

ADD YOU

I had in fact intended to end my website essay-writing with the four essays in this series, but having finished them in the Summer of 2017, Julio Teixeira, the good editor of *Divyadaan*, asked me for a further contribution to the journal which in fact grew into four essays, appearing in that journal in 2018 and 2019.¹

Now, having submitted those essays, it seems best, in my 87th year, to end my writing efforts, apart from Forum ramblings and normal goings on of e-mail etc. communications and other battered forms of what-shouts in this ongoing negative Anthropocene age of humanity. My efforts have been geared, but in increasingly precise and self-luminous tonalities, to foster “a resolute and effective intervention in this historical process.”² It is as well to give you a lift into a sense of continuity by quoting Lonergan’s expression, at the age of 30, of the form of that intervention.

What is needed is a metaphysics of history, a differential calculus of progress.

But what is progress?

It is a matter of intellect. Intellect is understanding of sensible data. It is the guiding form, statistically effective, of human action, transforming the sensible data of life. Finally, it is a fresh intellectual synthesis understanding the new situation created by the old intellectual form and providing a statistically effective form for the next cycle of human action that will bring forth in reality the incompleteness of the later act of intellect by setting new problems.³

¹ Best list those essays here, since this final essay points to them as climbing guides. In *Divyadaan*’s three volumes of 2018 there are, in the sequence listed, “Minding Reality,” “The Coming Convergence of World Responsiveness,” and “Steps Towards Effectively Converging Religions.” The final fourth essay, for 2019, originally titled “The Interior Lighthouse X, Y” is now titled “Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention.” More about that in the conclusion.

² *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306.

³ “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*, Michael Shute, University of Toronto Press, 2010, pp. 16-34. I quote from page 20. The essay “was very likely written in the spring of 1934” (*ibid.*, 15). Not yet thirty, Lonergan was working his way through his theological studies.

Is it not shocking to see and seize this deep, if thin, heuristic of progress, as anticipating his discovery thirty-one years later of that “statistically effective form for the new cycle of human action”? That later discovery, and its expression by him, was still a thin conceiving and expression. But can you honestly take the stand that it was too thin in expression and conception to take seriously? Can you join with those few, like myself, in some form of those sixteen lines—18-33—of *Method in Theology*, page 250, and, after that discomfoting joining, still claim that its agonizing self-revealing communal articulation of **horizon** (the first mind-blocking word of the block of words) could reasonably lead to the disgusting shambles called *Lonerganism*?

So, I arrive at my final appeal: Adieu; Add you; Add **U**.⁴

U. You?

Yes, a pause for you, of you, perhaps dreadful.⁵ Obviously you have read this far. Was it just an idle curiosity? I recall Fr. Fred Crowe talking of the discomfort his lecture became when he made a point of identifying it as a sermon. I invite you to meet, in some form, your destiny: Kismet, that we already met under *K*, but that you might have met in vague or growing discomfort from my title on through the alphabet. “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.”⁶

At this stage in my Adieu I had thought of fresh reflections on the concluding sections, V, W, X, Y, Z, of the alphabet soup of the first of four *Divyadaan* essays appearing in 2018–2019, but it seems now best not to push you thus forward to a quite new and strange horizon. The fourth of the essays, “Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention,” especially opens up that freshness, and it appears as a celebration of the 50th anniversary of Lonergan essay “Functional Specialization.” That essay has been abominably, disgustingly, treated by his so-called followers, and perhaps the lead up to my offensive ending to this essay might best be the quoting of a few very relevant sections of that first essay, “Minding Reality.” A change of typeface gives it an isolating prominence.

⁴ **U** belongs to the alphabet flow of the essay “Minding Reality,” from which I quote further later.

⁵ See *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, chapter 13, “Subject and Horizon.”

⁶ *Method in Theology*, 299.

D. Deafness

Here a little **Dare**, next a little **Edging**. The dare: might you, as a student of Lonergan, tell me, talk to me about, what you think Lonergan means by the challenge of replacing present hit-and-miss interpretative discussions that are the accepted style of teaching and writing in disciplines that are not healthy sciences, by a science of interpretation? Here I am connecting the last two words of *Method* page 3, "academic disciplines" with the outrageous supposition of *Insight*, 587, line 27: "if interpretation is to be scientific." My own claim here is that the entire Lonergan tradition has been conveniently deaf to Lonergan's appeal, and to the startling achievement of that third section of *Insight* chapter 17. That third section is at the heart of the "third way . . . difficult and laborious" that is proposed on *Method* page 4. But I would make the discomfiting point that it should have been brought into effect even without the shift to functional collaboration. The deafness is a deafness to *Insight's* program for philosophy, theology, and the humanities.

E. "The Empty, the Vapid, the Insipid, the Dull"

So, yes, I move to being offensive, quoting the last thumping words of the short section 6 of *Method* chapter 3, on "Incarnate Meaning," as an insult to the goings-on of Lonergan studies, conferences, teachings. The emptiness is magnificently disguised by standard academic styles of rambling learnedly and referencing copiously. But it is magnificently obvious in its being "effete,"⁷ utterly remote from "a resolute and effective intervention in the historical process."⁸ It is horridly fixed globally on a flywheel of tight neurotic normality.

F. Flywheel

I am contrasting here quite brutally, and some no doubt will say extremely, the motion of the closed cycle of Lonergan studies with the reach of Lonergan's appeal when he wrote, at the age of thirty, about the dynamics of

charity: an eternal fire of optimism and energy, dismayed at naught, rebuked by none, tireless, determined, deliberate; with deepest thought and unbounded spontaneity charity ever strives, struggles, labours, exhorts, implores, prays for the betterment of the unity of action man, for the effective rule

⁷ *Method in Theology*, 99.

⁸ *Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 306.

of sweetness and light, for a fuller manifestation of what charity loves, Wisdom Divine, the Word made Flesh.⁹

To repeat my edging claim, it is a flywheel of scholarly business holding initial meanings in stale uniformity. *Webster's Dictionary* tells the tale. "A heavy wheel for regulating the speed and uniformity of motion of the machine to which it is attached." This is in shocking contrast to the spiraling of meaning within Lonergan's Dream of "The Tower of Able."¹⁰

G. G^{ijk}

The symbol points you, perhaps, at a dreadful existential gap in your life as a cultured thinker. I use it as a symbol of an up-to-date cultured relationship with the Christian God, where N of section A's formula is now three.¹¹ Whatever your tradition you must face some such challenge if you are not to be a hokey-pokey low-key self-protective group hiding behind some holy wall.

So, I come to an end with that challenge to you, to step gallantly away from the hokey-pokey hiding.

The same day that the name came to me for my *Diyadaan* essay of 2019, "Converging Religions to Effective Historical Intervention," I finished John le Carre's most recent novel, *A Legacy of Spies* (Viking, 2017).¹² Near its conclusion (p. 247) there is a passage that struck me as

⁹ "Essay in Fundamental Sociology," *Lonergan's Early Economic Research*, edited with commentaries by Michael Shute, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 43.

¹⁰ See Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2013, 163.

¹¹ The formula is my usual W formula, where in the text of the article I had replaced, at the top, the usual 3P by NP.

¹² John le Carre (David John Moore Cornwell: born 19 October 1931) is four months older than I am, and I have trailed along with him and George Smiley over five or more decades. The film, *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold*, was a small haven when I was struggling in Oxford in the mid-1960s. He has provided useful passages to quote, where editors would hesitate if I 'personally' used the usual four-letter work. A passage from *Absolute Friends* (325–6) that concluded my preface "Collective Futurology" to "Celebrating the 60th Anniversary of Bernard Lonergan's *Insight*," *Diyadaan* 28/2, 2017, is worth repeating here, for the benefit of "the poor fuck of a student" that you may be. "I ask you again: What the fuck do we do to bring sanity and reason back into the political arena, if it was ever there in the first place? Do we need a new electorate? The fuck we do. It's not the people's fault they can't see straight. Do we need new politicians? Sure we do, but it's the electorate that has to find them. I am speaking, Mr. Mundy – I am speaking of something even more important to the development of Western society than the ballot box. I am speaking of the deliberate corruption of

appropriate, and appropriately vulgarly offensive, to borrow for concluding this series. It is a passage spoken by Christopher, the son of a man killed in odd circumstances by a spying operation. He expresses his take on the spying business to one of the suspects in the matter. “You’re all sick. All you spies. You’re not the cure, you’re the fucking disease. Jerk-off artists, playing jerk-off games, thinking you’re the biggest fucking wise guys in the universe. You’re nothing, hear me? You live in the fucking dark because you can’t handle the fucking daylight.”

Are you being drawn into a style of reading Lonergan that is just a sort of espy-ring, killing off Lonergan? Or are you capable of either walking clearly away into commonsense or cherishing the challenge of the Christ-opher-symbol,¹³ G^i_{jk} , that occurred above, that I repeat now, with its short attached slightly-modified text?

G. G^i_{jk}

The symbol points you, perhaps, at a dreadful existential gap in your life as a possible cultured thinker. I use it as a symbol of an up-to-date cultured relationship with the Christian God, where N of section A’s formula is now three. Whatever your tradition you must face some such challenge if you are not to be part of a hokey-pokey low-key self-protective group hiding behind some holy wall.

young minds at their most formative stage. Of the lies that are forced on them from the cradle onwards by corporate or state manipulation, if there is a difference any more between the two, which I begin to doubt. I am speaking of the encroachment of corporate power on every university campus in the first, second and third worlds. I am speaking of educational colonization by means of corporate investment at faculty level, conditional upon the observation of untrue nostrums that are advantageous to the corporate investor, and deleterious for the poor fuck of a student.” (201)

¹³ See Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*, 362ff regarding the Christoffel tensor. I have used it regularly to point to a serious modern thinking about the Trinitarian God. The name *Christ-offer* is a convenient twist.