

## THE INTERIOR LIGHTHOUSE II: *INSIGHT* AND FUTUROLOGY

### Preface

In her short Preface to *Middlemarch*, Georg Eliot writes of Teresa of Avila as a little girl walking south to convert the Muslims. In this short Preface an old man thinks of the road to rescue Putin's Russia and Palestine's children. The older Teresa writes of an Interior Castle which seems to have little to do with Muslims; this old guy writes of an Interior Lighthouse which has everything to do with Russians and Muslims.

When the editor and I first considered, at the beginning of March 2017, this essay of mine for *Divyadaan* 28/3 (2017), I mused about it in relation to world religions, and even arrived at a title that fitted that musing: "Prayers of *Insight*: The Interior Lighthouse II." I scribbled to him my initial musings:

You might be amused at my venturing this morning into: Prashna (Sanskrit) and Frashna (Avestan), the origins of the word *prayer*, which has a primitive meaning of **question**. All related to the meaning of my title for that article, now titled: "Prayers of *Insight*: The Interior Lighthouse II." Interesting that The **Yashts** (Yašts) [related to Frashna] are a collection of twenty-one hymns in the Younger Avestan language. So, the 21 sections of *Insight* {Epilogue as chapter 21} have a strange ancient echo. In both those ancient traditions Prayers – Persons – are in the realm of creators of the world. Now there's a fresh view of *Insight*!

At that stage I returned to my current project which was a follow-up on the struggle of the five authors in *Divyadaan* 28/2 (2017), and in particular to search forward, from suggestions there, towards a shifting of Lonergan Studies towards the "third way, difficult and laborious" that would leave behind the way of "academic disciplines" and present "successful science" to favor, foster, globalize, cyclic functional collaboration. So I began what in fact appears below under the title of "Futurology" and continued till I saw the need to move to the second section with title "The Interior Lighthouse." At that stage there came the enlightenment, a turn in my interior touring, that led me to merge the project with the challenge of this third article, and the challenge that emerged from the final article of Terrance Quinn in *Divyadaan* 28/2 (2017),

titled “Towards the Positive Anthropocene Age: Closing the Gap.” Our group effort had aimed thus high, seeking to arrive at a fuller heuristics perspective within the eighth specialty, but eventually we homed in on the possibilities of seeding some shift to functional collaboration within the followers of Lonergan. As I struggled on through March, my own high aim of reaching to a future convergence of what I call *Tower Prayers* in world religions was similarly, and consequentially displaced: pretty obvious from the end of my third section here. The three sections below capture the new direction expressed in the title, but still respect the old larger intention. The above title spreads comfortably across the sections: “Futurology”; “The Interior Lighthouse”; “Prayers of *Insight*.” The first section expresses some pointers regarding implementation. It was written for colleagues interested in shifting the focus of Lonergan studies, and my eventual decision was to leave it in that casual form. The second section is a random light-weight model of direct address regarding the turn I advocate regarding contemplation; the third section—a surprise even to me—eventually took the light-weight path, illustrating primitively the task of turning Lonergan studies into the seeding of global care. The third section pushes for a contemplation of the road forward in contemplative Christian hope. Its main focus is on contemplating the meaning of the first three paragraphs of *Method in Theology* in the context of Fred Lawrence’s essay in the *Divyadaan* **28**/1 (2017).

## 1. Futurology

### A. Turning Lonerganism

The first two 2017 *Divyadaan* volumes **28**/1 and **28**/2 will help, especially followed by a third essay of mine reviewing, lightly I suspect—the larger topic is mentioned below, in [5]—aspects of those two volumes and the inadequacy of Lonerganistic stuff, both in its facing of functional collaboration FS and in its avoidance of genetic, scientific, interpretation. The essay is to point to a mood, a challenge to religiosity to enter self-attention, and to Lonerganists to enter lines 18-33 of *Method* 250. If no entries, then it would seem wise to bring the stuff into the open through some form of *Assembly* (last word of *Method* 249) strategy.

An element in the nudging strategy could be to invite—cajole or force—Lonergan people at all levels to become involved in **implementational communication**, i.e., **C9**. This should

be especially tied into [1] the effort to draw effective attention to Lonergan's economics. In the 1984 *Compass* commemorative volume I expressed my view that the economics would be an initial break-through for Lonergan's work. It is much clearer to me now, especially in the fuller context of seeing the flow from Socrates to Lonergan—Jesus' relation to that stream is a tricky matter of the meaning of *Word*—as one of evolutionary sports pointing to a positive Anthropocene Age. Which brings me to the second topic: [2] ecological disorientation. Need I comment on the Republican idiocy of the EPA (versus Sander's view)? In that communicative bent there is [3] a possibility of positive moves in rescuing sexuality from Hebrew-Christian distortions. There is a need to follow up on "Finality, Love Marriage," pushing from Lonergan's end pages, pushing against the ban on further discussion that came after it. There is the problem of a turn of that entire realm of humanity (is it perhaps, an all-embracing realm? a core of integral spirituality?) into the dynamics named in [Posthumous 11](#), dealing with "all ur experiences." Then there is [4] the fourth zone of fertile possibilities: education on all levels. See [b] below. A final [5] fifth zone—but central—in my list relates to the missing "volume 3" of the Preface to *Allure*: the reach to world religiousness. The distant coming convergence can be fostered in commonsense mode, but the larger view is related to *Insight* as global seed, something I should expand on in *Divyadaan* **28/3** (2017), in "Prayers of *Insight*: Interior Lighthouse II."

In all five areas there is need to "make conversion a topic" (*Method*, 253), a "crucial experiment" (*ibid*).

I have not mentioned pushing FS—functional specialization—but yes, the issue lurks there: an involvement in implementation has backfire effects, and in any case FS will become a topic in areas like economics and ecology when there is a breakthrough to effective global science (note that *Method* page 3 does not point out the gross inadequacy of science as non-FS).

Can Lonerganism be shaken up and out through noise-making in these areas? Are there concrete communicative strategies available or inventable? Internet moves? My own effort, perhaps in a new blunt Question Series, is not enough. Further, there needs to be a presence of articulate dissent at normal Lonergan gatherings.

## B. The World Outside Lonerganism

Obviously, the five areas mentioned above are zones of outreach. It seems to me that here there is need for a discomfiting shift to direct self-involving talking and writing of a very elementary kind, like that implied concretely by the COPON principle, “when teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children.” An invasion of journalism and of school texts: converting ed-students or teachers is not enough without a support structure. There are possible—even for Lonergan initiates —“hobby-zones,” like turning a grade 10 text in Math or Chemistry or English into a non-truncated teaching and learning experience.

## C. The Problem of Actual Cultural Shifts.

That problem in its fullness is a long-term one of recycling pockets of success. The problem at hand is the creation of such pockets: the psychic shift of subgroups that is street-perceptible. No doubt we might postpone considering that till there is some blossoming of the groups leaning effectively edge-of-tower wise into the zones [a] 1–5 and [b] texts/journalisms: and to this blossoming we return under D. But there is value in pausing over the accepted norms of cultural shifts. These are generally not norms in the normative sense but simply normal patterns of shifts: e.g. technological innovations, internet innovations in particular. This is where zones [a] 1-5 and [b] need to push forward towards a new effective fullness of conception and implementation of norms proximate both to basics of heuristics and to actual patterns of behavior.

Implicitly there I have alluded to the definition of metaphysics in *Insight*.<sup>1</sup> But now it is in a new context. There is now the aim of an overall situating of personal luminosity, a new reach for the field that batters old metaphors (about)<sup>3</sup> *horizons*.<sup>2</sup> The new situation is matter-laced minding of the fullest topology of the nine layers of situations in finitude. See it, seize it, for instance, as a spread of minding over page 358 of *Method in Theology*, a minding-spread over the situation of 8 occurrences of *situation* within 17 lines, eyes and Aye sliding from “action,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Insight*, 416, end.

<sup>2</sup> The key text here is on *Phenomenology and Logic* page 199. Briefly, “The field is *the* universe, but my horizon defines *my* universe.”

situation”<sup>3</sup> to “resulting situation”<sup>4</sup> to “the messy situation,”<sup>5</sup> in a luminous knowing of this tiny “totality of temporal sequences”<sup>6</sup> that hovers in hope over “an ever deeper crisis in the situation,”<sup>7</sup> “part of the everything about everything”<sup>8</sup> luminous in grasping the grasp that “grasps the totality of temporal sequences in a single view,”<sup>9</sup> that grasping grasping the containment of its one self, “secondary intelligible,”<sup>10</sup> cherished in Subjectivities, a God galactically awesome non-object.<sup>11</sup> Continue, globally, to shrink that God into an object to which one objects and then “the messy situation is diagnosed differently”<sup>12</sup> and then there occurs “an ever deeper crisis in the situation” as we weave on in the negative Anthropocene’s cycle of decline. “Needless to say, the unconverted and especially those that deliberately refuse conversion will want to find some other root for alienation and ideology.”<sup>13</sup> “Once more, then, we are confronted with” “the need to push forward towards a new effective fullness of conception and implementation of norms proximate both to basics of heuristics and to actual patterns of behavior.”<sup>14</sup>

The two last notes of the previous paragraph point to recyclings: how often might you and I recycle personally in these days to sniff the remoteness of the controlling field from our horizons, from our times? How slowly might you and I and those who follow, in later times, recycle globally to mustard-seed a better grip on our global reading of the beginning **The Problem** of *Insight* chapter 20: “development does imply that perfection belongs not to the present but the future.”<sup>15</sup> “That problem in its fullness is a long-term one of recycling pockets

---

<sup>3</sup> *Insight*, 358, line 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, line 18. But do you notice, luminesce, that you are in the weave of the resulting situation?

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, line 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Insight*, 674, line 13.

<sup>7</sup> *Method in Theology*, 358, line 27.

<sup>8</sup> *Insight*, 674, line 14.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, lines 16–17.

<sup>10</sup> *Insight*, 683, “In the fourteenth place.”

<sup>11</sup> *Method in Theology*, 342, top.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 358, lines 18–19.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* We have cycled round, up or down—it is for you to 7<sup>th</sup>-gift-of-Holy-Sprite (discern)<sup>3</sup>—to the beginning of the page.

<sup>14</sup> We have cycled round to the end of the previous paragraph of my text. Might we try again?

<sup>15</sup> *Insight*, 720. The beginning paragraph of *The Problem*.

of success. The problem at hand is . . . .”: so we find ourselves recycled to the beginning of section C.

The problem at hand is, most likely, discouragement, a discouragement that originates and “culminates in the dull mind and sluggish body of the enslaved people or decayed culture.”<sup>16</sup> And now we are recycling back to begin again the way along the reverie run past Eve and Adam and Lonergan and global isolationism. Both these isms are enslaved in the decayed practicality of an undevelopmental settledness, “the capital of injustice that hangs like a pall over every brilliant thing.”<sup>17</sup> What is the reply of the 30-year-old Lonergan to this?

The Christian counterpart to this in the Christian’s victory over sin is charity. . . . charity is a fire of eternal optimism and energy . . . with deepest thoughts and unbounded spontaneity charity ever strives . . . for the effective rule of sweetness and light.<sup>18</sup>

Let us cycle back now again and again and again—armed and brained with Lonergan’s inspired nudge—round the musings of sections A. and B., and so find a grounding strategy that we may even weave into evil, the evil good perhaps of an age of robots and leisure that would be more manifest in a warless globe. What is his nudge? “The function of progress is to increase leisure, that men may have more time to learn.”<sup>19</sup> Such leisure and learning

creates **objective situations** that men cannot be truly just unless first the **objective situation** is changed. And finally – I am not certain I speak wildly – out of the very progress itself to produce a mildness of manners and temperament which will support and imitate and extend the mighty power of Christian charity. This then is the virtue of progress, the virtue of social justice, by which man directs his action so that it will be easier for his neighbours and for posterity to do what is right and just.<sup>20</sup>

Is not such leisure a winding round and into the universe’s 13.7 billion years, into “that order’s dynamic joy and zeal.”<sup>21</sup> Might you now and THEN<sup>22</sup> stretch your fantasy to see what

---

<sup>16</sup> “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*, Michael Shute, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 43. The essay is quoted later under its title.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 42–43.

<sup>21</sup> *Insight*, 722, end. See “*Insight* and the Interior Lighthouse: 2020–2050,” *Divyadaan* **28**/2 (2107).

<sup>22</sup> See [Cantover V](#), “Metaphysics THEN,” which ferments forwards with a contemplative poise.

this simple grounding pushing, “cajoling”<sup>23</sup> “forcing” might do to the reach for the objectives mentioned in A. and B. How strangely beyond the limits of present slugged and sluggish imagination is the shift that would ferment from leisure effectively haunting humans in their economics, their ecological ventures, their sexual intimacies, their education, their religiosity? What creative leaps of COPON would occur were we freed from the stony ground of busyness and business?<sup>24</sup>

#### D. The Non-stony Ground of Cosmopolis

The second last note of the previous section talked of a fresh venturing in **Method of Metaphysics**: a fresh venture, of course, that now weaves more closely into **The Problem** faced in *Insight*, chapter 20. Perhaps I might summarily say that the problem lurks in the six little words that begin chapter 2 of *Method in Theology*, “What is good, always is concrete,”<sup>25</sup> and the freshness lies or rather bubbles in your present better poise over the words in third sentence there, “one runs the risk of misleading.” This hardly brings spontaneously to your mind the tale of *The Little Prince*: “one runs the risk of weeping a little if one lets oneself be tamed.” I might well have been distracted here into asking about the taming of Lonergan in the twenty years of suffering between his outbursts of the mid-thirties and his output of the chapters, of interest to us here, of *Insight*. That is an extremely complex question. Positively one can see a control of his own intended long-term emerging that was tamed or battered by the conventional patterns of the Jesuit professorial training and life. But here my concern, yes, is doing what I am talking about: talking with you about such changes of life in us that would affect the towns and frowns of the present mystical body of Jesus, that would vibrate with the desire—Jesus’ and Lonergan’s—expressed in the final scriptural quotation in *Method in Theology*: “. . . may they all be one . . .” (John 17, 21).<sup>26</sup> Our interest is in the control of meaning that he explicitly yearned for in the mid-thirties and in the late-sixties. At least, my interest is: how about yours?

---

<sup>23</sup> The two words here are from line 4 of *Insight* 423, in the section on **Method in Metaphysics** (421–26). We need to tackle that section freshly in the next section, D, here.

<sup>24</sup> *For a New Political Economy*: e.g. psychology of business 35–6, 98 (this is not a reference in the present index); decreasing returns of profit motive, 54, 56, 80, 88.

<sup>25</sup> *Method in Theology*, 27.

<sup>26</sup> *Method in Theology*, 367.

Notice here that I am bargaining with you for \*leik,<sup>27</sup> for a liking of leisured presence in “biography meeting biography,” interest reaching to interest, yearning echoing yearning. Is this quite unreal? So I quote my comment on its real occurrence in our deprived globe:

Might I whimsically call it an X-factor? As it happens, my wife, Reverend Sally, and I spent some hours last night screening through the world’s talent shows, arenas filled with **whats**. Britain’s Got Talent, but so does Russia and Australia. Has Cosmopolis Got Talent? The well of loneliness radiates, in these shows, through the performances and the responses.<sup>28</sup>

Footnote 29 ends with the mark of a question: does that mark find the resonance of leisure? ? ? The leisure to read “in the midst” Inn the Midst? The leisure to read the previous section here, C., freshly, “broken down into little problems”? and on and on and in and Inn: so that you might become a **Non-stony Ground of Cosmopolis?** ? ?

## 2. The Interior Lighthouse II<sup>29</sup>

. . . reverie run past Eve and Adam, me and you . . .<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> \*leik: the Indoeuropean root of leisure, with meaning “to offer for sale, to bargain.”

<sup>28</sup> Philip McShane, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2015, 225-26. The title of this Chapter 19 is “The Well of Loneliness.” It matches the 19<sup>th</sup> chapter of *Insight*, and homes in one the sentence there: “The present section, accordingly, is concerned exclusively with the formulation of the notion of God.” The **present section** of being is there identified as you. See also note 14 of the next chapter there, where list the eleven times such a phrasing occurs in *Insight*. Does the possibility or, massively better, the actuality of reading these eleven self-placings untame you?

<sup>29</sup> This is not at all the essay I had intended as follow-up to [HOW 13](#), “The Interior Lighthouse.” The text emerged, 1000 words that may well—indeed, well!—be regarded as a ten minute sermon, to be read without venturing into this in the footnotes, in the first reading. The text was restricted but, as you shall see, not the footnotes, which are intended to add layers of contexts. Note 32 symbolizes one of those contexts, the context of recycling, since the Joyce text is continued from the final piece of this section 2 text—the end of *Finnegans Wake*.

<sup>30</sup> The quotation is a modified version of the beginning of James Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake*. “you”? Initially—obviously—a reader of *Diyadaan* and perhaps then someone with interest in the work of Bernard Lonergan. Later I would hope the audience would be one with interests spanning the universe. But it seems worthwhile, on your second or seventieth reading, to suggest a tuning in to present global ferments, tensions in U.S.A, in China, the Koreas, Israel, etc. Or shifts in culture that characterize the—hopefully—end of the negative Anthropocene Age. In the next note, after referencing my own work, I reference two works that refer to zones of tension today, the day after my middle March effort that is the text above. They are relatively random: they happen to have been part of my reading of the day.



You: What. What?<sup>31</sup>

What is going on here? Here and now?

Yes, what is going on here. Are you not? Are you not going on here? Are you not puzzled, puzzling? Are you not what?

The emergence of humanity is the evolutionary achievement of sowing what among the cosmic molecules. The sown what infests the clustered molecular patterns behind and above your eyes, between your ears, lifting areas—named by humans like Brocca and Wernicke—towards patterned noise-making that in English is marked by ‘so what?’<sup>32</sup>

There you are, stirred eyeballs, but not beast eyeballs: eyeballs alert in the planet beyond the apes.<sup>33</sup> Alerted now, though foggily, in stirred neuromolecules, even in blood and nerves: twisted towards “what’s what?”<sup>34</sup> More concretely, twisted towards what’s whatting: what is the activity of what?

The activity of what, whatting, is contemplation.

Obviously, then, to ask “What is contemplation?” is to ask what is whatting in its full activities.

But a pause is needed in what may seem, in that very pause, to be a hasty leap of identification. I and you are taking contemplation in its usual sense here: a reach, perhaps even

---

<sup>31</sup> Arjuna asks Krishna “what is man?” Might Krishna have replied, in a non-parallel universe, “yes, what is man.” (see chapter 2 of [Process: Introducing Themselves to Young \(Christian\) Minders](#), at notes 44–55). Might there have been different *Upanishads*? “OM. Urged on by whom does the mind fly?” (the beginning of *Kena Upanishad*).

<sup>32</sup> Philip McShane, *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, 3: it begins this book of contemplation and its chapter one, “Sow What.” I add the two promised random references: (1) Scott Patterson, *Dark Pools: The Rise of the Machine Trader and the Rigging of the U.S. Stock Market*, Random House, New York, 2013; (2) A. Pattakos and Elaine Dundon, *Prisoners of Our Thoughts: Viktor Frankl’s Principles for Discovering Meaning in Life and Work*, Berrett-Koehler, 2017. They represent two quite different worlds, both solidly truncated, distant – as all of present publishing is – from luminously sowing what. “Making an effort to reconnect with your core essence will help you build a life of meaning for yourself” (*Prisoners of Our Thoughts*, 161), but there is no such effort in this Frankl-focus book; *Dark Pools* tells the tale of an accelerating destructive idiocy. “If nothing is done to fix it, next time the devastation could be irreversible” (*Dark Pools*, 343).

<sup>33</sup> Recall, caul, the contemplative challenge of *Insight* 498, “... Not as an animal to a habitat, but ... to the intelligible context of some universal order that is or is to be.” The slow climb to this poise dislocates your eyeballs.

<sup>34</sup> Caul *Method in Theology*’s unnoticed possibility of you, men-shuned on page 53: “Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities.”

a conversational reach, for the divine, the other, OM, home, but for a Christian, it is a reach for a Threesome.<sup>35</sup> Are we not, then, in some folly of identification here, seen so simply in halting over such a questions as, “What’s the weather like outside?”, “what is this lump—a tree, a crown—made of?”<sup>36</sup>

“What’s the weather like outside?”

Is in not the Threesome’s weather?<sup>37</sup>

Yet, your pause may nudge you towards thinking that this large view of contemplation is quite daft: contemplation is a closeted business, a reach for some intimacy with the Beyond.<sup>38</sup> Put these last thirteen words in solemn inverted commas and pause again: “contemplation is a closeted business, a reach for some intimacy with the Beyond.” The thirteen words may be scarcely more than names, as many such presentations are. “A circle is the locus of coplanar points equidistant from a fixed point.” What do those last thirteen words mean to you? It depends on whether you have contemplated that to which they point, even the final *point*.

To what does the final *Beyond* point? For the Christian—which for the present I presume you to be—it points to the Threesome. And the pinnacle of Christian contemplation is the poise in which, luminously closeted within the contemplating what, the Threesome is vibrantly identified. The closeting is strangely and wonderfully parallel to the closeting, within the what, of the circle: no longer thirteen paged words, but a possession, possessing.

---

<sup>35</sup> The contemplative reach for the Threesome is to climb, in these next centuries, beyond the descriptive bent of the conclusion of *CWL* 12 that slides by pointers of scripture to the four lines (do correct the translation of line one) of 521. A help here is my Epilogue “Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling,” in *Seeding Global Collaboration*, edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2016).

<sup>36</sup> There is the deeper contemplative thing-issue of finitude’s molecular groaning for a neuromolecular identity in Jesus. Some leads are given in section 20, “Eschaton,” of my “*Insight* and the Trivialization of History,” *Diyadaan* 28/1 (2017).

<sup>37</sup> The existential contemplative issue to be cherished here is Christ’s human poise regarding the weather today. On the issue of his radiant causality see *Allure*, p. 244, note 36; p. 170, note 56; p. 246, note 44.

<sup>38</sup> A mature contemplative stance requires the slow luminous ingesting of analogical thinking, of the poise that (1) affirms the Beyondnesses reachability – they are persons, ‘just like us’; (2) denies the reachability (*Insight*, 706–8); and (3) glimpses contemplatively, e.g., the utterly glorious remoteness of the “absolutely supernatural” (*Insight*, 747, line 10: have you felt the shock of the shift to there from line 9?).

The circle is a cluster of geometric entities. The Threesome is a cluster of conversational entities. One must struggle with each naming, but the joy of being is that the first struggle brightens the second, indeed whether that prior struggle is a struggling with points or protons, seeds or sunflowers, persons or polymers.

The road to the vibrant identification, yes, is strewn in its fullness with cherishing persons and polymers and sunsets and stars. But we are writing and reading here about persons, you and I are conversing. I have been climbing towards this conversation for 85 years; you may be 58 or 18.<sup>39</sup> There is the Threesome nominally identified when we speak such words as *Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit*. They are one infinitely scintillating conversation. But what is a conversation?

It is a reality beyond the planet of the apes. At its best it is divine, even in the human zone. But how is it thus divine in our human grimace? I think of Rilke: “love consists in this, that two solitudes guard and bind and greet one another.” I think of a remark Lonergan once made to me: “that’s what life is all about: saying hello.”<sup>40</sup>

There are those rare occasions when you are greeted by an incarnate hello that what-bends ears and toes and neurozones to listen. There is a palpable presence of a radiant invitation for you to speak. You are embraced by listening. Have you such a memory from recent days or decades? A memory of words leaping from lips and limbs and lymph-nodes: what-loosened tongue twisting out of loneliness?

I recall now the moment when such a way of inviting a life of reaching for the Threesome dawned on me as I was about to address a strange mixed gathering of, mostly, religious women, unwed mothers, and retired prostitutes. I weaved us round four questions. “When did I last

---

<sup>39</sup> There is a central issue lurking here of a luminous contemplative on the accelerating character of adult growth, especially in its kataphatic contemplative mode. Strangely, there is some decent sympathy for its anaphatic counterpart, more respect for the climbing of The Interior Castle than for that of the Interior Lighthouse.

<sup>40</sup> We were outdoors, having a conversation about Dante’s Beatrice. See the further nudges in note 78 on page 222 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010.

have a real conversation? When was I last understanding, understood? When did I last speak? When did I last listen?”<sup>41</sup>

But I do not wish now to go on. I have a sudden memory of a piece of a film-dialogue.

We are discussing life and death and not in the abstract, either. We are discussing my life and my death. And I cannot conceive any other tone. Now is not the time for verbal thought-play. Nothing can be worse than a detailed scholarly analysis of erudition, interpretation, complication. Now is the time for simplicity. Now is the time for, dare I say it, kindness.<sup>42</sup>

Have I nudged you towards your lonely core, a well of loneliness? Not a dark well, but a well well. Well well!

Well well? Perhaps here and now a poise like Julian of Norwich, “All shall be well, and all manner of thing shall be well.” That poise may well, may be well, simply as resting what in Inn.<sup>43</sup> Within, within your what, a grip of truth, Truth, freshly opened. You are at home in the Inn. But the resting is only a pilgrim station on “a way a lone a last a love along the . . .”<sup>44</sup>

### 3. Prayers of *Insight*

Do you know His Kingdom? “In the last days the mountain of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say: Come, and let us go to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths. For the law shall come forth from Sion: and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge the Gentiles and rebuke many people: and they shall turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into sickles. Nation shall not

---

<sup>41</sup> Philip McShane, *Music That is Soundless: A Fine Tuning for the Lonely Bud A*, (Axial Publishing, 2005), 7.

<sup>42</sup> I quote from the film *Wit*, (2001, with Mike Nichols directing). The heroine, played by Emma Thompson, is speaking. Emma Thompson wrote the screenplay from Margaret Edson’s play.

<sup>43</sup> The implicit reference is to the Gospel of *Luke*, “no room for them at the inn” (2:7). The deeper pointer is to your possible poise, even now, or in later days or years, over the first word of the first chapter of *Insight: In. Inn?* Certainly it is the poise within *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.

<sup>44</sup> The conclusion of Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* is the lead into the first sentence, quoted at the beginning (at note 30): a symbol of the fundamental context of *Die Wendung zur Idee* that is the cycling dynamics of functional collaboration described in my essay, “[Arriving in Cosmopolis](#),” where I even gave a date for its maturation. That is the phyletic goal. But your ontic goal is the present issue: might you recycle your what through these 1000 words? This – if you are reading as instructed by me – is your second read, adding notes to the first note-free venture. Was it a slower read? Perhaps you are much older? And wiser?! Well, well?

lift sword against nation: neither shall they be exercised any more to war.”  
(Isaiah 2: 2–4).

Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, to think it no figure.<sup>45</sup>

“It would be fair and fine”: is this not to be taken as a prayer written by a prayer? In his retreat notes of 1937 he wrote, near the end, about “God’s love straining for my heart.” Might not one more than suspect that such a dynamic carried him through the writing of *Insight*? In the Epilogue he switches from the “moving viewpoint”<sup>46</sup> of the book to his stand as believer and Catholic, and in the footnote of the page referenced he makes what some may find an astonishing claim that “I believe personal relations can be studied adequately only in this larger and more concrete context” of theology. Could my reader have any doubt, then, about the dominion over and in—INN—the writer of *Insight* of the Personal Relations that he wrote in concluding the unfinished symphony of his view of the Trinity?

In the fullness of time he sent his incarnate Son in truth so that by believing the Word we might speak true inner words and understand; and through the Word he sent the Spirit of the Word in holiness so that joined to the Spirit in love and made living members of the body of Christ we might cry out, “Abba, Father.”<sup>47</sup>

Further, what haunts the Epilogue of *Insight* is his focus on the character and the fostering of integral development. Nor had he strangely forgotten at that stage his extraordinary climb towards an integral development of a developmental view of interpreting the past, sacred or profane. I symbolize that shocking perspective by the number 60910: it gives a precise reference to the turn of the page, the turn of a future culture of interpretation, which sadly finds no sympathy among his followers. Let us pause, contemplatively, over that stunning paragraph here.

The explanatory differentiation of the protean notion of being involves three elements. First, there is the genetic sequence in which insights gradually are accumulated by man. Secondly, there are the dialectic alternatives in which accumulated insights are formulated, with positions inviting further

---

<sup>45</sup> The conclusion to Lonergan’s 1936 “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” 44.

<sup>46</sup> *Insight*, 754.

<sup>47</sup> *CWL* 12, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 519–21. The translation is mine. The climb to explanation weaves us into a luminosity of the prayer of note 49 below.

development and counterpositions shifting their ground to avoid the reversal they demand. Thirdly, with the advance of culture and effective education, there arises the possibility of the differentiation and specialization of modes of expression, and since this development conditions not only the exact communication of insights but also the discoverer's own grasp of his discovery, since such grasp and its exact communication intimately are connected with the advance of positions and the reversal of counterpositions, the three elements in the explanatory differentiation of the protean notion of being fuse into a single explanation.<sup>48</sup>

I shall return to that startling paragraph below, but before doing that I must add some complexity to the issue, the complexity of the images and quotations of pages 160–63 of the biography of Lonergan already referred to.<sup>49</sup> As one quotation from Lonergan there claims, the complexity is necessary for an adequate control of meaning. Later in the book I remark, about those images,

there are lurking, in the present suggestions, refinements of imaging that would lift the Tower into a geo-historical point-presence, [my analogy would be the Einstein equations], giving a control of the meaning of ongoing, overlapping, merging, etc., contexts. How else is one to control the tunnels of meaning from Antioch and Alexandria, from Luther and Lainez, from the Hoang-Ho and the Ganges?<sup>50</sup>

I ponder here on whether you have some glimpse of the imaging involved here, or whether I can convey a decent impression of its nature and relevance? First, then, there is the problem of imaging a straight-forward genetic sequencing, such as would give heuristic control of the genesis of, say, a sunflower. This pitches us, alas, into that hairy area of *Insight* that I previously fell short of detailing. But perhaps you can hold together an imagining of each stage in the weeks of growth as a system, and the systems connected **systematically** in sequence. I bold-faced the word *systematically* there since it is the puzzle and the achievement of a dynamic

---

<sup>48</sup> *Insight*, 609–10.

<sup>49</sup> See note 40 above. The key image, on p. 161, of the contemplative challenge, is titled “W<sub>3</sub>: a Heuristics of Lonergan’s Perspective.” Accidentally but providentially it meshes neatly with the fundamental prayer, “Double You Three, in me, in all, Claspings, Cherishing, Calling, Craving, Christing.”

<sup>50</sup> *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, 245, note 82.

genetic system.<sup>51</sup> The reality of history is that pure genetic systems, even within minds, are abstractions. Systems are de facto geohistorical. Further, I must add the discomforting reminder that the systematics we are concerned about is the systematics of the seventh specialty, into which is weaved the full cyclic system: the weaving is symbolized by the expression FS + UV + GS as naming the full control of meaning. There is the convergence of pragmatic systems to be grasped and sifted in the first four specialties, the grasp revealing in each cycle various front-pockets of discovery and success. There is the heuristic reach into the future of the fifth specialty, a divergent topology of meanings realized in the baton-exchanges through the later specialties and the “FS<sub>8</sub> >C<sub>9</sub>” transitions, spreading such successes globally.

That, you must grant, is an indecently dense paragraph of contemplative climbing. It has not been attempted by the Lonergan community. Indeed, the more elementary challenge of 60910 has not been faced. So, that community must stand with the full non-Lonergan communities of interpreters—and prayers—that Lonergan wrote of in that impossible section 3 of chapter 17 of *Insight*.

One may expect the diligent authors of highly specialized monographs to be somewhat bewildered and dismayed when they find that instead of singly following the bent of their genius, their aptitudes, and their acquired skills, they are to collaborate in the light of abstruse principles and to have their individual results checked by general requirements that envisage simultaneously the totality of results.<sup>52</sup>

I return now to the challenge that was the original drive of this little article, the challenge expressed on the first page about Prashna (Sanskrit) and Frashna (Avestan), and the origins of the word *prayer*, with its primitive meaning of **question**. One might think of geohistorical trackings of interrogatives and related rituals and recitations through Panini and the Arabs and the West, the East, the aboriginals. Thinking thus could be a seeding of communities of later effective contemplation. But here I wish to bring us forward discontinuously to section one’s emphasis on communications, by illustrating the deep contrast between this “third way,

---

<sup>51</sup> The full Christian achievement of that genetic systematics was a puzzle for Lonergan in his reflection (*Insight*, 763–4) on a needed treatise on the mystical body. The solution is presented on pages 13, 17, 19–22, 38, of my *The Road to Religious Reality* (Axial Publishing, 2012).

<sup>52</sup> *Insight*, 604.

difficult and laborious”<sup>53</sup> invented by Lonergan and the approach he talks of at the conclusion of the first page of *Method in Theology*: “Theologians finally often have to be content if their subject is included in a list not of sciences but of academic disciplines.”

My illustration singles out Fred Lawrence’s brilliant essay of the first *Divyadaan* **28/1** (2017): “Contemporary Economic and Political Disorder and Bernard Lonergan’s Macroeconomic Dynamics.”<sup>54</sup> The contrast is to be between the “academic disciplines” approach and Lonergan’s suggested paradigm shift through which “theological reflection bears fruit,”<sup>55</sup> effectively hits the streets, the economists, the politicians. That contrasting brings us to the methodological contrast between vague dialectic discussion that “hangs like a pall over every brilliant thing”<sup>56</sup> and Lonergan’s neat scalpel operations of the end of page 250 of *Method*.

What is important here is that you rise to a contemplative pause over the meaning of those last two words on the first page of *Method*. Very few have faced the search for Lonergan’s meaning here: the unproductive, ineffective, meaning of the “academic disciplines” approach. We can learn from that ineffective unproductivity as it haunts Lawrence’s achievement, an achievement indeed that I would consider containing magnificent pointers to the work I talked of in section 1 above regarding economics.<sup>57</sup> To do this I would ask you to note and ingest that those pointers are weaved into a dense flow that indeed illustrates the standard “academic disciplines” presentation. In such works, when a position is taken, it is usually attributed to a favored authority,<sup>58</sup> the position taken is bolstered by abundant references<sup>59</sup> and telling

---

<sup>53</sup> *Method in Theology*, 4.

<sup>54</sup> *Divyadaan* **28/1** (2017).

<sup>55</sup> *Method in Theology*, 355.

<sup>56</sup> “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” 43.

<sup>57</sup> Lawrence gives great detailed twists, through his selective contextualization, but those pointers and twists are not the stuff of a beginning comprehension: indeed they are the stuff of later 500-page-texts. Details of such positive suggestions are too much for these brief comments. They would find their way into the challenge of the *1833 Overture* mentioned in the last paragraph below.

<sup>58</sup> Certainly, one can expect, in a Lawrence article, his allegiance to Lonergan’s stand. But the stand here is not given in *oratio recta*. Thus the article does not lean into the forward specialty ethos of such *oratio*.

<sup>59</sup> I count here 60 authorities of different sorts cited. But the citing has not the coherence that would place the work in the *oratio obliqua* of the first four specialties. So Lawrence’s essay would seem to be in the zone of communications. To whom does he communicate effectively? This is the major issue faced in the turn of page 3 of *Method in Theology*. I would note, furthermore, that the turn affects the



citations;<sup>60</sup> there is regularly the addition of a historical perspective, but it is generally selective;<sup>61</sup> there is rarely a bent towards effective scientific precision, but rather towards summary referencing the favored author.<sup>62</sup>

Lawrence's pointers, then, nudge us broadly forward towards noticing the ills of economics and politics, but it falls short of effective communications, and does not attempt to swing the noticing into the precision of either *Insight's* canons or *Method's* structures. The first failure, represented by the two quotations from Lonergan given above at notes 48 and 52, is one we all share, and perhaps it is as well to quote a report of mine on the subject, from 2016.<sup>63</sup>

The report concerns a dismal failure needing a serious discussion. We have all failed to take the challenge of Lonergan's canons of hermeneutics seriously: instead we putter along in the mode of "academic disciplines" (*Method*, end of the first page of chapter one), condemned by Lonergan on the next page of *Method*. The leadership leads in the stale outdated way. Doran swoops thus on *CWL* 11 and 12; Lawrence sweeps thus through German thinkers; McShane swaps thus one discipline for another repeatedly without tackling the genetic hermeneutics of any; etc. etc. Is it not time that we paused to be effectively embarrassed by a central doctrine? ["Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company" *Method*, 299] The embarrassment is in finding ourselves among those mentioned by Lonergan on *Insight* 604, in the flow of presenting his view of the needed serious science of interpretation. Being diligent and specialized is not enough.

Getting beyond diligent specialization is a massive challenge in which we all must humbly and repentingly<sup>64</sup> participate. Might we try that reach for the Beyond together? Might we

---

lopsided view of Aristotle named on that page, and indeed the entire tradition of science and its philosophy: but that is a much larger problem.

<sup>60</sup> The ethos of such citation is captured in, e.g., "According to Nicholas Boyle, a society of consumers-producers is no longer a civil society" (after note 10); "... has caused the political philosopher Pierre Manent to point out that with the eclipse of politics by the globalized economy, 'the idea of acting for the common good has lost its meaning for us'" (at note 56).

<sup>61</sup> Lawrence's historical contextualization is thus selectively sketchy in a manner that enriches his thesis regarding political disarray's grounding in unenlightened economics.

<sup>62</sup> Scattered through the article are summaries of aspects of Lonergan's economics, not greatly helpful in enlightening a reader who is not already in the know.

<sup>63</sup> The full report is available in [HOW 7](#), "The Deep Failure of Lonerganism." It was sent to the June 25, 2016 Boston College meeting of Lonergan leaderships. It had no effect. Perhaps the 2017 submission will fare better?

<sup>64</sup> See the reflections on repentance, as it is introduced in *Insight* 722, in my essay in *Divyadaan* 28/2 (2017), "*Insight* and the Interior Lighthouse: 2020-2050," notes 26, 27, 28, 29.

exchange about it, in a casual version of the challenge of what I call *Lonergan's 1833 Overture*? And might that effort lead a slowly increasing number of us to contemplate effectively the locus of that Overture in the full splendor of Lonergan's invention of effective functional global collaboration? Then we would be facing the second failure, the failure to cherish *Method's* structuring of future charity, "an eternal fire of optimism and of energy,"<sup>65</sup> structures that would have us, "fair and fine"<sup>66</sup> on the way to the New Jerusalem.

---

<sup>65</sup> "Essay on Fundamental Sociology," 43.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 44. Perhaps it is of consequence to add a pragmatic nudge within a new realism of contemplation: what I called *Amendment A* (to any constitution) in Philip McShane, *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump* (Amazon: Axial Publishing, 2016), 85–86 : "Do you view humanity as possibly maturing—in some serious way—or just oscillating between good and evil, whatever you think they are?"