

*Eldorede 9***Education and the Emergence of Functional Specialization**

<i>Individual</i>		<i>Social</i>	<i>Ends</i>
<i>Potentiality</i>	<i>Actuation</i>		
capacity, need	operation	cooperation	particular good
plasticity, perfectibility	development, skill	institution, role, task	good of order
liberty	orientation, conversion	personal relations	terminal value

It seems best to start with the diagram that became the centre of attention in the end of the previous lecture. To this add, of course, the basic diagrams that relate to Lonergan's view of our capacity and need: the first two terms in that diagram above. What is important for us to hold on to, and develop very slowly, is the meaning of *relate* in that last sentence. In what sense do or can we mean *relate*?

The diagrams relate to Lonergan's view in two senses: they relate to Lonergan's theory of how he, or any other human, can act: that is the meaning of *capacity* and *need* in his theory. But the diagrams also relate in a more fundamental way in that they point to the activities that are spontaneous in us humans, whether we have a theory or not, whether we have this theory or some other. A pause over this, using one of Lonergan's own examples, is worthwhile. Lonergan writes: "Hume presented human knowledge as a succession of impressions linked together by customs and habits, and Hume presented human knowledge to be that and nothing but that in an extremely acute, intelligent, convincing fashion. In fact, there is an opposition between the knowledge

that Hume described and the knowledge that Hume used in his describing. The knowledge that Hume was using to put across this doctrine of knowledge was something far more intelligent and rational than the mere succession of impressions linked by customs and habits that he said knowledge was."¹ Now what holds for the Englishman David Hume holds also for each of us: each of us here may have very different views of what we do when we know and do, but the spontaneous performance is pointed to by the two diagrams. If you do hold a view that is quite opposite to Lonergan's view, then by taking the measure² of it against our spontaneity, a conflict should show up between our theory and the view represented by the diagram. There is no doubt but that this suggestion is troublesome to some listeners, especially to those for whom today's presentation is new, and perhaps we should delay over it. But it seems better to round off the full presentation of Lonergan's view of the reform of education before moving round these diagrams and their meaning in a slower, questioning, manner, in the final session.

We want to take up the struggle of Lonergan as he left it in *Insight*, but before I do that it helps to give another version of the two diagrams, one that puts them together into a form that Lonergan used in those years of struggle between 1953 and 1965. One might, indeed, argue that his break-through to the long-term solution to the problem of education would have been more difficult without this more compact version of his view of **capacity**.³

In the version from *Phenomenology and Logic* that we are using you can see that there are 7 elements or zones in each of the diagrams: let us label them 1,2,3,4,5,6,7;

¹*Phenomenology and Logic*, 109.

²The word measure may remind some readers of Plato's perspective on *nomos*.

³It seems useful to put terms from the diagram form *Method in Theology* in bold-face throughout this essay. I must add here, regarding the compacting, that it led to a disorientation of Lonergan studies in that the subtle dynamics of the what-to-do question, so assiduously self-studied in Thomas *Prima Secundae*, qq.6-17, was glossed over.

1',2',2',4',5',6',7'. You see immediately that (1,2,3,4,5,6,7) is actually 1' : in simple realistic terms, you move from knowing the state of affairs, to asking what to do about the state of affairs. Is this not true of your spontaneity, and does this not help to appreciate the scientific method that Lonergan suggest we use in investigating knowing and doing?

There are many ways in which a compact version of the diagram can be made so as to have only four level in one diagram. Here are two versions:

2', 3', 4', 5', 6', 7'	5', 6', 7'
5, 6, 7	5, 6, 7
2, 3, 4	2, 3, 4
1	1

The first thing to notice is that only the top lines differs in the two versions. Knowing is kept as it was. But what is the significance of having two versions of the top line? In the first version we keep explicit the what-to-do question; in the second version we are taking a broader view, one that is discussed in *Phenomenology and Logic*: a what-question is a search for a possibility.⁴ So, the unprimed 2,3,4 actually include the primed. This is caught nicely in the question-phrase in English: What might that be? The question can refer to a cloud of dust approaching from a distance; but it could also refer to pieces of chicken taken out of a fridge: you might cook curry or a soup with the chicken.

It is useful to follow up this illustration from cooking in our effort to understand Lonergan's work. Let us go back to the three words, **institution**, **role**, **task**. A restaurant is an institution with a set of sub-**institutions**, and a network of interrelated **roles** and **tasks**. The menu expresses a sub-**institution**: we can produce any selection from this

⁴*Phenomenology and Logic*, Appendix A (319-323) discusses the modal distinction between the two questions. The generic what question reaches for possibilities of being, whether the possibilities exist or not.

list. But any cook is an incarnation of a set of institutions: work-pace, hand-movements, etc. And so on, in wonderful complexity.⁵

But I wish us to notice that, within the complexity, there is that range of possible outcomes, satisfactory and satisfying meals, that are considered worth producing for a set of reasons ranging from - think now of the owner - mere money to the joy of owning a successful establishment: and similar reasons down through the cluster of people involved. The set of reasons are connected with terminal values and we will get round to considering more about those shortly. But the point is that we can think of a certain range of possibilities, plans if you like, even hold to the narrower possibilities of the list on the menu. Then you can appreciate that the second version above seems enough to work with: at least to the extent that there is a fixed set of what-answers involved, items on a menu. But we can also appreciate that, concretely, the first version represents the actual situation: some customer, for instance, might just be worth a change of menu.

Let us go from this to a way of stating briefly the demands of the levels of **capacity** in us, but also in the **institution** of the restaurant: think of a slogan on the wall of the employee's lounge or on the wall of the kitchen: indeed, recent television shows illustrate this with competitions in which the master chef gives versions of the general slogan: be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible.⁶ What do these four phrases mean? Their meaning depends on your level and habits of self-attention, and I would note that they are perhaps easiest to catch on to through noticing their absence in someone else. So, for example, the master-chef notices the inattention, or unintelligence,

⁵Why not go directly to the topic of the school as **institution**? The message is easier to convey in a neutral zone! But, obviously, the school analysis is what needs to be tackled, and it will be a topic in the fourth session.

⁶This is a general slogan that relates to the compacted version of the 13 elements given above. It is the slogan that Lonergan used regularly in the 1970s, but it led to the missing of the problem of planning-questions in some of his followers. This is easily remedied, slogan-wise, by adding in an extra imperative after the third above: "Be adventurous" [plan, work the what-to-do question, whatever!]

or unreasonableness, or irresponsibility, of a particular cook. The third imperative may be puzzling at first: it simply means that it is unreasonable to ignore the facts, what is the actual situation. Then there is the simple meaning of irresponsible: the cook leaves out a key ingredient. Notice that, with a set menu, there is little need for a burst of creative planning, for fresh what-to-do questions.

An important word to notice in the last sentence is the word *notice*. To notice is simply the beginnings of an appreciation of the dynamics of our **capacity**, or the complex **capacity** of an **institution**. One has something like the common meaning of a slogan on the wall of the kitchen: be attentive, intelligent, reasonable and responsible! But if you do some prolonged self-attention in relation to the previous few suggestions - indeed in relation to the previous lectures - you begin to approach the central meaning of what Lonergan arrived at in *Insight*.

Now some of you do not know, may not know, the central meaning of what Lonergan arrived at in *Method in Theology*, and this is an advantage. What do I mean by that? I am, perhaps, one a very few left of the Lonergan disciples that lived through those years after the publication of *Insight* with the problem of Cosmopolis. There were those at the time that simply thought of Cosmopolis as simply the presence of grace, or of the supernatural, or of Christianity, or even narrowly of Catholicism. But the problem is posed by Lonergan in terms of requirements that are implicitly methodological: we need some set-up that does not work as a police force, that would put into operation timely and fruitful ideas, that would not just be busybody interference, that would operate to improve the future.⁷ The fifth and last characteristic of cosmopolis, "It is not easy,"⁸ can surely be seen as methodological: difficulty of operation.

The difficulty Lonergan faced in the 1950s, however, was that a sufficient

⁷*Insight*, 238-42[263-67].

⁸*Insight*, 241[266].

efficient method was difficult to discover. Here, if you are a non-knower in this regard, or were among those who struggled in the shadow of Lonergan during the years up to 1965, you can have a concrete sense of that difficulty. Let us see how we might come to it from reflection on the full problem of education.

We need some further musings on the **institutions** that surround education. Surround, indeed, is a good word: I recall Lonergan responding publically to a question about problems of government regulations, boards of education, organized meetings, reports, etc etc: he was quite vehement about “getting them all away from the classroom, and letting teachers teach”. Certainly we could easily begin now an exchange here that would reveal difficulties that teachers have to live with in present educational structures. We could draw up lists of problems internal to school structures; further, we could note studies of such problems, papers and committee and board reports and suggestions regarding such structures. Might we say, with Lonergan, of some of these operations that “they devote their energies to paper work and postpone decisions”?⁹ We could link the problems to government educational structures and policies: and note that such policies are **institutions**, like menus in a restaurant. Yet what is most revealing, and relevant to Lonergan’s approach to the full problem, is to see the massive amount of money and energy that is involved in keep the **operations** of certain schemes that study education, **operations** that manifest themselves as anything but **cooperation**.¹⁰

We could, in fact, do here something that would parallel what Lonergan did in general in that final section of chapter 7 of *Insight*, where he writes of decline. Might we even agree with him, applying his words to education, that “the social situation

⁹*Insight*, 235[260].

¹⁰In Canada, there is a massive supporting flow of financial grants the analysis of which would reveal appalling ineffectiveness etc etc.

deteriorates cumulatively”¹¹? Might we even go so far, looking at the buildings and technologies that surround education, that “that actors in the drama of living - [here we could substitute teaching] - become stage-hands; the setting is magnificent, the lighting superb; the costumes gorgeous; but there is no play.”¹² Yet this nudges us back to the image of schools and their facilities, whereas Lonergan’s interest would be in the causal maintenance of such structures.

We mentioned lack of **cooperation** in the various schemes that study education but a more vigorous phrase would be *lack of connectedness*. This helps us to see a basic direction of Lonergan’s search and the direction of the eventual pointing of his solution. In *Topics in Education* he remarks that “It is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is in the scientist, the reason why a science forms a unified whole.”¹³ Think of this in relation, not to a particular science, but to an integral science of education. The thinking, of course, has to be done, not in an armchair, but concretely. Since we speak of the study of education one evident concrete venture would be the going into library holdings on such study. Even if one limited one’s venture to the stacks of journals of education, it would not take long for an open-minded scanner of titles and contents to sense the mess of many unconnected interests and essays. I can only invite you to try it.

In trying it you would be coming close to the ten years of Lonergan’s broader searchings regarding decay as he searched on in Rome during the decade after writing *Insight*. What does one find? There are journals dealing with education at all levels,

¹¹*Insight*, 229[254].

¹²*Insight*, 237[262]. I used to point out to my student in Halifax that inner-city schools were rarely gorgeous, that a little field work round town would show a brutal contrast between bank-buildings and school-buildings. Such reflections bring in considerations of that other massive zone of decline: economic theory and practice, about which, of course, Lonergan was eloquent and massively creative.

¹³*Topics in Education*, 160.

regularly isolated in their interest. There are journals of history of education, journals with detailed analysis of effects of cultural change in certain subjects of education. There are journals representing conflicting philosophies of education, conflicting psychologies of education, conflicting theologies and sociologies of education. There are journals on educational reform, right from kindergarten to research programs for graduate studies, regularly disconnected from the debates in philosophy, psychology, etc. And so on.

A days' journey through the tables of contents of journals of education is a far cry from Lonergan's ten year journey through journals in all areas of inquiry: a mess is revealed to him that, as he wrote, "has done not a little to make human life unlivable."¹⁴ But what his searching struggle through the mess revealed to him, in an Archimedean leap that fortunately is documented,¹⁵ was a way that would pull out slowly from the mess in a creative, unified, beautiful global unity.¹⁶ It was February of 1965, at a time when he was in dangerous poor health without knowing it. His work was interrupted that year for an operation that extracted a cancered lung, and he did not return to his creative effort for a year. I recall vividly spending time sitting with him in his room in the Jesuit House on Bayview Avenue in Toronto during the recovery summer of 1966 when he gave me a ten-minute presentation with the fingers of his hands facing each other in front of both of us and he began by saying "Well its easy: you just double the structure."

How could he possibly say that it was easy? Recall the first lecture, when we

¹⁴*Topics in Education*, 232.

¹⁵It is available in the Toronto Lonergan Centre in an Archival File entitled [by me, in the early 1970s] file V.7. These files are now being systematically renamed. The file was studied by Dr. Darlene O'Leary and a study of it is to appear in a forthcoming book, *Lonergan's Practical View of History*, Axial Publishing, 2007..

¹⁶*Topics in Education*, 160, line 16, quoted already at note 13, points to the unity that a science gets from its efficiency: with that unity goes its beauty and its truth in history.

considered the process of arriving at a concept. Such achieved concepts have names, names that strategically organize words referring in an organized way to described experiences: the illustration there was the name of the definition of a circle: “the locus of coplanar points equidistant from a fixed point”. So, yes, he is right: every schoolgirl can get the name of the concept of the circle into her head, at least long enough to use it in an exam. And what we can do here is get the name of Lonergan’s answer in a strategic order of words, but what we are also trying to do is to get a sense that it is perhaps little more than a name. Lonergan solves his problem, and the problem of global collaboration in the genesis of progress, by doubling the structure with which we are now somewhat familiar. We take here the compacted diagram with the fourfold slogan about attention intelligence, reasonableness and responsibility, and follow Lonergan in thinking out a division of labour that would help us collaborate, locally, nationally, globally, geohistorically.

That last word reminds us that we are looking for a full solution, one that embraces past and future, a global detector that would carry the best of the past into the future, with creative additions. Immediately we see what Lonergan meant by doubling the structure: we attend to the past; we turn the results somehow towards attending to the future. Secondly, a further help to noticing how easy it is or might be is to see how current divisions fit it: so, there is the turn to the past in education represented by those who discover and investigate past instruments of education, be they texts or buildings or technological facilities. There are those who pick up on what we may call researchers who struggle to find the meaning of texts and technologies, the interpreters: what was the meaning of Euclid in his time; what the significance of the abacus?

Those meanings and significances are on-going: Descartes changes the meaning of Euclid, and computers cut down on the significance of the abacus. So there are histories of the place of Euclid and the changing character of technical support structures.

You notice here that we have linked three of the slogan elements with three

related layers of past interest: be attentive to past components in education; be intelligent, understanding them; be reasonable in making sure that you know just what is going on. Now we can get the same¹⁷ three to, so to speak, face forwards and when we do so we find that their operation corresponds to three familiar slogans about Policy, Planning, executive reflection. We have named, then, six collaborative¹⁸ zones: but what of the connecting of the slogan “be responsible” with both the past and the future? What about the fourth level of the patterned display of names which can now be helpfully added here?

Dialectic	Foundations
History	Doctrines
Interpretation	Systematics
Research	Communications

Before getting into that topic, the key topic of this struggle to understand Lonergan’s long-term solution to education’s problems, we must pause over a single problem of self-criticism.

We return to the table of contents of the book *Insight* to see just where Lonergan treats this problem of culture and education. We find that it is treated in that pivotal

¹⁷I am slipping past the fact that the dominant questions in the second and the seventh specialties are not the same: the dominant question in the genetic and systematic thinking of the seventh specialty is “what-is-to-be done?”. Indeed, there is subtle duplication involved here, for the dominant question in the entire system of educational reflection is the what-to-do question, the question of *Praxis*. But all this is far beyond an introductory presentation.

¹⁸I would note that, while Lonergan labored alone, the drive of his work was towards a type of collaboration quite unfamiliar to his Jesuit tradition. In the final twelve pages of the last chapter of *Insight* he mentions collaboration 29 times. The final page talks of identification. It is too easy to relate this identification to current ecclesiastical institutions. Grace, yes, is the upper dynamic: but the identification that he was searching for, that I am writing about, is the new cosmopolitan division of labour.

section of the book that talks of general bias. If we are reading *Insight* or we are reflecting on the problems mentioned - which after all belong in that reading - then we fail in our reading if we do not acknowledge that the **operation** and **cooperation** of general bias in our own daily doings. We are spontaneously and culturally biased against the any shift, but certainly against a shift that involves serious thinking and serious restructuring. Such is the shift that Lonergan names so easily. It is massively difficult to think it through; it will be still more difficult to implement.

But implemented it must be, if teachers are to more than victims and stage-hands. This is not our primary concern here today as teachers. There is a sense in which what we dealt with in the first lecture is our primary concern: can each of us shift our teaching some distance away from the conventions of memorization towards a fostering of curiosity and understanding? The answer is, Yes we can: but the effort to carry that shift forward and enlarge that distance is surrounded by all the ills already mentioned: the seeds of that fostering fall on the stony ground of present **institutions**. No doubt those **institutions** make present to us biases that are individual, personal and of particular groups: people who want to sell computers; people who think that bureaucracy is God's gift to humanity; people with narrow view of the colour of nation, skin, religion. What underpins all these is the general bias that stands solidly, and at times sinfully, against change fostered by ideas. There we meet in ourselves, our **operations**, our lack of **plasticity**, our settled **goods of order**, the fundamental dialectic of history.

We are in deep water here, and I do not intend to delay. The final page of chapter 7 of *Insight* poses the problem of a cosmopolitan method of dialectic analysis that "stands to generalized method as the differential equation stands to classical physics."¹⁹ Twenty years after writing of that need, he writes out the name of his definition of that

¹⁹*Insight*, 244[268].

method in a single brilliant page of *Method in Theology*.²⁰ The page remains to be taken seriously by Lonergan's disciples: general bias holds their theology and philosophy to a menu of stones instead of bread.

So we come, finally but with a sufficient context, to the topics that belong to the final line of the diagram with which we began this lecture. That single page of *Method in Theology* sketches brilliantly the practical interlacing of pressures of **liberty, conversion** and **orientation, personal relating** and **fundamental values**. How is it to do that? Lonergan remarks of the page that, in its **operations** and **co-operation**, "it will make conversion a topic and thereby promote it."²¹ The six divisions that we gathered up earlier have obvious relations to current activities of research, interpretation, and history, and to policy studies, planning strategies, reflection on execution. But here we have a novelty of enterprise precisely named and defined in a way that lifts it out of present academic menus, including the menus of present philosophy and theology. It calls for massive personal reachings towards interdisciplinary competence mixed with a nakedness in the expression of personal incompetence. The focal discernment of dialectic is the discernment of one's own failure to discern. Obviously, this topic and this reality in its full differentiated form is something quite beyond our introductory reaching here. But, strangely, it brings us right back to where we began, to ourselves as reaching for some improvements in education.

Dialectic is a discernment of discernments²² of the past: but it can be turned by

²⁰*Method in Theology*, 250. On that single page I have written a volume of essays available on the Website as 8 SOFDAWARES and the first dozen essays titled *Quodlibets*.

²¹*Method in Theology*, 253.

²²The **operation** and **cooperation** sketched on page 250 of *Method in Theology* actually involve discernments of discernments of discernments. Lonergan is pointing here to remote and refined regions that will take generations to become a reality of **institutions, roles, tasks**. I would note that the realities here boldfaced are in an essentially dynamic context. They are to fulfil the 5 sets of characteristics of Cosmopolis that Lonergan lists at the end of chapter 7 of *Insight*. Further, I would note that **personal relations** that are authentic have the same dynamic

each of us to the task of discerning ourselves in the concrete story of our dynamics of responsibility. We can return privately to that fourth line of the first version of the compact diagram to ask what are we to do about our what-to-do questions and about how those what-to-do questions are set or beset by our deeper bents.²³ What is dialectic analysis in education? It is to expose and reveal oneself to oneself and others in a way that brings forth the deepest hidden bents of progress, of that to which education calls us within the molecular dynamics of history. We are in the zone that Lonergan identifies by talking of originating values and **terminal values**.²⁴ But unless this talk leads us, discomfortingly,²⁵ to think of ourselves as originating origins heading towards death and life we are not on the move towards a dialectic life. I have written of such a searching previously and I yield to the temptation to use as image of the required commitment that of that queen of musical education in the twentieth century, Nadia Boulanger. So I quote from the Prologue to *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*:

“When asked in 1973 what advice she would give to a young musician - [read *young person aspiring to do dialectic work*] - she replied: ‘Do not take up music unless you would rather die than do so. It must be an indissoluble love. And one with great joy

character: teachers and students, friends, spouses, are always strangers reaching together in the darkness of being for each other’s growing meaning. The world of Proust tea-yet-to-be-tasted becomes a norm of living. Then we begin to see the challenge of section 1 of chapter 17 of *Insight* being met: mystery overpowers myth in streets and mouths.

²³Deepest bents, fundamental exigencies (see the index on *Exigence* in *Phenomenology and Logic*), **terminal values**, these are topics of enormous difficulty. They relate to the third meaning of generalized empirical method discussed in *Joistings 21*: “Research, Communications, Stages of Meaning”.

²⁴*Method in Theology*, 51. The key paragraph, beginning ‘terminal values’ is worth thinking through in the context of education as it points to the notion of an authentic educational community, subjects embracing the universe.

²⁵“Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.”(*Method in Theology*, 299).

of learning, the firm determination to learn, the unswerving perseverance, the intense faithfulness. But primarily, if it is not better to die than not to do music - then it is an excuse. And if not then why, why?'²⁶

And who knows? Perhaps I can be optimistic and envisage some few of my readers taking to minding minding as Nadia Boulanger describes taking to, being taken by, music, so that they can say with Stephen McKenna, 'this is worth a life.'²⁷ ²⁸

Might we generate such dedicated openness in the dialectic searchings of education? Not, perhaps, in this century. But each of us can take our own little dialectic steps towards finding in ourselves the seeds of a better foundational identity. Such finding in our times is sadly often altogether a self-reliant climb. In the fuller collaborative effort of later times, foundational people, and the foundational attitude in all teachers, will be more gently fostered by the solidarity of global effort that Lonergan suggests. Still, within our group such as it is, muddling along in our various discouraging situations, there is a sense of solidarity that might lift us forwards to the beginnings of a revolution in education. We leave reflections on such beginnings to the final session.

²⁶Alan Kendall, *Nadia Boulanger. A Life Devoted to Music*, with an Introduction by Yehudi Menuhin, Macdonald and James, London, 1976, 10.

²⁷Confided to his private journal on his thirty sixth birthday in 1908, with two decades of interpretation, translation and poverty before him..He was writing about his discovery of *The Enneads* of Plotinus, to which he produce a magnificent translation.

²⁸The book *Process. Introducing Themselves to Young Christian Minds*, written in 1988-89, is available, free of charge, on the website www.philipmcs Shane.ca . It was written as an introduction to the philosophy of religion, but certainly it relates to philosophy of education and would serve as a follow-up to these few lectures.