

Cantower XIII**Functional Specialization and Chapters 17 and 18 of *Insight*****April 1st 2003****13.1 Setting Our Sights**

The “our” in the title refers immediately to the group gathering for the West Dublin conference of August 11th - 15th, 2003, but obviously I would prefer to think of the larger group of those interested in the pursuit and promotion of Lonergan’s meaning. So far, The Revolution which I began this day last year - an Easter Monday as well as April Fool’s day - has been a quiet revolution and this includes rumbles of opposition. I would prefer, indeed, that the opposition be more vocal, even more dialectical: but the latter would be asking too much, since it would be an agreeing with me about the significance of Lonergan’s division of labour.¹ That is, unless it held itself to the dated patterns of controversy called dialectical disagreement that are non-hodic and so fundamentally inefficient.

However, the invitation that I spelled out in section 4 of ***Cantower XI***, “Dialectic Witness”, still stands for all, and it certainly stands for those interested in participating in the August Conference of this year. I do not think that it is a shockingly threatening invitation, even if you happened to hold down a professorial job or are the author of some revered thesis. But I note immediately that the invitation is merely that: it is not a requirement. I am well aware that laying one’s position soul bare could well constitute

¹Since writing this *Cantower*, I have had some response to my work in the form of a rejection (in January 2002) of a piece by the *Method* Journal that relates to the importance of functional specialization. It nudged me forward to more open controversy, which appears in ***Cantower XXII***: “Lonergan and the Ministry of Mayhem”. I include the rejected piece there and add further conflict. Further, I decided to make an entire year’s worth of *Cantowers* available ahead of time. So, by March 1st 2003 there will be avail all the *Cantowers* up to February 1st 2004, i.e. ***Cantowers I - XXIII***. I shall, however, stick to my plan of focusing on ***Cantowers XVII, XVIII*** and ***XXIII*** during the Conference of August 2003.

a threat: your thesis director might hear about it, or your search for a job in some quasi-friendly department might slip into jeopardy. As I type there comes to mind a remark of Eric Voegelin that when he entered a new department he would look around to see how many of the members would condemn him to death in a totalitarian state. So, if you would like to take a risk, ready yourself for positional talk during the August Conference. But you can surely, in the silence of your own self-searching, pursue the task sketched in the “Dialectic Witness” section of ***Cantower XI***. Above all, do not be discouraged by depressing discoveries. If you have seriously worked through the ***Cantowers*** up to now you may well have been thus discouraged unless it gradually became clear to you that the writing is programmatic, doctrinal. It is describing a life-work in a non-existent supportive culture. The beginning of such a life style in our times is risky: it is the Black Tower of ***Cantower IV***.

What, then, should your attitude be? Perhaps one that is primarily that of admiration and support? One that is willing to plug along at one’s own pace, but with a resolute believing commitment to battle against reductive tendencies, which range from simple-minded commonsense eclecticism to sophisticated and subtle denials of the possibility of adult growth?

So, you can settle your sights prior to arrival at your own pace. If the whole project is novel to you, then perhaps, instead of pushing through - and that is all it would be - the ***Cantowers*** or *Lack in the Beingstalk* you could settle for a perusal of chapter 4 of *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*,² which introduces you to the first and second words of metaphysics and the basic diagram there on page 124. This may seem strange stuff, but it is no stranger than printing the periodic table within the cover of a school or first-year university text on chemistry. It gives the beginner a clue to where the journey leads. Chapter 4 aims too at helping you to find where you are at, and if you sense that you have the bent, talent and time for

²P.McShane:Axial Press, Halifax, 1998.

this adulthood, then back you go to chapter one of that book.

And even if you are a beginner, you will not be lost in the gathering. Such is the present state of this infant zone, that the gathering does not resemble, say, a second course in mathematics or physics. In such a situation of a mature or successful science, the beginner is clearly lost, in the wrong place: perhaps you have had this experience. And, of course, for those who are “returnees” to our gatherings this is a clue to the sick and immature state of generalized empirical method and its application. In terms of the **Dark Tower** image that I have used for the hodic climb, we are still cycling round on the plain of common sense, hoping to begin to “slope up”: the task described in ***Cantower VIII***.

So, setting our sights here reminds me of my days in Oxford, when various people or even groups of people would contact me regarding a visit and I would have to “set the sights” to show the sights.. I eventually found a suitable little map and made on it a reasonable central and representative tour. For me, and for the non-beginner, the map had larger meaning just as the pieces of the tour had. The non-beginner reading this now might well look at the “maps”, the two words of metaphysics and the basic diagram of page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongues*, and enjoy cherishing both their call to sensAbility and their call to mystery.

So what are our sights this August? Or, if you are not a participant, what are our sights in this ***Cantower XIII***? We are, you may assume, adding to the mapping. We are sketching out the program of an answer to the task set by the first footnote of the chapter on “Interpretation” in *Method in Theology*. “”See my own discussion of the truth of interpretation in *Insight*, pp. 562-594, and observe how ideas presented there recur here in quite different functional specialties. For instance, what there is termed a universal viewpoint, here is realized by advocating a distinct functional specialty dialectic.”³

³*Method in Theology*, 153.

Evidently, **universal viewpoint** is a key topic, and we will tackle it in section 13.3. We are not interested in transitions of viewpoint that occurred between *Insight* and *Method in Theology*: details of these are available elsewhere.⁴ We are, rather, trying for some accurate preliminary identifications of divisions of implementation in regard both to fostering and to using the universal viewpoint within the hodic cycling. For this reason it seems best to begin our reflections with the manner in which hodic recycling shifts and refines the meaning of implementation. That first section may not be entirely novel to the non-beginners: but a second first tour of Oxford can yield startling new perspectives! Section 3, then, will tackle the locating of the universal viewpoint on the slopes of hodic enterprise. Section 4 will consider that locating in relation to pointers in the works of Ivo Coelho.⁵ I note that Coelho does not get into detail regarding Lonergan's "discovery pages" of February 1965, nor do we: we are interested at this stage in a broader sweep.⁶ Section 5 is continuous with the suggestions of *Cantower X*, section 3, the first Cantower of this year, and tunes us into the direction of the remaining Cantowers of the year, providing a context for the August Conference reflections, to which topic we turn in the final section.

⁴In particular, there is the thesis of Ivo Coelho, *The Development of the Notion of the 'Universal Viewpoint'*, in Bernard Lonergan. From *Insight to Method in Theology* (Rome, 1994). The thesis forms the basis of a later book, *Hermeneutics and Method. The 'Universal Viewpoint' in Bernard Lonergan*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 2001. I shall refer to these two below as Coelho 1994 and Coelho 2001. The bibliography there gives references to other relevant works. Further, the various writing so Robert Doran in recent years of *Theological Studies* and *Method* are also relevant. I would note that I avoid explicit expression of my different take on Lonergan's development here: my main aim is to improve your reading of the basic diagram (*A Brief History of Tongue*, 124), which makes use of the terminology 'Universal Viewpoint'.

⁵The work of Darlene O'Leary, *Lonergan's Practical View of History*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2003 also gives the relevant context of Lonergan's struggle towards a fuller basic context, a problem already raised in the first *Cantower*. We will be dealing with that praxis and functional perspective in more detail in *Cantowers XXIV-XXVI, XXXIV-V*.

⁶Pages 269-73 of Coelho's thesis deals with them. They are the central topic in O'Leary's work.

13.2 Re-structuring the Task of Implementation

I wish to keep this section relatively simple. The task of implementation first emerged as a piece of the new metaphysics: “metaphysics is the conception, affirmation and implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being”.⁷ I have commented in various places on the fact that *implementation* did not find its way into the index of *Insight* either originally or in the later edition: we are not going there. Again, in writing about the incompleteness of *Insight* I have linked the problem of implementation with the problem of cosmopolis, and the solution to the problem of cosmopolis to the emergence of the hodic division of labour. Further, there is the enlargement of perspective that comes from showing the need for the division in all areas of culture: this is aired in summary fashion in the third chapter of *Pastkeynes* and recalled in section 3 of ***Cantower X***, where the need for a different first chapter to a new *Method* was envisaged.

Finally, there is What it’s all about: efficiency. You may have read or heard comments from me on this issue previously, but perhaps it is as well to pause over the notion in this fresh context. There is, for instance, the added perspective of section 11.5 on “Witless Dialectic”. But to go deeper you need to follow up pointers from *Lack in the Beingstalk*: perhaps, indeed, it is no harm to recall a passage from the book immediately.

“Add, now, the further twists that come from considering first the unity of metaphysics, then the beauty of metaphysics.

It is a decade since I began to soak up the suggestion of Lonergan regarding the unity that comes to a science through efficient causality. ‘It is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is, in the scientist, the reason why a science forms

⁷*Insight*, 391[416].

a unified whole'.⁸ One could argue that part of Lonergan's achievement is to give unity to metaphysics for the first time in history by giving a functionally-efficient specification to Cosmopolis.

And there is the topic of the beauty of metaphysics, one that is fresh for me, raised only a week ago when I struggled anew with the broader problem of beauty, James Joyce's basket,⁹ the Jewish Holocaust¹⁰: in what way can we affirm beauty noun-wise, large and small, even in the horror of *felix culpa*? But these are trickier grapplings, worthy of a distant metaphysics that would give beauty back to God in subtler ways. The beauty, *claritas, radiance*, that I mention here is a simpler project, caught in the question for admiration, Is not effective global collaboration in the lifting of humanity a radiant idea?"¹¹

You have a first reflective challenge then: to contemplate towards admiration of the potential for such unified beauty that is the Hodic Way, a Then Way which sublates astonishingly the Zen Way of the East and the Ken Way of the West. It is to be a group reality, yet magnificently micro-autonomic.¹² And so, as chapter 2 of *A Brief History of Tongue* suggests, your contemplation should home in on yourself. Part - indeed the whole - of the conference project, is to invite you to reach for the unity, efficiency, beauty of your own life: if you happen to be Christian the reach is nicely

⁸*Topics in Education*, 160.

⁹See P.McShane, *A Brief History of Tongue*, chapter two, where I relate Joyce's effort, and Aquinas' "unitas, claritas, consonantia", to Lonergan's "unity, identity, whole". The relation is not symmetrical.

¹⁰The issue was raised freshly for me by reading Steiner's reflections on the twentieth century, on the season in hell.

¹¹P.McShane, *Lack in the Beingstalk. A Giants Causeway*, 17-18.

¹²I introduced the notion of *micro-autonomy* in chapter 10 of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of nations. Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*. The title of that book of 30 years ago seems to succeed in 'saying it all'. But it says it all quite differently to me now, like Proust's tea tasted decades later.

expressed as a reach for a Place in the Son.¹³

Can you glimpse here a freshening of the meaning of *function* in functional specialization?

And you have sensed that a massively integral meaning to the word *efficient* is at stake here. We are far here from the *Bauhaus* efficiency of a house as ‘a machine to live in’. We are closer to the notion of contemplative leisure as efficient, the heartstream of our conference.

But it would be well to think out efficiency in concrete terms, in relation to conversations and conferences, in relation to witless dialectic. I recall for your ingesting my regular introductory comment to a course taught on elementary logic called “Reasoning and Argumentation”: “Reasoning is jumping to conclusions, and argument is something to be avoided”. You can range in your illustrative searchings from efficiencies of child-care to inefficiencies of Christianity: “the children of this world are wiser than the children of light”, or as you perhaps have heard me say, ‘There is more intelligence and energy put into the promotion of soap than into the promotion of salvation’. And I note for you that this quip came to me forcefully as I perused books and journals in a commerce library, publications dealing with sales-management etc.

Nor have we deviated from our topic. All these reflections help us to see where we are aiming and the difficulty of getting there. Even if you have struggle with the **Cantower** project as expressed so far, you may reach a different take on it. You are still probably disoriented by academic conventions from the original bent of the gatherings in Academes’ backyard: What do we do with the town?

But back to metaphysics and the re-distribution of labour. Can you envisage the new meanings of *implementation*? These will concern us as we move through the conference but you can make your own beginning on the question.

First, separate off ‘conception and affirmation’ from ‘implementation’: but you

¹³The title of *Cantower X*.

need various abbreviations and diagramings here. C, A, and I are clear abbreviations; H_i means the i th functional specialty. So, I would suggest that $(\odot + A)$ is the *per se* task of H_4 and H_5 .¹⁴ I am not going to endlessly repeat the phrase *per se*, so let us clear up what I am getting at here. *Per accidens* anyone, within a specialty or not, can contribute to the development or the conception of metaphysics. But it is the *per se* job of the two specialties mentioned. What distinguishes the two specialties is the character of their creativity: H_4 is committed to fostering $(\odot + A)$ by the intussusception of the past described on page 250 of *Method*; H_5 is committed to extending that $(\odot + A)$ through efficient fantasy. The high point of H_4 's operation - best to think of the H s as persons - is the "scientific moment" that has been discussed in various contexts already, the taking of categorical positions.¹⁵ So, Lonergan's "scientific moment" of the end of page 250 is substantially expressed on pp. 286-7, though the expression runs on to page 293. I have drawn attention previously to the fact that a set (10) is missing, the categories of functional specialization. But I also noted that his work is foundational: his categories are very much his creation, the fantastic creation of his concrete fantasy. It is important, this week or whenever, that you too have a shot at a random "scientific moment" to thematize and tell yourself where you stand: this was a project of section 11.4.

Note that the foundational effort of H_4 and H_5 is towards a commitment. So, it is not just a reaching for $C + A$. Taking a stand is self-evaluative.¹⁶ So, here we have a precise specialized meaning of implementation emerging, the genesis of a change in oneself. H_4 aims at the genesis of the best of the past's foundational perspective in the

¹⁴But the conception includes a conception of implementation! And of course the task itself is a key implementation.

¹⁵This topic, "scientific moment" was first introduced in section 5 of *Cantower IX*. It will be dealt with in concrete detail in *Cantower XXV*.

¹⁶I am not here going into the thorny and sophisticated question of the notion of being in relation to personal willingness, but it will be a topic during the conference, relating to our reading of *Insight* chapter 18 and the corresponding *Cantower XVIII*.

self; H₅ aims at foundational advances. Both aim at changes of a - their - foundational characters. Don't the other specialist have the same aim: yes, but it is not *per se* creative; they are learners. It is important to advert to this distinction in the functional specialist division of labour, and to be clear on precise functional work. Learning in general is not to be considered a massively creative task, although it is obviously creative. "The use of the general theological categories occurs in any of the eight functional specialties"¹⁷ and advances in those categories are cycled - sloped - round. Further, that cycling, sloping, fits the reality of paradigm stagnation: the shift leans on lethargy and fixity through a more public and structured embarrassment of incompetence. So, the statistical distribution for survival of failed paradigm recurrence-schemes may well shift with a swifter time-dynamic to Bell from Poisson.

The identification of the functions of H₄ and H₅ locates purely creative metaphysics, especially when viewed in the pattern of its regular indifference to effectiveness¹⁸, in those two specialties. Metaphysics is 'only' **used** in the other specialties, although *per accidens* and *de facto* they enlarge it. However, one must hold on as luminously as one can to the new notion of culture rooted in generalized empirical method.¹⁹ Then what was once philosophy is now to be a cultural ethos that is intrinsically luminous. Here the discontinuity of Lonergan's project can become itself luminous: truncated subjectivity, the character of all modern philosophy, is to be

¹⁷*Method in Theology*, 292. Note, first, that we can drop the word "theological". Fourth level specialization is concrete, reaching in whatever discipline for the full metaphysic of progress. Secondly, what about the special categories? Lonergan envisages these to be special to particular groups claiming different revelatory sources. Data on these, however, must submit to the demands of the general categories on the first four specialties. There are, for instance, "normal" rules for "miraculous" interventions.

¹⁸I am thinking, not of people like Plato and Marx, but more of establishment philosophy in the modern university. "They become effete" (*Method in Theology*, 99).

¹⁹This topic will be tackled in an preliminary fashion in *Cantower XXIII*: "Introducing Generalized Empirical Method".

expected to be streetwise exposed as *fare lo stupido*.²⁰

So, the implementation that is differentiatedly split among the other six specialties is split according to the objective focus of those specialties. More on this topic in the next section. But it is as well to conclude with an eye on, an eye into, the norm of future culture, where the implementation is an internal feature of the culture, in its solitudes and in its conversations.

13.3 Hodics and the Universal Viewpoint

This section can be considered as a follow-up on section 5 in the previous **Cantower**, where the fourth illustration of confused topics noted that there were debates about what Lonergan meant by “Universal Viewpoint”, whether and how it survived in later work, whether even it involved Lonergan in contradictions. But this section can also be seen as pointing towards one aspect of implementation, one that I intend to continue through the rest of the year’s reflections on the sublation of the book *Insight*. That aspect can be associated with the third canon of hermeneutics, particularly with the first principle of criticism. I have mentioned this canon and the strategy before but it will be worth quoting in full presently when I seek to draw out an analogy with relatively successful scientific work. The principle, at all events, involves critical reflection on some work that seeks to contribute to some discipline. A first author in your line-up for criticism should perhaps be yourself: some essay or even thesis you have written. If you already got the doctorate, this could be a fun thing to publish: as far as I know, they can’t take the degree away from you, though the published work might effect your job-possibilities, so.... But certainly we can tackle such a reflection together during this conference. The standards I have in mind are not just the standards of *Insight* but also the standards of serious functional specialization. You recall the slogan, “if something is worth doing, then it is worth doing badly”. At present no one

²⁰See *Phenomenology and Logic*, 317, 361,

is doing better than badly when it comes to writing within a functional specialty. But we are in an empirical science, and the badly-done is data. Think of training a local team that is 'promising' only in some distant sense. We can at least try to edge each other towards the task, the slopes, of interpreting Lonergan, where by interpreting I here mean picking up his advice and running with it - or limping forward with it, luminously.

In the present section I am dealing in a positive and simple sense with the notion of a universal viewpoint, but it seems good to spread our attention a little, so I draw into the discussion the thesis and book by Ivo Coelho already mentioned.²¹ Referring to the thesis, features of it, pages in it, serves first a purpose that I have always considered relevant: the spread of pages in itself reminds us that it is a slow climb, especially when that spread represents years of devoted research and energy and interpretation. Can Ivo tell us "all" in four hundred pages (1994) or in three hundred pages (2001) - or indeed of his struggle in the years between? What is going on when we read such a work, be it Ivo's or Lonergan's doctorate work? Of course, you can go on or back to ask, What went on when I did my learned doctorate on some genius like Pascal or Einstein? We are back, perhaps with the problem of satire and humour here!

I leave that to you. But it is as well before proceeding to ask again, What is going on in these ***Cantowers***? You have read that the effort is doctrinal, mapping, outlining, in a sense that is to be taken luminously as non-summary, not a mythic glimpse of essence. This, of course, is the snag, when spirobics rather than aerobics are involved. The summary can be remembered, like a memorized definition of a circle or

²¹Above, at note 4. The two works differ in emphasis (see below, at note 46) and present an interesting problem of development of viewpoint. As I remarked above, I avoid refined discussion here of differences of regarding Lonergan's own development, but it is evident that my inclination is to accept that *Insight* was written from a moving viewpoint and that the view of chapter 17 of that work is open both to non-moving analysis and to later hodic refinements.

of emergent probability, and produced impressively. But we are over that by now, not? Referring to Coelho's work helps us to remember and member. And it is worth while to pause again over his final paragraph, on Lonergan's decades-long climb.²²

"There is something to be learned from Lonergan's own slow development on the question of method. His final position is the fruit of a lifetime of stubborn wrestling with fundamental questions and a refusal to indulge in half-measures. One of the roots of this phenomenal ability to 'withdraw from the chase' is indicated by a little word that surfaces time and agin in Loneergan's writings: providence. Lonergan's work is in fact suffused with a hope born of faith, with the confidence that it is God who works through history. This, I think, is a salutary attitude, especially for those who work on the frontiers; and besides, as we will perhaps realize through ongoing dialogue, such an attitude is not completely unrelated to the *anatta* (selflessness) of the Buddhists and the *niskama karma* (desireless action) of the *Gita*."

So, my few pages on universal viewpoint are meant as invitations, pointers, mood-setting in a group. And I am aided in that pointing by analogies with scientific achievement. The key one to brood over now is the one I drew at the conclusion of section 12.5, between universal viewpoint (UV) and Theory of Everything (TOE) or Grand Unification Theories (GUTS) in contemporary physics. If, for instance, you approach Ivo's work after a serious brooding on this you will find that you have the benefit of a viewpoint on the viewpoint on viewpoints that displaces refreshingly that thesis, and other theses, or the questions of Vertin or Tekippe about the topic that Coelho recalls.

First I must note that Pop-physics or *Scientific American* may make you familiar with the expression **GUTS**, but it doesn't get you into international conferences. So, to be in a position to discuss UV seriously you have to have specific viewpoints in some

²²Coelho 2001, 215. I already referred to the passage in the previous *Cantower*.

field under your control of meaning, then you have to have tried to control them, order them, collectively. So you have your own best-shot UV: then - take note - you have to have moved to have a viewpoint on your UV and other folks UV. Do you notice the triplicity here? Do you recall the three orders of consciousness mentioned by me in earlier *Cantowers*? A clue worth following.

But the main point deserves and requires digesting. Graduate students in physics are not really in the ballpark that is creative reflection on GUTS, and they are barely in the ballpark of GUTS. And they know it. Certainly they can talk about wanting something like the periodic table in chemistry to emerge in physics, but they have the sense that it is quite a different kettle of things. The search is for some “holding hypothesis” about genera, species, varieties, of particles. What do front-line physicists think of the emergent perspectives of new geometries, with or without string-structured things? There is still a bit of the foolishness of the beginning of the twentieth of being nearly at the point of pushing for a few decimal places. But serious scientists do not claim that they are pinning down essences, that we are 90% there.

What might we say, in parallel, of UV? I will skip the de facto situation, where some indeed do give the impression that we are 90% there, certainly 90% of the way to understanding Lonergan’s view: grist there for the dialectic mill. It seems best to write and think foundationally. THEN with a few good graduate courses - presuming, in a fantasy against present probabilities that there emerges a good foundationally-structure undergraduate formation - a community of students could reach a common plane of overlapping UVs. Notice here that I am loosening up Lonergan’s meaning of UV both to relate to the physics analogue and to reach a certain realism about our struggle. We are talking about what each of us thinks and we are thinking of UV: what we have is our best shot at UV, tied, with as much self-critical luminosity as possible, to Lonergan’s words. The best shots I am calling here UVs. Just as the front liners in physics have best shots at GUTS so there are to be front liners in, say, theology, with

goodly UVs. In so far as theology moves up slopes and reaches a new plane - recall the parallel with the stages of the calculus of variation²³ - there can be a relatively invariant UV holding a present context, backing a present heuristic, expecting replacement. Now - here's the key - you may take the contexted heuristic and the expectation as what is meant by "universal viewpoint". I have to take it that you have worked through and through Lonergan's doctrinal pointings in *Insight*? Perhaps even perused some of the theses writings referred to in Ivo Coelho's abundant bibliography? Then you will know that the "may take" is just that: the main thing is not to get trapped in words.

Let me illustrate, referring now to the diagram on page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*.²⁴ You see the circuit that includes UV{V...} in its flow? You may take that UV to be the UV of *Insight* chapter 17.²⁵ Now, what do I mean by "take it"? I mean that it is your up-front "actual context" as you work in that circuit. To pause to illustrate this would be adventuring into the book that is to replace *Method in Theology*. Perhaps I can leave the pause to you? Certainly, we will pause during the August conference, and illustrations will appear as we struggle on. For instance you bring your best UV to the reading of events or authors. But please notice that this is a strange type of reading: think of the reading of particle tracks by our serious GUTS expert.

But **that** is not your whole context: you whole context, within your root *notio entis*, is? perhaps what is expressed in the diagram from p. 124, which - I have just now decided - deserves the title GUT diagram. The title is quite appropriate. The diagram does express a Grand Unification Theory. It is evidently Christian, but you should have no difficulty in identifying the general categorical elements. Your proximately working

²³Discussed in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 4.

²⁴Reproduced in an appendix to *Cantower III*.

²⁵You have astutely noted that I seem to be cheating here. My identification of UV at the top of the diagram page places us in a Christian Theological context. We'll get back to that with Ivo Coelho shortly.

context is the “elementary” UV: but, “all we know is somehow with us, present and operative,”²⁶ and so there is the fuller operative context represented by the GUT diagram. And you might even call this fuller context your UV. As long as you know what you are doing, and the knowing is relatively communal.

The big thing is not to get Platonic about this stuff. I recall, from another version of my GUT diagram, a quotation from Lonergan, during his struggle forward in this matter “Theology

1) not a Platonic idea 2) but the many species (not individuals except as types as dominating personalities) 3) in a genetically and dialectically differentiated genus”²⁷ Think, for instance, of your own, perhaps vague, UV of the sequence of philosophers and followers and the handy ways of naming viewpoints.²⁸ And you are helped on here by Lonergan’s various efforts to line up the views.

13.4 Searching for Basic Context

It seems best now to get some help from Ivo Coelho’s work. I will weave into the reflections on his work further comments on the GUT diagram. And, with Ivo’s blessing, part of the help comes from trying to apply the third canon of hermeneutics. A general question will be one that will recur in the **Cantowers** to follow, Does Ivo manage to do some functional specialist work? But the prime benefit of pointing you toward his thesis, and towards such detailed work, is to invite you to continue to cultivate a proper heuristic attitude. Ivo Coelho writes about the universal viewpoint

²⁶*Insight*, 278[303].

²⁷A *Brief History of Tongue*, 109. The extract is from The Lonergan archives in Toronto, labeled Batch B, 8, 6, V. I’ll get back to the question of labeling later. You would find it interesting to recall the discussion of genetic systematics in *Cantower VII*, and try to envisage how the dialectic part of the sequence would be reversed to get to a pure genetic sequence. Tough work: a much later topic.

²⁸The obvious analogy here would be reference in physics to such views as those of Riemannian geometry or Maxwell’s equations.

as helping us to “avoid the creation of vague entities or easy generalizations such as ‘Indian culture’ and ‘Western culture.’”²⁹ Vague entities lose essential elements and distort the remainder, whereas a serious heuristic literally bears in mind all the cherished details, e.g. of the two sub-continent. But only if you have “embraced” the details. Again, think through the analogue: someone GUTS-competent in physics can range round the experimental findings. Or, taking another field, knowing the sonata form in elementary fashion is quite different from the heuristik, Askenazi, poised to play a particular sonata. UV, as introduced in *Insight*, may be pretty well parallel to learning the sonata form in first year music.

With that happy precautioning, let us get back to the question of what UV is, and whether or how UV as described in *Insight* survives in later works, or whether it even makes sense. Here, indeed, the problem of “knowing the object” as potential interpreter becomes acute. Coelho sanely concludes that the universal viewpoint is the notion of being grasped as “undergoing objectification, differentiation, integration”.³⁰ Lace that statement with reflection on the analogue: the notion of the beings of physics is grasped through the detailed struggle of physics governed by a subtle heuristic of GUTS. Both heuristics result from the digestion of “collaboration that will extend over generations”.³¹ The digestion reveals “the Way” as it is refined by the collaboration and the pressures of the relevant zone of being against fixity.

But there is the priority of personal digestion, the personal digestion of an innovator such as Lonergan, the learning-digestion of those who would either follow or challenge. I already quoted Coelho’s final paragraph regarding new meanings and

²⁹Coelho, 2001, 214.

³⁰Coelho, 2001, 207.

³¹Coelho, 2001, 67.

expressions of meaning.³² Within his thesis Coelho raises various subtle questions around the general problem of the relation of UV to doing³³, questions complicated by the moving viewpoint of *Insight*. They are further complicated by Lonergan's freedom from fixed language. What changes of meaning are to be associated with changing words such as "comprehensive viewpoint", "basic context"?³⁴ One cannot doubt but that there was a genetic advance, even daily leaps beyond his yesterday-horizon. And no more than I does Coelho find conflicts and contradictions in that advance or its expression. I see no point, however, in entering into debates about this: they are to be massively sublated by the proper development of dialectic.

But that proper development depends on the present generation's openness to digest, slowly, thoroughly, fantastically. And so I turn now to my final foundational pointing of this section regarding UV and its development.³⁵

I would ask you again to cultivate the parallel with physics as it emerges and is digested by the undergraduate mind. The beginning takes elementary gross data - such as the moon orbiting the earth - to arrive at reasonably valid correlations. The parallel in the zone of method is the gross data that is one's own raw uninvestigated viewzone: one arrives at the elementary correlations represented by chapters 9 and 18 of *Insight*, or by the diagrams of Appendix A in *Phenomenology and Logic*.

Now I have regularly insisted that the parallel weakens as one moves to later

³²See note 22 above.

³³Coelho, 2001, 84-88, 142-3, 195, 210. There is the large issue lurking here, that I mentioned already in the concluding sections of *Cantower VII* and *Cantower IX*, of the manner in which will and my will are reached and thematized in a fullness of interiority. More on that when we get to *Cantower XVIII*, section 1.

³⁴Discussions of these are laced through Coelho's work.

³⁵Only 'final' for now of course: so, you may find that my older effort of the first part of *Cantower XIV* helps further, and surely by *Cantower CXVII* we will have a little more light!

years, supposedly higher levels of comprehension. I appeal there to my own experience of teaching, on the same days each week in consecutive hours, a first year course on mathematical physics and a graduate course. We were in vastly different worlds in the two classes: a first year student would be quite lost after five minutes in the graduate class. At present there is no parallel reality of education in methodology or theology and - the deeper evil - no expectation within the ethos of present humanities of such a paralleling. So we are here in the proper zone of foundations: fantasy. Can you reach for some concrete fantasy of the move forward that might occur from the gross view of our own view, through the heuristic naming of UV - think of the parallel with the periodic table named early in first year chemistry - to a intussusception of other views, moving to an undergraduate integral refinement worthy of the name UV. So there could emerge graduates with their own little but respectable UVs. They would be views of views corresponding to the views had by graduates in physics of particles and forces.

So, a next generation might move to being a collaborative community getting at the GUTS of the field, always the mine-field of a remote mind-field. Moreover, that getting at absorbs tandem-wise the heuristics of the search; what is luminously intussuscepted is the basis and the nature of the procedure. "So it comes about that"³⁶ - maybe - there emerges, through committed recurrence-scheming³⁷ and operated fantasy, a community of viewzones capable of loosely and conveniently talking of UV or transcendental method or hodings much as Thomas could talk of his distinctions and classifications loosely and conveniently.

³⁶*Insight*, 514[537]. This is one of my favorite phrases in *Insight*, paralleling in some ways the phrase "one can go on" on p. 287 of *Method in Theology*. To whom does it come about? Who is the one that can go on? The phrase, "so it comes about", is the title of the fifth section of *Cantower XXIV*, and we will reach there for the meaning of the following ten lines regarding, guarding, the "basic enterprise of human intelligence".

³⁷*Insight*, 227[252].

Obviously we are in the area of “aiming high and far”³⁸ but the force of analogy is with us. Einstein moved through a decade of digestion from special to general relativity, and general relativity now features in undergraduate courses. Lonergan, similarly, went in a decade from his UV to hodics: could not a parallel shift come about? But it would be going massively against a present ethos of mythic familiarity in human studies. Lonergan conferences gather in the confidence of a democracy of meaning. And what of our gathering in this coming August? Can we acknowledge our massive molecular sickness and its basic sin and the universe’s groaning for repentance? Can we begin the move up the twisted slope of a repentance of minding? So we arrive more fully into the context of the demands of the first nine ***Cantowers***.

And in a sensing of this distant context let us return to the key question of Coelho’s stab at the specialties Research and Interpretation. He gives some account of that stab and of the place of UV in such stabs. And, no: I would not say that he is in that new ballpark, no more than I have ever been, nor Fr. Crowe, nor Fr. Doran, nor Fred Lawrence nor any of the others strugglers with Lonergan’s meaning. I don’t think that we are even doing it badly yet, though we have perhaps gross data that can nudge us forward. Part of that data is the effort made subsequent to the August conference of last year: we will get to our gross performances during the Conference week.

But what, in conclusion, of Coelho’s thesis, that UV is replaced by whatever?³⁹ I

³⁸I am recalling the editors’ title - borrowed from Lonergan - for my contribution to *Compass*, March 1985, “The Historical Reach of Lonergan’s Meaning”, a relevant context.

³⁹“The thesis may be stated thus: the notion of the universal viewpoint, first formulated in a hermeneutic context in *Insight*, is replaced in *Method* by a transcendental method heading through the functional specialty dialectic towards a comprehensive viewpoint”(Coelho, 1994, 1). The thesis becomes more complex in Coelho 2001, through his later reflections on such topics as ‘horizons’. I quote one statement of his 2001 view: “The thesis upheld is that because of a complex shift that Lonergan makes from ‘faculty psychology’ to ‘intentionality analysis’ and from the primacy of metaphysics to the primacy of method, the functions of the universal viewpoint are taken over by transcendental method” (Coelho, 2001, 10).

would suggest that UV was never more than a component in metaphysics, and metaphysics is replaced in its creative aspect by the fourth and fifth specialties, or, as Coelho puts it “it might be said that dialectic and foundations are transcendental method functioning as an upper blade”⁴⁰ That part of metaphysics that is its use-function is distributed, as I noted in section 13.3, beyond those specialties. But if you wish to talk about UV in a new full sense of *Praxisweltanschauung* that is in fact hodic method and that replaces the old *Insight* sense, well, why not?⁴¹ What really matters is that we take seriously the concrete possibility within the fantasy of “bolder spirits. They select the conspicuously successful science of their time. They study its procedures. They formulate precepts. Finally, they propose an analogy of science.”⁴²

13.5 Founders [of Theology]

The title of this section will be no surprise for those who attended the West Dublin Conference of 2002. It emerged for me during a stay in the Bronx, New York, in July of that year. I was led, or leaped there, to think of such things as a “Manhattan Project” quite different from the bomb-project associated with that title. I worked my way round New York, I hope to some extent as Plato worked his way round Athens, puzzling over the challenge of what I now title as “Founders of New York”: a sublation and relocalization of *The Republic*.

We have, THEN, reached the question raised already, What do we do with the town?, with a fuller context. It is to be tackled in the following **Cantower**, which is titled “Communications: Fresh Founding of New York”. What I want to do here,

⁴⁰Coelho, 2001, 202.

⁴¹This does indeed lead into a host of complications. For instance, much a traditional metaphysical thinking does not extend into a thematic of changing the world. Changing the world, would have been a sort of commonsense addition to the thinker’s view: recall the Oxbridge tradition.

⁴²*Method in Theology*, 3.

however, is point you towards an enrichment and complexification of context for our conference work and for the reading and digestion of the remaining **Cantowers** of this year.

That enrichment and complexification is brought out most simply by a strange connecting, the connecting of the first twenty one **Cantowers** with *Insight's* twenty chapters, adding the Epilogue as parallel to **Cantower XXI**. This should certainly freshen the reading, re-reading of *Insight*. The drive of **Cantower XI** was to a fresh self-affirmation. **Cantower XII** makes discomfortingly present the problem of miss-reading one's own notion of being if one misses the bridge of chapter five of *Insight*:

“interpretations of being or of absolute objectivity in terms of space and time are mere intrusions of imagination”.⁴³ The quotation is from the thirteenth chapter of *Insight* and so it brings in the odd parallel of the reflections of this with the reflections of that chapter on our notion of objectivity. The parallel gives a new twist to the question “What are we to do with the town?” **What** town? Perhaps I should be typing **Wheretown?**, to tune you into the core of the question, the twisted experiential objectivity that would identify Manhattan, or your own town or village, with the familiar streets and signs and sights and sounds that make “the universe of being as unreal as Plato's noetic heaven”.⁴⁴ All this puts the final question of chapter thirteen of *Insight*, the key question of the book, “What is objectivity?”, in a fresh minding. Just as I associated the question of chapter twelve with the oriental search for enlightenment, so here we carry that association into the streets, if you like into the *maya* of Manhattan. And the question of foundational implementation turns new corners in the city of my sensibility.

⁴³*Insight*, 379[404].

⁴⁴*Insight*, 385[410].

13.6 The August 2003 Project

It is as well to look back on the program for the previous conference (***Cantower III***) and the report on it (***Cantower VI***). There is no need for me, then, to repeat pointers about leisure, participation etc.

But it seems to me now that what is needed is a fuller pragmatism with regard to the small piece of implementation that the August conference is, a pragmatism that can be shared by readers of these ***Cantowers***. Above, I wrote about a certain pragmatism of reflection on the universal viewpoint, UV, and I paralleled the search for it with searches in physics for GUTS and TOES. This is, I hope, already a help: you can locate yourself as a beginner better, or someone who has come some distance in sorting out viewpoints, the way a second year university student of physics has sorted out elementary aspects of the work of Newton and Maxwell. In section 1 of ***Cantower XIV*** I draw parallels with both chemistry and with the broader scientific perspective of generalized emergent probability. You may well find a better parallel from some other area: the main point is to seriously push oneself to specifying where one stands with regard to “viewpoints on life”, and that stand should be an operative viewpoint on life. This is the key problem that we will muse over together during the conference. Is the conference about interpretation? Yes: first, because we are trying to interpret ourselves; secondly, because we are trying - I will come to details presently - to interpret Lonergan’s work; thirdly, we are trying to interpret the degree of our achievement in interpreting Lonergan’s work. And I note that all through that sentence the word ‘interpretation’ is like a wild card: only you can say what you mean by it, and we together may arrive slowly at precision about it.

But a little precision here can help to see how the present conference differs from the previous one.⁴⁵ There the presenters were mainly struggling with interpretation in a sense that involves implementation: how, for instance, to bring Lonergan’s thinking

⁴⁵I am returning here to a topic I dealt with in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 1.

to bear on a particular field or area. Here the emphasis shifts back to the implement that is each of us, and interpretation can be seen as more a matter of digestion. If you like, our focus is on interpretation as discussed on pages 155-65 of *Method in Theology*. Our focus, indeed, is towards foundational shifting which I noted above to be a key implementation.⁴⁶ Popularly put, we seek to become better implements of shifting the statistics of good readers of *Insight* and *Method in Theology*. That shift is the heart of the matter of established reductive reading. This is not to say that there will not be efforts in other directions at the conference: some may have advances to report, directions to share, and all this will be catered for. But the drive of the morning discussions - and they are to be textual discussions - will be towards discovering ecstatically⁴⁷ that we massively beaten down by the cultures of this late axial period, cut off from the ecstatic that is a molecular longed-for.

I do not wish to enter further into that topic now. Rather I wish to be immediately pragmatic. What, then, is my suggestion as the core of the gathering? It is the shared reading of three **Cantowers**, two of which parallel two chapters of, the other one paralleling a central problem of the book: the menace of descriptive competence, the “gap”⁴⁸, the “existential gap”⁴⁹, between the subtle use of words and the incarnate mind-grip on the meaning of the objects to which they refer.

The two paralleling **Cantowers** are 17 and 18, corresponding to chapters 17 and 18 of *Insight*. The third one is **Cantower XXIII**: “Redoubt Describing”. This **Cantower**,

⁴⁶Pp. 6 ff.

⁴⁷“To describe this feature of historical investigation let us say that the cumulative process of datum, question, insight, surmise, image, formal evidence, is ecstatic”(*Method in Theology*, 187-8).... there is the “openness to adventure, daring, greatness, goodness, majesty”(*Ibid.*, 62)

⁴⁸*Insight*, 542[565].

⁴⁹*Phenomenology and Logic* adds various contexts, not only on the question of the existential gap but on the context of the present massive obscurity regarding truth and decision.

transition point beyond the first fifth of the entire enterprise, is a key, a corner stone, a stumbling block, whatever: a redoubt, fortifying our Tower-structuring struggle. It will be the context from which and in which we attempt to move from the beginning of the conference, and it will be made available early in the year 2003, as will the other two **Cantowers**.⁵⁰ The personal struggle to which it invites cuts deep into our unenlightened loneliness, which unenlightened loneliness is indeed the main message of our linguistic and non-linguistic reaching out to one another and to nature.

The other two **Cantowers**, strangely are massively strategic as re-introductions. But come in three sections, and I might humorously describe the 18th as “Good Will Hunting”. As you will, will-to, see, the three sections parallel the sections in chapter 18 of *Insight*. What is ‘the good’? What means ‘willing’? How do we hunt for a possible cultural ethics?

And the previous **Cantower XVII** reaches back into the same three questions, but now focused on Truth. Again, the three sections parallel the three sections of the corresponding chapter 17 of *Insight*, and I suppose I could humorously use the same name “Good Will Hunting”, since a) the mystery is good and the good is mystery, b) the notion of truth is our deepest want, will, testament, c) the want reaches, hunts, in human history, for structure. And you will, will-to, find that the structure of this **Cantower** has the odd structure of a beginning, like the beginning of a chemistry text

⁵⁰Obviously I would hope that some of the less-burdened participants would carry forward the specific struggle with the three **Cantowers** and so be able to actively help others, and themselves, forward. It should help to note that the simple version of the challenge is Appendix A of *Phenomenology*, which presents the fundamental diagrams of human desire. This helps not only previous participants but beginners. What are either previous participants or students freshly attracted to Lonergan’s work to make of these **Cantowers XVII, XVIII, XXIII**, dated respectively August 1st, 2003, September 1st 2003, February 1st 2004? What about the other **Cantowers**? Let me say, briefly and optimistically, that there is light to be had from these three essays taken in separation from the full decade-long project. It would be quite unrealistic of me to expect anyone to keep up with my seventy-year old struggle for meaning; indeed, I cannot keep up with myself! See again, note 1 above, added just before sending this to the Web.

with the under-cover periodic table. Instead of the periodic table we have here the three beginning words of metaphysics, each corresponding to one of the three sections.

But I say no more about these things: I simply invite a good-will hunting. Nor is this good-will hunting restricted to the potential conference participants. Indeed, the particular twist of the program is related to the possibility of a wider - more efficient, then, and beautiful - implementation. There are, I would hope, various other readers of these essays that are good-will hunters after a meaning larger than light-weight Lonerganism.