ideology that provoked, pro-
moted, and sustained the violence (ibid). In the aftermath of World
War II and the subsequent separation of East and West Germany,
for instance, the East German churches called for a just peacemaking
theory that is based on dialogue, built with persons of other faiths
and of no faith (Stassen 1992, 91). This is the same path to peace that
African parties involved in dialogue seek.

Almost from the inception of the modern African political land-
scape in 1885, violence has been part of the African worldview. In spite
of the gains that have been made in the reconciliation process, peace in
Africa remains a constant challenge and ever elusive. The elusiveness
of peace may not be unconnected with the controversial methods that
have been used. Speaking of the search for peace, Schreiter was right
when he asserted that a move to a new world order cannot be made

simply by ignoring or repressing the memory of the violent past, and that to pretend not to remember what has happened will likely mean that we end up inventing new ways of continuing the cycle of violence" (Schreiter 1992, 11).

Schreiter raised an important question regarding the Rwandan genocide. Is the issue needing reconciling, he asks, the slaughter that took place after the death of president Habyarimana or is there the need to go back to the inequities established between Hutus and Tutsis under Belgian colonial rule? (Schreiter 1998, 107). This question is as applicable in Rwanda as in every other African country. This is why the Christian churches have to play a more active role in the search for peace through reconciliation. For every religion exists, not in a void, but in a culture. Cardinal Arinze, the revered advocate of dialogue among religions and former president of the Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, was right when he argued that dialogue among religions is essential for promoting a culture and civilization of peace. Dialogue between religion and culture will go a long way in dismantling the structures of prejudice, promote peace, understanding, and love Arinze 2002, X). Such a dialogue must permit mutual criticism and rethinking concerning philosophical and theological foundations on the part of the dialogue partners. The dialogue partners also must "reckon with others who start from different premises, venerate different paradigmatic heroes, and expect different conclusions" (Carmody and Carmody 1988, 1).

Schreiter suggests that dialogue be conducted with an ecumenical spirit and that to achieve this the Church's role in reconciliation process be examined in two ways: in terms of the resources the Church brings to the reconciliation process, and in terms of the active role she plays in it. He suggests that three resources be considered regarding what the Church has to offer: (a) its message about reconciliation and the spirituality that flows out of it: this focuses on the plight of victims and the restoration of their humanity. It addresses such issues as memory, forgiveness and the building of trust; (b) The power of its rituals: the Church has rituals, based on the ministry entrusted to her in 2 Cor. 5:17, that can be used in the process of reconciliation; and (c) its capacity to create communities of reconciliation (Schreiter 1998, 127-8). The Church makes no pretext of the ministry of reconciliation that has been entrusted to her by our Lord Jesus Christ. The Roman Catholic Church expresses this ministry in the sacrament of

reconciliation. However, Schreiter points out that the theology of this sacrament "has yet to be fully brought to bear upon situations of social conflict, although progress is being made." Though he acknowledges that John Paul II, since 1995, has explored the relation of justice, forgiveness, and reconciliation in a number of allocutions, no clear connection with the sacrament has yet been made (ibid.). The Church can help both individual and society in these three ways. "The Church as an international organization has opportunities through its relief and development agencies, through its international religious orders, and through critical solidarity to work for reconciliation. Reconciliation could become one way of defining its mission in the world today" (ibid. 129-30).

Cardinal Arinze, who has carried this line of argument further, has rightly pointed out that the religions of the world all extol peace. While Christians have the custom of exchanging the sign of peace, Muslims interpret the name of their religion to mean peace. While Jews greet each other by uttering *shalom* (peace), Buddhists, Sikhs and followers of Traditional Religions seek to promote peace. Why then do we have religious tension? Arinze argues that it may be too simplistic to attribute the cause of tensions or conflicts in such hot spots of the world such as Nigeria, Sudan, Ivory Coast, India, Indonesia, Middle East, etc, to religion. These conflicts, he rightly argues, have multiple causes of which religion is but a part. "There may well be other causes: ethnic rivalry, racial tensions, quarrels over land, and economic struggles. There may also be the burden of history, unhealed memories of past injustices, whether these are real or merely perceived. All these grievances may be smoldering below the surface" Arinze 2002, 31-2). Added to this also is the fact that some unscrupulous politicians use religion to create dissensions to score political points. Actions like this, which lead to violence or war, Arinze argues, can be traced to pride, intolerance, egoism of the individual or group, greed, envy and the desire for revenge. What is the role of religion but to heal? The healing process begins with dialogue.

> On the African continent, many cases of civil tension and violence are due to political instability, the difficulty of getting democratic constitutions to work, the attitude of politicians who find it hard to accept defeat in an election, or the sheer challenge of building a modern state out of many peoples of varying ethnic backgrounds thrown together because boundaries were arbitrarily fixed by the

colonial powers. In all such situations, a positive contribution can
be made by wise religious leaders. They can help to promote har-
mony, to go through a process of social change successfully, and to
establish a tradition of peaceful and smooth political transfer of
power (ibid. 39).

Dialogue helps believers of all religious persuasions to overcome
misunderstandings, stereotypes, caricatures, and other prejudices,
inherited or acquired (ibid. 57). It is "an activity carried out in hope,
whose purpose is to build enduring bonds of friendship and mutual
appreciation between confessional groups that will be strong enough
to overcome pressures and communal tensions that could arise in the
future" (Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, 56). Dialogue
is a necessary step for the attainment of peace. Peace has no religious
frontiers (Arinze 2002, 57). Arinze said it better when he argued there
is no separate Christian peace, Muslim peace, Hindu peace, or Bud-
dhist peace. Recalling John Paul II's statement that inter-religious con-
tacts and ecumenical contacts are now an obligatory path to follow "in
order to ensure that the many painful wounds inflicted over the course
of the centuries will not be repeated, and indeed that any such wounds
still remaining will soon be healed," Arinze urged the religions of the
world to work together for peace (ibid.).

Scott Appleby introduces an important category in this effort to-
wards peace. He makes a fine distinction between peace-making and
peace-building. Peace-making hardly brings about the required change
of heart in times of conflict. In peace-making, conflict mediators only
succeed in bringing a halt to the killing and abuse temporarily through
negotiated settlements and political solutions, and by defusing im-
mediate tensions. But peace- builders make peace real by working for
months, years, or even decades to sustain peace, transform non-violent
conflict resolution and make reconciliation into a way of life. In es-
sence, peace building starts with and brings about the required change
of heart. This is why peace building precedes and follows upon peace-
making (Appleby 200, 13).

In conclusion, the works of Gadamer, Schreiter, Arinze, and Ap-
pleby help us to better understand the contributions of Lonergan.
They, like Lonergan, lament "the existence of division … that resides
mainly in the cognitive meaning of the Christian message" (Loner-
gan 1996, 368). Where Lonergan offers a theoretical approach to bias
and ideology, and the dialogue and dialectic needed overcome them,

Schreiter, Arinze, and Appleby, in particular, offer us some practical illumination of how dialogue and dialectic, when conducted in an ecumenical spirit, can help overcome bias.

Speaking of ecumenical spirit, Lonergan describes ecumenism as a dialogue between theologians, and a dialogue between the churches.

> In so far as ecumenism is a dialogue between theologians, our our chapters on *Dialectic* and on *Doctrines* indicate the methodical notions that have occurred to us. But ecumenism is also a dialogue between churches and then largely it operates within the framework of the World Council of Churches and under the directives of particular churches. Illustrative of such directives is the decree on ecumenism issued by the Second Vatican Council (ibid. 367).

Lonergan argues that though Christians disagree on the cognitive meaning of the Christian message, most agree on the constitutive meaning and the effective meaning of the Christian message. When Lonergan says Christians, by and large, disagree on the cognitive meaning of the Christian faith he is talking about the disagreements among Christians because of their "different confessions of faith" and their "different notions of the church." When he speaks of the agreement that exists on the constitutive meaning and effective meaning of the Christian faith he is talking about "the real unity" and "the ideal unity" that exists among Christians. The real unity (constitutive meaning) is the Christian "response to the one Lord in the one Spirit," and the ideal unity (effective meaning) "is the fruit of Christ prayer: … 'may they all be one' (John 17:21)" (ibid.). But such unity or agreement still needs an expression. One conceivable way of expressing it is by working collaboratively to fulfill the redemptive and constructive roles of the Christian church in human society, i.e. by promoting the common good.

THE ROLE OF DIALOGUE AND DIALECTIC IN PROMOTING THE COMMON GOOD

In *Insight*, Lonergan advances the argument that civilization has witnessed a shift, a shift away from intersubjectivity to a "more grandiose undertaking." As Lonergan explains it, intersubjectivity is a hallmark of primitive society. It is that kind of society in which one's membership in the community is determined solely on the basis of family, clan or feudal dynasty. "The bond of mother and child, man and wife, father

and son, reaches into a past of ancestors to give meaning and cohesion to the clan or tribe or nation. A sense of belonging together provides the dynamic premise for common enterprise, for mutual aid and succor, for the sympathy that augments joys and divide sorrows" (Lonergan 1970, 212). Intersubjective community is crude and impervious to change. Lonergan says of it that though it precedes civilization and underpins it, it remains even when civilization suffers disintegration and decay.

Lonergan argues that though civil society has its obscure origins in human intersubjectivity, modern society has fast shifted away from it. This shift, or transformation, forces on the human person a new notion of the good. While in the primitive or intersubjective community the good was identified simply with the object of desire, in the new phase the good is to be called the good of order. The good of order, unlike objects of desire, "consists in an intelligible pattern of relationships that condition the fulfillment of each man's desires by his contributions to the fulfillment of the desires of others, and similarly, protect each from the object of his fears in the measure he contributes to warding off the objects feared by others" (ibid. 213). Lonergan says of this good of order, that it is not an abstract entity independent of human actions, not an unrealized ideal that ought to be but is not. Rather, it is concrete, real, intelligible, and all embracing. It is not just an intelligible pattern of relationships but also an indispensable constituent of human living. Lonergan cites, as examples of good of order, the polity, the economy, and the family as an institution. Any economic or political decay, therefore constitutes a breakdown and decay of the good of order.

In *Method*, Lonergan speaks of the good of order as an instance of human good and takes up a lengthy discussion of the structure of this human good. The human good, he says, is at once individual and social. Lonergan selects eighteen heuristic terms and relates them together to explain how the human good is at the same time individual and social. He makes a threefold categorization of these terms: (1) Individuals in their potentialities and actuations (2) cooperating groups and (3) ends, yielding the following scheme:

Individual	Social	Ends
potentiality actuation		
capacity need operation	*cooperation*	*particular good*
plasticity development	*institution*	*good of order*
perfectibility skill	*role, task*	
liberty orientation	*personal*	*terminal value*
conversion	*relations*	

Lonergan relates four terms: capacity, operation, particular good, and need, and argues that individuals have capacities for operating, and by operating procure themselves instances of the particular good (Lonergan 1996, 48). He relates the other four terms: cooperation, institution, role, and task, and argues that, given that individuals live in groups, operating is cooperating. The other four terms Lonergan relates are: plasticity, perfectibility, development, skill, and the good of order, and argues that the capacities of individuals for the performance of operations, because they are plastic and perfectible, admit of the development of skills, the very skills demanded by institutional roles and tasks. He argues that the concrete manner in which cooperation actually is working out is what is meant by the good of order. Finally Lonergan relates the terms liberty, orientation, conversion, personal relations, and terminal values.

> Liberty means, of course, not indeterminism but self-determination. Any course of individual or group action is only a finite good and, because, only finite, it is open to criticism. It has its alternatives, its limitations, its risks, its drawbacks. Accordingly, the process of deliberation and evaluation is not itself decisive, and so we experience our liberty as the active thrust of the subject terminating the process of deliberation by settling on one of the possible courses of action and proceeding to execute it. Now so far as that thrust of the self regularly opts, not for the merely apparent good, but for the true good, the self thereby is achieving moral self-transcendence; he is existing authentically; he is constituting himself as an originating value, and he is bringing about terminal values, namely a good of order that is truly good and instances of the particular good that are truly good (ibid. 50).

In *Method*, Lonergan makes a distinction he does not make in *Insight*. Here he makes a fine distinction between good of order and particular

good. A particular good is not the same as the good of order. Though the good of order is distinct from particular goods, it is not separate from them. While my dinner today might be an instance of my particular good, the everyday dinner of all members of the group that earn it is part of the good of order, or while my education might be an instance of my particular good, education for everyone that wants it is part of the good of order. Lonergan, however, cautions that the good of order should not be viewed as a "sustained succession of recurring instances of types of the particular good." He reiterates a position he had earlier advanced in *Insight* that the good of order is not some unattainable ideal. "It is to be insisted," he argues, "that the good of order is not some design for utopia, some theoretic ideal, some set of ethical precepts, some code of laws, or some super-institution. It is quite concrete" (ibid. 49).

Perhaps it is because of the relationship between the good of order and particular good that Lonergan argues that the human good is at once individual and social. By human good being individual and social, Lonergan means that individuals do not just operate to meet their needs, but also cooperate to meet another's needs.

> As the community develops its institutions to facilitate cooperation, so individuals develop skills to fulfill the roles and perform the tasks set by the institutional framework. Though the roles are fulfilled and the tasks are performed that the needs be met, still all is done not blindly but knowingly, not necessarily but freely. The process is not merely the service of man; it is above all the making of man, his advance in authenticity, the fulfillment of his affectivity, and the direction of his work to the particular goods and a good of order that are worthwhile (ibid. 52).

Lonergan recognizes that the development of modern society is moving at a very fast rate and argues that the structure of human good he outlines is compatible with any stage of development in human society, be it technological, economic, political, cultural or religious development. Societies, like human persons who sometimes develop and at other times suffer breakdown (decline), also develop and suffer breakdowns. For this reason, Lonergan adds to his analysis of human good, a discussion of social progress and social decline.

One who makes a single improvement, Lonergan argues, cannot claim to have made progress. For progress is not some single improvement but a continuous flow of them. Progress stems from being true to

oneself, by one observing the transcendental precepts. We recall that the transcendental precepts can be summed up in the imperatives: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, and be responsible. One who is attentive pays unreserved attention to human affairs. One who is intelligent grasps hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities. One who is reasonable acknowledges what probably would work, while rejecting what probably would not work. One who is responsible bases one's decisions and choices on an unbiased evaluation (ibid. 53). Thus when one is attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible progress is attained.

Lonergan, however, recognizes that these transcendental precepts are not always observed. In fact, sometimes they are willfully violated. "Evaluation may be biased by an egoistic disregard of others, by loyalty to one's group matched by hostility to other groups, by concentrating on short-term benefits and overlooking long-term costs" (ibid.). Both individual and group egoism have this in common: they shortchange development, direct it to their own aggrandizement, provide a market for opinions, doctrines, theories to justify their ways, and purport to "reveal the misfortunes of other groups to be due to their depravity" (ibid. 54). Lonergan speaks further of the dysfunctional nature of development guided by group egoism:

> But development guided by group egoism, is bound to be one-sided. It divides the body social not merely into those that have and those that have not but also makes the former the representatives of the cultural flower of the age to leave the latter apparent survivals from a forgotten era. Finally, in the measure that the group encouraged and accepted an ideology to rationalize its own behavior, in the same measure it will be blind to the real situation, and it will be bewildered by the emergence of a contrary ideology that will call to consciousness an opposed group egoism (ibid.).

Aberrations such as these (individual and group egoism), Lonergan argues, are easy to maintain, and difficult to correct. They not only conflict with the good of order, but also cause it to deteriorate. This deterioration leads society to cumulative decline.

Decline has a deeper level. Since it is a disregard for the transcendental precepts, it compromises and distorts progress. "Not only do inattention, obtuseness, unreasonableness, irresponsibility produce objectively absurd situations. Not only do ideologies corrupt minds. But compromise and distortion discredit progress" (ibid. 54-5). Lon-

ergan argues that a society in decline digs its own grave with a relent-less consistency. No wonder he says that though alienation has been used in different senses, the basic form of alienation is the disregard for transcendental precepts. The basic form of ideology is a doctrine that justifies such alienation, which in turn corrupts the social order. Yet just as there is progress, and decline, there is also redemption. It is interesting that Lonergan identifies religion as a force that can play a redemptive role in society and undo the mischief of decline, while re-storing the cumulative process of progress. This is because it is religion that promotes self-transcendence and self-sacrificing love.

The Significance of Jean Piaget and Dietrich von Hildebrand for Lonergan's Notion of the Human Good.

Lonergan begins his discussion of the human good by acknowledging his indebtedness to the scholastics who regarded the good as one of the transcendental properties of Being, the others being truth, one-ness, and beauty. But what is good? Lonergan avoids a definition on the ground that definitions are abstract and that the good, on the other hand, is concrete. Rather than define the good, Lonergan gives a descriptive analysis and lists the various components of human good: skills, feelings, values, beliefs, cooperation, progress and decline (ibid. 27). Let me comment on the first three beginning with skills. Lon-ergan finds Jean Piaget's analysis of skills very relevant and uses it to explain stages in cultural development.

> Jean Piaget analyzed the acquisition of skill into elements. Each new element consisted in an adaptation to some new object or situation. In each adaptation there were distinguished two parts, assimilation and adjustment. Assimilation brought into play the spontaneous or the previously learned operations employed successfully on some-what similar objects or in somewhat similar situations. Adjustment by a process of trial and error gradually modified and supplemented previously learned operations. As adaptation to ever more objects and situations occurs, there goes forward a twofold process. There is an increasing differentiation of operations so that more and more different operations are in one's repertory. There also is an ever greater multiplication of different combinations of differentiated operations. So the baby gradually develops oral, visual, manual, bodily skills, and he increasingly combines them in ever varying manners (ibid.).

Lonergan notes that skill begets mastery and follows Piaget who, in defining it, invoked the mathematical notion of group. "The principal characteristic of the group of operations is that every operation in the group is matched by an opposite operation and every combination of operations is matched by an opposite combination" (ibid. 27-8). Piaget was able to identify stages in child development and predict the kind of operations school children of different age groups would be able to perform by distinguishing different groups of operations.

> As the child learns to speak, he moves out of the world of his immediate surroundings towards the far larger world revealed through the memories of other men, through the common sense of community, through the pages of literature, through the labors of scholars, through the investigation of scientists, through the experience of saints, through the mediation of philosophers and theologians (ibid. 28).

Lonergan notes that the relevance of Piaget's analysis goes far beyond the field of educational psychology, enabling one to distinguish stages in cultural development.

In explaining feelings, a second component of the human good, Lonergan draws on the work of Dietrich von Hildebrand and from it makes a distinction between intentional responses and non-intentional states. Feelings are intentional responses. One is oriented to a world mediated by meaning because of feelings. As intentional responses, feelings orient one toward self-transcendence and by so doing help one to transcend oneself. Feelings also respond to values. "They do so in accord with some scale of preferences so we may distinguish vital, social, cultural, personal, and religious values in an ascending order…. Social values, such as the good of order which conditions the vital values of the whole community, have to be preferred to the vital values of individual members of the community" (ibid. 31-2).

Lonergan argues that just as there is the development of feelings, there are also aberrations. As example, he cites the word "ressentiment," a French word, he notes, introduced into philosophy by Friedrich Nietzsche and later revised and used by Max Scheler. Lonergan says of "ressentiment" that it is a distortion of values that can spread through a social class, a whole generation.

> According to Scheler, ressentiment is a re-feeling of a specific clash with someone else's value qualities. The someone else is one's supe-

rior physically or intellectually or morally or spiritually. The re-feel-
ing is not active or aggressive but extends over time, even a life-time.
It is a feeling of hostility, anger, indignation that is neither repudi-
ated nor directly expressed. What it attacks is the value-quality that
the superior person possessed and the inferior not only lacked but
also feels unequal to acquiring. The attack amounts to a continu-
ous belittling of the value in question and it can extend to hatred
and even violence against those that possess the value quality. But
perhaps its worst feature is that rejection of one value involves a
distortion of the whole scale of values and that this distortion can
spread through a whole social class, a whole people, a whole epoch
(ibid. 33).

One should be cognizant of one's feelings, regardless of how deplor-
able the feelings may be. It is better to take care of them than to brush
them aside or ignore them, Lonergan argues. "To take cognizance of
them makes it possible for one to know oneself, to uncover the inat-
tention, obtuseness, silliness, irresponsibility that gave rise to the feel-
ing one does not want, and to correct the aberrant attitude" (ibid.).

Lonergan advances the argument that value, a third aspect of the
human good, is a transcendental notion. It is a transcendental notion
because it is what is intended in questions for deliberation and it also
leads to the dynamism of conscious intentionality. Transcendental no-
tions elevate the subject from lower to higher levels of consciousness:
from the experiential to the intellectual, from the intellectual to the
rational and from the rational to the existential. "Not only do the tran-
scendental notions promote the subject to full consciousness and di-
rect him to his goals. They also provide the criteria that reveal whether
the goals are being reached" (ibid. 35). Everyone has to find value in
his or her living and operating. "It is the function of culture to discover,
express, validate, criticize, correct, develop, improve such meaning and
value" (ibid. 32). In this light then, a person who has a personal value
is one who in his or her self-transcendence is loving and being loved,
one who is the originator of values in himself or herself and his or her
milieu, and who inspires and invites others to do the same. Thus for
Lonergan, at the heart of the meaning and value of one's living, one's
world, is religious value. He uses the illustration of love to explain the
point:

A man or woman that falls in love is engaged in loving not only
when attending to the beloved but at all times. Besides particular

acts of loving, there is the prior state of being in love, and that prior state is, as it were, the fount of all one's actions. So mutual love is the intertwining of two lives. It transforms an "I" and "thou" into a "we" so intimate, so secure, so permanent, that each attends, imagines, thinks, plans, feels, speaks, acts in concern for both (ibid. 32-3).

Lonergan's Work on Dialogue and Dialectic as a Means of Promoting Common Good in Light of More Recent Theories

Lonergan does not explicitly speak of the "common good." He speaks of "common meaning," "human good," and "community." But we can infer from what he says about these terms and use them to explain the "common good." In *Method* where he discusses 'common meaning,' he speaks of it as "embodied or carried in human intersubjectivity, in art, in symbols, in language, and in the lives and deeds of persons." Meaning, he says, fulfils various functions in human living, opens up different realms, and yields insight into the diversity of the expressions of religious experience (ibid. 57). Perhaps the reason why Lonergan did not speak of the "common good" was because he was aware of the fact that the problem of approaching social problems primarily in terms of "common good" (as against "particular goods") is that it tends to overlook that which makes a "common good" practicable with the result that too much is pinned on moral and affective, and not enough on intellectual conversion.

What Lonergan says about the structure of human good has drawn the attention of some modern day scholars. David Hollenbach (2002), the Catholic Jesuit theologian who has been largely influential in helping American Catholic bishops shape Catholic social teaching for an American audience, has done a formidable work on the notion of the common good that is consistent with Lonergan's position on the structure of the human good. Hollenbach re-examines and re-evaluates the age long Greco-Christian understanding of common good, which he argues has been skewed in modern day democratic society largely because of "liberalism," and draws on social analysis and moral philosophy (Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Ignatius of Loyola, in particular) to bring to bear the discussion on current social divisions in modern society. Hollenbach draws a parallel between the sixteenth/seventeenth century Catholic-Protestant religious wars that were fought

over conflicting understanding of the common good and modern day tensions between Christians and Muslims, Hindus and Muslims, and Catholics and Protestants in many parts of the world. Hollenbach argues that developing a plausible understanding of the common good in a diverse democratic society is one of the greatest needs of our time, especially in sub-Saharan Africa where it is imperative that "any understanding of the common good that can be meaningful today will be one that challenges cultural, racial, ethnic, and national definitions of who counts as part of the community." Hollenbach calls for a reconstructed understanding of the common good that incorporates the insights of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Ignatius of Loyola, and suggests the use of dialogue as a way of addressing conflicting views of what constitutes the common good in society. He challenges the Christian church to do more to bring about a just and more equitable society in which everyone, regardless of race, ethnicity or religion, has equal access to societal goods (see Hollenbach 1994, 1990, 1983, and 1979).

Of particular interest is Lonergan's assertion in *Method* that the human good is at once individual and social (Lonergan 1996, 47). Kenneth Melchin, the Lonergan scholar who has done a genetic study of Lonergan's work on bias (see Chapter Two), interprets this to mean that Lonergan differs with people he (Melchin) has identified as liberal theorists of society (Marx, Hobbes, etc). These liberal theorists, Melchin continues, tend to conceive the common good "in terms of an aggregated result of individuals pursuing their interests within the framework of a social contract which authorizes the state to ensure minimal standards of equity in the distribution of liberties" (Melchin 1995, 16: 80). While this liberal view may be based on a narrow, natural-scientific conception of rationality born out of the Enlightenment, Lonergan would share the liberal theory's requirement that the public sphere be reserved only for those principles and procedures of justice that guarantee individual liberties and regulate conflicting claims to individual rights.

> For citizens to ensure the good of political society, they must understand and responsibly regulate the full range of cooperative meaning schemes, which constitute their living. Moreover, they must do so in dialogue with each other. For in a democratic society, the long range project of political living requires that people from the more diverse, conflicting, and even hostile sectors of society come to understand

the respective inputs of all parties into the common schemes which
condition the good of all (ibid. 80).

Melchin interprets Lonergan essentially as saying that the way one
lives one's life in the social setting, willy-nilly impacts the common
good. "Social living is constituted by a vast array of complex, concrete-
ly functioning structures and institutions of social cooperation which
have emerged spontaneously and which can only be regulated or coor-
dinated through wide scale public input" (ibid. 79). Melchin calls these
structures "recurrence schemes," i.e. irreducible structures of meaning
which link together to form wider ecologies of meaning (ibid). Put
in practical terms, we live in world that is interconnected and inter-
related. Financial experts, for instance, would readily agree that the
markets of Japan, Hong Kong, Europe, and the United States are but
subsets of a single global economy (Carmody and Carmody 1988, 6).
Ecological pollution of one country travels by air, water, and land to
affect many other countries, and culturally national boundaries seem
fictitious as scientists and artists communicate across languages and
different heritages (ibid.). Similar interconnectedness and interrela-
tions exists among religions. In Nigeria, for instance, whether one is a
Muslim, or Christian, or member of ATR one is faced with the com-
mon social problems the nation experiences and you are faced with
the need to relate your faith to that of others. So whether it is in the
realm of scientific exchange or cultural enrichment, or even religious
dialogue, the only high road one can reasonably travel, i.e. the only vi-
able option, is to promote cooperation, understanding, mutual respect,
and mutual concern.

   Speaking of inter-religious collaboration, W. Huber notes that inter-
religious dialogue is a candid reminder that the religion of the partici-
pants is a way of life to them and that only those who can name their
differences can identify what binds cultures together (Huber 1996,
65). "The real answer is joint action by people of all the religions in the
area, together with other citizens, to promote justice, development,
sound economic programs, honesty in private and public life, and
willingness on the part of the rich to show serious solidarity with the
poor" (Arinze 2002, 79-80). Francis Cardinal Arinze alludes to the
many ways dialogue and inter-religious collaboration can contribute
to the promotion of the common good. He makes the argument that
there are many human problems and challenges that do not respect

frontiers of religion or race, and sometimes even country. Examples are war, hunger, refugee problems, unemployment, and drugs (ibid. 72). Collaborations undertaken, especially inter-religious collaboration, to fight these problems promote the common good and help ensure peace and stability of the polity. Denise and John Carmody carefully articulate it in this way:

> Inside the Christian churches, as inside the assemblies of all other religions, many people ponder the relation between their faith and the world they live in. Outside the religious assemblies, people on the streets of New York and New Delhi, San Francisco and Sao Paulo, ponder hunger, sickness, and warfare. For most religious faiths, loving God and attaining wisdom are manifested by loving fellow creatures and improving the world. To many of the contemporary world's five billion people, the problems of hunger, sickness, and warfare suggest the need for a new social order, a new worldview (Carmody and Carmody 1988, 3).

Huber, Arinze, D. Carmody, and J. Carmody all agree with the basic position advanced by Lonergan that dialogue can be used as a means of enhancing inter-religious collaboration and promoting the common good. They share Lonergan's conviction that there is the need to tap into the rich resource or common areas shared by the such World Religions as Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, ATR. These common areas, in Lonergan's words, are "that there is a transcendent reality; that he is immanent in human hearts; that he is supreme beauty, truth, righteousness, goodness, that he is love, mercy, compassion; that the way to him is repentance, self-denial, prayer; that the way is love of one's neighbor, even of one's enemies; that the way is love of God, so that bliss is conceived as knowledge of God, union with him, or dissolution into him" (Lonergan 1996, 109). Lonergan, relying on these ideas derived from the thoughts of Friedrich Heiler (1959), argued that being in love with God is the ultimate fulfillment of the human person's capacity for self-transcendence. Religion, therefore, must be conceived and directed towards what is good, to genuine love of one's neighbor and to a self-denial that is subordinated to a fuller goodness in oneself. For not to do this would mean that "the cult of God that is terrifying can slip over into the demonic, into an exultant destructiveness of oneself and of others" (Lonergan 1996, 111).

THE NEED FOR A LARGER VISION OF THE COMMON GOOD: ENGAGING THE WORK OF SHAWN COPELAND

When Lonergan speaks of the human good he speaks of it in light of his conviction that the interrelation of human intersubjectivity and practical intelligence is realized in human society and history. Intersubjective spontaneity, which he locates in the primitive community, is that psychic comfort, experience, and feeling of belonging human beings derive from being members of a clan or tribe or group, and which divides them from others (Lonergan 1970, 212). But civil society, as Lonergan argues, must rise above intersubjective spontaneity and be open to transformation, a transformation that forces on us a new notion of the human good (ibid. 213). An understanding of Lonergan's idea of human good is essential for our understanding of self-appropriation which Lonergan invites us to partake in, and by extension essential for our understanding of intellectual, moral, religious, and affective conversion, a curative to the four fold bias: dramatic, individual, group, and general bias of common sense. In other words, Lonergan's vision of the human good is a useful tool for developing a philosophy of action. In this section, I shall engage the work of Shawn Copeland to help us understand the development of Lonergan's thought on the subject. Copeland (1990) has offered a genetic study of the idea of human good in the thought of Bernard Lonergan. In this careful study, she discusses, in chronological order, Lonergan's idea of the human good as a 'structure' and identifies changes in Lonergan's overall thought process.

   In this developmental study, Copeland points out, and rightly so, that Lonergan sees the good of order, not as some unattainable ideal, but as something empirical, intelligible, concrete, and real. Like the transcendental precepts, the good of order is discovered by asking questions and is grasped through accumulation of insights. "The good of order is composed by an intelligible pattern of relationships which condition the fulfillment of an individual's desires by his or her contributions to the fulfillment of the desires of others in society" (ibid. 110). Copeland dismisses any attempt to associate Lonergan's view with that of the seventeenth century political philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, who in *Leviathan* gave an account of the human condition that is rooted in raw, unrefined passion. In Hobbes' view, human be-

ings are in a perpetual state of war of all against all, a conception that denies that human beings are by nature political and social beings. While for Hobbes the social, economic, and political orders are merely artificial and achieved only by means of external constraint, for Lonergan the good of order is far more comprehensive. Though society imposes constraint on its members, society is also about collaboration and cooperation. I have noted (see chapter two) that Hobbes was one of the liberal theorists of society whose views Lonergan set out to correct.

Copeland reminds us that Lonergan conceives of the human good as a 'structure,' a result of Lonergan's "ongoing thinking about interaction of human intersubjectivity and practical intelligence as realized in society and history" (ibid. 112). She explains that 'structure' functions as a field theory to explain the threefold (non-chronological) movement of progress-decline-redemption of the human good in society and history. She alludes to two earlier works by Lonergan in which he analyzed the human good in the context of culture in which education occurs. The first essay was "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," published in Montreal, Canada, under the title, "Le role de l'universite catholique dans la monde moderne" (translation of this essay has been published in *Collection*). The second was Lonergan's lectures on the philosophy of education. The lectures (still unpublished) were given at an education institute and sponsored by Xavier university, Cincinnati, OH, August 3-14, 1959.

In these earlier works, Lonergan "works out the notion of the human good in terms at once pertinent and open to diverse historical events, resistant to uncritical moral idealism, and avoiding the static quality of the scientific ideal-type" (ibid. 151). Lonergan gives a more precise articulation of his notion of human good in a later essay, "The Role of a Catholic University in the Modern World," where he sketches a threefold dynamic notion of the good: the good as object of desire, as good of order, as value (ibid. 152).

These threefold aspect of the good is also found in the seventh and eighteenth chapters of *Insight*. Copeland is not sure if this essay, written in 1951, predates the chapters on *Insight* or vice versa. There is no evidence to suggest one way or the other. But it would make sense to think that these essays pre-date the chapters on *Insight* because Lonergan often utilizes, in his lectures and writings, earlier materials.

Lonergan acknowledges the social nature of the human person. Communication and cooperation in the pursuit of the good are not only spontaneous but also natural and hypothetically necessary.

> For Lonergan, practical intelligence moves from particular objects of desire to the schemes, structures, and systems of civil community. Practical intelligence seeks the good of order, but there is an ambiguity of the good because intellectually and morally, individually and socially, human beings are subject to change, to development, to decline. For men and women to be "truly practical" is to prefer the common good of order over personal and private advantage. The condition of civil communities is dependent on practical intelligence since "civil communities are the cumulative products of many acts of practical intelligence." Their validity, or lack thereof, stands revealed in their histories [Coll. 116] (ibid. 153).

Copeland locates Lonergan's second articulation of the human good in the years between 1953 and 1964, when Lonergan gave summer lectures in Canada, Ireland, and the United States on such topics as existentialism, redemption, mathematical logic, philosophy of history, and theological method. Lonergan delved into the works of Jean Piaget and Susanne Langer to help him in these lectures in which he focused on the social order. In these lectures, Lonergan raised such pertinent questions as: what is meant by the good? Is it changeable? Is it pervious to time, custom, and convention? What makes a society good? And how does that society know what is good?

> In these lectures on education, Lonergan works out a concrete notion of the human good that accounts for human persons and society, that is interconvertible or interchangeable with an idea of the structure of history [LOE 19]. He discusses the general notion of the human good under two headings which correspond to the seventh and sixth chapters of *Insight*: the human good as "developing object" and the human good as "developing subject." Lonergan (1) expounds the human good as a finite and concrete notion with supernatural import; (2) proposes an invariant structure of the human good; (3) utilizes the analogy of the differential equation as a way of thinking theoretically about variables in human societies; (4) employs the notions of common sense and development that were presented in *Insight*; (5) introduces the notions of levels of integration and of horizon; and (6) raises the problem of the human subject (ibid. 158).

Copeland points out that when Lonergan speaks of the human good as a developing object he seeks to point out how the human good is not some abstract, utopian, static object. Like Aquinas, Lonergan stresses the limitedness and finiteness of the human good. "Lonergan's thought on the human good follows in the tradition of the classical thinkers, Plato and Aristotle, for whom education for character and virtue was an integral function of politics" (ibid. 197). The most distinctive feature of the human good is that it is rooted in intelligence and choice. The human good is dynamic. "It is the product of cumulative, complex manifold development. As human apprehension and choice may be good or evil, so the human good is history, a concrete, cumulative process, open to the growth and creativity resulting from good as well as distortions and aberrations resulting from evil" (ibid. 159). As a developing object, the human good is a concrete manifestation of aesthetic, ethical, and religious value simply because one chooses intelligently to incarnate values, live and transmit them within the social order. When he treats of the human good as a developing subject, Lonergan seeks to show how the human good is the product of human apprehension and choice, i.e. how a man or woman, through apprehension, choice and decision, determines progress and decline of the human good (ibid. 181).

Copeland identifies a shift in Lonergan's thinking and locates this shift in the years between 1961and 1972. She alludes to a 1971 interview in which Lonergan acknowledged a shift in his own thinking with regard to three areas: the human sciences, the notion of the good, and the question of God. This was also the period Lonergan suffered serious illness and had to undergo surgery. In 1954 Lonergan suffered lung cancer and subsequently had to retire from the Gregorian University where he was teaching and had to retreat to Toronto for surgery in 1965. In the years that followed his surgery, Lonergan stayed at Regis College, Toronto, where he continued his research, especially on theological method. He also spent time giving public lectures and allocutions until 1971/1972 when he served as Stillman professor at Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, MA. Copeland was right in identifying this period as that in which there was a significant shift in Lonergan's thinking, not only because Lonergan acknowledged a shift in his own thinking around this period, also because this was the period Lonergan wrote *Method in Theology*, the work that clearly manifests a shift in this thinking. It was in this work that Lon-

ergan paid attention to the hitherto neglected affective aspect of the human person.

Copeland notes that the good of order, for Lonergan, consists of particular goods and the human needs and abilities that mediate them. "The good of order has a meaning that is mediated by institutions-the family, society, educations, morals, law, the economy, the state, and technology" (ibid. 256). The structure of the good is such that it is not just something already-out-there but the good in the ongoing historical process. For the human good is never independent of the personal development in intelligence, authenticity, genuineness and holiness of everyone in the society. Lonergan considers authentic any-one whose values are self-transcending and who responsibly chooses what is good. "The authentic human subject fully acknowledges, ex-amines, corrects feelings; questions, scrutinizes, and admits motives; consciously scrutinizes and eradicates instances of bias from his or her outlook, thoughts, words, and deeds. The existential human subject is radically constituted by moral consciousness or conscience" (ibid. 261). Thus Copeland summarizes Lonergan's idea of human good as follows:

> The human good is best understood as a transcultural and transhis-torical structure within which solutions to the problems of human living are worked out. These solutions are constituted and realized by asking a cluster of questions that intend the knowledge and prac-tice of value. In general, those questions regard the best, the most choice worthy way of of life. The standard of the human good is a complete life of authentic self-transcendence --the real life of good women and good men, authentic self-transcending subjects. A just and good society is contingently dependent upon sets of probable schemes of recurrence, but the primary contingency is the sufficient presence of authentic self-transcending subjects: women and men who by their inquiry, understanding, reflection, judgment, delibera-tion, evaluation, and decision constitute such a society (ibid.).

Copeland's genetic study of Lonergan's idea of human good is very significant for our analysis of overcoming bias as a component in a social process for several reasons. First, Lonergan's idea of the human good as a 'structure' which she articulates very well, suggests not only that the human person is a self-transcending subject and originator and master of his or her values, but also that as self-transcending sub-ject, the basis of differentiation and realization of human good lies in

the human person. For as Lonergan notes in *Method*, the transcendental notions, i.e. the questions for intelligence, for reflection, and for deliberation, constitute the human capacity for self-transcendence (Lonergan 1996, 105). Second, Lonergan brings to our awareness that one way of evaluating social progress and decline is in the recognition or realization of the transcendent solution offered by God, which is grasped in his gift of grace and religion, religion being that process of "being in love with God" in an unrestricted fashion. Third, religion has its role in the social process. It promotes human good by promoting self-transcendence and self-sacrificing love. It can play a redemptive role in society in as much as it can undo the mischief of decline and restore cumulative process of progress (ibid. 55).

THE NEED TO CONCEIVE OF A MULTI-ETHNIC AND A MULTI-RELIGIOUS COMMON GOOD

Though Lonergan does not speak of a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good, he often speaks about collaborations among religions in the quest to achieve self-transcendence. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) has done a remarkable work and has been in the forefront of a collaborative effort to promote the common good and build a just and equitable society in Africa. During the height of apartheid regime in South Africa, the bishops stood in solidarity with the people of South Africa in their struggle against apartheid. The USCCB is, at present, working closely with the bishops of Sudan in their search for peace and religious freedom, and in their quest to end slavery and abduction. The USCCB Migration and Refugee Services assist African refugees resettled in the US, providing them with spiritual, moral, and material support. The Catholic Relief Service (CRS) is another organization that has labored for about half a century to promote the good of order in Africa. The CRS runs and supports programs in about thirty-six sub-Saharan African nations. They work with the local church in areas like health care, agriculture, education, micro-finance, HIV/AIDS program, reconciliation, and peace building. CRS is also involved in the campaign for debt relief for Africa and poverty elimination.

In *Method*, Lonergan identifies grounds for ecumenical dialogue and dialogue with all religions by making a good distinction between faith and belief. He defines faith as "the knowledge born of religious

love." Lonergan's definition of faith in *Method* is a paraphrase of Blaise Pascal's famous statement that heart has reasons which reason does not know. Lonergan interprets 'reason' here to mean the compound activities on the first three levels of cognitional activity: experiencing, understanding, and judging; and interprets 'heart's reason' to mean feelings that are intentional responses to values, and finally interprets 'heart' to mean the subject on the fourth, existential level of intentional consciousness and in the dynamic state of being in love. Lonergan, therefore, understands Pascal's statement to mean that besides factual knowledge reached by experiencing, understanding, and verifying, there is another kind of knowledge that is attained through discernment of value and the judgments of value of a person who is in love.

For Lonergan, faith becomes an instance of further knowledge when the love is God's love flooding the human heart. The import of this is that in addition to the human apprehension of vital, social, cultural, and personal values, there is an added apprehension of transcendent value, an apprehension that consists in experienced fulfillment of one's unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence. Belief, on the other hand, is a component of faith. "Among the values that faith discerns is the value of believing the word of religion, of accepting the judgments of fact and the judgments of value" (ibid. 118). Lonergan argues that no matter how personal and intimate a religious experience may be, it is not so personal as to be solitary. "The same gift can be given to many, and the many can recognize in one another a common orientation in their living and feeling, in their criteria and their goals. From a common communion with God, there springs a religious community" (ibid.). Lonergan speaks further of this religious community:

> Community invites expression, and the expression may vary. It may be imperative, commanding the love of God above all things and the love of one's neighbor as of oneself. It may be narrative, the story of the community's origins and development. It may be ascetic and mystical, teaching the way of total other-worldly love and warning against pitfalls on the journey. It may be theoretical, teaching the wisdom, the goodness, the power of God, and manifesting his intentions and his purposes. It may be a compound of all four or of any two or three of these. The compound may fuse the components into a single balanced synthesis, or it may take some one as basic and use it to interpret and manifest the others. It may remain

unchanged for ages, and it may periodically develop and adapt to different social and cultural conditions (ibid.).

Why does Lonergan find it important to make a distinction between faith and belief? He is unequivocal about his reasons, contending that "by distinguishing faith and belief we have secured a basis both for ecumenical encounter and for an encounter between all religions with a basis in religious experience" (ibid. 119). Lonergan argues that in the measure that the experience is genuine, it is oriented to the mystery of love and awe. It becomes the bond that unites the religious community, directs their common judgments, and purifies their beliefs. Beliefs differ, but behind the differences lay a deeper unity. "For beliefs result from judgments of value, and the judgments of value relevant for religious belief come from faith, the eye of religious love, an eye that can discern God's self-disclosures" (ibid.).

By distinguishing faith and belief, Lonergan has secured a basis for ecumenical dialogue and dialogue among religions. In this section, I am working with the understanding of dialogue as an instrument in advancing the common human good in light of what Lonergan has said about the relation of dialectic and the conversion associated with foundations. Building on Lonergan's contribution, I will explore here precisely the need for the common good to be conceived in multi-ethnic and multi-religious terms. Lonergan did not speak about the multi-ethnic and multi-religious character of the common good. It is, however, in keeping with what he had to say about the empirical approach to cultures (in contrast to a classicist viewpoint).

In order to have a fruitful discussion on the nature of the common good, in a multi-cultural society especially, it is would make sense to begin by finding ways to reconcile and heal wounds that have been caused by division. Robert Schreiter makes a good distinction between individual and social reconciliation and goes to great lengths to show how the two relate to each other. There can be no true common good (in Lonergan's sense of the word) without individual and social reconciliation. "Individual reconciliation occurs when the victim's damaged humanity is restored…. For social reconciliation to be successful, there must be reconciled individuals present to help give leadership to the process, as well as a cadre of people who understand the meaning of individual reconciliation" (Schreiter 1998, 111). There is preponderance of evidence to suggest that in Africa religious and cultural

identity are often manipulated for political and economic ends. The continent suffers from a large measure of political instability and insecurity (Adedeji 1986, 41). Coup d'etats and counter-coups have been the hallmark of many African countries since independence. Political instability, major indicator of state decay, is endemic in Africa. "Colonialism, by lumping together heterogeneous peoples in common territories, has perforce sharpened ethnic consciousness which has in turn been aggravated by economic stagnation and uneven development and skewed distribution of the fruits of whatever little distribution there has been" (ibid.).

The relationship between natural resources and conflict in Africa is very clear indeed (USCCB 2001, 17). While the scramble for diamonds in countries like Sierra Leone, Angola, and Democratic Republic of Congo have produced immense suffering and political instability, in Nigeria, especially in the Niger Delta areas, oil exploration and the fight to control its revenues been largely responsible for economic impoverishment, political disenfranchisement and ecological disasters for the people that inhabit the region. Oil exploration is at the root of the decades-long Angolan civil war. Oil exploration also in southern Sudan has not only led to the forcible displacement of large numbers of people but also has fueled the government backed war against the south (ibid.). One sees in these countries an apparent disregard for the good of order and misappropriation of the common fund, a trend that further weakens the fabric of an already religiously and ethnically polarized people. There is then the need to conceive of a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good, a common good that is all-inclusive. In Africa, a land blessed with natural resources, what ordinarily should be a source of blessing and joy unfortunately has become a source of pain and suffering for the people. A great many have been dehumanized and emasculated because of uneven and unfair policies that have been used in the distribution of national wealth and resources. These unfair policies have made the need for individual and social reconciliation more urgent. But first must come individual reconciliation, because the people's damaged humanity needs to be restored before any meaningful discussion on the common good can take place. After this then must follow social reconciliation. Social reconciliation is not just a "process of reconstructing the moral order," but also a "process that engages the entire population" (Schreiter 1998, 112). Schreiter's definition of social reconciliation derives by and large from Jose Zala-

quett's (1994) definition. Zalaquett was the chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation in Chile. All too often the misappropriation of the common fund in many an African country, besides greed and political manipulation by the ruling elites, is fueled by some external factors. "Foreign corporations – American, European, Asian, and others – reap large profits from diamonds and oil while too often demonstrating little concern for the negative impact their activities may have on peace, stability, human rights, and the environment" (USCCB 2001, 17). In some cases these multinational corporations and foreign governments, in exchange for natural resources, provide arms to African governments and non-governmental entities further destabilizing the country. The reason why social reconciliation is important, to use the words of Robert Schreiter, is because "all have been touched in one way or another by the violence, so all have to be engaged in the rebuilding" (ibid.).

The future of Africa depends very much on how imaginatively and innovatively common problems are tackled. The quest for a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good should begin with social reconciliation. Apart from intractable sufferings, carnage, and wanton destruction of lives and property that follow these political unrests, there is also the byproduct, i.e. large number of refugees and large number of internally displaced persons. Internally displaced persons (people who are forced to flee from their homes without crossing international border) do not enjoy international legal production. They often lack the basic necessities needed to survive and very often are not provided opportunities for asylum or resettlement in another country. The United States Bishops Conference estimate that the 18 plus years civil war in Sudan has produced more than 4 million internally displaced persons, the largest number in any country in the world.

> Africa hosts more than 3.5 million refugees – nearly 30 percent of the world's total – and approximately 50 percent of the world's 25 million internally displaced persons. Primarily because of long-standing conflicts in the Horn of Africa (Sudan, Somalia, Ethiopia, Eritrea), the Great Lakes region (Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda), and West Africa (Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea), millions of refugees have fled unrest in their respective homelands, only to face an unstable and meager existence in insecure refugee camps. Many of these camps are subject to violence, shortage of food, and insufficient sanitation and portable water. Be-

cause of lack of resources and political will from the international community, many refugees, for whom resettlement is the only durable solution, languish in camps for years (ibid. 18).

Social reconciliation, as a process of reconstructing society, is very valuable because it involves digging into the past and discovering the truth "amid the tangled lies of violence" (Schreiter 1998, 112). Adebayo Adedeji has rightly suggested that unless we accept wholeheartedly and unreservedly that we are each other's keeper, unless we accept our common humanity and put into practice the belief that everyone, regardless of race or ethnicity, is created equal and is entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, then our faith will remain an escape from reality. In this case it would be an escape from the challenge posed by Jesus, an escape from the challenge posed by Muhammad, and an escape from the challenge posed by the respective religious faith we profess to follow. It is no wonder then that Adedeji particularly challenged Christians to be in the forefront of the fight against corruption and exploitation of people. "The church would have to play a more positive and aggressive role in getting the governments and peoples of all countries, particularly of Christian countries, to move closer to Christ and be guided by him in their public policies and actions" (Adedeji 1986, 43).

To promote a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good, it would be helpful to consider the recommendations of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) on the need to eradicate poverty by promoting peace, stability, and good governance, a campaign that can be achieved by placing the people's interest first and must be done by Africans and for Africans. This is a kind of social reconciliation. "Civil society should play an increasing role in the monitoring of good governance and in the formation of a deeper understanding of the common good" (USCCB 2001, 21). Schreiter considers social reconciliation a moral and spiritual work, a view that is consistent with Lonergan's idea of conversion. For in reconstructing the moral order of society social reconciliation uses the social means available to achieve its goal (Schreiter 1998, 112). One of these available means is education. The USCCB pointed out the need to promote and strengthen education in Africa. "Education plays an essential role in the formation of moral conscience, responsible participation in democratic processes, professional and technical expertise, promoting the common good, and development of a holistic understanding of

human sexuality and relationships" (USCCB 2001, 22). If given access to quality education, the hopes and aspirations of teeming young Africans would be greatly realized. Adebayo Adedeji articulated it in this manner:

> The ecumenical movement must open the hearts and minds of people throughout the world to the inescapable need for neighborly love on a global scale and for the building of the social, political and economic institutions that can express that love and for achieving mutual understanding among the various religions, sects and ideologies of the world so that instead of strife there is cooperation, instead of suspicion there is understanding and instead of hate there is love (Adedeji 1986, 113).

This is a good example of social reconciliation that transforms the good of order. Schreiter stresses this transformatory nature of social reconciliation when he notes that a society reaches a point where it becomes futile to concentrate on the past not only because this leaves much undone but also because "dwelling any further on the past will not lead to healing but allow in a perverse way the divisions of the past to take on new valence" (Schreiter 1998, 113). Rather a society becomes more fruitful when its energies are directed to the future.

Given that social reconciliation is deeply concerned with morality, its principal moral claim in that process is justice. Justice here is not an abstract concept, but refers to concrete efforts that address violations of human rights, the restitution of what has been stolen, and focus on social problems that need to be addressed (ibid). The USCCB highlights, as an area wherein Africans are wont to receive raw deal from the international community (i.e. the area of trade) and urged the United States to open its market to African goods as a way to help lower Africa's international debt, and the bishops also called on their European counterparts not only to open their agricultural trade and industries to African nations, but also amend their "excessively high agricultural tariffs" (USCCB 2001, 24). This is necessary not only to meet the requirements of social justice but also to help "promote more equitable terms of exchange, greater development, and broader political and economic participation within African countries, thus strengthening Africa's self-reliance" (ibid. 24-5).

In sum, individual and social reconciliation are important in forging and building a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good. Schreiter considers the relationship between the two to be somewhat

asymmetrical, in the sense that is possible to achieve individual rec-
onciliation when there is no social reconciliation, although it would
be hard to imagine what a social reconciliation would look like with-
out considerable individual reconciliation (Schreiter 1998, 115). That
this relationship is asymmetrical does not in any way make individual
reconciliation superior to social reconciliation. Rather their goals are
similar and interconnected (ibid. 116). For truly reconciled persons
concern themselves with the welfare of others and that of the larger
society and promote the common good.

Peacebuilding and Reconciliation

From what has been said so far, it is clear that reconciliation is an es-
sential tool for achieving peace and promoting the common good. Ac-
cording to Peter van der Horst of the Dutch branch of Amnesty Inter-
national, there has been a real crisis of human rights over the past few
years in many African countries. "After the fall of the Wall in 1989, the
major powers suddenly began to make conditions about democratiza-
tion. This resulted in less official aid, without which many of the Afri-
can regimes could no longer sustain the nation state. Some countries
collapsed completely, while in others you can hardly speak of a state
infrastructure now" (Bronkhorst 1995, 142). Caritas Internationa-
lis provides an important resource, comprising both conceptual and
practical tools, for achieving this. Their manual makes an important
distinction between peace-building and reconciliation. Peace-building
is a way to achieve societal reconciliation. It is people-centered, rela-
tionship- building, and a participatory process. "Peacebuilding occurs
either before violent conflict erupts (a preventative measure), or after
violent conflict ends (an effort to build a more peaceful society). Peace-
building may take the form of activities designed to increase tolerance,
promote coexistence, or activities may address structural sources of in-
justice or conflict" (Caritas Internationalis 2002, 15). In other words,
peacebuilding assumes that conflict is a natural part of human exis-
tence. Its goal therefore is to transform the destructive ways we deal
with conflict and opt for more constructive outcomes (ibid. 54). Rec-
onciliation, on the other hand, is a pathway to peace. Peace, here, is not
to be conceived as the absence of war or conflict, but a state of personal
and social health and wholeness. The concept of peace is captured by
the Hebrew *shalom* and the Greek *eirene* which, used in the Christian
New Testament, implies a wholistic vision of peace that includes the

well-being, as well as right and just relationships and structures. It is for this reason that Caritas considers reconciliation a Christian concept, even though the concept is found in other religions and often assumes different characteristics in different cultures (ibid. 29).

Peace building and reconciliation requires perseverance and commitment. Effective peacebuilding requires such qualities as adaptability, non-defensiveness, empathy, creativity, ability to model good conflict resolution skills, and ability to be comfortable with ambiguity. Though reconciliation is to be achieved in a given cultural and religious context, "one way of imagining reconciliation is that it is about making space" (ibid. 27). This can be physical space (i.e. zones are created where people feel safe and free from harm) or social space (i.e. where people speak their mind and talk about the future) or internal space (where people who have been traumatized can be free from the burden of the past).

> When people experience trauma, in contrast to reconciliation, they lose personal and physical space in which to maneuver. In countries controlled by a military power or dictator, people cannot move freely. The historical burdens of colonialism and current pressures of economic globalization can take away the social space of people to think and act differently. Denying people human rights can likewise wipe out social space. One of the effects of torture is to make the victim not feel at home in his or her own body. Reconciliation and peacebuilding then are about opening up spaces (ibid.).

Caritas asserts, and rightly so, that a Christian understanding of reconciliation must place Christ at the center of the reconciliation process, for a Christian reconciliation aims at restoring relationships: spiritual, personal, social, and ecological. The spiritual aims at creating harmony and restoring one's broken relationship with God. The personal involves reconciling with the "self," i.e. personal tranquility, peace, and harmony with one self. The social involves reconciling with those around us, i.e. one's neighbors and the larger human community in ways that reflect justice, mercy, respect and love. Finally, ecological reconciliation recognizes that human beings cannot be truly reconciled with God when they disrespect and abuse nature and God's creation.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LONERGAN'S TREATMENT OF DIALOGUE, DIALECTIC, AND COMMON GOOD FOR ADDRESSING THE AFRICAN SITUATION

At the beginning of this chapter reference was made to Justin Uk-pong's criticism of the *Lineamenta* to the African synod's statement on dialogue. Ukpong, it will be recalled, was critical of the fact that the *Lineamenta* does not offer a working definition of dialogue, and when it speaks of dialogue "the text is based on the institutional model of dialogue rather than the people-of-God model" (Ukpong 1996, 37). Ukpong points out that while the institutional model may be suitable for analyzing dialogue at the level of the universal church, the context of Paul VI's *Ecclesiam Suam*, it is grossly inadequate at the local level, which is the focus of the *Lineamenta*. "By its very nature the institutional model implies that dialogue is verbal, formal, and structured, while at the level of the local church dialogue is more often than not informal, unstructured, and non-verbal" (ibid. 38), he argues. Lonergan's treatment of dialogue and dialectic is very significant because it addresses, among other things, some of Ukpong's critical comments. Before I address the significance of Lonergan's treatment of dialogue, dialectic, and common good for a solution to the African situation, I wish to highlight some of Ukpong's comments on dialogue germane to this discussion.

Responding to the *Lineamenta*'s statement, "without dialogue the Church cannot proclaim the Good News" Ukpong argues that it would be more accurate to say that evangelization, by its very nature, calls for dialogue, and that any approach to evangelization that is not dialogical would be inadequate (ibid.). Ukpong's statement is very logical. The Christian message has been proclaimed in Africa for over a century with some measure of success, but with little or no dialogue. When the Good News was first preached to Africans, who were mostly practitioners of African Traditional Religion (ATR), the then Christian missionaries did not engage ATR in dialogue. This goes far to explain the resentment and distrust of followers of ATR toward those who proclaim the Christian message, and brings us to another important issue raised by Ukpong concerning the nature of dialogue with ATR. I agree with Ukpong that the Christian dialogue with ATR has to

be distinguished from dialogue with other non-Christian religions, mainly because the world view of ATR remains, by and large, the world view of most Africans, even when they have allegiance to the Christian or Muslim faith. The basis of Ukpong's argument is worth considering:

> Similarly, the analysis of dialogue with African traditional religion appears to miss a central point that distinguishes this dialogue from dialogue with other non-Christian religions. African traditional religion is an integral part of the African world view, and it is basically what informs the day-to- day existence of average African Christians. Today the average African Christian is severely torn between the African and the Christian world views. The primary purpose of dialogue in this case is to integrate the two world views so as to give the African Christian an integrated religious personality. In this context, dialogue takes place first and foremost in the minds of individual Christians; it is basically non-verbal and absolutely fundamental. The issue is to help Christians (and not just neophytes and catechumens) engage in this dialogue. At one level, this involves formal study and analysis of African traditional religion; at another level, it involves interaction with its practitioners (ibid.).

Regional and national Episcopal conferences in Africa have come to recognize the value of dialogue as a means to peaceful resolution of conflicts in the face of ethnic and religious violence. Not much has been done, however, to distinguish, as Ukpong proposes, the dialogue with ATR from dialogue with other non-Christian religions, although some steps have been taken to educate African Christians on the rich values of ATR. In April 1976, the Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria had this to say:

> The Conference adopts the resolution of the Episcopate of Africa and Madagascar which recommended "that research be made so that the good values in Traditional African Religion may be incorporated into Christianity. This will enable the Church to enter into meaningful dialogue with African Traditional Religion, for Christianity builds on the seeds of the Gospel, some of which are present in traditional African religions" (Schineller 2003, 47).

The Nigerian bishops further believe that conflicts in the country can be prevented and the existing ones resolved if there is a commitment to dialogue.

> As a result of numerous hurts arising from injustices of the past, there is an urgent need for national reconciliation. We recall that this was the main thrust of the Holy Father's message during his recent visit to our country. The path to genuine reconciliation is dialogue. We appreciate the efforts of the present administration to initiate dialogue among various contending political groups. We appeal to government to widen its scope to include the religious, ethical, social, and economic spheres of our national life (September 1998, *Promoting Dialogue and Reconciliation*).
>
> Most of the problems causing conflicts in the nation can be prevented, and what has gone wrong put right, if there is a commitment to dialogue. Authentic democracy entails a culture of dialogue. For us Christians, Jesus the Son of God established the eternal dialogue between God and man and united himself in some sense with every human being. He, thus, provides the basis for us Christians to dialogue with others. Consequently, we cannot but prefer dialogue to violence, and propose it as the way to collaboration, harmony, solidarity, and unity (March 2000, *Dialogue Provides the Way*) (ibid. 49).

What the Nigerian bishops, and other national and regional bishops' conferences are doing to promote and sustain dialogue should be lauded because it is a move in the right direction. For history attests to the fact that human beings, when faced with ideological differences with people that are different from them, tend to choose between one of two options: exclusion or embrace (see Volf 1996). Speaking of exclusion, Albert Memmi once observed that the temptation to defeat people who are different from us, reduce them to slavery, and find some ideological pretext for doing so is a very common phenomenon (Memmi 1969, 205). Ethnic conflicts and religious upheavals in sub-Saharan Africa are borne, too often, of the desire to find ideological pretext to suppress and exclude people that are considered 'different.' When dealing with people who are different by the fact of their language, religion, or ethnicity in sub-Saharan Africa, in spite of the laudable efforts of African bishops to sustain dialogue, the phenomenon of embrace is still very much elusive. I suggest then the need to re-think the notion of difference and make this an essential part of the on-going dialogue. For as Memmi rightly observed, "we must come around to recognizing certain differences among human beings and to showing that these differences are neither harmful nor scandalous" (ibid. 195).

The desire to understand differences (see Townes 1992), and appreciate people who are different from us and respect contrary opinions, was at the root of Lonergan's discussion of dialectics, to remind us that understanding differences and appreciating them is a necessary step to achieving the much needed solution to a problem, and a path towards achieving authentic Christian conversion. Lonergan's treatment of dialectics is a further reminder that as we dialogue across faith traditions and cultures, though full understanding may be long ways away, it could be realized if we create a non-threatening environment where all the dialogue partners are free to speak their minds. It is very significant that Lonergan offers, as ground for dialogue, the gift of God's grace that orients the believer to the transcendent. By so doing, Lonergan reminds us of Paul's paradoxical formula in Galatians 3:28 that there is no longer Jew nor Greek, no slave nor free, no longer male and female, and that in light of the Christian belief in Christ, the Muslim belief in Allah, and the African Traditional Religion (ATR) belief in the supreme God, that our "irrevocable differences be relativized in such a way that these differences become not only bearable but advantageous and constructive" (Huber 1996, 68).

Finally, it must be pointed out that Lonergan's treatment of dialogue is a further reminder of the dynamic phenomena of exclusion or inclusion that confronts us. Lonergan's discussion helps us better understand the African synod's statement that dialogue ought to be used to redress the many imbalances in African society and also as a means of attaining social justice. Ukpong was right in pointing out some key oversights in the synod's document (recall that Ukpong faults the document for not offering a working definition of dialogue, and for not answering the question, "dialogue for what?" in addition to implying only an institutional model of dialogue).

Lonergan's dialectic not only helps correct these imbalances, but also leads us to a deeper understanding of how dialogue can help one attain religious, moral, and intellectual conversion. When Lonergan offers, as ground for dialogue, the gift of God's grace that is open to all, he, as it were, reminds us, that the phenomenon of exclusion is an affront on the goodness of God whose preferential option for the poor and afflicted (especially those who have been made strangers) is highlighted in the Hebrew scriptures. There is a growing interest in modern theological circle in what is now called "hermeneutic of the stranger" (Huber 1996, 68). Dialogue can help bring together people

who have been made strangers to each other. Collaboration among the different ethnic groups in sub-Saharan Africa should be encouraged and joint Muslim-Christian, and even ATR projects be intensified. Efforts like this will go a long way in reducing prejudice, promote mutual understanding, and enhance the good of order.

CHAPTER 5

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AFRICA IN LIGHT OF LONERGAN'S CONTRIBUTION: CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

SUMMARY

In a work of this size, usually one has nothing new to add at the end, other than to give a recapitulation of the work. But not so when one is writing about Lonergan. Lonergan always evokes reactions from admirers and critics alike. Contemporaries of Lonergan and theologians after him have written much about the significance of Lonergan for future theology, some of them complimentary, others not so complimentary or critical at best. I shall here examine the assets and limitations of Lonergan's work, with a view to highlighting the significance of his work for the overall project of peace-building and conflict resolution in sub-Saharan Africa. Not too many scholars have had the opportunity to respond to the objections of their critics in print. Lonergan was aware of some of the objections that had been raised against his work, and sometimes responded to them. Where he does not directly respond to his critics he seizes the opportunity to clarify his own position. It is beyond the scope of this paper to itemize Lonergan's response to his critics. But I shall highlight some of the objections that have been raised against his work. But before embarking on this, a recapitulation of the last four chapters will be in order. I shall begin with a summary of the work. Then, I shall examine the 1994 African synod's statement on dialogue and attempt a re-write in light of Lonergan's contributions. Thereafter, I shall examine the assets and limitations of Lonergan's contributions.

CHAPTER ONE

In the first chapter, I began by exposing and analyzing the harsh reality of African worldview, a worldview beset by struggle for ethnic identity and religious recognition.

Gregory Baum and Harold Wells have addressed, in a unique way, the issue of ethnic and religious conflicts, which the twentieth century has thrust upon us. Using the Rwanda and Bosnia genocides of the 1990s as their backdrop, Baum and Wells call on Christians, Christian theologians especially, to embrace the gospel call for reconciliation and peacemaking. The collapse of communism and the Soviet Union in 1989, they argued, have led to a new world order, "one in which old and seething national, ethnic, or religious hatred has erupted to the surface in many places. At the same time, the increasing power of multinational capital and the accompanying decline in the significance of nation states and their governments appear, ironically, to release new passions for cultural, ethnic, and religious identity. Moreover, dreadful economic strain and suffering in some parts of the Third world, especially Africa, due to the tightening squeeze of the capitalist world system and its "structural adjustment" strategies help to break down the authority of governments. All of this fuels the despair and restlessness of peoples, who become more vulnerable than ever to disorder and violence" (Baum and Wells 1997, viii).

Intra ethnic squabbles and struggle for ethnic identity and recognition, we noted, is neither a new phenomenon nor a phenomenon that is limited to Africa. The only difference between Africa and other hot spots of the world is that Africa is particularly notorious for group conflicts: racial, ethnic, tribal, and religious. While South Africa, for instance, is notorious for racial conflict, ethnic/tribal and religious conflicts, on the other hand, characterize the rest of sub-Saharan Africa. Given that Africa is a big geographical entity and its peoples are not homogenous, for the sake of expediency, I limited the scope of this study to sub-Saharan Africa. Even at that, there are still questions that need to be resolved, questions like (i) who is an African? (ii) What distinguishes an African from a non-African? And (iii) is it proper to speak of an African identity or identities? After all said and done, it becomes clear that an attempt to define an African often proves abortive. Nevertheless, we noted that despite the differences in language and culture of the many peoples (countries) that constitute

Africa, there are still sufficient reasons to speak of an African culture. As Lonergan rightly remarks, "besides the memories of each individual, there are the pooled memories of the group, their celebration in song and story, their preservation in written narratives, in coins and monuments and every other trace of the group's words and deeds left to posterity" (Lonergan 1996, 177).

We used Nigeria, the most populous black nation in sub-Saharan Africa, as a case study, in the attempt to show that political boundaries of most, if not all, of the countries in Africa are merely artificial. Some would argue that because of the notoriety it acquired by way of the now infamous genocide of the 1990s that Rwanda serves as the best case to illustrate the interplay between ethnic and religious conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa. The argument is not without its merits. A good historical account of the Rwandan crisis has been offered by Ian Lindel (1997), a former lecturer in Malawi and Nigeria and later professor of African Studies at Hamburg University (see also Lindel 1977). The political boundaries that took shape shortly after the 1885 Berlin Conference divided the then homogenous ethnic groups and lumped them together with groups with whom they had hitherto no affiliation. Such a configuration, to say the least, caused people to be "out of touch, misunderstand one another, hold radically opposed views, commit themselves to conflicting goals" (Lonergan 1996, 178). Lonergan rightly observes that when this kind of situation persists, "then common meaning contracts, becomes confined to banalities, moves towards ideological warfare" (ibid.). This description comes close to capturing the state of affairs in sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, the ideological warfare Lonergan talks about is very evident in the on-going ethnic tension. Although many reasons can be adduced for the ethnic tension, one cannot in fairness overlook the fact that these tensions are, to some extent, a vestige of colonialism, which today's politicians and military leaders exploit for their own narrow ends. This same idea that ethnic tension, in sub-Saharan Africa, is a vestige of colonialism, which modern day African leaders manipulate to foster their own selfish ends, is what the analyses of different respectable groups we examined yields. Religious bodies such as the Pontifical commission on Justice and Peace, the Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue, the African Synod of Bishops, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), and John Paul II, addressed the issue of ethnic conflict and religious intolerance with a view to finding a solution to

this menace of African society. They all traced the remote cause of the conflict to periods pre-dating independence of the countries involved in these conflicts but differ significantly on the immediate cause of the conflict. Nevertheless, they all condemned these conflicts as a threat to peace and offered different solutions that would bring the conflict to a halt. As good and helpful as their analyses and solutions might be, though they noted that at the root of the conflict is religious and ethnic prejudice, they failed to address the pertinent issue of what it is in the human person that induces a person to act in a prejudicial manner. They failed to address why the human person is to prone to acts of prejudice or bias, both individually and in groups, an issue that Lonergan discusses at some length.

CHAPTER TWO

It is a fact of experience that human beings are prone to acts of prejudice and are sometimes wont to act in that manner. In Chapter One we saw how, in sub-Saharan Africa, prejudicial acts find manifestation in racial, ethnic, tribal, and religious conflicts. But the question left unanswered was: what is it in the human person that induces one to act in a prejudicial manner, even when one knows that such acts are contrary to reason? This is the issue the second chapter addresses. We explored the work of Albert Memmi and Hans-Georg Gadamer, among others, to discover *why* the human person is prone to acts of prejudice. In Memmi's view, prejudicial acts are so culturally deep, general, and extensive that they impose themselves on the individual. This prejudice that afflicts the individual is sometimes rooted in ideologies and institutions, in education and in one's culture. This perhaps explains why Gadamer speaks of prejudice as having both positive and negative value, and contends that 'understanding' inevitably involves some prejudice.

Taking the argument further, Lonergan speaks of prejudice mainly in cognitive terms. Lonergan acknowledges that some negative extraneous principles can militate against knowing and make one act contrary to knowledge. This negative principle he calls bias. Bias is not only a cognitive issue, but also "the infantile beginning of psychic trouble" (Lonergan 1997, 223). It distorts intellectual development and scuttles understanding. It is a blind spot, a scotoma, a flight from

understanding that ultimately leads to decline in the human person and society.

Using the work of Kenneth Melchin we attempted a genetic study of Lonergan's work on bias. Melchin reveals how Lonergan's work on bias was occasioned by Lonergan's desire to engage in dialogue Hobbes, Kant, Hegel, Marx, and other proponents of the liberal thesis of automatic progress. It was Lonergan's dialogue with these people that led to him to enumerate four principal ways that distortion of intellectual development occurs. These four ways he identifies as the four types of bias: dramatic bias, individual bias, group bias, and the general bias of common sense. Dramatic bias is the "bias of unconscious motivation" that is due to psychological conditioning and often beyond one's control. Lonergan speaks of this as analogous to "a love of darkness" (ibid. 214). Individual bias is the willful, deliberate, and conscious flight from understanding. It is an egoism that results in the incomplete development of intelligence. Group bias is a more powerful kind of bias that interferes with the development of practical common sense. It feeds on group prejudice and distorts the good of order. And general bias of common sense finds expression in the human tendency to seek short-term, immediate solution, to even complex problems. It is a shortsightedness that pays attention only to what seems expedient, and in the process produces a distorted community. What Lonergan calls bias theologians and religious thinkers may call 'sin.' Harold Wells has identified, not only "inherited sin," but also "structural" and "systemic" sin. What this means is that sin "cannot be understood adequately in personal and individual terms, that our personal sinfulness both contributes to and is a result of the sinfulness of our social structures and of a long history and world system of greed and violence. We are all implicated in the systemic injustice that leaves so many helpless, hungry, and poor, all participants more or less willingly in economic and societal systems that benefit some at the expense of others" (Wells 1997, 8).

One of the negative effects of bias, in Lonergan's view, is that it leads to cycles of decline. Lonergan discusses what he means by "cycle" of decline in the context of his critique of Marx's economic theory. There are two types of cycles of decline: the shorter cycle and longer cycle. Group bias produces the shorter cycle of decline, and general bias of common sense leads to the longer cycle of decline. The havoc wrought by the longer cycle is deep and extensive. When general bias aligns

with group bias the result is cataclysmic. It produces a distortion in the social sphere, and progress is replaced with stagnation and decline. Lonergan explains, however, that it is possible to reverse bias and its shorter and longer cycle. One of the ways to do this is to seek a higher viewpoint. "There is a convergence of evidence for the assertion that the longer cycle is to be met, not by any idea or set of ideas on the level of technology, economics, or politics, but only on the attainment of a higher viewpoint in man's understanding and making of man" (Lonergan 1997, 258). The embrace of this higher viewpoint reverses decline, and ushers in progress. Lonergan calls on cultures to embrace this higher viewpoint. In *Insight*, he calls this higher viewpoint a 'cosmopolis.' Cosmopolis prevents common sense from being short sighted. It is the foundation for the possibility of reversal of decline, and calls for higher integration of human living.

What Lonergan says about the role of human intelligence in history and society as well as the relation of that intelligence to social and cultural progress is very applicable to Africa where ethnic and religious violence thrives. Lonergan, in helping us understand the nature of bias, has helped us to understand what is at the root of ethnic and religious prejudices in sub-Saharan Africa. It is the scotoma that is rooted in ideologies, in cultural institutions and in the cultural education that the individual, from birth, is socialized in. In other words, tribal or religious prejudice is not a natural phenomenon but only acquired by nurture, and since it is not inborn it can be corrected and overcome. This is why Lonergan calls for an embrace of "higher viewpoint." In the African context, a higher viewpoint would be a quest for an educational process (both verbal and non-verbal) that values diversity and recognizes that one's tribe or ethnicity is only enriched by the existence of the members of other tribes or ethnic groups whose uniqueness highlights the beauty of the commonalities and differences between the various groups.

CHAPTER THREE

In chapter three we examined the fundamental issue of conversion, which Lonergan says is germane to combating bias, and goes to great length to explain its nature. We saw that at the heart of Lonergan's notion of conversion is the idea of self-transcendence. Conversion transforms one and one's world. Self-transcendence is the criterion for

realizing this transformation. Using the distinction made by Joseph de Finance between a horizontal and a vertical exercise of freedom, Lonergan sees conversion as a movement to a new horizon, a new beginning, an about-face. It is an individual event that is at the same time multi-dimensional, bringing about changes that are personal, social, moral, and intellectual. The key to understanding Lonergan's idea of conversion lies in a better understanding of the word horizon. Horizon is "the maximum field of vision from a determined viewpoint and embraces both relative horizon which describes one's field of vision relative to one's development—e.g., psychological, sociological, cultural—and basic horizon which describes the human subject as related to the four basic or transcendental conversions: intellectual, moral, religious and Christian" (Curran 1971, 19-20). Horizon is a key category in Lonergan's work. Each of us is confined and bound, and limited by our horizon, partly due to the historical tradition in which we are born and partly due to the social milieu in which we are nurtured. For this reason, Lonergan sees conversion as a radical change or shift in horizon. Although our horizons limit us, it is still in the context of horizon that conversion takes place.

Using the work of Robert Doran and Michael Rende, we attempted to get at the root of Lonergan's work on conversion, to see how his ideas on the subject grew and changed in the course of his intellectual development. Both Doran and Rende have done landmark works on the origin and development of Lonergan's work on conversion. Through these works, we see how Lonergan differentiated between religious, intellectual, moral, and what is now known as affective conversions. These four conversion processes, though differentiated, are related. It would seem that the various kinds of conversion are in many ways related to the different kinds of bias, and more so, because Lonergan conceives of the former as a corrective to the latter. Nowhere in his works does Lonergan show, in an explicit way, how the various levels of conversion are related to the levels of bias; the relationship, however, is everywhere implied in his works. Just as there are four kinds of bias, which are interconnected and interrelated, there are four kinds of conversion, which are interconnected and interrelated. Intellectual conversion, the clarification and elimination of exceedingly stubborn and misleading myth concerning reality, is a corrective to individual bias. Moral conversion, the change in one's decisions and choices from satisfaction to values, is a corrective to group bias, general bias of com-

mon sense, and even individual bias. Religious conversion, the utter falling in love with God, is a corrective to dramatic bias, and even individual bias, group bias and the general bias of common sense.

What Lonergan says about bias and its corrective, conversion, can be correlated to the African situation where years of ethnic division and religious polarization have necessitated the call for change of heart and attitude. For some reason Africans are ethnically particular; and that is not necessarily bad. Ethnicity becomes vicious only when it is used to foster hatred and division. The ethnic divide frequently becomes more pernicious when religion is added to the brew. Attempts at a solution by many African countries have still not paid off. Different countries have applied different solutions but to no avail. In attempting a solution to their ethnic problems, Zimbabwe, for instance, has tried the policies of "ethnic arithmetic" and "regional balance," and Nigeria the policies of "regional balance" and "quota system," but these have yielded little or no success. Most Africans do agree, however, that the wanton destruction of lives and property must not continue unabated. The call for change is almost a universal one. Christian leaders, both at the national and regional level, have also taken steps to address the religious tension. They see dialogue as a necessary means of arriving at a solution. There is an on-going dialogue between Christians and adherents of ATR, and dialogue between Christians and Muslims. While the dialogue between Christians and members of ATR has achieved a relative measure of success, the same cannot be said of the Christian dialogue with Muslims, which has often been marred by suspicion on both sides. In sum, these national and regional efforts have not done enough to effect change. Lonergan, I have argued, offers a better tool for effecting this change. His cognitional method, if well appropriated, would go a long way in helping Africans come to terms with their prejudices and to seek ways to correct them. Moreover, the four kinds of conversions Lonergan offers provide a much-needed tool for effecting this change.

CHAPTER FOUR

In Chapter Four we dealt with the issue of overcoming bias as a component in the social process. We examined Lonergan's argument that bias can be overcome in the social process for the reason that that which can become communal can become historical, and can pass

from generation to generation, from one cultural milieu to another while, adapting to changing circumstances and confronting new ones. Lonergan makes the point that a higher integration is needed in order to overcome bias, a higher integration he locates in living a life of self-sacrificing love, a life in which all work collaboratively because of their "unrestricted act of understanding towards God. But the question still remains: how do people who live in a society that has been ravaged by war and conflict, and who have been fragmented and polarized in every conceivable way, achieve a life of higher integration? Lonergan suggests the use of dialogue as a starting point and as a means of achieving a life of higher integration. Though he does not have a lengthy discussion of dialogue in any of his works, Lonergan often discusses dialogue in the context of dialectics. He says of dialectic that it reveals the polymorphism of human consciousness, i.e. the deep and irreconcilable differences on religious, moral, and intellectual issues. Dialogue and dialectic, for him, are related. They both serve as corrective to bias. Whenever he discusses dialogue and dialectic, it is always with a view to helping the human person attain conversion. While dialectic reveals the multiplicity of human horizons, i.e. the deep and irreconcilable differences, dialogue reconciles these multiplicities of horizons. Dialectic is a catalyst for conversion from bias towards a more inclusive approach to the common good. Our view of the common good has been skewed by bias, and hence the need for conversion.

Charles Villa-Vicencio, a South African writer who lived during the height of apartheid, has advanced the argument that our world has not coped well with difference. Criticizing South Africa for having not yet exploited the riches of difference, Vicencio argued that any talk of reconciliation would remain fruitless until the notion of difference is thoroughly investigated and understood. "Difference has been exploited by apartheid to impose separation on people of different cultures, ethnic identities, and races" (Vicencio 1997, 30). Marty has also spoken of a much-needed shift from "global village" to "homogenization," and "planetization" to "particularism" and "difference" (Marty 1994, 51: 5-16).

We examined Lonergan's treatment of dialogue and dialectic in light of other theories and observed that Lonergan's view of dialectic and its relation to dialogue is similar to that of Hans G. Gadamer. Dialogue and dialectic figures prominently in the work of these two thinkers and both agree that dialogue and dialectic entail openness to the other.

They both view dialectic as the art of thinking correctly and agree that it is a useful tool for conducting dialogue. For Gadamer, dialogue helps one eliminate "horizons of the present," and brings about "fusions of horizons." For Lonergan dialogue, this produces conversion, leads to a "shift in horizon." This "shift in horizon" might be intellectual, moral, religious, or even affective. Thus both Gadamer and Lonergan suggest that dialogue be used as a means of resolving conflicts. The call for dialogue, as a means of resolving conflict, is not a new phenomenon. There has always been the recognition that dialogue helps to overcome misunderstandings, stereotypes, and prejudices, and very essential to the process of attaining peace. But one cannot overlook Lonergan's contribution to the subject. Because of the way Lonergan explains the meaning of dialogue and its relation to dialectics, one can advance the argument that the efforts by Christian leaders, notable groups, and individuals, to promote peace by dialogue, provides a concrete application of Lonergan's theory of dialogue and dialectic as they bear upon overcoming bias. John de Gruchy holds a position that is similar to Lonergan's view on the primary role of the Christian church in resolving conflict when he argued that the Church has the potential for creating a common culture. The Church, he continued, represents a diversity of culture and ideology, and also embodies the potential of enabling conflicting groups to enter into a nonviolent and creative dialogue with each other (Gruchy 1997, 26).

For Lonergan the process of overcoming bias is essential for the promotion of the common good. Lonergan notes that though modern society has its origin in human intersubjectivity, it has since shifted away from it. This shift, or transformation, now forces on the human person a new notion of the good, which Lonergan calls the good of order. The good of order, he says, is not some abstract entity that is independent of human actions. It is not an unrealized ideal but concrete, real, intelligible and all embracing. The good of order, Lonergan says, is an instance of human good. The human good is individual and social. By that he means that individuals do not just live to meet their own needs but they also have to cooperate to meet the needs of others. Human society, like the human person, sometimes develops (progress) and at other times suffers from breakdown (decline). For this reason, Lonergan finds it pertinent to add an analysis of social progress and decline in his discussion of the human good. Progress results from being true to the transcendental precepts: be attentive, be intelligent, be reason-

able, and be responsible. Decline is as a result of willful disregard of these precepts. Such a willful disregard does not only lead to conflict in the good of order, but also deteriorates it.

We noted that when Lonergan speaks of the human good he often speaks of it in light of his conviction that the interrelation of human intersubjectivity and practical intelligence is realized in human society and history. We also noted that an understanding of Lonergan's idea of human good is essential for our understanding of self-appropriation to which he invites us. In light of this, we appealed to the work of Shawn Copeland, who has done a genetic study of the idea of the human good in the thought of Bernard Lonergan, to help us understand the development of Lonergan's thought on the subject. She points out that Lonergan essentially sees the human good as a 'structure,' and explains that structure functions as a field of theory, in Lonergan's work, to explain the three fold movement of progress-decline-redemption. From this developmental work, we were also able to locate the different shifts in Lonergan's thinking as he articulated his position. The importance of Copeland's work can be reduced to these three points: first, her point about Lonergan's idea of the human good as a structure, suggests that the human person is a self-transcending being. Second, the way of evaluating social progress and decline lies in the realization that there is a transcendent solution offered by God, a solution that is grasped when one is utterly in love with God, e.g. by way of religion. Third, religion has its role in the social process. Its role is to promote human good by promoting self-transcendence and self-sacrificing love. We argued that these could be used as the basis for conceiving a multi-ethnic and multi-religious common good, especially in Africa.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE AFRICAN SYNOD'S STATEMENT ON ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN LIGHT OF LONERGAN'S CONTRIBUTION

The Special Assembly for Africa of the synod of bishops, which held its first session on Monday April 11, 1994, at a moment when most African countries were going through difficult times, saw itself as "the Synod of Hope." At a time "when so much fratricidal hate inspired by political interest is tearing our peoples apart, when the burden of the international debt and currency devaluation is crushing them," the

bishops saw their task as that of offering " hope and encouragement"
to the disparaged "family of God in Africa" (Message of the Synod, 2).
To this end, the synod addressed many of the issues that pertain to
the ordinary life of the African Christian, especially issues regarding
evangelization, inculturation, and dialogue. Regarding dialogue, the
synod had many interesting things to say. I have cited at great length
(in Chapter One) what the synod had to say regarding the cause of
religious and ethnic conflicts in Africa and the solution they offered
for these conflicts. I also offered a critique of the synod's statement in
light of Lonergan's contribution. Here I shall attempt a re-write of the
synod's statement using the language and contributions of Lonergan.
I am assuming that the reader of these re-writes has read the previous
chapters of this work and has developed familiarity (even if just initial
familiarity) with the language of Lonergan, since I have not attempted
here to re-write them for an audience not familiar with Lonergan's
technical terms. The synod statement on dialogue comes in two forms:
first in *Message of the Synod*, and second in *Propositions*. Both state-
ments are substantially the same, though couched differently. I shall
cite an unedited version of these statements and embark on a re-write
in light of Lonergan's contribution in the right column. In the section
that follows I will indicate what Lonergan contributes to each section
of the Synodal statement.

MESSAGE OF THE SYNOD
ON DIALOGUE AND JOINT
COLLABORATIONS

The Church-Family has its origin in the Blessed Trinity at the depths of which the Holy Spirit is the bond of communion. It knows that the intrinsic value of a community is the quality of relations, which makes it possible. The Synod launches a strong appeal for dialogue within the Church and among religions (message of the synod, no.20).

A RE-WRITE OF THE MESSAGE
OF THE SYNOD ON DIALOGUE
AND JOINT COLLABORATIONS
IN LIGHT OF LONERGAN'S
CONTRIBUTIONS

The origin of the Church-Family is in God, the transcendental Being, who is also Trinity, to whom everyone has a native orientation. The source of all true knowledge is the Holy Spirit. True knowledge orients the human person, as proportionate being, to the divine, and constitutes a bond that holds together other proportionate beings (human persons). The quality of every proportionate being depends on the questions they raise about being, namely, what being is, whether being is real, and the relationship that exists among proportionate beings. The Holy Spirit, the source of true knowledge knows that the intrinsic quality of a person depends on the quality of the relationship of that person to his or her community. The Synod therefore launches a strong appeal for dialogue within the Church and dialogue among religions to enhance the quality of the relationship between individuals and their community. (Message of the synod, no.20).

AN APPEAL FOR DIALOGUE WITH TRADITIONAL RELIGION

Particular attention should be paid to our customs and traditions in so far as they constitute our cultural heritage. They belong to oral cultures and their survival depends essentially on the dialogue of generations to assure their transmission. Corporate personalities, wise thinkers who are its guarantors, will be the principal interlocutors in this phase of profound change in our cultures. A dialogue with the guarantors of our cultural values and of our traditional religion (ATR) structured around the cultural heritage is strongly recommended in our local churches (message of the synod, no.21).

Particular attention should be paid to our customs and traditions. Our cultures and traditions constitute our cultural heritage, and therefore, constitute our history. They constitute our common field of experience, our common mode of understanding, and give us a common mode of meaning. Since they constitute our history, their survival depends essentially on how we disseminate this knowledge, and appropriate this common fund of knowledge to which we all draw, i.e., how rationally self-conscious we become. Dialogue constitutes an essential means of disseminating and transmitting knowledge to future generations. Corporate personalities, wise thinkers, and everyone who is empirically, intelligently, intellectually, and rationally conscious, should be a principal interlocutor, in this phase of profound change in our culture, as we seek to enthrone rational self-consciousness. Our culture, like every other human culture, is not a fixed and immutable entity. It can adapt to changing circumstance. Certain elements of our culture, as valuable as they are, can be reconceived in the light of new ideas and be subjected to new meanings. A dialogue with the guarantors of our cultural values and our traditional religion (ATR) is therefore strongly recommended in our local churches (message of the synod, no.21).

DIALOGUE WITH OUR CHRISTIAN BRETHREN

We call for the intensification of dialogue and ecumenical collaboration with our brethren of the two great African churches of Egypt and Ethiopia and with our Anglican and Protestant brethren. We wish together to bear witness to Christ and to proclaim the gospel in all the languages of Africa. The presence of this Synod of our brothers of the churches and the ecclesial communities of Africa has been deeply appreciated by all and we are grateful to them for addressing the Assembly and for their participation in its work (message of the synod, no.22.)

DIALOGUE WITH OUR CHRISTIAN BRETHREN

We call for the intensification of dialogue and ecumenical and collaboration with our brethren of the two great African churches of Egypt and Ethiopia and with our Anglican and Protestant brethren. Together we wish to bear witness to God's gift of his love to us in Christ and to proclaim the gift of this love in all the languages of Africa. If the gift of this love of God in Christ is to be effectively proclaimed to all the languages and cultures of Africa, it becomes essential that we enlarge our horizons to include an accurate understanding of the cultures and peoples we wish to evangelize. The presence at this Synod of our brothers of the churches and the ecclesial communities of Africa is a first step in the broadening of this horizon and is deeply appreciated. We are grateful to them for addressing this assembly and for their participation in the work of this synod (message of the synod, no. 22).

DIALOGUE WITH MUSLIMS.

We assure our Muslim brethren, who freely lay claim to faith in Abraham (cf. *Nostra Aetate*, 3), that we wish to collaborate with them, everywhere on the continent, in working for the peace and justice gives glory to God. The living God, Creator of heaven and earth and the Lord of History is the Father of the one great human family to which we all belong as members. He wants us to bear witness to him through our respect for the faith, religious values, and traditions of each person. He wants us to join hands in working for human progress and development at all levels, to work for the common good, while at the same time assuring reciprocal respect for the religious liberty of individual persons and that of communities (*Redemptoris Missio*, 39). God does not want to be an idol in whose name one person would kill other people. On the contrary, God wills that in justice and peace we join together in the service of life. As servants of his life in the hearts of men and in human communities, we are bound to give to one another the best there is in our faith in God, our common Father (message of the synod, no. 23).

DIALOGUE WITH MUSLIMS.

We assure our Muslim brethren, who share with us the gift of God's love, who love God in an unrestricted manner, and freely lay claim to the faith of Abraham (cf. *Nostra Aetate*, 3), that we wish to collaborate with them, everywhere in the continent, in working for the peace and justice which gives glory to God. The living God, the transcendent reality, who is immanent in human hearts, the supreme beauty, who is loving and merciful, is the Father of the one great human family to which we all belong. This living transcendent God, who loves us unconditionally, wants us to love Him in an unrestricted manner by loving our neighbors and enemies the way He loves us. He wants us to bear witness to him through self-denial, shared values, and respect for each person. He wants us to join hands in reversing decline caused by our biases: dramatic, individual, group, and general bias, and work for human progress and development by being attentive, intelligent, rational, and responsible. By being faithful to these transcendental precepts we would be enhancing the good of order by enthroning religious liberty (*Redemptoris Missio*, 39). For God does not want to be an idol in whose name one person kills other people because of their individual or group bias. On the contrary, God wants us to love, for love is the fulfillment of our unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence. As people united in the gift of God's love, our common inheritance, we are bound to give to one another the best there is in our faith in God, our common Father (message of the synod, no.23).

<table>
<tr><td>

PROPOSITIONS OF THE SYNOD
ON DIALOGUE AND JOINT
COLLABORATIONS

</td><td>

A RE-WRITE OF THE
PROPOSITIONS OF THE SYNOD
ON DIALOGUE AND JOINT
COLLABORATIONS IN LIGHT OF
LONERGAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS.

</td></tr>
</table>

DIALOGUE.

Evangelization continues the dialogue of God with humanity and reaches its apex in the person of Jesus Christ. The attitude of dialogue is the way of being for the Christian within the community and with other believers and men and women of good will (Proposition, no.38.)

DIALOGUE.

Dialogue and dialectic help foster evangelization. Dialectic, by helping us identify contrary views helps promote dialogue. The dialectical character or dimensions of dialogue serve the process of conversion. We encourage their use, thereof, if we are to share with all humanity the love of God, which has been revealed to us in Jesus Christ. First there ought to be a shift in horizon by all the dialogue partners. For the path of dialogue is the path to true conversion. By means of dialogue, Christians in the community and other believers can iron out their differences and reach a fusion of horizon (Proposition, no 38).

DIALOGUE IN THE CHURCH.

Aware of belonging to a Church-Family, Christians are earnestly invited to practice first of all this dialogue between themselves at all levels:- -between particular churches and the Apostolic See; --between particular churches on the continent itself and those of other continents;—and, in the particular church, between the bishop, the presbyterate, consecrated persons, pastoral agents, and the faithful; --among various rites within the Church. The spirit of dialogue allows for a respect for the competence of each level of authority and leadership, and guarantees the application of the principle of subsidiarity. It is therefore recommended that the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM), the regional associations of bishops' conferences, and national conferences and dioceses, have structures and means which guarantee an exercise of this dialogue (Proposition, no.39).

DIALOGUE IN THE CHURCH.

Aware that they belong to a Church-Family that is grasped, like other human religious families, by ultimate concern, the other-worldly falling in love, Christians should pursue vigorously dialogue and dialectic at all levels:--between particular churches and the Apostolic See --between particular churches in the African continent and other human family in other continents; --and particularly between the bishop, the presbyterate, consecrated persons, pastoral agents, and the faithful; --and various rites within the church. The spirit of dialogue ensures a movement towards transformation of one's living and feeling, thoughts, words, and deeds, and respect for each individual and the various levels of authority and leadership, and therefore changes the criterion of one's decisions and choices, thereby leading to a genuine conversion. It is by so doing that the application of the principle of subsidiarity is guaranteed. It is therefore recommended that the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar (SECAM), the regional associations of bishops' conferences, and national conferences and dioceses, put in place structures that can help uncover the root of individual, group, and general bias, and help guarantee the exercise of this dialogue (Proposition no. 39).

ECUMENICAL DIALOGUE

Linked to Jesus Christ by their witness in Africa, Catholics are invited to develop an ecumenical dialogue with all their baptized brothers and sisters of other Christian denominations, so that the unity for which Christ prayed might be realized and so that their service to the peoples of the continent may make the Gospel more credible in the eyes of those who are seeking for God. In a common concern for truth and charity, but with patience and prudence, it would be convenient to assure that there ecumenical translations of the Bible, to work out together a Christian theology of development and open a common accord for a more just and brotherly society where the rights of persons would be respected. In order that ecumenism be promoted and abuses in this field prevented, it is necessary that all agents of evangelization, especially priests, be given a solid ecumenical formation. In addition, and in accordance with the directions given by the Holy See, every Episcopal conference should have a commission for ecumenism, while at the diocesan level there should be at least a special office entrusted with this pastoral task (Proposition, no.40).

ECUMENICAL DIALOGUE

Linked to Jesus Christ by their witness in Africa, Catholics are invited to develop an ecumenical spirit, aimed ultimately at a comprehensive viewpoint, with all baptized people of other Christian denominations, by acknowledging differences and eliminating superfluous oppositions. When such a comprehensive viewpoint is reached, real and apparent oppositions would be eliminated, and the body of believers would be on the path to realizing the unity for which Christ prayed, and the Gospel would be more credible in light of this otherworldly falling in love. Since conversion is not just personal and private, but also communal, in order to help others in this self-transformation, we recommend an ecumenical translation of the Bible that works out a Christian theology of development and opens the horizon of the Christian to a more just and fraternal society where the good of order is promoted. In order to promote ecumenism and eliminate individual, group, and general bias, it is necessary that all agents of evangelization, especially priests, be given a solid ecumenical formation that is grounded in religious, moral, intellectual, and affective conversion. In addition, all Episcopal conferences under the guidance of the Holy See, should have a commission for ecumenism that will work towards eliminating all Christian divisions that arise mainly from differences in cognitive meaning of the Christian message. Even at the diocesan level, the ecumenical commission should work towards reaching a common cognitive agreement of the Christian message so that the redemptive and constructive role of the Christian church can find its fulfillment in human society (Proposition, no.40)

DIALOGUE WITH MUSLIMS.

This effort of dialogue ought to embrace equally all Muslims of good will. Christians should not forget that there are many Muslims attempting to imitate the faith of Abraham and to live the demands of the Decalogue. Catholics are in addition invited to practice with them a Decalogue of life in the family, at work, at school, and in the public life, of a kind which will bring about the realization of a just society where a veritable pluralism guarantees all freedoms, and especially religious freedom. This encompasses the freedom of persons and of communities to profess publicly their faith, as well as the freedom to change one's religion, to meet in common worship and to erect structures for such purposes, and to exercise educational and charitable work. To facilitate such an undertaken on the part of Christians at the local, regional, or national level, it is desirable that commissions and institutes be created to form and to be informed on positive interreligious dialogue with reciprocal respect for the spiritual values of each of them. It is essential that we be vigilant in the face of dangers which come from certain forms of militant Islamic fundamentalism. We must become more vocal in exposing their unfair policies and practices, as well as their lack of reciprocity regarding freedom of religion (Proposition, no.41).

DIALOGUE WITH MUSLIMS.

The ground for justifying the "love of God which floods our hearts" (Rom. 5:5) is God's gift of grace. The gift of God's grace, which is offered to everyone, underpins that which is good in all human religions. This gift of grace is the basis for the Christian quest for dialogue with Muslims, who share with us this "love of God flooding our hearts," and also join us in imitating the faith of Abraham by living the demands of the Decalogue. Catholics should show a differentiation of consciousness when dealing with Muslims and other non-Christians. Such differentiation of consciousness requires that Catholics collaborate with Muslims, especially in practicing the demands of the Decalogue, whether at home, work, school, or other public places. A religiously differentiated consciousness leads to a just society and guarantees freedom of religion. Differentiated consciousness, when allied with religious sensibility, leads to a heightening of consciousness, which ultimately promotes the good of order. It is desirable that commissions and institutes that promote inter-religious dialogue be created at the local, regional, and national levels. For dialogue carried out in the spirit of dialectic, ensures reciprocal respect of all dialogue partners. We should, however, be vigilant, in the face of dangers that come from certain people who, either in the guise of Islam or blatant Christian intolerance, teach a fundamentalist doctrine that destroys the good of order. We need to be vocal in uncovering and exposing their individual, group, and general bias, which undermines religion freedom (Proposition, no.41).

AFRICAN TRADITIONAL
RELIGION

It is evident that the dialogue with African Traditional Religion must continue because African Traditional Religion still has an influence on the African and often directs the way of life of even the best of Catholics. There are positive values in African Traditional Religion which could stand the Church in good stead. The central doctrine of African Traditional Religion is the belief in a Supreme Being Who is Creator, Giver of Everything, Just Judge, Eternal, and so forth. Adherents of African Traditional Religion are worthy of respect. They are believers in God and in spiritual values. Such beliefs and values will lead many to be open to the fullness of revelation in Jesus Christ, through the proclamation of the gospel. National Episcopal conferences should give African Traditional Religion more attention. Derogatory language, such as "heathenism" and "fetishism" must be avoided when describing African Traditional Religion. There is also a need for courses in ATR in seminaries and houses of formation, while research must be intensified in order to discover those elements which are compatible with the Gospel (Proposition, no.42). Finally, it is necessary that this spirit of dialogue equally inspire the relations of African Christians with local political powers and international institutions, whether political, economic, or cultural, in such a manner that a North-South dialogue as well as South-North dialogue may be established and developed to assure better the necessary solidarity based upon mutual respect (Proposition, no.43).

AFRICAN TRADITIONAL
RELIGION.

Christians should continue to seek dialogue with African Traditional Religion (ATR), not only because ATR still has direct influence on Africans, and directs the way of life even of the best Catholics, but also because the religious experience of the Christian is similar to that of ATR in so far as the experience manifests itself in changed attitudes, yielding harvests of goodness, kindness, tolerance, and self-control. The central doctrine of ATR is the search for transcendence, the other-worldly falling in love with a God who Creator, Giver of Everything, Just Judge, Eternal, etc. This religious experience, this love of God, which Christians share with ATR should translate into love of neighbor, and respect for ATR. For the way to God, who is transcendent beauty, is found in repentance, mercy, compassion, goodness, self-denial, and love, even love of one's enemies. Beliefs and values such as these can lead many to the fullness of revelation in Jesus Christ. National Episcopal conferences should continue to give meaningful attention to ATR. Prejudicial language like "heathenism" and "fetishism" should be avoided. Everyone has within oneself a native orientation to the divine, and ATR is no exception. Courses should be taught in seminaries and houses of formation to enable people discover those elements in ATR that are compatible with the Christian Gospel (Proposition, no. 42). Finally, no matter how Christians, Muslims, and ATR may differ, everyone has within oneself a native orientation to the divine, and in one's inner being are questions that show the transcendental ten-

dency of the human spirit to raise
questions, questions that are without
restrictions, i.e. questions about God.
The spirit of dialogue, which exists in
these religions, should be extended to
political rulers and international in-
stitutions, be they political, econom-
ic, or cultural, so that a fusion of ho-
rizon can be achieved. This fusion of
horizon, which should characterize
our North-South and South-North
dialogue, is the one that ensures not
only intellectual conversion, but also
religious, moral, and affective conver-
sion (Proposition, no. 43).

LONERGAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO
THE SYNOD STATEMENT

Lonergan makes significant contribution to the Synodal statement. Here is a brief highlight of his contributions to each section of the Synodal statement:

ɦ *Message of the Synod on Dialogue and joint collaboration*: Lonergan makes a metaphysical contribution by making a clear distinction between God as transcendent being, and humans as proportionate being. By introducing the concept of being, he reminds us that being is at the core of all meanings, and that the human grasp and conception of God is the most meaningful of all possible objects of thought. The implication of this is that if God is real and is the object of reasonable affirmation, then other human beings must be real and ought to be object of reasonable affirmation, whether or not we share their basic religious beliefs.

ɦ *An Appeal for dialogue with traditional religion*: Lonergan has an empirical approach to culture. Here he makes an epistemological contribution, which helps us in the task to which he invites us: self-appropriation and heightening of consciousness. The pragmatic value of his epistemology is that it leads us to ask the three basic questions at the root of his cognitional structure: What I am doing when I am knowing? Why is doing that knowing? And what do I know when I do it? These questions lead to self-appropriation and heightening of consciousness, which Lonergan says helps one attain human fulfillment, peace, and joy, by moving one beyond the realm of common sense into the realm in which God is known and loved (Lonergan 1996, 83-4). There is no doubt that it is when God is known and loved that dialogue becomes more fruitful.

ɦ *Dialogue with our Christian brethren*: Lonergan introduces a unique category, i.e. God's gift of love, which God makes available to everyone. He conceives of being in love with God as the ultimate fulfillment of the human person's capacity for self-transcendence. Lonergan reminds us that at the root of all religions is this human desire to respond to God's gift of love. This view is sustained in every religion because God is often conceived as the supreme intelligence, truth, reality, righteousness and goodness. This way of conceiving God becomes more paramount in the Christian religion where God's love is expressed in the sufferings of Jesus Christ on the cross. For this reason it becomes more

imperative that the Christian churches work together on the basis of this shared gift of God's love in order to bring about a more just and peaceful social order.

h *Dialogue with Muslims*: Lonergan continues his disquisition on the gift of God's love, which God makes available to everyone. He reminds us that because of God's infinite goodness, He makes available to everyone sufficient grace for salvation. God is full of love and compassion, and the way to Him is by prayer, self-denial, love of one's neighbor, and even one's enemies. For to love God also means to love those that God loves.

h *Propositions of the Synod on dialogue and joint collaborations*: The category of dialectic, which Lonergan introduces, is novel. Lonergan is aware that Christianity has been plagued, from its very beginning, by internal and external conflicts. Lonergan's dialectic deals with the concrete, the dynamic, the contradictory, and the relations of many viewpoints as found in conflicting Christian movements, their conflicting histories, and conflicting interpretations. Dialectic brings to light conflicting viewpoints, and by so doing promotes dialogue. The dialectical character or dimensions of dialogue serve the process of conversion.

h *Dialogue in the Church*: Lonergan once again highlights the importance of dialectics and its relation to dialogue. Dialogue and dialectic can be used as a tool that not only transforms one's living, feeling, thoughts, words, and deeds, but also helps one to attain authentic conversion.

h *Ecumenical Dialogue*: Lonergan locates the basis of society in the community. A community may be built on moral, religious, or Christian principle. The moral basis of society is that humans, as individuals, are responsible for what they make of themselves, and are collectively responsible for the world in which they live. Lonergan locates the basis of universal dialogue in this collective responsibility (ibid. 360). But besides universal dialogue, there is also religious or ecumenical dialogue, which our collective responsibility imposes on us. Lonergan locates the basis of ecumenical dialogue on the gift of God's grace. He notes that it is the grace that God offers to all humans that underpins what is good in the religions of humankind, which in turn explains how those that have never heard the gospel of Christ can be saved. Lonergan makes the point that for us to live harmoniously in the society and live out the ideals of the human community, we must

take steps to eliminate individual, dramatic, group, or general bias that undermine this harmony. It is when these biases are eliminated that one can truly lay claim to authentic conversion.

h *Dialogue with Muslims*: Lonergan again stresses the gift of God's love. Being in love with God translates to being in love with someone, for love always has a personal dimension. This personal dimension of love secures the basis of the Christian dialogue with Muslims. Lonergan acknowledges that there are many forms of religious aberration. This aberration sometimes comes in form of religious intolerance. The Christian is as capable of religious intolerance as the Muslim. This is why the one in love with God must seek self-transcendence.

h *African Traditional Religion*: Lonergan introduces the concept, horizon, a concept that needs to be further explored. The Christian worldview or horizon is essentially different from the ATR worldview or horizon. Yet both religions share some commonalities. At the heart of the two religions is the love of God, and the human response to this love, an unrestricted thrust to self-transcendence. The one that fulfills that thrust must be supreme in intelligence, truth, and goodness (ibid. 109). Both ATR and the Christian religion have got to find ways to fuse or articulate their different horizons.

In sum: Lonergan makes a fine distinction between transcendent being and proportionate being and the dependence of the former on the latter (Lonergan 1997, 692). God, in so far as He is knowable and experienced, is the transcendent being to which all human beings have a native orientation. By calling God the transcendent being Lonergan reminds us that the notion of being cannot be fully comprehended. It is an unrestricted notion, for while we know a lot of things about this transcendent being (God), there are far too many things about him that still remain unknown. There is the need then for humility on our part whenever we approach God, humility in the way we conceive him in our faith traditions, and humility in the way we communicate our knowledge of him. For beyond all that we know there lies multiplicity of others we don't know. Who then can afford to be dogmatic and arrogate to themselves complete knowledge of this transcendent God whose full knowledge is beyond human comprehension? Lonergan, in other words, calls for care, caution, and compassion in our expression of our knowledge of God as we dialogue across faith traditions.

Lonergan reminds us of the interconnectedness between God's existence (which all religions affirm), God's grace (which He offers to ev-

eryone), and conversion (which follows the reception of this grace). He highlights the fact that the reception of God's grace and the embrace of conversion both have ecumenical implications. For one can not lay claim to a true conversion and still have a hostile attitude towards one's neighbor and countless others who, in conscience, respond to God's gift of grace in a different manner, i.e. different religious expression. By so doing Lonergan adds something new to the recurrent issue of ecumenism. He conceives of ecumenism in a new light, proposing a methodical approach that challenges Christians to face up to their past and present conflicts with a view to finding ways of reconciling their differing systems of thought and doctrine. This is what the whole system of dialectics aims for, to lay bare opposing horizons, with a view to finding a significant 'shift' that all parties concerned would find mutually appealing.

Lonergan being the consummate theologian that he is understands that it is possible for one to be converted and still have an undifferentiated consciousness. This is why the distinction he makes between intellectual, moral, and religious conversion is very significant. A good many Africans, because of their excessive religious fervor, tend to degenerate into fideism. New Religious Movements and Christian sects, which multiply daily in most African countries, are particularly guilty of this. Thus while they may acknowledge religious conversion and laud moral conversion they tend to lack intellectual conversion. Intellectual conversion is a good corrective to excessive fideism. By highlighting religious, moral and intellectual conversion, and even affective conversion, Lonergan gives us a balanced notion of conversion capable of moving ecumenical dialogue in the right direction.

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF
LONERGAN'S CONTRIBUTION

My goal in this work has been to find ways of tapping into the rich resource of Lonergan's work with a view to appropriating him into the overall project of peace building and conflict resolution that is currently taking place in the African continent, sub-Saharan Africa especially. Lonergan scholarship is indeed rich. The significance of Lonergan's work for the overall project in Africa goes far beyond what I have stated here. A lot needs to be explored. I shall itemize some of the rich resources that Lonergan provides. But before I embark

on this, perhaps I should point out that I am under no illusions that Lonergan scholarship is without its limitations. Lonergan scholarship sometimes evokes a negative response and critics are quick to point out that Lonergan's unique style lends itself to some criticisms that merit attention. However, I do not intend to rehearse some of the general criticisms of Lonergan's work, for that would be beyond the scope of this work. McShane (1971) has documented some general criticism of Lonergan's work. One recurrent theme is the charge that Lonergan is abstract and esoteric, a charge that B.C. Butler (1971), the auxiliary bishop of Westminster, articulated very well: "I cannot claim with confidence that I have understood Lonergan. I know not how many times I have read *Insight*. I think I understand to some extent the main lines of his argument. I feel sure that I can recognize gross deformations of his thoughts when they are propounded by others. I am not sure of the correctness of my own interpretation." I will allude briefly only to those criticisms that have bearing on Lonergan's approach to bias, cycles of decline, conversion, and human good.

LIMITATIONS

Lonergan does not offer a specific approach to racial and ethnic bias, nor does he offer a specific approach to religious bias, two issues whose significance cannot be overstated in the overall discussion of bias and its impact on the common good. Put in a nutshell, Lonergan's work on bias does not adequately address the issues of racism, tribalism, ethnocentrism, and religious intolerance. Consequently, his work lacks specific theological responses to these issues. Added to this is the fact that in his discussion of the various levels of bias, Lonergan was primarily concerned with socio-economic analysis, especially socio-economic problems in Europe and North America. He was in no way concerned with how his analysis impacts the peoples of Africa politically, economically, or socially, and his work does not offer any theological considerations of these. This raises the question whether one can justifiably transpose Lonergan's Euro-centric analysis to an Afro-centric worldview. I do not necessarily share Rahner's view when he criticized Lonergan for the lacking specifically theological dimension in his work on method. Lonergan's theological method, according to Rahner, is "so generic that it really fits every science, and hence is not methodology of theology as such, but only a very general methodology

of science in general, illustrated with examples taken from theology." Rahner also suggests that in Lonergan's structuring of theology into its functional specialties what is specific about Christian theology in its subject matter and in its method either gets lost or fails to find expression (Rahner 1971, 194-6). I do not, however, wish to lose sight of the fact that Lonergan's work on bias, in and of itself, does not adequately address the issues of racism, tribalism, ethnocentrism, and religious intolerance.

Lonergan's work on conversion has also come under some severe criticism.

In some of his writings, Lonergan indicates that he is aware of the objections of his critics to some of his own position and takes time to clarify his position while responding to objections. He does not always respond in the same manner to all objections, because "not all papers calls for the same type of response. There are those that admit no more than an expression of my admiration and my gratitude." Lonergan was also aware that some of the objections of his critics came at a time when some of his works (e.g. *Method*) that would have clarified or shed more light on these concerns were yet to be published. Even when he refutes his critics, Lonergan acknowledges that the answers he has given will only raise "further and more complicated questions" (Lonergan 1971, 223-34).

In "Christian Conversion in the Writings of Bernard Lonergan," Charles Curran examines the place of conversion in theology, the reasons for its meager development in Roman Catholic theology, and the place of conversion in Protestant theology, and uses these as helpful perspectives in examining Lonergan's concept of Christian conversion. Writing in 1970, shortly before the publication of *Method in Theology*, Curran argues that Lonergan has yet to develop a systematic explanation of his concept of Christian conversion and its relationship to the other transcendental conversions, intellectual, moral, and religious (Curran 1971, 46). Curran says, "Lonergan must realize that he has employed different and even conflicting terminology in describing Christian conversion as a radical transformation, conversion, development and enlargement, and integration" (ibid. 52). Curran also suggests that Lonergan adopt "a more radical understanding of sin in terms of relationships or of a condition of separation from, neighbor, self and the world--which, however, still sees the sinful man as a self-transcending subject who finds his own fulfillment in the supernatural

solution to the problem of evil which is aptly described as Christian conversion" (ibid.).

Curran has also argued that Lonergan's notion of conversion remains open to the charge of individualism because of its failure to pay sufficient attention to the social, ecclesial, and cosmic aspects of redemption:

> In *De Verbo Incarnato* sin was explained merely in terms of an act and the malice was seen in relationship to God; whereas sin involves man in the core of his being and affects his multiple relationships with God, neighbor, and the world. Redemption, at least in *De Verbo Incarnato*, emphasized the personal or individual aspect without developing the cosmic and social aspect. One would not expect this work to include a full-scale development of the ecclesial understanding of redemption for the Christian but at least some mention of this dimension is necessary. In *insight* Lonergan does acknowledge a social and cosmic dimension to the reality of sin by showing how bias and prejudice bring about the social surd. This could serve as a basis for developing a social and cosmic understanding of Christian conversion which seems to be implicit in some of Lonergan's thinking, but one would have to conclude that this aspect of conversion needs further development. The complaint among some Protestant scholars that conversion theology has been too individualistic finds something of a parallel in Johannes B. Metz's criticism that the transcendental method employed by Karl Rahner does not give enough importance to the world and history. At the very least, Lonergan needs to develop the social and cosmic aspects of Christian conversions (ibid. 73).

Curran is perplexed by the relationship that exists among the various levels of conversion that Lonergan describes. He suggests that Lonergan combine "the moral, religious and Christian conversions into one generic concept of conversion which retains the somewhat radical character that Lonergan seems to demand of conversion and which calls for a much closer relationship between the moral, religious and Christian aspects of conversion" (ibid. 55). In the real order, Curran insists, there are only two conversions, the intellectual conversion and existential conversion (ibid. 59).

In light of Curran's criticism (and that offered by Rahner et.al.), Lonergan's analysis leaves him open to the charge that he relativizes Christianity by his lack of emphasis on the role of Christ in the process of conversion. I am not sure how one can sustain the argument

that Lonergan relativizes the Christian faith, especially when some have advanced the argument that his theology is too conservatively Catholic. B.C. Butler, for instance, remarked, "I need not give a detailed account of the heuristic structure whereby Lonergan holds that the solution can be identified. It is, however, sufficiently obvious that anyone who has followed and accepted his argumentation will, at the end of it, face an obligation--if he is not already a Catholic--to make contact with a Catholic priest and seek admission to the Church" (Butler 1971, 4).

Lonergan's analysis seems to conceive of Christianity as one among many religions. He does not sufficiently place Christ at the center of conversion. The grace of God, no doubt, is at work in many non-Christian religions. But in light of the New Testament is it not legitimate to argue that grace is not fully transformatory if it does not lead to knowledge of Christ? This leads us to the other conceivable related charge that Lonergan's analysis of conversion is too theologically neutral. Is it not possible for one to be intellectually, morally, and religiously converted, as Lonergan suggests, and still not be converted to Christ?

The concept of horizon, as we know, is a key category in Lonergan's analysis of conversion. Lonergan calls for a "shift in horizon" in order to effect intellectual, moral, and religious conversion. African Christians, Muslims, and traditional religions, would find the idea of "shift in horizon" troubling, if shift here means abdicating one's deeply held religious conviction. The Muslim idea of strict monotheism does not admit of the plurality of persons in the Godhead which the Christian has no problem believing, and the Christian idea of Godhead does not admit of the multiplicity of Godhead which African traditional religions laudably proclaim, or the radical monotheism of Islam. These different theologies of the Godhead have far-reaching implications for the social and moral life of the African who has been socialized in these opposed viewpoints. How can people with diametrically opposed horizons as these people effect a 'shift,' since each has been bound and imprisoned by his or her own religious horizon? Is a shift ever possible, given the differences in horizons that ipso facto lead to opposed viewpoints and value judgments? Is it not possible for one to be converted and still have undifferentiated consciousness, which in turn would make it difficult to effect a "shift in horizon?" But in

spite of these perceived shortcomings, Lonergan scholarship is a rich resource that cannot be overlooked, as I shall explain next.

ASSETS

Lonergan has been situated within that Thomistic school that comes from the Louvain tradition. The Louvain Thomist tradition was founded in 1889 at the University of Louvain's Higher Institute of Philosophy, largely due to the influence of Pope Leo XIII's *Aeterni Patris*, which called for a revival of Thomism. Ralph McInerny has argued that the appointment of Cardinal Desire Mercier to a chair of the philosophy of St. Thomas, at the University of Louvain, marked the beginning of that university's ascendancy to the front ranks of the Thomistic Revival. "From then on, its faculty and then its students would make its impact worldwide" (Boileau 2002, xv). In trying to "reach up to the mind of Aquinas," the members of this school engaged in dialogue the post-Kantian philosophical current that was active at the time and confronted the modern denial of faith and the confidence in the certainty of knowledge associated with the findings of modern science. The members of the Louvain tradition saw as their goal, not just the preservation of faith, but also the attainment of truth and epistemological justification of metaphysics.

Cardinal Mercier spoke glowingly about the method of the Louvain tradition, contrasting it with that of the Gregorian university: "At the Gregorian University, the teaching is exclusively in Latin: it is addressed exclusively to clerics, as it must prepare them directly for dogmatic theology that the Gregorian University is honored, with all the rights, to teach with predilection and success. "At the Institute of Louvain, the teaching is, in content and in form, quite different. It is addressed to an elite of young lay people and, at the same time, to an important group of ecclesiastics. By the will of its august founder, it has been established in the heart of a university so that, at the classes of logic, of metaphysics, of cosmology, of psychology, of moral, of social philosophy and of theodicy that are forming the fundamental part of the traditional programs, we could easily add classes of physics, chemistry, general biology, anatomy, physiology, psycho-physiology, economical and political sciences. Furthermore, the philosophy of St. Thomas is not only the object of learned expose, it is still conformed, in a teaching done in French, with the thoughts of the modern or con-

temporary masters of philosophy. Whoever has had the opportunity to read the written or published works by the doctors of the school of Louvain, has been able to realize that Kant, Herbert, Spencer, Courte, Marx, Fouillee, Boutroux, Bergson, are cited and studied with the same attention as Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, Suarez, and Cajetan" (ibid. 509-510).

Cardinal Mercier, in extolling the virtue of this school, described it as "unity of purpose, diversity of methods according to the circumstances they work in: *in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*" (ibid. 512). Lonergan has been associated with this school, not only because he responded to the Leonine mandate to revive the study of Thomism, but also because he worked tirelessly to combat the epistemological problems of his time. As an active and prominent member of this tradition, Lonergan provides a useful resource for combating and refuting errors that extend beyond the confines of Europe, a resource I have argued, useful for engaging in dialogue in a religiously and ethnically diverse society, such as sub-Saharan Africa. Lonergan explains the benefit of his long years of studying Aquinas this way:

> After spending years reaching up to the mind of Aquinas, I came to a two fold conclusion. On the one hand, that reaching had changed me profoundly. On the other hand, that change was the essential benefit. For not only did it make me capable of grasping what, in the light of my conclusions, the *vetera* really were, but also opened challenging vistas on what the *nova* could be (Lonergan 1970, 748).

Among the many lessons one can learn from Lonergan's years of "reaching up to the mind of Aquinas" is that the quest for truth, and personal appropriation of one's rational self-consciousness, is a long and arduous task that can be accomplished, a lesson I believe bodes well for anyone who loves *veritas*.

In the midst of the turmoil engulfing many an African country, largely due to intolerance, polarization along ethnic and religious lines, and blatant disregard for the good of order, the journey to which Lonergan invites us, a journey that is also an invitation to discover our own mental activities, is especially significant. The quest for knowledge, he reminds us, is not "any recondite intuition but the familiar event that occurs easily and frequently in the moderately intelligent, rarely and with difficulty only in the very stupid" (ibid. IX). "Stupidity" can be induced and supported by scotoma. This explains why in the ideal de-

tective story one may be given all the clues and yet fails to spot the criminal (ibid.). Perhaps the reason why one fails to "spot the criminal" is because "reaching the solution is not the mere apprehension of any clue, not the mere memory of all, but a quite distinct activity of organizing intelligence that places the full set of clues in a unique explanatory perspective" (ibid). By helping us "spot the criminal," Lonergan helps us discover our own dynamic power of inquiry. There is a "supervening act of understanding" that goes with the search for knowledge. The search for knowledge is a personal, though not solitary, journey that begins with the four levels of consciousness: experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding. There is an intrinsic interconnectedness between these four levels. One understands only because one has experienced, one weighs evidence and makes judgment simply because one has understood, and one makes decisions only because one has had grounds for making a judgment. In making the case that the aim of his work is to help one gain insight to insight, Lonergan has this to say:

> Mathematicians seek insight into sets of elements. Scientists seek insight into ranges of phenomena. Men of common sense seek insight into concrete situations and practical affairs. But our concern is to reach the act of organizing intelligence that brings within a single perspective the insights of mathematicians, scientists, and men of common sense (ibid.).

That Lonergan helps us correlate, as he said, "within a single perspective, the insights of mathematicians, scientists, and men of common sense" underscores the fact that one of his chief contributions is gnoseological (epistemology). Epistemology is a foundational issue. One can make the argument that the problems that confront sub-Saharan Africa are reducible to gnoseological problems. When the Hutu, for instance, thinks the Tutsi is not trustworthy and reprehensible, how did the Hutu arrive at such a body of knowledge? Or when the Arab Sudanese considers his or her black Sudanese neighbor inferior and detestable, on what basis is the Arab Sudanese assumption of their superiority justified? When the African Christian considers his Muslim neighbor or her ATR counterpart unworthy of salvation and therefore subject to forced proselytization under the pain of extermination, how did the African Christian arrive at such a grandiose knowledge? Isn't this attempt to impose one's culture or religion and lord it over oth-

ers a form of classicism that Lonergan goes at length to repudiate? Without doubt, the most significant aspect of Lonergan's cognitional theory, for us as Africans, is that Lonergan helps us discover ourselves. He introduces us to ourselves and helps us discover what is wrong in our hitherto long-held assumptions. By discovering what is wrong in our assumptions, and by remedying them through the self-correcting process of learning, we come to a more true knowledge that we can appropriate. This is why Lonergan's self-appropriation activities are very important for a society like ours that is still grappling with a lot of social ills. Self-appropriation becomes important in the quest to cure the social ills of ethnic and religious violence.

In the two Thomist studies he completed between 1938 and 1949, Lonergan, in delving into the mind of Aquinas, takes up some critical philosophical problems that emerged from his reading of Aquinas. In "The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas," which he wrote in an attempt to come to terms with what Aquinas means by *emanatio intelligibilis* (intelligible emanation) of the inner word (*verbum*) as distinct from understanding (*intelligere*), Lonergan explores not only the psychology but also the metaphysics of Aquinas' theory of intellect.[2] He argued that to understand what Aquinas meant by *intelligere* (understanding), "one must practice introspective rational psychology; without that, one no more can know the created image of the Blessed Trinity, as Aquinas conceived it, than a blind man can know colors" (Lonergan 1997, 24). Lonergan devotes time to exploring the psychological facts of direct and reflective understanding, and discovers, from experience and the writings of Aquinas, evidence to suggest that direct understanding of "insight into phantasm" that produces meaningful definitions and the reflective understanding that grounds concrete judgments are both intelligent processes from which inner words proceed from conscious acts: *actus ex actu* (ibid. 152). In going into the mind of Aquinas, Lonergan makes relevant to us the

---

2   This article was the second of the two Thomist studies (*Grace and Freedom* being the other) Lonergan completed in the years between 1938 and 1949, and was published in five articles in *Theological Studies*, 7 (1946): 349-392, 8 (1947): 35-79, 404-444, 10 (1949): 3-40, 359-93. These articles were later edited and published into a book that appeared in French: *La notion de verbe dans les ecrits de saint Thomas Aquin* (1966) and in English: *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas* (1967). This work has now been re-edited and re-published in English by Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, and can be found in *The Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* vol. 2.

rich thought of Aquinas. In a very pragmatic way, Lonergan shows us the empirical benefits of delving into the intellectualism of Aquinas and brings to light the fact that essential to Aquinas' cognitional theory is understanding, not inner words or concepts. Lonergan reinvents epistemology by helping us "grasp just how it is that our minds are proportionate to knowledge or reality" (ibid. 96). This is especially significant for African Dominicans who are still grappling with the idea of the relevance of Aquinas' writing to modern philosophy and theology.

As Africa struggles to find its bearing in the midst of its multitude of cultures, one of the things Lonergan brings to the table is the awareness that there is no one normative culture to which all should aspire. The idea of a classicist notion of culture is no longer tenable. Classicism, Lonergan reminds us, "is no more than the mistaken view of conceiving culture normatively and of concluding that there is just one human culture" (Lonergan 1996, 124). Ethnic tensions in Africa at times stem from the desire of people from a given tribe to dominate the rest of the populace in a manner that suggests that theirs is a superior culture. After all, the classicist notion of culture, apart from being one, normative, universal, and permanent, is that kind of culture that insists all (i.e. the "uncultured") must aspire to its norms and ideals. Lonergan reminds us that the modern fact is that culture has to be conceived empirically, and "that there are many cultures, and that new distinctions are legitimate when the reasons for them are explained and the older truths are retained" (ibid. xi). The fact is that human beings, as Lonergan reminds us, differ from one another, not only through individuation by matter, but also in their mentalities, characters, and ways of life. "For human concepts and human courses of action are products and expressions of acts of understanding, human understanding develops over time, such development is cumulative, and each cumulative development responds to the human and environmental conditions of its place and time" (ibid. 302). For this reason, the classicist assumption that there is but one culture, whether in Africa, Asia, or Europe, or even in any human organization, can no longer be tenable. Lonergan shows us that even classicism can be repudiated and corrected. Classicism, like every other thing that conflicts with the good of order, is subject to conversion. Rather than seek hegemony, one can seek unity. "The real root and ground of unity is being in love with God—the fact that God's love has flooded our hearts

through the Holy Spirit he has given us (Rom. 5:5)" The acceptance of this gift, Lonergan argues, constitutes religious conversion, which in turn leads to moral and intellectual conversion (ibid. 327).

In the quest to move away from a classicist to a more open and global culture, Lonergan offers three sources of pluralism that may serve as a starting point for future discussion or dialogue: linguistic, social, and cultural differences. These sources of pluralism are very essential in the quest to move away from a classicist notion of culture. Linguistically, the Akan is different from the Fulani, socially, the Ibo is different from the Ewe, and culturally the Yoruba is different from the Massai. Even in religious terms, there are linguistic, social, and cultural differences between Islam, ATR, and Christianity. That is why there is the need for pluralism of expressions when speaking of our faith and ethnicity. The in-fighting among different Christian groups in sub-Saharan Africa in particular makes no sense when considered in this light. These squabbles, it can be argued, stem from the old classicist insistence on worldwide uniformity. Lonergan reminds us that there is a plurality of manners in which Christian meaning and Christian values can be communicated, for "to preach the gospel to all nations is to preach it to every class in every culture in the manner that accords with the assimilative powers of that class and culture" (ibid. 328). Lonergan explains this line of argument further:

> Now a classicist would feel it was perfectly legitimate for him to impose his culture on others. For he conceives culture normatively, and he conceives his own to be the norm. Accordingly, for him to preach both the gospel and his own culture, is for him to confer the double benefit of both the true religion and the true culture. In contrast, the pluralist acknowledges a multiplicity of cultural traditions. In any tradition he envisages the possibility of diverse differentiations of consciousness. But he does not consider it his task either to promote the differentiation of consciousness or to ask people to renounce their own culture. Rather he would proceed from within their culture and he he would seek ways and means of making it into a vehicle for communicating the Christian message (ibid. 363).

At the root of the ethnic skirmishes and the sporadic religious violence in many African countries is structural injustice or structural sin that has been left un-addressed. Lonergan recognizes the power of human sinfulness as well as the character of structural sin. In discuss-

ing the four kinds of bias, Lonergan's point is not so much to highlight bad things people do as to bring to the fore the power of patterns or structures of sinfulness (injustice) that exits in every society. Individual bias, as bad and as damaging as it may be, is not as problematic as group bias and the general bias of common sense. In group bias and general bias of common sense structural injustice becomes more evident, hence the long cycle of decline that accompanies them.

Lonergan's discussion of bias and its various levels is very momentous in its applicability to the African experience. His contribution offers a new way of conceiving and discussing tribal and religious prejudice in a continent beset by these ills. Tribalism is a social fact, and due to the configuration of African countries (as discussed in Chapter One) with tribalism often comes religious fanaticism, which in most cases translates into bigotry. Tribalism and religious zealotry (or bigotry as the case might be) have become a social fact in many sub-Saharan African countries. The causes of this are partly structural and partly behavioral. Tribalism is structural because of the inherited prejudices against people of other tribes or religion one acquires in his or her socialization process, which makes one to live in disdain of these peoples and their religions. A case in point would be the April 2004 ethnic clashes in six remote farming villages between Plateau and Taraba states of central Nigeria, which left scores of people dead. According to the Nigerian Red Cross, which attended to the wounded, the skirmish was between the Muslim Fulani cattle herders and Christian Tarok farmers. They were fighting over land and cattle. Christians in northern and central Nigeria often claim to be victims of inequitable land distribution. Tribalism is also behavioral because of the personal prejudices one acquires by oneself in interacting with people of other tribes or religion. Lonergan provides a new and better category for articulating the problem, the category of bias. When prejudice is conceived in terms of bias, as Lonergan does, this paves way for a solution, i.e. conversion as Lonergan calls it.

Charles Curran lauds Lonergan's attempt to bring the issue of conversion to the fore, at least in Roman Catholic theological circles. Curran admits that Lonergan's assertion that conversion, as a theological topic, receives very little attention in traditional theology, "holds true in Catholic theology although some Protestant theology has paid more attention to the concept." To underscore this point, Curran points out further, "leading French theological dictionaries such as *Dictionnaire de*

Theologiae Catholique, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, and *Catholicisme* do not even contain articles on conversion as such. The manuals of Catholic moral theology do not even mention the term in their quite narrow treatment of moral theology. In the past few years, however, Catholic theology has begun to discuss the reality of conversion. Bernard Haring has insisted on the centrality of conversion in the moral life of the Christian. A 1958 article by Yves Congar develops the concept of conversion with emphasis on the biblical understanding of conversion and the psychological experience of those who are converted, but the article still to a great extent view conversion in terms of confessional conversion to a particular denomination, specifically conversion to Roman Catholicism" (Curran 1971, 41).

Others have also acknowledged that Lonergan' essay on conversion is of great importance to ecclesiology and a useful tool for religious dialogue. B.C. Butler sees a correlation between Lonergan's work and that of Cardinal Newman:

> And one becomes a subject- such is the message of 'Theology in its New Context' —by a 'conversion' which is in principle radical: 'The convert apprehends differently, values differently, relates differently because he has become different. The new apprehension is … not new values so much as a transvaluation of values.' Conversion is personal, but 'it can happen to many and they can form a community to sustain one another in self-transformation, and to help one another in working out the implications, and in fulfilling the promise of their new life. Finally, what can become communal can become historical. It can pass from generation to generation. It can spread from one cultural milieu to another. It can adapt to changing circumstances, confront new situations, survive into a different age, flourish in another period or epoch.' What Lonergan is here describing, in a passage that reminds one of a famous passage in Newman's *Essay on Development*, is the origin and development of the Church. 'Religion,' he says, is conversion in its preparation, in its occurrence, in its development, in its consequents, and alas in its incompleteness, its failures, its breakdowns, its disintegration.' And he goes on to infer that theology should be reflection upon conversion, and it is in such reflection that we can hope to reach a foundation for a renewed theology (Butler 1971, 16-7).

Lonergan's conversion processes suggest practical ways tribalism and religious intolerance can be remedied. His central notion of conversion as a kind of self-transcendence that transforms one and one's world

and germane to the on-going call for a halt to the rash of ethnic and religious violence in sub-Saharan Africa. In April 2004, for instance, The Tablet reported that the Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), an umbrella group that represents different Christian Churches in peace talks with Muslims, pulled out of peace talks with their Muslim counterparts in the northern Nigerian state of Kaduna, citing mounting attacks against Christians, even as the peace talks were taking place. CAN claimed that the peace talks were being undermined by attacks against Christians, attacks that had already claimed hundreds of lives and millions of dollars in lost property, and unequivocably stated that its members had doubts about the "sincerity and commitment to peace" of their Muslim counterparts. According to The Tablet article, although the Jamatu'ul Nasir Islam (JNI), the Muslim partner in dialogue refuted CAN's claim, it in turn accused CAN of "circulating inciting leaflets, videotapes, books in English, Arabic, and Hausa, containing messages of hate and denunciations of Muslims and their faith across northern Nigeria." The accusations and counter-accusations by CAN and JNI lend credence to Lonergan's idea that conversion is a long process of overcoming bias, whether it be individual or group bias. Lonergan's position that conversion is a radical transformation that is accompanied by an interlocking series of developments that bring about changes that are not only personal, but also social, moral, and intellectual is well within reason. The mutual suspicion between CAN and JNI and their accusations and counter-accusations lend weight to the paradox that Lonergan consistently makes clear: that conversion, which is realized in authentic self-realization, is manifested, not in satisfying one's personal desires, but in bringing about the good of the other. This is why conversion must indeed be intellectual, moral, religious and affective. These four kinds of conversion will no doubt enrich religious dialogue in Africa. Redoubled attention, discussion, and dedication among believers to practices that promote and deepen conversion also stands to enrich the church itself. B.C. Butler said it best when he stated:

> But, if conversion is the foundation of religion, and reflection on conversion the foundation of theology, we are brought back to the fact that the Church is, materially speaking, much more than a community of the converted. As already indicated, it contains a large number of the immature, and a large number of drifters. It has been one of its historical characteristics that it has baptized infants

and has refused to turn itself into a sect of saints. It follows that theology has to apply its own dialectic to the data for a renewed ecclesiology. It also seems to me to follow that the theology that will matter for the future will be the reflection of men who are themselves 'authentic' and 'converted' (Butler 1971, 17).

In sum, in his earlier works, Lonergan, as a transcendental Thomist, embraces Thomistic metaphysics, cosmology, and epistemology. In this schema, Lonergan shows himself to be an avowed follower of that Thomistic school of thought that places high premium on cognition and the act of knowing. But in his later works, Lonergan makes a valuable and important shift. Making use of works of Max Scheler and Dietrich von Hildebrand, Lonergan appeals to the fundamentally important affective part of the human person, and emphasizes feeling and value over knowing. Lonergan underscores the importance of feelings, which "relates us, not just to a cause or an end, but to an object," for "without these feelings our knowing and deciding would be paper thin" (Lonergan 1996, 30). Where Thomas emphasizes the natural human capacity for transcendence, Lonergan adds that feelings and value not only help one achieve self-transcendence, but also help us select "an object for the sake of whom or which we transcend ourselves" (ibid. 31). I am not suggesting that Lonergan in his earlier works did not pay attention to the role of feeling. In fact, in *Insight*, Lonergan implicitly alludes to the importance of feelings in arguing that faithfulness to one's knowing ought to be the criteria of morality. Or as he puts it, "from that identity of consciousness there springs inevitably an exigence for self-consistency in knowing and doing" (Lonergan 1970, 599). My point is that the role of feelings is not very explicit in Lonergan's early works. He acknowledges in *Insight* that moral living is difficult, and to help the human person come to terms with this he suggests that the inconsistencies "between knowing and doing can be removed by revising one's knowing into harmony with one's doing" (ibid.). In dealing with such speculative subject matter in his quest for rational self-consciousness, Lonergan pays little attention to feelings, perhaps because of his commitment to the Thomistic schema of knowing. It was not until later that Lonergan began to appreciate the much-needed missing link, the affect. While agreeing with the Thomistic notion that feelings are constituted on the psychic level, Lonergan adds that feelings are also related to the four levels of consciousness (experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding).

The role of feelings in Lonergan's later works is very important in our discussion and quest for authentic conversion in Africa, for an authentic religious conversion manifests itself, not only in changed attitudes, but also in feelings of love, joy, peace, goodness, altruism, gentleness, fidelity, kindness, meekness, self-control, and magnanimity. Such a changed attitude will lead to the much-needed inter-religious and inter-ethnic collaboration that will turn the fortunes of Africa in the right direction.

Speaking on this subject of turning the fortunes of Africa in the right direction, John Paul II, in his message for the 2005 World Day of Peace, invites the world community to be active collaborators in this effort. The Pontiff advocates "a radically new direction for Africa" where the need to create new forms of solidarity, at bilateral and multilateral levels through a more and decisive commitment, and the conviction that the well-being of the peoples of Africa is an indispensable condition for the attainment of the universal common good becomes the driving force behind this collaboration.[3]

The Pontiff, no doubt, was right in connecting the fortunes of Africa with that of the international community and also for suggesting that the well-being of the peoples of Africa is an indispensable condition for the attainment of the universal common good. But if, as Lonergan reminds us, that society is self constituting in the sense that it trains its own personnel, distinguishes roles, and assigns each one his or her own tasks in the effort to promote the common good (Lonergan 1996, 363), then the peoples of Africa cannot forever depend on foreign aid and shirk their responsibility. There has to be, not only a new political culture, but also a new economic, social, and religious culture that will undo the mischief of ethnic and religious conflicts (bias). This new culture can be attained by changed attitude, or through what Lonergan has described as a process of conversion that is religious, moral, intellectual, and affective. It is also by this process that the peoples of Africa can become, in the words of John Paul II, "the protagonists of their own future and their own cultural, civil, social and economic development."

---

3 See www.zenit.org; accessed on Dec. 17, 2004. This news organization has also reported that John Paul II has announced the convocation of the second Synod of Bishops for Africa.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

Lonergan B. 1974. *A Second Collection*. Ed. Ryan William & Tyrell Bernard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1971. "Bernard Lonergan Responds." In *Foundations of Theology: Papers From the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Ed. Philip Mcshane. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

———. 1967. *Collection: Papers by Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. F. E. Crowe. New York: Herder & Herder.

———. 1997. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan: Insight*. Vol.3. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1980. *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan: Understanding and Being* Vol.5. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2002. *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1940. Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Ph.D. Dissertation. Pontifical Gregorian University Rome.

———. 1970. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. Paperback edition. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

———. 1951. "Le role de l'universite catholique dans la monde moderne." *Relations* 11: 263-65.

———. 1996. *Method in Theology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1978. "Religious Experience," in Thomas A. Dunne and Jean-Marc Laporte, eds. *Trinification of the World*. Toronto: Regis College Press.

———. 1978. "Religious Knowledge," in Fred Lawrence, ed. *Lonergan Workshop*. Missoula: Scholars Press.

———. 1946. "The Concept of Verbum in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas." *Theological Studies* 7: 349-92.

———. 1948. "The Concept of Verbum in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas." *Theological Studies* 8: 35-79, 404-444.

———. 1949. "The Concept of Verbum in the Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas." *Theological Studies* 10: 2-40, 359-393.

———. 1978. "The Dimensions of Conversion," In Walter E. Conn, ed. *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. New York: Alba House.

———. 1977. "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods." *Studies in Religion* 6:4: 341-55.

———. 1978. "Theology in its New Context." In Walter E. Conn, ed. *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. New York: Alba House.

B. STATEMENTS OF AFRICAN EPISCOPAL CONFERENCES

African Delegation to the Synod of Bishops. 1983. "Appel a la reconciliation et a la penitence en Afrique." *La Documentation Catholique 1864*: 1182-1183.

Association of Episcopal Conferences of Anglophone West Africa (AECAWA). 1998. *A Self Reliant Church*. Kumasi, Ghana: AECAWA.

———. 2003. "Statement on Inter-Religious Dialogue. November 10-14.

Association of Member Episcopal Conferences in Eastern Africa (AMECEA). 1995.

"The Twelfth AMECEA Plenary Resolutions on Development." *African Ecclesial Review* 37: 353-359.

Catholic Bishops' Conference of Kenya. 1990. "A Society Built on Peace and Love." *Catholic International* 1: 89-92.

Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria. 1992. "The People's Responsibility To Themselves." *Catholic International* 3: 1039-1041.

Catholic Bishops' Conference of Zambia. 1990. "Economics, Politics, and Justice." *African Ecclesial Review* 32: 314-321.

Episcopal Conferences of All-Africa. 1982. "Report on the Experiences of the Church in the Work of Evangelization in Africa." In *Modern Missionary Documents and Africa*, ed. Raymond Hickey, OSA, 209-245. Dublin: Dominican publications.

Southern African Bishops Conference. 1999. *Economic Justice in South Africa*. Pretoria.

Statement of Catholic Bishops of East Africa. 1999. August 6.

Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar. 1997. "Africa Will Rise." *Catholic International* 8 : 355-359.

———. 1997. "Church as Family of God and Hope for Africa." *African Ecclesial Review* 39: 278-285.

———. 2001. *Pastoral Letter*.

The Catholic Bishops Conference of Cameroon. 2000. *Of Goodwill on Corruption.*

The Catholic Bishops Conference of Nigeria. 2001. *A Communiqué.*

———. 2003. "Hope for a Better Nigeria."

———. 2003. "Seeking the Way of Peace."

The Catholic Bishops Conference of Sudan. 2000. "Bishops in plea to IGAD."

C. STATEMENTS FROM THE SYNOD FOR AFRICA

Africa Faith and Justice Network, ed. 1996. *The African Synod: Documents, Reflections, Perspectives.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Synod of Bishops Special Assembly for Africa. 1990. "Lineamenta Questions." *African Ecclesial Review* 32: 322-329.

———. 1991. "Lineamenta." *African Ecclesial Review* 33: 1-100.

———. 1993. "Instrumentum Laboris: Evangelizing Mission of the Church in Africa." *Origins* 22: 653-684.

———. 1994. "Synod of Resurrection for the Family of God: Final Message of the Synod For Africa." *Catholic International* 5: 360-377.

D. STATEMENTS FROM NON-AFRICAN EPISCOPAL CONFERENCES

Bernard Cardinal Law. 2000. "Statement on Sudan."

Caritas Internationalis. 2002. *Caritas Internationalis, Peacebuilding: A Caritas Training Manual.* Vatican City.

John Paul II. 1995. *The Church in Africa (Ecclesia in Africa) And Its Evangelizing Mission Towards the Year 2000*: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation.

Washington DC: United States Catholic Conference.

Pontifical Commission 1988. *Iustitia et Pax. The Church and Racism: Towards a More Fraternal Society.* Vatican City.

Pontifical Council for Inter-Religious Dialogue. 1994. *Recognize the Spiritual Bonds Which Unite Us.* Vatican City.

———. 1999. *Journeying Together: The Catholic Church in Dialogue with the Religious Traditions of the World.* Vatican City: Liberia Editrice Vaticana.

The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide. 1907. *Collectanea S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide sue Decreta, Instructiones, Prescripta pro apostolicis missionibus (1622-1866).* Vol. 1. No.35. Rome.

The Vatican. 2000. *Statistical Yearbook of the Church, 2000*. Vatican City: Liberia Editrice Vaticana.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. 2001. *A Call to Solidarity with Africa: A Statement of US Catholic Bishops*. Washington DC: USCCB Publishing.

———. 2002. *Answering the Call to Solidarity With Africa*. Washington DC: USCCB Publishing.

E. Secondary Works

Adam, H. 1995. "Clan Conflicts and Democratization in Somalia." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Glickman, H, 197-226. Atlanta: The African Studies Association Press.

Adedeji, A. 1986. "Towards the Dawn of the Third Millenium," in *Diakonia 2000*

Called To Be Neighbours: Official Report, Larnaca Consultation 1986 ed. Klaus Poser, 35-49. Geneva: WCC Publications.

Aden, LeRoy. 1992. "Faith and the Developmental Cycle." In *Christian Perspectives on Human Development*. Ed. L. Aden, D.G. Benner and J.H. Ellens, 19-33. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Allan, T.J. 1995. *Womanist and Feminist Aesthetics*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

Allport, G. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addisson-Wesley.

Ankrah, K.E. 1979. "Church and Politics in Africa." In *African Theology En-Route. Papers From the Pan-African Conference of Third World Theologians (December 1977)*, eds. Kofi Appiah-Kubi & Sergio Torres, 155-161. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Appiah, A. 1994. "Identity, Authenticity, Survival: Multicultural societies and Social Reproduction." *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutman. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appleby, Scot R. 2003. "Catholic Peace Building." *America* September: 12-15.

Arinze, F. 2002. *Religions For Peace: A Call for Solidarity to the Religions of the World*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Arndt, S. W. 1991. "The Justification of Lonergan's Cognitional and Volitional Process." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65: 45-61.

Arthur, B. & Maynard, M. 1984. *Sexism, Racism and Oppression*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Awolowo, O. 1947. *Path To Nigerian Freedom*. London: Faber & Faber.

Bailey, R.C. & Grant, J., eds. 1995. *The Recovery of Black Presence*. Nashville.

Baitu, J. 1999. "Christian Ethical Principles and Societal Problems in Sub-Saharan Africa." *African Christian Studies* 15: 1-18.

Banton, M. 1966. "Africa South of the Sahara." In *Research on Racial Relations*. UNESCO.

Barden, G. & Mcshane, P. 1969. *Towards Self Meaning*. New York: Herder & Herder.

Barth, K. 1978. "The Awakening to Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 35-49. New York: Alba House.

Baum, G. 1978. "Critical Theology." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 281-295. New York: Alba House.

Baum, G. & Wells, H., eds. 1997. *The Reconciliation of Peoples: Challenge to the Churches*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Boahen, Adu. 1987. *African Perspectives on Colonialism*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Boileau, D.A., ed. 2002. *Cardinal Mercier's Philosophical Essays: A Study in Neo-Thomism*. Leuven: Peeters.

Bolaffi, Guido, et. al., eds. 2003. *Dictionary of Race, Ethnicity & Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. 1982. "Crisis of Liberal Democratic Capitalism: The Case of the United States." *Politics and Society* 11: 51-94.

———. 1986. *Democracy and Capitalism: Property, community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought*. New York: Basic Books Publishers.

Braxton, E. K. 1978. "Bernard Lonergan and Black Theology." *Civilisation noire et Eglise catholique*. Paris.

Breault, J. A. 1978. *A Transformed Mind and Heart*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books.

Bronkhorst, D. 1995. *Truth And Reconciliation: Obstacles and Opportunities for Human Rights*. Amsterdam: Amnesty International.

Bronowski, J. 1973. *The Accent of Man*. Boston: Little Brown.

Brown, R. 1985. "Exploitation or Exclusion." *Sociology* 19:2: 233-5

Buckser, A. & Glazier D. S., eds. 2003. *The Anthropology of religious conversion*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bujo, B. 1992. *African Theology in its Social Context*. Translated by John O'Donohue. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1993. *Die etische Dimension der Gemeinschaft: Das afrikanische Modell im Nord-Sud-Dialog*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder.

———. 2001. *Foundations of an African Ethic: Beyond the Universal Claims of Western Morality*. Translated by Brian McNeil. New York: Crossroad.

———. 1998. *The Ethical Dimensions of Community: The African Model and Dialogue Between North and South*. Nairobi, Kenya: Paulines Publications.

Burrel, D., ed. 1967. *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*. Notre Dame.

Butler, B.C. 1971. "Lonergan and Ecclesiology." In *Foundations of Theology: Papers From the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Ed. Philip Mcshane. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Cannon, K. 1988. *Black Womanist Ethics*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 1995. *Katie's Canon*. New York: Continuum.

———. 1985. *God's Fierce Whimsy: Christian Feminism & Theological Education* ed. New York.

———. 1988. *Inheriting Our Mother's Gardens* ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Carmody, D. 1988. "The Desire for Transcendence: Religious Conversion." In *The Desires of the Human Heart: an introduction to the theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press.

Carmody, D. L. & Carmody, J. T. 1988. *Peace and Justice in the Scriptures of the World Religions: Reflections on Non-Christian Scriptures*. New York: Paulist Press.

Clark, J. F. 1995. "Ethno Regionalism and a Democratization in Zaire." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Harvey Glickman. Atlanta: African Studies Association Press.

Conn, W. E. 1979. "Bernard Lonergan and Authenticity: The Search for a Valid Criterion of the Moral Life." *The American Benedictine Review* 30: 301-21.

———. 1986. *Christian Conversion: A Developmental Interpretation of Autonomy and Surrender*. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1981. *Conscience: Development and Self-Transcendence*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

———. 1978. *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation* ed. New York: Alba House.

———. 1979. "Ethical Style for the Creative Conscience." *Louvain Studies* 7: 183-94.

———. 1983. "Moral Conversion: Development Toward Critical Self-Possession." *Thought* 58: 170-87.

———. 1981. "Moral Development: Is Conversion Necessary?" In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

———. 1998. *The Desiring Self: Rooting Pastoral Counseling and Spiritual Direction In Self-Transcendence*. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1978. "The Ontogenetic ground of Value: On Bernard Lonergan's Transcendental Analysis of the Human Subject and the Developmental Perspectives of Erik Erikson, Jean Piaget, and Lawrence Kohlberg." In *Theological Studies* 39: 313-35.

Copeland, S. 1991. *A Genetic Study of the Idea of the Human Good in the Thought of Bernard Lonergan*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: Boston College.

———. 1987. "The Interaction of Racism, Sexism, and Classism in Women's Exploitation." *Concilium* 194: 19-27.

———. 1998. "Women and the Country of Knowing." *Women of Spirit 2*: 5-20.

Corcoran, P., ed. 1975. *Looking at Lonergan's Method*. Dublin: Talbot Press.

Cross, A. 1981. *Death in Tenured Position*. New York: Dutton.

Crowe, F. 2000. *Three Thomist Studies: Supplementary Issue of Lonergan Workshop* 16: viii-ix.

Crysdale, C. S.W. 1992. "Lonergan and Feminism." *Theological Studies* 53: 234-56.

Curran, C. E. 1978. "Conversion: The Central Moral Message of Jesus." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 225-245. New York: Alba House.

———. 1971. "Christian Conversion in the Writings of Bernard Lonergan." In *Foundations of Theology: Papers from the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Ed. Philip Mcshane. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Davis, C. 1986. *What is Living, What is Dead in Christianity Today? Breaking the Liberal-Conservative Deadlock*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Denny, F. M. 2006. *An Introduction to Islam* 3d edition. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Dixon-Krauss, L. 1996. *Vitgosky in the Classroom: Mediated Literacy Instruction and Assessment*. New York: Longman Publishers.

Doran, R. M. 1979. "Aesthetic Subjectivity and Generalized Empirical Method." *Thomist* 43: 257-78.

———. 1988. "Introduction-Lonergan: An Appreciation." In *The Desires of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1979. "Jungian Psychology and Christian Spirituality." *Review for Religious* 38: 497-510.

———. 1979. "Jungian Psychology and Lonergan's Foundations: A Methodological Proposal." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 47: 200-23.

———. 1977. "Psychic Conversion." *The Thomist*: 200-236.

———. 1977. "Subject, Psyche, and Theology's Foundations." *Journal of Religion* 267- 287.

———. 1977. *Subject and Psyche: Ricoeur, Jung and the Search for Foundations.* Washington: University press of America.

———. 1990. *Theology and Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1978. "The Theologian's Pysche: Notes toward a Reconstruction of Depth Psychology." *Lonergan Workshop I*: 257-278.

Dulles, Avery. 1992. *The Craft of Theology: From Symbol to System*. New York: Crossroad.

Dunne, T. 1994. "Authentic Feminist Doctrine." In *Lonergan and Feminism*. Ed. Cynthia S.W. Crysdale. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1975. *Lonergan on Social Progress and Community: A Developmental Study.* Toronto.

Ela, J. M. 1978. "Le droit a la difference ou l'enjeu actuel des eglises locales en Afrique noire." In *Civilization noire et Eglise catholique: Colloque d'Abidjan 12-17 Septembre, 1977, 204-217*. Paris: Presence Africaine.

———. 1980. *Le cri de l'homme africain: Questions aux chretiens et aux eglises d'Afrique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

———. 1988. *My Faith as an African*. Translated by John Brown & Susan Perry. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1994. "Christianity and Liberation in Africa." Translated by Robert Barr. In *Paths of African Theology*. Ed. Rosino Gibellini, 136-153. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1996. "The Church-Sacrament of Liberation." In *The African Synod: Documents, Reflections, Perspectives*. Ed. Africa Faith and Justice Network, 131-138. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Esack, F. 1997. *Qur'an Liberation & Pluralism: An Islamic Perspective of Interreligious Solidarity Against Oppression*. Oxford: OneWorld.

Esposito, J. L, ed. 1999. *The Oxford History of Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, S.M., and Boyte, H.C. 1992. *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eze, E. C. 2001. *Achieving Our Humanity: The idea of the post racial future*. New York: Routledge.

Fluehr-Lobban, C. 1994. *Islamic Society in Practice*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Freire, P. 1974. "Conscientisation." *The Month* 7: 575-578.

French, P. 1975. "Types of Collectives and Blame." *The Personalist* 56: 160-169.

Fuchs, J. 1978. "Sin and Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed.Walter E. Conn, 247-262. New York: Alba House.

Gadamer, H. G. 1999. *Truth And Method* Second Revised Edition. Translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Continuum.

Gelpi, D. L. 1978. *Experiencing God: A Theology of Human Emergence*. New York: Paulist Press.

Giddens, A. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gilligan, C. 1986. *Women's Ways of Knowing: the development of self, voice, and mind* Edited by Mary Field Belenky, et.al. New York: Basic Books.

Grant, J. ed. 1995. *Perspectives on Womanist Theology*. Atlanta.

Greenwald, A.G. & Schuh, E.S. 1994. "An Ethnic Bias in Scientific Citations." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 24: 623-639.

Gregson, V., ed. 1988. *The Desires of the Human Heart: an introduction to the theology of Bernard Lonergan*. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1988. "The Desire to Know: Intellectual Conversion." In *The Desires of the Human Heart: an introduction to the theology of Bernard Lonergan* ed. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1981. "The Historian of Religions and the Theologian: Dialectics and Dialogue." In Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

———. 1988b. "Theological Method and Theological Collaboration II." In *The Desires of the Human Heart: an introduction to the theology of Bernard Lonergan* ed. New York: Paulist Press.

Gruchy, J. 1997. "The Dialectics of Reconciliation: Church and the Transition to Democracy in South Africa." In *The Reconciliation of Peoples: Challenge to the Churches*. Ed. G. Baum and H. Wells. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Habermas, J. 1994. "Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State." *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hackett I.J. R. 1999. "Radical Christian Revivalism in Nigeria and Ghana." In *Proselytization And Communal Self-Determination In Africa*. Ed. An-

Na'im A. Abdullahi, 246-267. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Hammond, D. M. 1988. "Imagination in Newman's Phenomenology of Cognition." *The Heythrop Journal* 29: 21-32.

Happel, S. & Walter, J. 1986. *Conversion and Discipleship: A Christian Foundation for Ethics and Doctrine*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Haring, B. 1978. "The Characteristics of Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 213-223. New York: Alba House.

Haughton, R. 1978. "Formation and Transformation." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 23-26. New York: Alba House.

Heilbrun, C. 1983. *The Representation of Women in Fiction* Edited with an introduction by C.G. Heilbrun & Margaret Hugonnet. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

———. 20002. *When Men were the only Models we had: my teachers Barzun,Fadiman, and Trilling*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

———. 1999. *Women's Lives: the view from the threshold*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 1988. Writing *a Woman's Life*. New York: Norton.

Heiler, F. 1959. "The History of Religions as a Preparation for the Cooperation of Religions." In *The History of Religions*, 142-153. Ed. M. Eliade and J. Kitagawa. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Henriot, P. J. 1978. "Social Sin and Conversion: A Theology of the Church's Social Involvement." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 315-326. New York: Alba House.

Hiltner, S. 1978. "Toward a Theology of Conversion in the Light of Psychology." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed.Walter E. Conn, 179-190. New York: Alba House.

Hinze, B. 2000. "Ecclesial Repentance and the Demands of Dialogue." *Theological Studies* 61: 207-238.

———. 1998. "Ethnic and Racial Diversity and the Catholicity of the Church" in *Theology: Expanding the Borders*. Ed. Aquino, M.P and Goizueta, 162-199. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

Hobbes, T. 1957. *Leviathan*. Edited with an introduction by Michael Oakeshot. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hollenbach, D. 1979. *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition*. New York: Paulist Press.

———. 1994. *Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public*

Philosophy ed. With Bruce R. Douglass. New York: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2002. *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: University Press.

———. 2003. *The Global Face of Public Faith: Politics, Human Rights, and Christian Ethics*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

———. 1983. *Nuclear Ethics*. New York: Paulist Press.

Huber, W. 1996. *Violence: The Unrelenting Assault on Human Dignity* Translated by Ruth C.L. Gritsch & Foreword by Daniel Berrigan. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Hunt, C. & Walker, L. 1974. *Ethnic Dynamics: Patterns of intergroup relations in various societies*. Homewood, ILL: Dorsey Press.

Hurston, Z. 1978. *Their Eyes were Watching God*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Huszar, G. 1946. *The Anatomy of Racial Intolerance*. New York: The H.W. Wilson Co.

Idowu, B. 1973. *African Traditional Religion*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Ivo, C. 2001. *Hermeneutics and Method: The 'Universal Viewpoint' in Bernard Lonergan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

James, William. 1978. "The Divided Self and Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives On Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed.Walter E. Conn, 121-136. New York: Alba House.

Jenkins, R. 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments & Explorations*. London: Sage Publications.

Johnson, P. E. 1978. "Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 169-178. New York: Alba House.

Kidder, P. 1994. "Woman of Reason: Lonergan and Feminist Epistemology." In *Lonergan and Feminism*. Ed. Cynthia S.W. Crysdale. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kohlberg, L. 1973. "The Claim to Moral Adequacy of a Highest Stage of Moral Judgment." *The Journal of Philosophy* 70: 631-2.

Komonchak, J. A. 1988. "The Church." In *The Desire of the Human Heart: An Introduction to the Theology of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Vernon Gregson. New York: Paulist Press.

Kritzeck, J. & Lewis, W. H, eds. 1969. *Islam in Africa*. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold Co.

Kruszewski, A. Hough, R. & Ornsetein-Galicia, J., eds. 1982. *Politics and*

Society in the Southwest: Ethnicity and Chicano Pluralism. Boulder, CO: West-view Press.

Kung, H. 1978. "Christian Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 273-277. New York: Alba House.

Lacan, D. M. 1978. "Conversion and Grace in the Old Testament." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 75-96. New York: Alba House.

———. 1978. "Conversion and Kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 97-118. New York: Alba House.

LaCentra, W. 1987. *The Authentic Self: Toward a Philosophy of Personality*. New York: Peter Lang.

La Farge, J. 1937. *Interracial Justice*. New York: America Press.

———. 1950. *No Postponement: US Moral Leadership and the Problem of Racial Minorities*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

———. 1956. *The Catholic Viewpoint On Race relations*. New York: Hanover House.

———. 1945. *The Race Question And The Negro: a study of the Catholic Doctrine of Interracial Justice*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

Lamb, M. L. 1978. *History, Method, and Theology: A Dialectical Comparison of Wilhelm Dilthey's Critique of Historical Reason and Bernard Lonergan's Meta-Methodology*. American Academy of Religion Dissertation Series 25. Missoula: Scholars Press.

———. 1981. "Praxis and Generalized Empirical Method." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

———. 1982. Solidarity with Victims: Toward a Theology of Social Transformation. New York: Crossroad.

Landis, D. & Boucher, J. 1986. "Themes and Models of Conflict," in *Ethnic Conflict: International Perspectives*. Ed. Jerry Boucher, et.al. London: Sage Publications.

Lawrence, F., ed. 1978. *Lonergan Workshop*. Missoula: Scholars Press.

———. 1978. "Political Theology and 'The Longer Cycle of Decline.'" In *Lonergan Workshop* vol.1: 239-243.

Lindell, I. 1977. *Church and Revolution in Rwanda*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Levtzion, N. Randall P. & Randall L, eds. 2000. *The History of Islam in Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press.

———. 1997. "The Church and Genocide: Lessons from the Rwandan Tragedy." In *The Reconciliation of Peoples: Challenge to the Churches*, 43-55. Ed. Gregory Baum and Harold Wells. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Loewe, W. P. 1994. "Foreword." In *Lonergan and Feminism*. Ed. Cynthia S.W. Crysdale. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Logan, S.W. ed. 1995. *With Pen and Voice: a critical anthology of nineteenth-century African-American Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Lwaminda, P. 1991. "The African Background to the African Synod." *Catholic International* 2: 1074-1076.

MacKinnon, A. S. 2004. *The Making of South Africa: Culture and Politics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Magesa, L. 1976. *The Church and Liberation in Africa: Spearhead 44*. Eldoret, Kenya: AMECEA Gaba Publications.

———. 1985. "Instruction on a 'Theology of Liberation': A Comment." *African Ecclesial Review* 27: 3-8.

———. 1991. "Christ the Liberator and Africa Today." In *Faces of Jesus in Africa*. Ed. Robert J. Schreiter, 151-163. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1992. "Am I not a Human Being and a Brother/Sister?" *African Ecclesial Review* 34: 95-114.

———. 1998. "Christian Discipleship in Africa in the 21st Century." *African Ecclesial Review* 40: 320-332.

———. 1998. "The Political Axis of African Liberation Theology." In *Liberation Theologies on Shifting Grounds: A Clash of Socio-Economic and Cultural Paradigms*. Ed. G. De Schrijver, 130-152. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.

Mansini, G. 1988. "Quasi-formal Causality and 'Change in the Other': A Note on Karl Rahner's Christology." *The Thomist* 52: 293-306.

Maphai, V. T. 1995. "Liberal Democracy and Ethnic Conflict in South Africa." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Glickman, H, 71-119. Atlanta: The African Studies Association Press.

Marsh, J. 1999. *Process, Praxis and Transcendence*. New York: SUNY Press.

Marty, M.E. 1994. "From Centripetal to the Centrifugal in Culture and Religion: The Revolution within This Half Century." *Theology Today* 51:1: 5-16.

Matustik, M. J. 1988. *Mediation of Deconstruction: Bernard Lonergan's Method in Philosophy. The Argument from Human Operational Development*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

May, L. 1987. *The Morality of Groups: Collective Responsibility, Group-Based Harm, and Corporate Rights*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press.

Mbiti, John. 1969. *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.

McKnight, S. 2002. *Turning To Jesus: The Sociology of Conversion in the Gospels*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

McShane, P., ed. 1970. *Foundations of Theology: Papers From the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Dublin: Gill and MacMillan.

———. 1970. *Language Truth and Meaning: Papers from the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Melchin, K. R. 1987. *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability: Ethics, Society and History in the Work of Bernard Lonergan*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

———. 1988. *Living with Other People: An Introduction to Christian Ethics Based on Lonergan*. Liturgical Press.

———. 1995. "Pluralism, Conflict, and the Structure of the Public Good." In *The promise of critical theology: essays in honor of Charles Davis*. Ed. Marc P. Lalonde, 75- 92. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

———. 2001. "The Cognitional Theory of Bernard Lonergan and the Structure of Ethical Deliberation." In *Ethical Deliberation in Multiprofessional Health Care Teams*. Ed. Doucet, H, Larouche, J. and Melchin, K, 113-128. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Memmi, A. 1968. *Dominated Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Merton, T. 1978. "Final Integration." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 263-272. New York: Alba House.

Meynell, H. 1978. "On Objections to Lonergan's 'Method.'" *The Heythrop Journal* 19: 405-10.

Mooney, H. A. 1992. *The Liberation of Consciousness: Bernard Lonergan's Theological Foundations in Dialogue with the Theological Aesthetics of Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Frankfurt Am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht.

Morelli, M. & Morelli, E. 1997. *The Lonergan Reader*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Morrison, K. F. 1992. *Understanding Conversion*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Muigai, G. 1995. "Ethnicity and the Renewal of Competitive Politics in Kenya." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Glickman, H, 161-196. Atlanta: The African Studies Association Press.

Murphy, R. 1985. "Exploitation or Exclusion?" *Sociology* 19: 225-43.

Mushete, N. 1989. *Les Themes majeurs de la theologie africaine*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Mveng, E. 1992. "The African Synod: Prolegomena for an African Council?" Translated by John Bowden. In *Toward the African Synod: Concilium*, 1992/1. Ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Alphone Ngindu Muchete, 112-128. London: SCM Press.

———. 1994. "Impoverishment and Liberation: A Theological Approach for Africa and the Third World." Translated by Robert R. Barr. In *Paths of African Theology*. Ed. Rosino Gibellini, 154-165. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1996. "The Historical Background of the African Synod." In *The African Synod: Documents, Reflections, Perspectives*. Ed. Africa Faith and Justice Network, 20-31. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Mveng Englebert & Lipawing, B.L. 1996. *Theologie, Liberation et cultures africaines: Dialogue sur l'anthropologie Negro-africaine*. Yaoundé, Cameroon: Editions CLE.

Mwikamba, M. C. 1989. "A Search for an African Identity." *African Ecclesial Review* 31: 91-107.

Niebuhr, R. 1978. "Grace as Power in, and as Mercy Towards, Man." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 27-34. New York: Alba House.

Niebuhr, R. 1963. *The Responsible Self*. New York: Harper & Row.

Nilson, J. 1979. *Hegel's Phenomenology and Lonergan's Insights: A Comparison of Two ways to Christianity*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag anton Hain.

Nmoma, V. 1995. "Ethnic Conflict, Constitutional Engineering and Democracy in Nigeria." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Glickman, H, 311-350. Atlanta: The African Studies Association Press.

Nock, A.D. 1978. "The Idea of Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 65-73. New York: Alba House.

Oakley, A. 1981. *Subject Women*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Oates, W. E. 1978. "Conversion: Sacred and Secular." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Edited by Walter E. Conn, 149-168. New York: Alba House.

O'Callagan, M. 1981. "Rahner and Lonergan on Foundational Theology." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

O'Donohue, J. 1988. "Re-examining religion and its abuses." *African Ecclesial Review* 30: 233-241.

Okolo C. 1982. "Church and Racism: Nigerian Perspective." In *The Church and Racism* ed. G. Baum & J. Coleman. New York: Seabury Press.

———. 1982. "Liberation Theology and the African Church." *Bulletin of African Theology* 4: 173-187.

———. 1991. *The Liberating Role of the Church in Africa Today*. Eldoret, Kenya: AMECEA Gaba Publications.

Okwudiba, N. 1989. *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

O'Neill, M. 1990. *Women Speaking, Women Listening*. New York: Orbis Books.

Oppenheim, M. 1995. "Welcoming the Other: The Philosophical Foundations for Pluralism in the Works of Charles Davis and Emmanuel Levinas." In *The Promise of Critical Theology: Essays in Honor of Charles Davis*. Ed. Lalonde, P. Marc, 93-116. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Ousmane, K. 2003. *Muslim Modernity in Postcolonial Nigeria: A Study of the Society for the Removal of Innovation and Reinstatement of Tradition*. Boston.

Owens, R. 2001. *Organizational Behavior in Education* 7th edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Parker, J. V. 1978. "Bernard Lonergan and Doctrinal Pluralism," in *Bijdragen* (Nijmegen) 39: 152-72.

Passelecq, G. & Suchecky, B. 1997. *The Hidden Encyclical of Pius XI*. Translated from the French by Steven Randall. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.

Pasquier, J. 1978. "Experience and Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 191-200. New York: Alba House.

Patrick, Anne. 1998. "With a Different Ear? Women and Moral Responsibility." *Women of Spirit* 2: 21-32.

Peter, C. L. 1979. "A Shift to the Human Subject in Roman Catholic Theology." *Communio* 6: 56-72.

Pulliam, J. & Van Patten, J. 2003. *History of Education in America* 8th ed. Columbus, OH: Merill Prentice Hall.

Quesnell, Q. 1981. "Beliefs and Authenticity." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan* Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Rahner, K. 1978. "Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 203-211. New York: Alba House.

———. 1994. *Hearer of the Word: Laying the Foundation for a Philosophy of*

Religion. Translated by Joseph Donceel. Edited with an introduction by Andrew Tallon. New York: Continuum.

———. 1971. "Some Critical Thoughts on 'Functional Specialties in Theology.'" In *Foundations of Theology: Papers from the International Lonergan Congress 1970*. Ed. Philip McShane. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Rambo, L. R. 1993. *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Reeves, N. 1971. *Womankind: beyond the stereotypes*. New York: Aldine.

Rende, M. L. 1989. "The Development and the Unity of Lonergan's Notion of Conversion." *Method* 1: 58-73

———. 1989. *Lonergan on Conversion: The Development of a Notion*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Ricoeur, P. 1970. *Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Riggs, M. 1993. *Awake, Arise & Act: a womanist call for Black liberation*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Ring, N. 1981. "Alienation and Reconciliation: The Theological Methods of Paul Tillich and Bernard Lonergan." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Roach, R. 1978. "Nature and Praxis." *Communio* 5: 252-74.

Robinson, D. 2004. *Muslim Societies in African History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobsen, L. 1966. "Teachers' Expectancies: Determinants of Pupils IQ Gains." *Psychological Reports* 19: 115-118.

Ruether, R.R. 1985. *Womanguides: Readings toward a feminist theology*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Schineller, P., ed. 2003. *The Church Teaches: stand of the Catholic Bishops of Nigeria on issues of faith and life*. Abuja: Daily Graphics.

Schreiter, R. J. 1998. *The Ministry of Reconciliation: Spirituality & Strategies*. New York: Orbis Books.

———. 1992. *Reconciliation: Mission & Ministry in a Changing Social World*. New York: Orbis Books.

Sher, G. 1987. "Groups and the Constitution." In *Moral Rights in the Workplace*. Ed. Gertrude Ezorsky. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sithole, M. 1995. "Ethnicity and Democratization in Zimbabwe: From Confrontation to Accommodation." In *Ethnic Conflict and Democratization in Africa*. Ed. Glickman, H, 121-160. Atlanta: The African Studies Association Press.

Sizer, T. & Sizer, N. 1999. *The Students are Watching: Schools and the Moral Contract*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Smith, J. E. 1978. "The Concept of Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 51-61. New York: Alba House.

Smith, M. 1979. "Is There a Thomistic Alternative to Lonergan's Cognitional Structure?" *The Thomist* 43: 626-36.

Spelman, E. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stangor, C., ed. 2000 *Stereotypes and Prejudice: Essential Readings*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Stassen, G. H. 1992. *Just Peacemaking: Transforming Initiatives for Justice and Peace*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Stavenhagen, R. 1996. *Ethnic Conflicts and the Nation-State*. London: MacMillan Press.

Stewart, W.A. 1996. *Introduction to Lonergan's Insight: An Invitation to Philosophize*. Lempeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Tallon, A. 1997. *Head and Heart: Affection, Cognition, Volition as Triune Consciousness*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Taylor, C. 1994. "The Politics of Recognition." In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thielsleton, A. 1992. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Thouless, R. E. 1978. "The Psychology of Conversion." In *Conversion: Perspectives on Personal and Social Transformation*. Ed. Walter E. Conn, 137-147. New York: Alba House.

Towness, E. M., ed. 1999. *A Troubling In My Soul: Womanist Perspectives on Evil and Sufferings*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

———. 1993. *Womanist Justice, Womanist Hope*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Tracy, D. 1971. "Lonergan's Foundational Theology: an Interpretation and a Critique." In Foundations of Theology: Papers from the International Lonergan Congress

 1970. Ed. Philip Mcshane. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

———. 1970. *The Achievement of Bernard Lonergan*. New York.

———. 1981. "Theologies of Praxis." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Trimiew, D. 1993. *Voices of the Silenced: the responsible self in a marginalized community*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press.

Turner, J. et.al. 1987. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Tyrell, B. 1981. "Passages and Conversions." In *Creativity and Method: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*. Ed. Matthew L. Lamb. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Ukpong, J. S. 1996. "A Critical Review of the Lineamenta." In *The African Synod: Documents, Reflections, Perspectives*. New York: Orbis Books.

Uzukwu, E. 1996. *A Listening Church: Autonomy and Communion in African Churches*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Vertin, Michael. 1994. "Gender, Science, and Cognitional Conversion." In *Lonergan and Feminism*. Ed. Cynthia S.W. Crysdale. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vicencio, V. C. 1997. "Telling One Another Stories: Toward a Theology of Reconciliation." In *The Reconciliation of Peoples: Challenge to the Churches*. Ed. G. Baum and H. Wells. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Villalon, L. A. 1995. *Islamic Society and State Power in Senegal: Disciples and citizens in Fatick*. Cambridge: University Press.

Volf, M. 1996. *Exclusion & Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1981. "The Genesis of Higher Mental Functions." In *The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology*. Ed. J.V. Wertsch. New York: Sharpe.

Waines, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Islam* 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, A. 1983. *In Search of Our Mother's Gardens*. New York: Harcourt Press.

Wells H. 1997. "Theology for Reconciliation: Biblical Perspectives on Forgiveness and Grace." In *The Reconciliation of Peoples: Challenge to the Churches* ed. G. Baum & H. Wells. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Young, I. M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zalaquett, J. 1994. *Dealing with the Past: Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*. Ed. Alex Boraine, Janet Levy & Ronell Scheffer. Capetown: IDASSA.

INDEX

D

S