

*Cantower XXXVI***The Function of the Cantowers**

March 1st 2005

36.1 Getting the Show on the Roll

This is the first of seven sections in which I seek to throw some light on the various aspects on my strange project. But I would like this first section to get you to the point simply and quickly. And, if you get the point and value it, then you might pass this section on as a simple appeal for a change of policy, of attitude, towards the show.

What show? Near the end of this section I shall broaden the notion of **show**, reaching forward to the other sections, indeed to the entire 117 essay project. But here, let us take it gently, pushing for a glimpse of what I think - but I have been puzzling about it since 1966! - is obvious. Minimally, then, What show? Well, there is the show that is represented by the previous **Cantower**: the show that is the decade of articles there on facets of Christology. Broadly speaking, all the writers there are trying to show the way forward. And this is true of any journal in any area. It is true of a group of climbers at the base camp; it is true of a football team; it is true of a family planning a holiday.¹ It is true of the Zen tradition in its search for Supreme Ways as represented by such masters as Kukai (774-835), Dogen (1200-1253), Nichiren (1222-1282).² But in

¹In section 36.2 I reproduce an elementary presentation of the need for functional specialization in terms of a dysfunctional family from *A Brief History of Tongue*. The presentation here serves different functions. Certainly, it is an introduction. But recall the reproduction of my text of 1984 in section 2 of *Cantower XXXIII*. Here I add no footnotes to help up-date the effort of a younger man. The passage in *A Brief History of Tongue* goes back to class presentations in the 1980s: it lacks precisions and sophistications. Might you detect these lacks? So, you have an exercise that you can return to at various stages to test your progress in coming to grips with the functional *Cantowers* between here and *Cantower LII*.

²See Ruben L.F.Habito, "Japanese Perspectives and Comparative Theology: Supreme Ways in Intersection", *Theological Studies*, 64(2003), 362-387.

mentioning that tradition I am venturing beyond the simple. Or, as you might have noticed, I am turning back to the context of the previous *Cantower*, the scattered community that are the writers for *Theological Studies*. We shall get to them again, and to Zen, later.

Back then to The Show. It is obviously helpful if you have a favorite illustration, and it is best if the illustration has a history, if The Show has been on the road for a century or for millennia. Then The Show has a story of good ways and poor ways, of suggested improvements, of successes and stupidities. The Show has learned from its mistakes: maybe. Now what about Adam Smith's suggestion? "The division of labour, so far as it can be introduced, occasions, in every art, a proportionable increase in the productive power of labour."³ It has certainly taken hold in the world of industry. And there are those who consider that it is not all good there, that an individually-crafted product is regularly better than the factory product.

Now The Show that I am interested in involves a product such that - so I claim - the strategy of division of labour that I have in mind is beyond criticism. Wow: that should annoy a few! Annoyance, of courses, is part of the function of these *Cantowers*, but I leave the topic to section 36.6. Still, the point is worth attend to here. The product that is of interest is the product of Ideas To Live By, doctrines and policies of daily doings. It is in a different world from the production of pens or pianos or penthouses. So, it is that world from which criticism of the patterns of production of such goods emerges: is the line-production of guitars always a good idea, a good idea to "do by", to live by? But what of the patterns of the production and criticism of ideas to live by? I am making the possibly-annoying claim that there is an unavoidable pattern in that case. Lonergan made that claim for theology (as Mendeleev claimed for chemistry: but that's another show on another level!), and perhaps I can stay with theology here for the moment, in continuity with the previous *Cantower's* pointings. What might the reaction of the readers and writers of *Theological Studies* be to my suggestion? Recall the

³Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, chapter one.

old song “Don’t Fence Me In”? That, certainly, represents a major reaction to Lonergan’s suggestion of 30+ years ago. Other reactions, of course, include a variety of non-reactions or distortions. But let us stay with the fence haters, “Let me ride....”.

The central function of my *Cantowers*, indeed of my work since the late 1960s, has been to bring out the fact that the fencing is not Lonergan’s but history’s. It is history as represented by humanity’s reach for Ideas To Live By that has generated the eight-fold mess that is present in every zone of inquiry into how-to-live. My efforts to communicate that have varied over audiences and disciplines. The effort in the previous *Cantower* was a calculatedly complex one, which indeed derailed my original idea of trying to present the wonder of functional collaboration in a simple manner. Without the show of learned competence, I would not be taken seriously. But will I be listened to effectively? I have my doubts. Oh well: just another shot in the Ark. But the key strategy, apart from learned discussion and references and pushes for an enlargement of insights for myself and others, is the same always. There is a mess, a waste of energy: there is a better way, and that better way is somehow staring us in the face.

That is not the way I wrote in the previous *Cantower* regarding the mess that is present Christology. I was being diplomatic, but also seeing the story of the searching as “better than it was”⁴. In *Cantowers XXXIX -XLI* I will move towards the suggestion that The Show in Christology is in fact pretty shabby. But in the article on *Theological Studies* ‘communal effort I was focused on “cajoling”’.

Did you read that *Cantower*? How you read it depends on whether you were in agreement about the hodic division of labour, or skeptical about the project. If you were in agreement, then what you got was perhaps some clues as to how you might go about sharing the conviction. That, obviously, is a major piece of my revolutionary enterprise. If you were skeptical, did I perhaps shake that skepticism? I tried to show that the situation in the study of Christology as represented by ten years of *Theological Studies*,

⁴*Method in Theology*, 251.

was pretty scattered, and I nudged towards the notion that the bits could be ordered in a manner that would add some measure of efficiency. I could have been more blunt; but blunt just does not do it. What will do it, and what that essay was hoping for, is some few getting the point, taking up the challenge, trying the functional thing in the zone of their own present competence.

I have, then, some who agreed with me before reading the previous essay, and a few added. I continue, in various ways, to try to add to the group of those who agree: but that is not getting *The Show on the Roll*. So: obviously part of my effort to get the show on the roll is to help towards performance, and that is the concern of these present *Cantowers*. *Cantower XXXIV*, as I noted there, emerged from a collaborative effort, from an editor and a journal and a group who wanted to have a shot at functional interpretation. We await the results, but learning how to improve performance as we go along. And my own effort in these next *Cantowers* is very much a learning effort. We are moving forward in a zone of fantasy and happy failure, trying to do something worthwhile in shrinking degrees of badliness.

That, in brief, is what these *Cantower* are about: getting the community, scattered in interests and efforts, to shift to a perspective of collaboration. I have been writing about that perspective in much heavier terms throughout these past decades but that fuller view is beside the point at the moment. Still, you may wish to pause and cherish the fuller perspective, and sections 36.5 and 36.7 below dovetail with that wish. But it is important to note, even in this first section, that both obviousness and cherishing are very relative businesses. I recall an earlier discovery of mine, that I have shared previously. **Great ugliness is as remote as great beauty**. The ugliness of our present messy journaling towards better ideas of life may be evident enough from the previous *Cantower* for those who have ears to hear: but the ugliness will be brutally evident aided by history's eyes and ayes.

And perhaps there is some worth in calling the issue of authenticity within history, and raising now the annoying question of present authenticities. Are there people writing in journals now who have read and tuned out of Lonergan's and

history's challenge to cut back to humbler but more beautifully efficient contributions to our search for ideas of progress? We are on the topic of the communal search for meaning, for a functional meaning, surely also for a functional search for meaning? So, I recall as context the simple introduction of *Method in Theology* to the functions of meaning, to the degrees of common meaning and the shades of authentic and inauthentic existence in the achievement of such meaning.

“Such existing may be authentic or unauthentic, and this may occur in two different ways. There is the minor authenticity of the subject with respect to the tradition that nourishes him. There is the major authenticity that justifies or condemns the tradition itself. In the first case there is passed a human judgment on subjects. In the second case history and, ultimately, divine providence pass judgment on traditions”. We are nourished now by a tradition of research, scholarship, political and pastoral concern, etc that defines an acceptable, plausible authenticity. It is a minor authenticity of the longer cycle of decline in which “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively.”⁵ The major authenticity echoes the cry of history for a functional global community. The journals of chemistry changed in the 1870s under the pressure of Mendeleev's authentic discovery. Lonergan's discovery of the major authenticity of a cosmopolis of culture “tends to be shouldered out of the busy day”⁶ forty years after its revealing. The longer cycle of decline in theology makes all the twists that Lonergan describes for the general culture.

But I am broadened reflections overmuch. Let me get back to the obviousness in its simplest illustration: it is to be a help to you, whether you agree or disagree. If you agree, then develop my illustration in your own zone, for your colleagues (but check your job security!); if you disagree, my seemingly harmless illustration from a non-threatening zone might bring both delight and light. So, here I presume to repeat my tale of a family mess from chapter 3 of *A Brief History of Tongue*, whose title lurks in the

⁵*Insight*, 229[254].

⁶*Insight*, 625[648].

title of this section: “A Rolling Stones Gathers *Nomos*”. The chapter presents a way into thinking functionally, and the following chapter is a help to finding your own way in that way, finding your way indeed to W3 and to hints about the *mos* of modernity and post-modernity, and the *nomos* that is to be a global obviousness in a millennium. If you are familiar with the tale and the text you might skip the next section. Still, we are in a new context here, so it could be a fresh telling telling telling.⁷

36.2 Showtime in the Family⁸

So I move to a final story that I and my students have found helpful in discovering the homeliness of functional specialization.⁹ The story is of a Toronto family that has a holiday cottage at some lake north of the city. Your imagings might best be served by thinking of your own environment of escape, from Bombay, from London, to a *daca*, whatever. Twenty years previously, Molly and Poldy, both in their early twenties, inherited the cottage, and it has been their July holiday spot ever since. At that time their children, Zack and Till, were toddlers of age 3 and 4 years. Over the initial years the holiday group grew to include Molly’s mother, Moses, and Poldy’s brother-in-law, Tseng. After twenty years the holiday group is now Grandma Moses, aged 68, Uncle Tseng, aged 50, Molly and Poldy, both at 43, Zak at 22 and Till at 23. They regularly pack up and head for the cottage each July. And increasingly over the years the reality is that they are not happy campers.

You may already sense the direction I am taking: noting the emergence of a pattern of attention to the past that leads to a parallel pattern of reaching a feasible

⁷Recall note 1 above. The finding of one’s way beyond *mos* to *nomos* is a topic of chapter 4 of *A Brief History of Tongue*. The tripling of *telling* reminds you, I hope, of the lift of culture symbolized by such tripling e.g. of *about* in in previous *Cantowers*. See note 20 of *Cantower XXVII* .

⁸The section is quoted from pp. 100-105 of *A Brief History of Tongue*.

⁹See *Method in Theology*, 14, 351. Recall the discussion in *A Brief History of Tongue* chapter one of the axial shift. Paradigm shifts take time to become ‘homely’.

strategy for a better holiday collaboration. I stress here the value of your concrete intention and imagination. My classroom leisured discussion always generated the emergence of personal anecdotes of hidden misery and pretended joy: an Oscar Wilde could elaborate with a Dorian Earnestness or a Chevy Chase. So, in my version, Grandma Moses' real joy has grown over the years to be bingo; it is left behind during 'vacation'. Uncle Tseng, a well-practiced alcoholic, does not drive, and at the lake he is far from a liquor store. Zak and Till, at 3 or 10, were happy in isolation lake-side play: now their interests are more in condoms than canoes. Molly and Poldy, of course, are caught in the conventional middle. Etc etc.

There comes, then, the crisis time, a February decision time regarding holidays, which never before was a real decision time, bursts into a communal need to pause, to take stock, to turn to the idea, the ideas of holidays and misery, of desperations and desires.

And here I must ask of you a fantasy of optimism. The family is magnificently resilient; a lift occurs in their 'notion of survival', *supervivere*.¹⁰ They shift from a plane of moral impotence, probably with the help of satire and humour, to a plane of effective and affective freedom of creative conversation.¹¹ The frank and discomfiting issue? What has really been going on, and what is to be done about it. Remarkably, our family does not take the easy barren routes of anecdotal accusation or monadic protectiveness or groundless optimism. They structure their reflective efforts. They need, not anecdotes, but evidence: so, they dig up diaries and souvenirs, accounts of weather and neighborhood changes, etc. Till's diaries of 15 years reveal the frustrations of blossoming feminine freedom in the presence of paternalism; uncle Tseng's jottings to a Chinatown mate show a growing horror of mere water; etc.

¹⁰'The Notion of Survival', where survival is taken in the superlative sense, is the title of chapter ten of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*. The treatment there complements the present discussion.

¹¹The context here is *Insight*, chapter eighteen, sections 2.6 - 3.5.

But the family are wise enough to consider 'revealing' and 'showing' to somehow be a task beyond the mere gathering of records.. What might be called research can provide the old account, the quaint shoreshell; but these have to be interpreted, and the interpretation may vary greatly from family member to family member, from one age-level to another.

Further, it is one thing to talk about the meaning of this shoreshell for Zack fifteen years ago; it is another task to place it in the+ story of Zack's 23 years. What was going on in Zack's growing up, particularly in those July holidays? What was, is the true story of those Julys together in theses decades?

Again, you must envisage here an open struggling group, each with their own bent, putting together his or her story,, each a version of their story together; the genesis of a set of histories.

Which is the correct history? How might the family tackle the further, fourth, task? Surely each must mull over all the versions on a sort of discomfoting dialectic tightrope.¹² Each, in that mulling struggle, seeks not just a 'best account' but something basic to a future July, a set of norms,, measures, for 'best times together'¹³, a forward-looking *foundation* that itself grounds a descent towards future policy, planning, concrete decisions.¹⁴

So, out of Dialectic emerges, painfully, illuminatively (think of the puzzles of the first chapter of *A Brief History of Tongue*) a *foundational* view that is hard to disagree with self-consistently: genuine desire of all should not be frustrated; the desires of each are changing, growing realities that all should advert to, attend to, but always with a reach towards the full context of change, emergence, limitations. And, strangely but not so strangely, this turn from the four tasks regarding the past generates a mirroring of

¹²The relevant strategy is described very precisely in *Method in Theology*, 245-250.

¹³See *Ibid.*, 251: "presenting an idealized version of the past, something better than was the reality".

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 365-7.

those tasks in the reaching towards the future, towards July. Policy reaches for truths in a way that parallel's history's search, but now they are truths that, normatively, should be laced through the story as it emerges: "We hold these truths," as the American Constitution puts it. Interpreting them adequately is another and difficult matter, task: planning must be systematic and deeply the opposite of amnesia.¹⁵ In the light of past success and failure - itself subject to constant creative anamnesis - a spectrum of possible holidays can be hypothesized, a range of which seems better than the shrinking conventions of recent years. The final step of shared strategic decision will bring that spectrum into the concrete context of present finances and weather forecasts, states of health and moods of ages, the give and take of an upcoming July together or perhaps not together.

I hope that, as you worked through my story, you had glimpses of where I was leading you. In its fullest scope you could come to associate Tseng, the relation by marriage, with the Chinese Ecumene which puzzled Eric Voegelin.¹⁶ Tseng's bent towards booze, of course, has no significance, though one could think of parallels regarding oriental psychic strangeness and potentials of The Middle Kingdom frustrated by so-called Western Civilization.¹⁷ For the 20 years you may substitute 20 centuries, or 20 million years: Grandma Moses is a bow both to remote African and proximate Middle eastern origins.

My concern, then, is for the human family in its obscure Vedic reachings for a structure of reflection, education, *Wendung zur Idee*, that would raise the chances of communal well-being. The relevant present structure, I would claim, an eightfold

¹⁵I have treated this topic in "Systematics: a Language of the Heart", chapter five of *The Redress of Poise*.

¹⁶*The Ecumenic Age*, the concluding sections.

¹⁷See P. McShane, "Middle Kingdom, Middle Man. T'ien-hsia: i jen", chapter one of *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, edited by P. MCSHANE, University Press of America, 1984.

structure of global 'academic'¹⁸ collaboration meets needs desperately present in areas as seemingly separate as linguistics, musicology, economics and law.¹⁹ Arne Noess, the father of the Deep Ecology movement, has struggled with something similar in ecology. He arrived at four collaborative layers that correspond roughly to the four forward-looking tasks.²⁰

36.3 Forward-Looking, Treacle-Turning

The previous section ended in the company of Arne Noess and the Ecology Movement, looking forward. What I wish to bring to your attention in this section is the apparently simple and obvious function of the *Cantowers*, to face us forward. It is a function that is caught neatly in the slogan "Remembering the Future"²¹; more obscurely it lurked in the title of *Cantower IV*: "Metaphysics THEN." But I would have you note that it is not just the forward specialties that are forward-looking. Think again

¹⁸I write 'academic' thus to recall the serious concerns of those in Academus' backyard. Such concerns stand in contrast with what is regularly meant now by the words 'merely academic' - which surely says something about learned discourse. See Eric Voegelin, *Order and History*, vol. 3.

¹⁹Chapter five of McShane, *Economics for Everyone. Das Jus Kapital*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2000, has the same title as this chapter of *A Brief History of Tongue: "A Rolling Stone Gathers Nomos"*. Bruce Anderson, *Discovery in Legal Decision-Making*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1996, treats of functional specialization in law in chapter eight. I have discussed functional specialization in musicology in "Metamusic and Self-meaning", chapter two of *Shaping of the Foundations. Lonergan's Challenge to the University and the Economy*, chapter five, treats of functional specialization in literary studies.

²⁰Arne Noess, "Deep Ecology and Ultimate Premises", *The Ecologist*, vol. 18, 1988, 131. This volume includes the special double issue on deep ecology (nos. 4 and 5), devoted to "Rethinking Man and Nature: Towards and Ecological Worldview".

²¹I borrowed the phrase from Declan Kiberd's title for his essay on J.M.Synge in *Inventing Ireland. The Literature of the Modern Nation*, Harvard University Press, 1995. The mood of that essay is relevant here.

of the researchings of our quaint family: were they not forward-looking? To bring the odd point heart-home to you perhaps a pause over the nature of historical work is relevant. Lonergan's reflections on it would seem to be a prolonged mediation and commentary on "Ranke's perpetually quoted phrase, *wie es eigentlich gewesen*,"²² on the strategies of finding out "just what went on". But what went on is what is going on, the tadpole of the human story. History is factual, yes, but the fact includes the largest facts of history, the exigent tadpole-hearts of our darkness and loneliness. Functional history is then to be factual in a full luminous sense of "what is going on", where **what** is **whats**, you and I going on.²³

And the whats of our historical interest are those whats that expressed some madness of reach, cousins to the Hermines and Harrys who bone-claim, "my kingdom is not of this town."²⁴ There are the madnesses of reach that seem purely aesthetic or primarily solitary, like the reachings of a Georg Sand or a Dogen, but they are not; they echo forward our tadpole tale. Then there are the madnesses that are solidly pragmatic, yet still are not enslaved by axiality, by an ecumenic age. Neither group of reachers can be reached by you and I except by contemplation, time out from the cycling decline that seeks to constitute our daze. So, the core forward-looking that is within my invitation is a sublation of Zen and Ken wisdom into a Then stance that yet is Now, now. Core forward looking, THEN, is an effort - what type, for whom, how: we shall touch on

²²*Method in Theology*, 185.

²³I introduced this perspective first in reflection on Arjuna's problem of life, of "what is man?", in the *Bhagavad-Gita: See Process: Introducing Themselves the Young (Christian) Minders*, chapter 1 section 4.

²⁴Hermine and Harry are two of the characters of Herman Hesse's *Steppenwolf*. "Ah, Harry, we have to stumble through so much dirt and humbug before we reach home. And we have no one to guide us. Our only guide is our homesickness" (Penguin, 179). The reference to Jesus is obvious, where one can uncomfortably replace the broad "world' with some town or institution of Christianity. Paralleling Jesus' pilgrimage with other pilgrims is useful. In *Process* I parallel Jesus with the fictitious Molly Bloom: see *Process*, sections 1.2 and 5.2.

these points in the next two sections - to be about, perhaps to be “about about about” in one’s pilgrimage. What do I mean, What is it to be about, round and about? If you have been struggling through these *Cantowers*, especially those that tried a new entry into the early chapters of *Insight*, then you sense that I cannot tell you. We are dealing here with a principle of displacement far deeper than the one that occupied Archimedes, a measure, a *nomos*, in a zone remote from the sticks of our measuring exercises. We are back with the challenge of a new existentialism, reaching for the constitution of the subject that is me, a constitution of a Whatas, Whereas, Whenas, that perhaps, like Nadia Boulanger or Pericles, can hear the music of the spheres?²⁵ How far might you go in such madness? The function of my writing, of this paragraph, is to invite you to at least a single step of madness, now, Now.

Such a step is a treacle-turning, “I-caught”, I-catching, Aye-catching, All-catching, that may well continue to pilgrim ocean-end in gull and skull rejoicean murmurings.²⁶ But without some such stepping the treacle-turning that I wish to speak a little of now can too easily become “vacant, empty, vapid, insipid”²⁷ even if its deeper dullness is cloaked “by an air of profundity, a glow- of self-importance, a power to command respectful attention.”²⁸ But let us turn now to some musings about treacle-turning.

I am, of course, back, or forward, to talking about the revolution that was the topic of *Cantower I*, a small group challenging an empire, the madness of the Vortex Movement of Pound and Wyndam-Lewis. But now, this far out in the venture, I may

²⁵The orientation of the elder Shakespeare’s *Pericles* is considered in a relevant manner at the conclusion of chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. Nadia Boulanger’s final conversation is considered in the Afterword of *Process*.

²⁶The references here are to Hopkins’ *Windhover* (see the Epilogue to *Music That Is Soundless*) and to the conclusion of Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*.

²⁷*Method in Theology*, 73. The final word of Lonergan here is “dull”.

²⁸*Insight*, 542[566].

be more explicit about strategic points of attack. These, of course, have been a topic before, so the present few pages are perhaps no more than an illustrative ramble, recollecting: a chance for you to pause and poise over your own luck, your own cunning possibilities. Are you the chemistry teacher that I talked about in *Cantower XXXVIII*? Are you the crazy young lady that was the focus of attention when I wrote “will you go, lassie, go?” In *Cantower V*? Even if you are busy just surviving the daily insanity, you have read thus far, most of you good-willingly, and so at least you can share my tale of section 33.2 in your own way, in your own zones. You can thus “make conversion a topic and thereby promote it”²⁹; and perhaps “go in a friendly manner,”³⁰ remembering that “doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.”³¹ A function of the *Cantowers*, obviously, is to get others to promote the needed division of labour, and I invite you, if you are too busy, to get in on the same game. Be a shrewd mix of Socrates and Diagalev, or perhaps as brutal as Nadia Boulanger: nudge the music and the musing forwards. “This is the way to the musey room.”³²

In the last two *Cantowers* especially I have talked of entry points to the Tower-tasks. The group with which I presently work are homing in on illustrative efforts at functional interpretation in an effort to turn treacle in that area.³³ It seems to me to be a

²⁹*Method in Theology*, 253.

³⁰I quote here from Ezra Pound, “Commission”, *Selected Poems*, Faber, London, 1959, 97. I recall it again, referring to it merely as **Commission**. A lengthy extract from it forms the Interlude before chapter 1 of my *Music That Is Soundless. A Fine Way for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2003.

³¹*Method in Theology*, 299.

³²*Finnegans Wake*, 8.

³³In *Cantower IX* I reflected on that sad volume, *Lonergan’s Hermeneutics*, that came from a meeting of experts in Montreal in 1986. Mainstream efforts in the area of interpretation since do not lift heart or hope regarding Lonergan’s project.

key entry zone, the GPO to be occupied, if only by a rag-tag group of amateurs.³⁴ But if you happen to be in some other zone that is a pale shadow of functional reflection, and this in any academic area, then you might risk some discrete pushing in the new direction. My reflections in these next *Cantowers* may be of some help. Since you are reading along here, I must presume that you have some interest in Lonergan's writings, may even be a teacher or a student, struggling for light, or even for a thesis.

No need for me to repeat here my advise about getting through the system, summed up in a quip of Lonergan: "never try to teach your professor anything!". But clearly a function of my *Cantower* effort is to change the teaching of e.g. *Insight* and *Method in Theology*. *Cantowers XXVII-XXXI* parallel the first five chapters of *Insight*, and *Insight's* chapters 15-21 (counting the Epilogue as 21) are paralleled by the identical sequence of numbers in these essays. *Method in Theology*, both in its teaching and in its application, is our present concern.

The application is in itself an education: to say that is simply to advert clearly to what I call GEMb. So, it is no great leap to see that centre stage is education, formal and informal. But I would note the critical need to change gear in the study of education. What I have said previously e.g. of the teaching of economics and of chemistry is vital if we are to rescue the next generation from the serial killers. But we desperately need the shift to scientific respectability that hodings or functionality will give to education. Present studies in education could well be paralleled to chemistry before Mendeleev, except that chemistry before Mendeleev had a good century or two of decent health.³⁵ Is there someone among my readers who might do for education what Lonergan attempted for theology in *Method*? But here there is also the attack-zone of

³⁴*Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 4, (2004), focuses on functional interpretation. None of the writers (including myself!) claim competence in the area.

³⁵The lag in 'higher' fields of inquiry mounts, uncomfortably reaching a peak in the rich descriptive decadence that is dominant in theology. A type of Platonist nominalism excludes the study of hylemorphic grace. This massive failure obviously cuts the heart out of serious progress in education.

interpretation. Perhaps my attack on Mankiw's "Thinking Like an Economist" might give you a start in your own area? And if you are a teacher you have the discomfoting challenge of the Childout Principle which is quite beyond present classroom performances in any discipline.³⁶ It is worth doing badly as we all struggle to "speak against the tyranny of the unimaginative," to "be against all sorts of mortmain."³⁷

36.4 The Personal Search

In the previous section I referred back to my lengthy quotation from Ezra Pound's "Commission", a piece of the book *Music That Is Soundless*, written in the Summer of 1968, and its subtitle then betrays its 'sixties' context: "*An Introduction to God for the Graduate*". I was "into" guitar at the time, and Paul Simon and Bob Dillon and Joan Biaz and revolution. I still am "into" revolution, at 72, precisely double my age then. The little book, written crazily then in 33 days, strangely survives well, much better than the piece in section 36.2 above, on the crazy family.³⁸ It fermented out of an afternoon's reading of the poetry of John of the Cross, walking on Sandymount Strand - a famous *Ulysses* scene of Joyce. By the time I returned to my ill-fitting 'home' in the Jesuit house of studies I had seven chapter titles in my head.

Thirty six years later I am *telling* you about it, and indeed, as it happens, I wrote just now - at 4.00 a.m.! - the blurb for its new appearance. But my problem herenow therethen is the meaning for you and me of *telling*. We are back - or forward - at the curious tripling that I have used in regularly, as in the conclusion of section 36.2. But let me avoid that topic and keep a focus on my central topic here, which is **growth**. Can I tell you of growth? Here, perhaps, I am at the heart of the function of these *Cantowers*.

³⁶I dealt with both the large-scale and the small-scale needs of education in "A Reform of Classroom Performance", *Divyadaan. Journal of Education and Philosophy*, 13 (2002), 279-309. The article is reproduced as the second half of *Cantower VI*.

³⁷**Commission**, 96-7.

³⁸Recall the comment of note 1 above.

Why am I spending this decade - to end with *Cantower CXVII* in December 2011, or earlier if I am reprieved - struggling up through this rather crazy agenda of searching? The answer in this section is three-faced. Let me start with the face of you, talked of in so many different ways so far.

There is my hope that I am not alone in my craziness, that there surely are some few on our global trek who seek my type of enlightenment. What that is perhaps is evident enough from the direction of my efforts so far and I shall return to that problem below and later. But I talk at the moment of some few: in the next section I write of a larger reach. Perhaps, though, it is as well to reiterate a point I make regularly to other searchers: each of us has his or her own climb, and for some the call is for little of the type of climbing that I write of here. So what I have in mind, in minding, here, is the possibility that you are weird enough to want to "go all the way"³⁹ in the search for an answer to the question, "Who am I, what is my pilgrimage, and where is my joyous destiny?"⁴⁰ And what do you and I, therethen herenow, mean by that question? If you are on a track, a trek, that parallels mine, then you are a tadpole of meaning reaching towards a frog that is also, wonderously, a luminous fog.⁴¹ My luminous fogfrog question herenow repeats a dynamism that was there at 36 in my cherishing of

³⁹A context here is Lonergan's reflection, "Mission and Spirit" (*A Third Collection*, 27) on Aristotle's reach for excellence.

⁴⁰I shall shortly (note 43) refer to Jaworski's book on *Synchronicity* where he thinks out features of Jung's view of synchronicity, "a meaningful coincidence of two or more events, where something other than the probability of chance is involved" (*Synchronicity*, ix). Synchronically, the blurb-question for the cover of *Music That Is Soundless* that I wrote earlier this morning bubbles nicely into the text. But what is relevant herenow for you is the possible improbable neural looseness in you that would auto-screen in and round-about and biodynamically the present patterns of suggestions.

⁴¹I cannot emphasize enough the needed move, towards the post-axial period, into a bone-echoing of mystery that would change our streets and speech. See *Cantower XVII*, sections 1, which meshes with Lonergan's discussion of mystery in *Insight 17*, section 1.

Bachelard eccentricity: "Late in life, with indomitable courage, we continue to say that we are going to do what we have not yet done: we are going to build a house."⁴² And, I have insisted, since it is a fact of staying thus alive, that the house built any day can turn out or up or on to be a mere chrysalis for the morrow's butterfly.⁴³

Am I indulging you and me in flighty metaphor? No: I am writing about the explanatory life. What, you may ask, is the explanatory life? And I might answer - and of course do now, glibly and gloriously - that it is the Speech of Infinite Understanding.⁴⁴ But what is the explanatory life that is possible for you - some few - and me now? It can be described as heartholding Lonergan's challenge with a life-longing seriousness: "Thoroughly understand what it is to understand....".

What that challenge is, of course, and who you few might be, is only discovered in the effort, an effort that is grippingly circumstantial and, when successful as a life

⁴²Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969, 61.

⁴³I would like very much to answer the next question in the text adequately, conclusively. But that is impossible unless you are either tinged with the madness of the quest or already old in it. It is the topic of many of my efforts, but particularly the Bacchus Page at the end of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. Perhaps a twist on my favorite parallel would help. I am not talking about anything vague or mystical: I am talking about the effort to understand, say, either the self-energy of an electron or the self-energy of a minding. If I give a week to the task in the first case, focusing on particular leads, I make progress: and I could not 'tell' myself of last week the content of that progress. Further, this is true at any age, even if there is a question of good pedagogy, symbolism etc, shortening the days and the daze. Why should this not apply to the second task? Especially if you take GEMb seriously, so that the data of the inquiry into minding increases in view of first- task work? I see no grounds for the implicit claim of axial decadence that the growth of the elder metaphysician's meaning of minding be more communicably than progress in the simplest of sciences.

⁴⁴We are in the deepest of wonder here, touching on the cherished creational content of the proceeding word of God: a beginning is in Lonergan's *De Deo Trino. Pars Systematica, Quaestio III*. They is God's tense intense **Explanation** of our being. A very worthwhile read here is Lonergan's marvelous free-flowing reflection - an answer to a question on suffering - in *Understanding and Being*, 374-77.

style, massively lucky.⁴⁵ An aim of these *Cantowers* is to change your circumstances and increase your luck. But let me look at this negatively for a moment, with a negativity that can generate in you a sigh either of relief or regret. First, “thoroughly understand” doesn’t mean thoroughly understand: it means reach out towards understanding all the realms of reality, slowly, painfully, so as to arrive at some serious heuristic neurodynamic grip on that reaching. So: you face face face the discomfort of your little luck when I identify one key element of that reach and that grip. It sits therenow as a painful presence, present, gift, in Lonergan’s “Canon of Complete Explanation”. What are you and I to make of the word **complete**? But the word does not sit: it flickers forward there on screen or page, locked into a molecular and photonic referencing of space-time and its neurodynamic notion that is you and I, thus screen-tested for “The Hero’s Journey.”⁴⁶ There is the discomfoting invitation of “a natural bridge over which we may advance”⁴⁷. Is the invitation yours, that

“at his council I should turn aside
 Into that ominous tract which, all agree,
 Hides the Dark Tower”⁴⁸?

⁴⁵I mention luck here are there in the text. It is a massive contemplative challenge to soak up the fact that luck in its fullness refers to your cherished presence in the **Explanation** that is the Word of God. You are “The Song of the Adorable” (the title of section 5.4 of *Process*).

⁴⁶The title of Part Three of Joseph Jawarski, *Synchronicity. The Inner Path of Leadership*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, 1998. Part three begins (p. 89) with a diagram adapted from Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. I shall return to this book in the conclusion of the final section.

⁴⁷The first paragraph of chapter five if *Insight*.

⁴⁸Robert Browning, “Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came” (1855), lines 13-15. I am recall the relevant context of my previous quoting of the poem (p. 22 of *CantowerIV*) and the note there continues: “It is the beginning of mad Edgar’s song (Shakespeare, *King Lear*, III. Iv. 171). A childe is a young knight who has not proved himself. Obviously I am thinking here of a new age lady, and perhaps not of a tower but a well, a womb, of meaning.”

If you suspect it is, then I wish you better luck than I had, with companionship in your decades-asking, What is energy, What is *Energeia*?

But it is more than a wish, for a function of my Cantowers is to identify a *Tao*, thus to change the statistics of your luck. And the global structure of your circumstance: but that is the third face of the three I mentioned above, one to which I return in the following section. The first face, then, is yours: and if it is not, then the cliff-face described is to be admired by you, as you take a stand “against all sorts of mortmain”, so to “bring confidence upon the algae and the tentacles of the soul”⁴⁹ that would face on and in and about about about.⁵⁰ And that face about leads so strangely to a spirally about-face, a coming about so gently presented by Lonergan in his old-style writing that replaces **you** by **it**. I had better quote fully here this favorite write of passage of mine, so you may brood over your possible invitation to reach towards being a *Sargawit*.⁵¹

“So **it comes about** that the extroverted subject visualizing extension and experiencing duration gives place to the subject oriented to the objective of the unrestricted desire to know and affirming beings differentiated by certain conjugate potencies, forms, and acts grounding certain laws and frequencies. It is this shift that gives rise to the antithesis of positions and counter-positions. It is through its acknowledgment of the fact of this shift that a philosophy or metaphysics is critical. It is only by a rigorous confinement of the metaphysician **to the intellectual pattern of**

⁴⁹**Commission**, 96-97.

⁵⁰One of the great pages of *Insight* describes the brutality of commonsense’s stand - “taking care not to lose the common touch, maintaining one’s sense of reality” (417[442]) - against the metaphysical heroine that I describe, who “seeks to embrace the universe” (417[442]).

⁵¹For a discussion of *Sargawit* and a context of the full challenge see *Process*, chapter 6. *Cantower XXV*, section 4, reproduces the relevant central reflection on *Sargawit*. *Sarga* is the Sanscrit for ‘process of world creation or emanation’.

experience and of metaphysical objects to the universe of being as explained, that this basic enterprise of human intelligence can free itself from the morass of pseudo-problems that otherwise beset it”.⁵²

So, the first face is possibly yours, or your child’s child, or your student’s. My *Cantowers* offer encouragement and help.

The second face is my own, speaking these Cantowers to myself and you as I edge into the unknown. They are written from the moving viewpoint, but not like Lonergan’s *Insight*. I do not have the heuristic explanatory answers to the range of present and still-unspecified questions. So I live oddly in “such striving and groaning as would announce a new and higher birth”.⁵³ The reach, in the ending *Cantowers*, is for a heuristics, a dark luminous neurodynamic presence in energy’s noetic blossoming in me, of energy’s end. Indeed, there is the oddness and surprise of having named the reach for myself in the simple poem that brackets the second *Cantower*:

*Sun, flowers, Son-flowered,
 Speak to us of growth,
 Seed cauled, cribbed,
 Kabod yet confined,
 Crossed with dark earth,
 Light-refined,
 Rill open-ends a trill,
 Annotaste of Throat.*

36.5 Layered Communities

⁵²*Insight*, 514[537]. The boldfaced **boldface** is mine.

⁵³B. Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 26. On the next page he recalls Aristotle’s high way. “He presses us to strive to the utmost to make ourselves immortal and to live out what is finest in us. For that finest, though slight in bulk, still surpassed by far all else in power and in value”.

I seem, in that previous section, to be appealing to the few weirdos who might take some Proustian way, those able to take hodics as seriously as Nadia Boulanger would have her students take music. "Do not take up music unless you would rather die than not do so. It must be an indissoluble love. And one with the great joy of learning, the firm determination to learn, the unswerving perseverance, the intense faithfulness".⁵⁴ Heavens, that would even put me off, if I was young and serious: my own seriousness was always tempered by a committed unseriousness.⁵⁵ And indeed, the third face turning all of us to face the future must be regularly a face of tears or smiles, one distant from academic solemnity. Each us must find our own slow-growing contented level: and that encouragement is a piece of my *Cantowers*-function. I would say that this Lonergan stuff, or this philosophy and theology stuff, is all too serious. Here I appeal, as Lonergan did, to the analogy with the successful sciences.⁵⁶ People can do bachelor and master degrees in physics without having any original ideas and then go on to teach or whatever with reasonable success. You can get a doctorate in physics without any original work, indeed without even understanding the stuff properly!

I left this section of my essay on function till last, with endless jottings about the layers, the collaborations, whatever. But now I cut it all out or back to make that one simple point. I recall now a cartoon I used in a handout of thirty years ago: the runner running forward, while two runners up ahead and running forwards with the finishing

⁵⁴Quoted in Alan Kendall, *The Tender Tyrant. Nadia Boulanger. A Life Devoted to Music*, Macdonald and James, London, 1976, 10.

⁵⁵My reverend wife Sally pointed me this morning towards a poem "Lighten Up" (Joyce Rupp, *Prayers to Sophia*, Innisfree Press, Philadelphia, 2000, p.66), of which I quote the first and last verses: "Holy Wisdom, / 'lighten up,' your graced voice urges, / as I dig my way deeper / into the paralysis of anxiety. / Slowly I become more grateful / for your strong persistent voice / nudging me towards the laughter of letting go / and the chuckle of neglect."

Of course, there are the occasions of accidental uncommitted unseriousness: perhaps waking up pre-hungover in bafflingly strange places?

⁵⁶*Method in Theology*, 3.

line. And on the same page I quoted a Chinese worker of Moa's cultural revolution, The Great Leap Forward: "This leaping forward really takes it out of you!"

So: seriously, what I would like the *Cantowers* to do is to bring in a realism of attainment and attainability. That realism, of course, is best illustrated by my comic attention to the principle of displacement mentioned on the first page of *Insight*, something skipped by the experts. A few years ago a recognized expert in Lonergan studies showed me a page on which Lonergan tried to get him to the insight about taking square roots: the attempt, the expert admitted with a grin, was a failure. The first few generations of people interested in Lonergan's work were, are, just not sufficiently cultured to get the show seriously on the road. Nor perhaps are you. But you can find your niche. You can get a decent commonsense grip on the levels of your consciousness - making sure you shake off the Lonerganesque nonsense of leaving out attention to **planning**.⁵⁷ There is nothing wrong with a commonsense grip on the dynamics of question. What is deeply wrong, immoral, serial-killing, is when common sense overreaches, as it does in the main in contemporary Lonergan studies.⁵⁸

⁵⁷How this came about, and how legitimate it is to hang in with the slogan "be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible", is in fact a quite complex problem. You have a lead on it in Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic*. One of the deeper aspects is the twist I give to the meaning of **explaining** as a sort of 'guide forward', a valued word lining up with eternal creative speech. Again, reflect on chapter 12 of *Insight* and see how you can mesh in the notion of survival to the notion of being. But these are all heavy sophisticated pointers.

⁵⁸I mentioned **planning**, which will relate eventually to a massive new systematics, a zone the conception of which seems quite beyond the present experts. But perhaps thinking of, questioning about (I am not into the cajoling etc business of the next section) policy might be enlightening, a shaker of commonsense illusions. There is the sixth specialty called **Doctrines**. Ask an expert what is meant by "doctrine" (the equivalent, "policy") there: even ask for illustration. Does it mean the same as it would mean for an interpreter or a historian? Does it mean the same as what one might preach or advise about? No doubt the question puzzles you, for it is a difficult question relating to the slow emergence of the Tower, layers of remote meanings. On this you might find helpful my reflections in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chs. 3 and 4, on layers of meanings and strategies of ex-plaining. But you get the point: before we arrive at

But that is a topic for the next section: here I am talking about how you find your own way, your own pointing forward, your own ex-plaining. I find the topic altogether too large to putter around here. It is Aristotle's grappling with virtue, Aquinas pondering on prudence, Oriental searches for enlightenment. It is the Joycean thing of "walking into eternity along Sandymount Strand". All I would say at present is that finding your own version of the Tomega principle is important, a contemplative stand, and finding your own version of the Childout Principle, a principle of conversation, and finding your self luminously in the axial period so that you temper your optimism. The heart-difficulty is pushing to be luminous as a biography in history and meeting people thus. And in the axial period there is a massive problem of companionship. Perhaps recalling Oscar Wilde's quip is relevant: your life is a success if you find one friend.

36.6 "It Proceeds by Cajoling or Forcing Attention"⁵⁹

There's that **it** again! You and I, I hope, are **it**, trying for a come-about. What come-about? The original title of this section was "The Function of Annoying", a topic I raised early in *Lack in the BEINGSTALK*.⁶⁰ Certainly, that is a function of the *Cantowers* in the Lonergan community, even by their very existence. For many, they and I are an annoyance. There is a sense in which I do not belong in that community: I was going another way. In the late 1950s, of course, there was no great community, but by the mid-1960s there were signs, and by the Florida Conference it seemed that there was a community, but as I flew back from that conference it was pretty clear that the old conventions of philosophy and theology were in charge. I was the designated editor,

refined strategies of dealing with BS we have to wittily detect it. In the final section I would call your attention to the problem of detecting it in popular high-priced remedies that flow steadily from the media.

⁵⁹*Insight*, 398[423].

⁶⁰See *Lack in the Beingstalk*, 8.

indeed I was the editorial board! - of the mass of papers, and chatted with Lonergan before leaving about the publication process. I followed his suggestion of putting the popular stuff in the first volume and getting to the heavy stuff in volume 2.⁶¹ But the heavy stuff was heavily conventional, not in the line of the revolution lurking in *Insight*: and so things have remained, “breathless and late.”⁶² I hung in with the ‘Lonergan Movement’ through the following decades but by the mid-1990s I was out. From the point of view of the movement, of course, I was never “in”: an annoyance, yes, but one that could and should be ignored. I found small receptive audiences in Mexico, Columbia, Manhattan, but they, like myself, were on the fringe. I tried the Maritime “West Dublin” conference in recent years but that really did not take off. Still, the few participants were alive and well, living mentally outside the mainstream of serial-killing conventions.

Why am I tacking along this way, instead of tackling this aspect of *Cantower*-function, the function of shaking up Lonerganism? Because I am pretty sure that my readers here, and all along, are those few fringe-people. Certainly I could echo Hugo Meynell about Lonerganism, but with more vigour, “a small embattled segment of the learned Catholic Ghetto.”⁶³ But my readers know that. What to do? The title is Lonergan’s suggestion, his commission, and I add Pound’s commission, “Go in a friendly manner, Go with an open speech”.⁶⁴ I suspect that those who take me seriously have to go somewhat closed-mouthed, following Lonergan’s advice to me

⁶¹I organized the papers from the conference in six volumes, but only the first two appeared: *Foundations of Theology and Language, Truth and Meaning* (Gill, Macmillan, 1972,3).

⁶²*Insight*, 733[755].

⁶³Hugo Meynell, “The Plight and the Prospects of Lonergan Studies: A Personal View”, *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 3(2003), 167.

⁶⁴**Commission**, 97.

about my doctorate work in Oxford: "Give the fellow what he wants". But eventually there must be open speech. It was evident to me in the beginning of the 1960s - with the shallow evidence of a young enthusiast - that "this stuff wont take". It is massively obvious now that Lonergan can talk of historical consciousness eloquently and at the same time miss the point of its own imitation of Aristotelianism and Thomism. This is one sick puppy! The puppy does not wish to put its frisky nose into the medicine of the *Cantowers* but I suspect that history is on my side. I have spelled that out in various ways, and would point you especially towards the minimalism of chapter 3 of *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*. I tried for that minimalism regarding theology in *Cantower XXXV*, where the tone is one of tolerant cajoling. I have the suspicion and hope that cultural needs will force the attention of theologians and philosophers to acknowledge that what is missing out of their perspective is, bluntly, understanding. Theology and philosophy are pretty empty if there is no serious **of**. By serious I hope it is evident to you that I mean quite the opposite of pop-familiarity with the woes and the words and the wisdoms of modern culture: but I have a few word on that dangerous drift in the final section.

Meantime, I am asking for your revolutionary allegiance in cajoling rather than forcing attention. Attention to what? Positively, to the meaning of metaphysics as described by Lonergan, supplemented by his perspective on the division of labour - with the added kick in the ass, **as**, of that brutal central paragraph of *Method* 287. Negatively, there is the mess that corresponds to the family holiday strategy, with the parallel of twenty years of shrinkage since Lonergan's death. At the conclusion of *A Brief History of Tongue* I wrote "Lonergan is now ten years dead: we could do him honour by burying Lonerganism and moving in dreadfilled detailed seriousness towards the inner foothills of positional and positional being in a concern with the luminous flow of consciousness".⁶⁵ Heavy stuff, heavily put. It is ten years later now, and ten years 'worsen'. You, I hope, can put it more tellingly - without, of course,

⁶⁵*A Brief History of Tongue*, 158.

mentioning my unwelcome name. Are you Zack or Till, now at 23, being sucked into conventional Lonerganism? Might you not ask gently, subtly, What is going on? You must ask this first regarding your own biography: where is this going to leave you in ten or twenty years? : puttering along, e.g., with the same old same old comparative stuff, Lonergan and Jones on the notion of Junk?

But above all there is the need to nudge people towards having a shot at functional specialization. I have described elsewhere how its operation will gradually lift it Towerwise in a self-cleansing vortex,⁶⁶ but perhaps here you might take my word for it. Functional specialization will eventually chew up Lonerganism.

36.7 How to Build Global Community

I am writing this at the beginning of November, 2003, and as it happens our copy of the small Catholic paper, *The Catholic New Times*, published in Toronto, arrived yesterday.⁶⁷ Printed large across the top of the front page is what I now put above as the title of this section. Down the page are listed suggested strategies, which I list a few in the order of their appearance: think of no one as them; don't confuse your comfort with your safety; listen to music you don't understand; question consumption; know where your coffee comes from; etc. Not a very profound list, but yes, there is at least mention of the larger reach further down: redefine progress; understand the global economy. Still, the paper does not bear witness to that reach, nor do most religious papers and magazines: it should be evident, then, that I am not singling out this particular paper. Indeed, I need not even keep a focus on religious papers. Even the best of papers, like perhaps the 'heavier end' of the British Sundays, despite pretentious pages, do not have much serious reach. In the beginning of the previous century both Proust and Joyce wrote of newspapers. Proust regretted that the daily dose of print was

⁶⁶The central text on community development is chapter 4 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*. The individual challenge is compactly expressed in *Cantower IX*.

⁶⁷November 2, 2003.

not just a copy of some great work of fiction: how it would lift the day! And there is Joyce's quip, "Sufficient for the day is the newspaper thereof".

Why do I take this seeming accidental turn in the conclusion of this *Cantower*? But, after all, is not the title appropriate? And the twist towards newspapers brings us uncomfortably into the street. The twist resembles the twist I gave our reflections on metaphysics when I took you touring in Manhattan, and the pointing is the same. In perusing the mix of manuscript and typescript of one of Lonergan's efforts to close the section "Undifferentiated Consciousness in the Later Stages of Meaning" I sense his agony as he finally carved down the last sentence of that chapter three: "never has the need to speak effectively to undifferentiated consciousness been greater."⁶⁸ And perhaps, now, you might do worse than taking that tour again with me⁶⁹, as I wandered from the laughter of the poor on the crowded sands of Coney Island back to the glitter of Times Square: "a wonderland for anyone who could not read", to quote Chesterton's remark about a visit to New York.

Metaphysics, the metaphysics so strangely described in chapter 14 of *Insight*, is simply our daily bent made luminous: indeed, the prayer of the metaphysician might well be "give us this day our daily bent". Give us? But prayer and contemplation as I have presented it is a positive puzzling forward under the gentle pressure of the Cosmic Word. Insights are given gracefully in the "luminous darkness of circumstances"⁷⁰, but our brains and bones must reach.

To build global community is to begin to salvage that reach from the superficialities of papers and pieties. There is for the individual "A fine way for the lonely Bud A" , "trying to live... suffering.... threatened": the fine way is the excellent way of Aristotle, that is to emerge in later millennia as the obvious way, the

⁶⁸*Method in Theology*, 99.

⁶⁹See the second half of *Cantower XIV*.

⁷⁰I am recalling the title of a relevant article available in the Website Archives, "Towards a Luminous Darkness of Circumstances: *Insight* after Forty Years"

Tomega way, a way beyond Zen and Ken in a Then-stance that could be globe-turning. But the pace of that emergence pivots on the genesis of the Tower of Able, Tower People in a vortex reach for inner spaces where “no one has gone before” because these spaces have to emerge from fantasy to flesh and flash forth new homes.

So I must return to the book, **Synchronicity**, quoted earlier, to nudge you further to the suspicion that the emergence in fantasy and flesh of the full foundational vision is not a matter of some deep piety or some sudden light.⁷¹ The adequate foundational vision, whether achieved by an individual eccentrically in these coming decades or within the hodic vortex in the centuries to come, is, and is to be, the result of decades of plodding, spiraling. The book that I ask you to pause over now is one of the better ones of myriads of books that offer help, vision. They invite common sense to rise to some glimpse of a larger life. But they just do not cut it as foundations. Joseph Jaworski has certainly things to offer in his tracking of his version of “the journey Joseph Campbell describes in *The Hero of a Thousand Faces*”.⁷² But his version is not the journey that I describe here. He is right in agreeing that “it’s difficult, Betty Sue said, to find the language to talk about the life of the spirit in this secular world of ours”.⁷³ But that difficulty, within the fuller foundations, becomes a precise difficulty of thinking about about that life so as to push for both the full distant elder vision and the layers of language that would promote the salvific Tower climb. Jaworski can certainly pose the

⁷¹Why must I return, in this short section, to **Synchronicity**, a book that is certainly not central to any great movement? Because it is representative of a literature that meets a growing need with pointers that just don’t make the grade. Indeed it is a better-class effort than very many such works. It is highly praised within its particular tradition, as the lengthy blurb-collection indicates. “Jawoprski’s personal search for insight and inspiration is told so compellingly that the reader hardly notices how deep is the philosophy of leadership it conveys”, “From seemingly simple chords, this book develops into a prophetic symphony by its conclusion”. But global loneliness deserves better.

⁷²**Synchronicity**, x.

⁷³*Ibid.*, 191.

\$64,000 question. “What is the ground of being of being that allowed me to take action in a way that was consonant with my overall quest?”⁷⁴ But is not that question very like the question that baffled Augustine, that concerned Thomas for decades, that Lonergan struggled with on his way to a foundational vision?⁷⁵ And that foundational answer is radically remote from the demands of late cycling decline’s reach for fixes.

But Jaworski is doing his best, as Candace Pert is, in their search for meaning. She and he reach into the available print, but the printsteps bear witness to centuries of betrayal by metaphysics and theology. So we swing back to the grim reality of a general bias of culture, living in screaming comfort in a world gone nicely mad. The inner cry not only of such people as Pert and Jaworski, but of Zack and Till and all the ‘little people’ is for a cosmopolis that is “not a police force”⁷⁶, “not a busy body”⁷⁷, but bearing “witness to the possibility of ideas”⁷⁸ in its struggle “to protect the future against the rationalization of abuses and the creation of myths”⁷⁹. “It is not easy”.⁸⁰ It has some identity in the Tower of Able.⁸¹

⁷⁴*Ibid.*, 133.

⁷⁵I am referring to Lonergan’s doctorate work, published in *Grace and Freedom*.

⁷⁶*Insight*, 238[263].

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 239[264].

⁷⁸*Ibid.*

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, 240[265].

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 241[266].

⁸¹I am prescinding from the aspect of grace, and focusing on method. It is not a miracle or a quick fix but simply the latest human move towards the solution of Plato’s and Lonergan’s problem of the implementation of history’s energy.