

Field Nocturnes CanTower 45
Eau Canada: Global Water Collaboration

In the past forty years of desert I have rambled round different regions of global interest, making the point, in different ways, that the region needed and would profit from, functional specialization. I still recall my first venture into such a pointing, coming from the sudden inspiration in the Bodlean Library that musicology was not in too good shape. It had been three years since Lonergan had sketched the functional division for me with eight outstretched fingers, as we say facing each other in his room in Regis College on Bayview Avenue, Summer 1966. I had brooded over his subtle leap to efficient collaboration in the years between, not at all recognizing the efficiency, the profit, as I do now. Indeed, my slowness should be an encouragement to others who suspect vaguely that Lonergan has hit on a strategy of global and transhistorical significance. So, in the last century, I rambled through other areas making the same point: the need is there in literature, economics, ecology, linguistics, law, feminism, even in mountaineering. But it was only in this century that I began to grope my way towards effective strategies of initiating a beginning on the new science of humanity and history.

My strategy here benefits from that groping and seeks to be concretely helpful to those reaching for glimmers of a beginning by turning to a very practical global issue. Further, my strategy of presentation in this essay is very deliberately empirical and pedagogical, even while remaining massively broad. That broadness is contained in my answer to the question pose by Robert Doran, *What is Systematic Theology?*¹ My answer

¹University of Toronto Press, 2007. Relevant comments on the book and his previous *Theology and the Dialectic of History* are available in my Website Book of 2007, *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, chapter 8, "Terms and Relations", chapter 9, "The Dialectic of Psychic Orientations", chapter 11, "Theologies and the Dialectic of History". See also Joistings 15, "*What is Systematic Theology?*", and Joistings 20, "Identifying Systematic Theology".

is that Systematic Theology - or should I not be secular about it and say "Global Systematics"? - is to be a cyclic structure of global functional collaboration yielding cumulative and progressive results.² But at once my empirical pedagogical bent intervenes. Part one of this essay invites a sharing of musings about the problems expressed in the book from which I take my title.³ Do not fear that the problem is something merely national: it is a global problem which, of course, is always local.⁴ It is best to make it local as you read. British Columbia and Vancouver, where I live, is a great zone of water consumption with its own local problems. What are we doing about them? I have to hand a quite silly glossy pamphlet of public advice to local citizens: but what is really going on around me, and how do I, do we, detect the goings-on effectively? That is an altogether more subtle question of method that one might superficially suspect. Part Two here will turn towards such subtleties and to broader

²My best effort at introducing this is Part One of the Website book of 2006, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*.

³*Eau Canada. The Future of Canada's Water*, edited by Karen Bakker, University of British Columbia Press, 2007. Referred to below as **Eau Canada**. Karen Bakker is Director of the Program on Water Governance in the Department of Geography, University of British Columbia. I am indebted to my good wife, Reverend Sally McShane, for the nudge to read this book and so to write this essay. Other books she keeps flowing my way are books on pastoral operations in Churches and the manner of making the past "better than it was" (*Method in Theology*, 251) as a strategy of concrete improvement. I am tempted to use such work to illustrate the functional dynamics of a seriously-empirical *ecclesiology*, but the road forward there is massively complex. Is the future Church to echo something of the conversation about water of Jesus (John 4) with the woman at the well? "The hour is coming when true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth" (*Ibid*, v. 23) : but where? Is the present essay an essay about global worship beyond temple, synagogue, mosque, "neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem" (*Ibid*, v.21)?

⁴That apparently simple point is well worth lengthy consideration, but it would be too much of a distraction at the moment. It relates to the topic raised at the end of the previous note and also to the problems raised by the concluding remarks of my Introduction to Lonergan's *For a New Political Economy*: "The massively innovative primers that would meet millennial needs, 500 page texts of empirically rich, locally oriented, normatively focused non-trivial writing, are distant probabilities" (*Ibid.*, xxxi)

deeper long-term strategies of lifting our global care. Part Three will turn to some blunt comments that ground a fresh appeal for the beginning of collaboration. So, we have three parts to follow: the first on semi-immediate strategies, the second on long-term strategies, the third, amazingly perhaps, on immediate strategies regarding the functional shift.

1. Semi-immediate Strategies

What might I mean by semi-immediate strategies? One meaning is that the strategy is pretty evident - immediate in that sense - but how to get it into actual operation is the problem. Semi, then, might be taken to mean **Short of Effective Methods of Implementation**. The book *Eau Canada* gives a key example of this which provides me with a semi-immediate strategy of proceeding here: the European Union's directives regarding water. Let us muse over this.

Karen Bakker notes the striking contrast between Canada's operating water policies and those of the European Union, EU. "In 2000, member states of the European Union reached a historic agreement. After years of negotiations, the European Union passed the Water Framework Directive, a lengthy binding policy for the water management and protection in Europe.⁵ The directive sets out a comprehensive water management strategy based on integrating watershed management, including transboundary watersheds."⁶

There is no point in entering into details here about the EU policies regarding subsidiarity, quality norms, harmonization, pricings, etc. Suffice it to note, with Bakker, that "the directive is the most ambitious water legislation in the world."⁷

⁵*European Commission 2000*, Brussel. Directive 2000/60/EC.

⁶M.Kaika, "The Watershed Framework Directive: A New Directive for a Changing Social, Political and Economic European Framework, *European Planning Studies* 11 (3), 2003, 299- 316.

⁷*Eau Canada*, 365.

In contrast, Canadian water legislation is a patchwork of provincial and federal laws, with a spectrum of oversights, gaps in responsibilities, inconsistencies, stalemates. And of course the muddles link into broader political muddles, as Karen Harrison makes evident.⁸ But again, details do not suit my purpose here, but it seems useful for our broader purpose to quote now the last paragraph of the book and then return to the first three paragraphs. Bakker's last paragraph reads:

"What is Canada's Vision? The contributors to *Eau Canada* have pointed out not only where we are lacking but also where we might be heading. To begin with, we would be well advised to revisit the 1987 Federal Water Policy, which called for 'clean, safe, and secure water for people and ecosystems.' This policy has yet to be implemented. As Canada's Senate recently reminded us, failure to work towards a vision for Canada's water is 'unacceptable' (Senate, 2005). This failure can only have dire consequence for what is arguably the most important resource of our time. A new alliance between local communities, water managers, and all levels of government is urgently needed. We hope that this book will inspire Canadians to act together for the future of our water."⁹ Her concluding sentence echoes the concluding sentence of the Preface of the book, written by David Schindler: "It is to be dearly hoped that *Eau Canada* will be the start of a new dialogue between academics, the public, and politicians - a dialogue directed at ensuring that strong and sustainable policies underpin our future treatment of water and other natural resources."¹⁰ He began that Preface with the three paragraphs that I wish to quote now: they give us a sense not

⁸Karen Harrison, *Passing the Buck: Federalism and Canadian Environmental Policy*, University of British Columbia Press, 1996.

⁹Karen Bakker, in her concluding essay, "Conclusion: Governing Canada's Waters Wisely", 359-68; p. 366.

¹⁰**Eau Canada**, xiv. David Schindler is Killam Memorial Professor of Ecology at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, internationally recognized for his research on water ecology and winner of the first Stockholm Water Prize - the Nobel Prize of Water.

only of this problem but of such problems and messes in, well, in pretty much any area touched by the longer cycle of decline. Further, they are relevant, sentence by sentence, to our brooding over the messes, the book, the needed lift to a better way. So, I quote them fully.

“Canadians feel very strongly about water governance. A 2004 Ipsos-Reid poll conducted on behalf of the Council of Canadians found that 97% of Canadians agreed with the statement, ‘Canada should adopt a comprehensive national water policy that recognizes clean drinking water as a basic human right.’ A high proportional of Canadians blame politicians for the water crises at Walkerton, Ontario, and North Battleford, Saskatchewan. Therefore, this book should be of widespread interest to Canadians since, in language that is intelligible to the public, it summarizes many of the problems of water governance of Canada.

The libraries of academic institutions contain many papers on important facets of water governance in Canada. They are diffused through broad literature and written in the professional jargon of scientists, constitutional lawyers, policy analysts, and other professionals. As a result, the public, and even more politicians, is unaware of the increasing problem that our country faces in securing its water supplies for the future. Bakker and her colleagues do a remarkable job of sifting through this diffuse mountain of academic and legal work, summarizing what is relevant to contemporary water governance. One hope that politicians will read the book, people will demand action, and the frustrating decades of inaction by politicians on national Canadian water policy will end in the near future.

The Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences once attempted a similar thesis: unfortunately, however, government bulletins are poorly advertised (see M.C.Healey and R.R.Wallace, 1987, *Canadian Aquatic Resource Bulletin* 215, Canadian Bulletin of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, Ottawa). The academy’s book received only limited use by academics and attracted little attention from politicians or the public. It was written in the heady days following the Pearse Federal Inquiry on Water, and most academics

hoped the inquiry would result in a strong federal water policy that would form the basis for international and interprovincial water management, to be enforced by Environment Canada's Inland Waters Directorate. This did not happen. Many of the reasons why are outlined in *Eau Canada*. Today, we still have no strong Canadian federal water policy, and the Inland Waters Directorate has been disbanded. The Rawson Academy of Aquatic Sciences, comprised of a collection of prominent academics interested in translating water research into strong policy, no longer exists, and federal water policies have become increasingly weak. The federal government is largely ignored by the provinces when they make their decisions about water. As a result, throughout the country, we have a mish-mash of water policies that are inconsistent with respect to the precautionary protection of the environment and to protecting the rights of Canadians. Shades of the Balkans!"¹¹

Shades, indeed, of the longer cycle of decline, and as we shall see in Part Three, shades of its presence in the mish-mash called Lonerganism. But our first interest here is in exploiting the meaning of the European Union achievement as an illustration of functional research. Were functional collaboration a reality then what would be illustrated would be the potential of an immediate instance of system recycling. I have written of functional research before in various helpful contexts.¹² Let us repeat, or recall the key points.

Research in a mature cycle is done by a group whose mind-set is the Standard Model. Think of present physics. The boys and girls working in research at one of the cyclotronic centres are up to date on the theory of what they observe, and indeed are sufficiently clued in to be on the look-out, say, for signs of a Higgs particle, but certainly for anomalous signs. What do I mean by anomalous here? I mean "against present

¹¹**Eau Canada**, xi-xii.

¹²See the Website books, *ChrISt in History*, chapter 8, and *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, chapters 11 and 22.

rules” where the against may be either positive or negative. It is positive if it reveals something new, not previously noted, possibly adding to progress. It is negative if what is happening is a flaw in the full system: the standard model is not working forwards properly. Don’t forget here that research is into the past, but the recent past includes the recent present: so the flow could be a failed application of the standard model, whether the application be in experimenting, in innovating new technology, or in teaching, or concretely adapting policy.¹³

In the present illustration we have a positive instance of policy-precepts as they emerge from the eighth specialty, flowing into operation at some acceptable level of efficiency, and we can think of Karen Bakker as the lady on the research spot. The lady notices the anomaly: “there is a set-up elsewhere that is better than ours”. What does our research lady do in principle? Think of the physics parallel, or something similar in your own zone of inquiry. In physics, the anomaly might be curious traces that could just be something Higgsean or it might indeed be a new technology of research. But in either case there is a handing on for the purpose of interpretation. We are envisaging a standard model or vision: the question “What is Canada’s Vision?” has been answered: it is, normatively, the standard global vision, a foundational vision supplemented by advances in both dialectic and genetic understanding.¹⁴ Then we are not in the area of the semi-immediate, **Short of Effective Methods of Implementation**. We are in the cycle of functional efficiency. Why is this? Because the relevant groups are in place in the

¹³The notion of a **standard model** dominates the Website book, *Loneragan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, where the expression *standard model* is taken from present physics, and its reality in theology is envisaged as something of the next century. Then the cyclic flow from communication’s failures to research findings will be commonplace. See the discussion at notes 36, 37, 38 and 39 below.

¹⁴The vision, of course, is to the contemporary standard model mentioned in the previous note, with its components, UV + GS, mentioned in the *FNC 44*.

topologically-complex Water-Tower.¹⁵ The local researcher has a global group, meta-internetted in the world of theory, to which they can hand on the anomaly. I find it useful to think here in an image that plays on the name *Ten Thousand Villages*.¹⁶ So come with me in imagining 22,220 operating in the Tower of Able, or even in only the Water-Tower. That gives 10,000 researchers,¹⁷ 1000 interpreters, 100 historians, 10 dialecticians, 10 foundational personalities, 100 working on the theoretics of Policy, 1000 pushing for a fuller geohistorical genetic pragmatics, and finally 10,000 handling with some efficiency the tasks of the final specialty, Communications.¹⁸

Karen would normatively and ideally have this back-up team between here and the final flowering of her discovery, the concrete persuasion of parliaments, academics, local authorities, citizens at large, to implement a Canadian version of the EU Directives. Note that each group of the back-up team are called to be creative. One does not simply translate the European document into Canadianese. Interpretation calls for subtle twists of selection, correction, and creative additions. History can be a substantial shake-up even of the story of the distant past, and dialectic work can reveal that story in a manner that oddly shows “something better than was the reality.”¹⁹ There can be a lift in foundational fantasy, new wine for new bottles that require complex policies if the new bottles are to be available, envisaged in geohistorical possibilities, and - in

¹⁵Water-Tower: the name and its capital letters point to the beginning of my paralleling and indeed my puns. The writers in the book *Eau Canada* now become the Water-Tower People, or simply the Water People..

¹⁶Ten Thousand Villages is a founding member of the International Fair Trad Association (IFTA), a global network of more than 2000 fair trade organizations in 50 countries.

¹⁷I think of the future envisaged by Lonergan; “it will make the practical economist as familiar a professional figure as the doctor” (*For a New Political Economy*, 37).

¹⁸My focus in this essay is on effective communication. I leave the reader with the puzzle regarding the difference between the care given by the village researcher, mentioned in the previous note, and the care given by the village communicator.

¹⁹*Method in Theology*, 251.

Communications - conceived in concrete systems both of persuasion and of operation. Persuasion will, of course, include patterns of admiration and embarrassment: in a later stage of meaning, the Tower of Able will have a respectability not presently due to any national or international institution. Lonergan remarked in *Method in Theology* that “doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company”²⁰: this will then be discomfortingly untrue.

But we are in fantasy land, the fantasyland of good foundational work. The present reality is of one of semi-immediate strategies. We are in the zone of ineffective or even effete hope. “The antecedent willingness of hope has to advance from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference with intellect’s unrestricted finality”²¹ is a future state. What we have now is the hope expressed by Karen Bakker and David Schlinder, “It is dearly hope that *Eau Canada* will be the start of a new dialogue”²²; “We hope that this book will inspire Canadians to act together for the future of our water.”²³ Yet, is there anything in the book that points towards a lift out of the rut describe so plainly in those three introductory paragraphs, quoted above, of the Foreword?

2. Long-term Strategies

The rut so described is, of course, just an instance of the presence of the longer cycle of decline, of humanity’s immaturity. These paragraphs, and indeed the Preface that follows, could and should be read in that context. But who could be thus reading? “Most experts working on water issues - including the majority of contributors to this book - would likely agree that an integrated approach, although difficult, is absolutely

²⁰*Method in Theology*, 299.

²¹*Insight*, 726[747].

²²**Eau Canada**, xiv. Schindler’s last comment.

²³**Eau Canada**, 366. Bakker’s last comment.

necessary”²⁴ Would the agreement mount to a sharing of Lonergan’s heart-rending viewpoint that “the social situation deteriorates cumulatively”²⁵ even as we write and think ineffectively of hope, that “the culture has become a slum,”²⁶ that centuries of “politics, economics, education have been trying to remake man and have done not a little to make human life unlivable.”²⁷ I do not think so. Nor do I think that Lonergan’s followers share his incarnate discomfort. Otherwise, surely, they would take his delineation of decline and the remote redemptive characteristics of cosmopolis seriously enough to follow him in his agony of searching towards finding the effective auxiliary to frail hope. But no, the school of Lonergan putters on as usual, taking a stubborn stand on the competence of common sense to pull us through, leaning a little perhaps on religious decencies or on theories that are, indeed, only a disguised mish-mash of common sense and common nonsense.

This makes the long-term strategy of what I call the *Water Tower* all the more difficult. The genuine people who wrote *Eau Canada* have no idea that what they need is a Water Tower. They have no idea of such a Tower, nor is the Lonergan school bursting to tell them about it. The Lonergan school is part of what is describe in those three paragraphs, each turning out old-style papers in relative isolation from other members of the Lonergan group, involved in this or that good cause, rarely with any long-term effect or interest. Is this harsh? More than Crowe’s similar talk of 1964?²⁸ There is need

²⁴**Eau Canada**, xv. The Preface is unsigned, but I presume that it is the work of Karen Bakker.

²⁵*Insight*, 229[254].

²⁶*Method in Theology*, 99.

²⁷*Topics in Education*, 232.

²⁸F.E.Crowe, “The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan’s Intellectualism”, *Spirit as Inquiry. Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan S.J.*, Herder and Herder, 1964. Crowe remarks that “unless his readers are ready to undertake a parallel labor they have little chance of understanding what Lonergan is doing and talking about. This is rather bluntly said, but is there not room for a

now for a larger measure of bluntness.

Without, then, this minimal encouragement, the Water People have to grope their way to the missing collaboration that might be effective. Still, they might read this piece and be encouraged; some of my readers might tell someone among them about this, about this hope, about this auxiliary system, resting, rusting, in the wings, these forty years.

That telling would help them grope in the minimal fashion that I have written of before. There is no need for them to get involved in Lonergan studies, or, God help us, Lonergan talk. Like people in other areas, they have to notice an emerging pattern such as is pretty evident in any area that pauses to take stock of its own fragments. Wellek and Warren's book on literature practically list the functional parts in the table of contents.²⁹ Alessandra Drage points out their lonely presence in feminism.³⁰

I do not wish to anticipate the direction of the struggle of the water people's travels in the desert of method, not surely a trip of forty more years. Might some of them take serious note that, yes, the EU stuff is worth pausing over creatively? Might they notice also that the pause should be patient and partial? Not, then, a matter of hastily pulling together a government or academic committee, but of staggering messily into a "study of the organism"³¹ that is the working animal rambling round Europe in its "flexible circles of ranges of schemes of recurrence"?³² Without the heuristic that the

measure of bluntness at this stage?" (*Ibid.*, 27). Crowe is writing there about elementary self-appropriation. I am writing about the global self-appropriation that would lead one to envisage the longer cycle of decline and thus be lifted to reaching desperately for a cosmopolis, the cosmopolis whose natural structure is global functional collaboration.

²⁹R. Wellek and A. Warren, *Theories of Literature*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

³⁰Alessandra Drage, *Thinking Woman*, Axial Press, 2005, in the concluding chapters.

³¹*Insight*, 464[489].

³²*Ibid.*

two books, *Insight* and *Method*, provide, they can still mess along to detect in an amateur or pre-scientific fashion what can be snatched from the European perspective and practice. The snatching is likely to be of a compact nature: a picking of the applicable controlled by spontaneous commonsense orientations. Enlarging on that snatching might well be a second volume of *Eau Canada*, the basis not only for a nudge towards better governance, but also the basis of methodological self-criticism. But all this would likely be a very pale shadow of what would emerge were the full heuristic adverted to.

It would seem, in the present circumstances, that such compact snatching must be done: but it would surprise the participants, I think, to find how much of a lift even the short-term push would get from adverting heuristically - even thought relatively nominally - to the missing steps. This adverting would involve a sensitivity to the fact that "the inquiry was *voraussetzunglos*"³³ in various ways, needing a guidance that would only slowly reveal itself - for entrenched truncated consciousness is the dominant consciousness of the authors of *Eau Canada*³⁴ - as an astonishing shift to simple self-appreciation.³⁵ But the seeds of, and nudge to, that shift, could emerge from honest puttering. Then some feel for the further division of collaborative work would bubble up: the dependence of critical interpretation of the EU directives on a geohistorical sensitivity; the need to be more explicit on the grounds for policy, a sense

³³*Insight*, 578[600].

³⁴Lonergan writes of truncated consciousness in his essay, "The Subject", *Second Collection*, edited by W.F.J.Ryan and B.J.Tyrrell, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 1974, especially on page 73: "The truncated subject not only does not know himself but also is unaware of his ignorance". This is a grim cultural fact: nor does one break from the fact merely by reading Lonergan. The Water People are trapped in that culture. Later (after note 68) I write about the old style work comparing Lonergan with various other moderns. Pretty well all of these moderns are truncated consciousnesses. One does not self-appropriate towards a precise position on self without being luminous about what one is achieving.

³⁵This is a very significant piece of history's gentle care: levels of human consciousness and human knowing's position in itself and in history's flow is to be revealed by functional collaboration.

that remote policy needs to become an explicit focus if patterns of management and governance are to be arrived at that are genetically open and flexible, and finally, the need to have a distinct sub-group who would face the task of suggesting effectively to the various elements in culture the range of implementations involved.³⁶ These pointings should bring to mind for students of Lonergan the full cycle from the work of research groups to the complex tasks of communications, but for the non-Lonergan thinkers that wrote the book *Eau Canada* there is the evidence from their own writing - as the book sits there, ineffective, in these next years - that communications is a massively obvious problem. So, Lonergan's comment will have a growing echo in their psyches: "It is a major concern, for it is in this final stage that theological reflection bears fruit. Without the first seven stages, of course, there is no fruit to be borne. But without the last the first seven are in vain, for they fail to mature."³⁷

Here, perhaps, we have the biggest existential nudge towards "an integrated approach, difficult, but absolutely necessary"³⁸ - and this is true both for the Water People and for the Lonergan People. The integrity is revealed, or to be revealed to both groups, as part of their science. It is not enough to write *Eau Canada* and hope for effects from the comfort of an academic cocoon; it is not enough to write, read and publish learned papers and then lope back into the cocoon to prepare for the next conference. That it is not enough is, I would claim, a massive shock to the present ethos both of science and of theology. Effectiveness, I would say, is not a dominant ethos of present academic work.

But am I here just pointing towards the need for a specialized sub-group in a new sales department called *Communications*? I am, rather, talking of a massive shift in the bent of scientists. And within that massive shift I am noting the need for a

³⁶See notes 12 and 13 above, and of course the following note.

³⁷*Method in Theology*, 355.

³⁸**Eau Canada**, xv.

futurology of serious substance, especially in relation to explanatory implementation.³⁹ That seriousness is symbolized for me in the image of what is needed to study and cultivate effectively the maturing of a tadpole.⁴⁰ The parallel serves to bring out quite simply the deeper challenge: we do not have the evidence of the frog's activities in the case of human's organic historic collaboration. But the massive shift to an existential openness to explanation is unimaginably beyond common sense.

3. Immediate Functional Strategies

We invite ourselves - I hope, but with what measure of hope? - to face that issue of openness to explanation, made seriously and wonderfully personal, in savoring the concluding words of this next section. But it seems best to return to the question which began the previous paragraph. So I wish to speak of a new sales department of Communications, and indulge here in a new sales pitch, internal to Communications, for that sales department.

The twisting about in and about Communications is legitimate: indeed it draws attention to the fact that my effort in these Cantowers, Field Nocturnes, Field Nocturnes CanTowers, perhaps even the effort of my life of writing essays and books, has been an effort to light high and rescue from distortion the full explanatory understanding of, and within, the task of communications. In a way, the twisting about is superfluous. After all, Communications, like Research, is fully within the Tower requirement of up-to-dateness in a Standard Model. But the deeper point is that the standard model has to have within it's cyclic operation, in its maturity, a chemically-patterned zeal for

³⁹Futurology is a pretty limp zone of human inquiry, as is its flowering, the study of eschatology. What is needed is a massive effort of fantasy in relation to the heuristics developed by Lonergan, the heart of which is EU.

⁴⁰*Cantower 57* the original list (see *Cantower 24* for one version of the list) was to have been "Tadpoles, Tell Us Talling Tales". It is clear to me now that what is required is, not an essay, but a collaborative effort generating a cluster of books.

effective communication.⁴¹ We are going places as cosmos-bred humans: we are going there adequately in so far as explanation heart-holds our desires and our molecules. That adequacy, in our time, has been identified as pivoting on the supporting by the human group of a sub-group with a self-luminous Tower-quest. Communicating that identity is key to the move from mish-mash to spiraling progress.⁴²

Perhaps it helps to note that we are re-reading sections of the Epilogue of *Insight*, but now in the shadow of the Tower of Able. What was the task of theology there is now a task of a specialty that transcends theology, the task of ten thousand villagers lifting fellow-villagers “to the joyful, courageous, whole-hearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by world order.”⁴³ , “not only to encourage scientist to complete fidelity to their calling but also to teach non-scientists the high office of the scientific spirit.”⁴⁴ Lonergan goes on there immediately to add, “in this fashion he can hope not only to promote scientific willingness to undertake fundamental research but also to mitigate the pressures that are exerted by so-called practicality and that ever seek to turn scientists away from their proper tasks and to direct their energies to projects with a significance that, because it is minimal, easily is understood.”⁴⁵

Lonergan at that time, the early 1950s, was writing of the theologian - he or, rarely, she - and perhaps we can take comfort in the fact that now the task is to belong to a wider community, fewer professional theologians and more women. We thus may

⁴¹There is the zeal, of course, of those involved in persuasion of various types, such as advertising. Here I am pointing, in fantasy, towards a larger cosmic zeal, Note 72 below adds a perspective.

⁴²Spiraling progress is, of course, a wavering suffering reality. But that is a topic for another day.

⁴³*Insight*, 723-4[745].

⁴⁴*Insight*, 746[768].

⁴⁵*Ibid.*

take comfort because the tragedy of his following in theology and philosophy is that it was not at all up to his game. "Original thinkers can found only a school. There are going to be only a limited number that will not merely seek a new set of concepts and a new approach but also have a revolution, a development, in themselves. The school splinters because those that follow him effect in themselves a conversion in unequal measures. The school can also decay."⁴⁶ The standards in that school can eventually be much lower, scientifically speaking, than e.g. the standards of the Water People.⁴⁷ Theology, then, becomes visibly in no position to advise or encourage. They, and their governance and their direction, take on the character of the mish-mash mentioned in those first three paragraphs of the Foreword to *Eau Canada*. They can carry forward the ethos that Lonergan condemned in a paragraph of the Epilogue of *Insight* that is worth quoting fully now.

"But if Catholics have endeavored to establish the synthesis of the objects and the symbiosis of the principles of reason and faith, it also is true that their effort has been embarrassed continually by the instability of the pronouncements of scientific reason. From the nature of the case the initiative seemed permanently in the hands of those who invoked science against religion and, if it mattered little to them that at any given moment the issue had shifted from physics to Semitic literature, from Semitic literature to biology, from biology to economics, or from economics to depth psychology, the defenders were left in the unenviable position of always arriving on the scene a little breathless and a little late."⁴⁸

In the conclusion to FNC 44 there were comments on this ethos, in terms of a

⁴⁶*Phenomenology and Logic*, 281.

⁴⁷Note 34 above talks of their cultural handicap, but this does not retract from the excellence of their work. I pass over the set of essays in *Eau Canada*, though it would be a valuable exercise not just to review them but to view them as potential to ordering by functional distinctions.

⁴⁸*Insight*, 733[755].

dominance of predicamental contentment. It is a very complex methodological issue and I prefer to leave it at that for the present.⁴⁹ What seems best here is to make some few suggestions about immediate strategies. Those suggestions pivot on a pun, one that winds back round the challenge to the Water People, so the pun and the winding have a possibility of making the suggestions memorable, making them a topic, if only because of the poor, if pointed, wit. "Proofless, purposeless laughter can dissolve pretense; it can disrupt conventional humbug; it can disillusion man of his most cherished illusions, for it is in league with the detached, disinterested, unrestricted desire to know."⁵⁰

How might I play out my outrageous pun, or muddle of puns? How might I sum up the reality of, and the question to appreciate, the unrestricted desire to know? Well, the previous FNC 44 is already such a heuristic summary of the ineffable loneliness that is that desire. Might I sum up that incarnate reach in a sigh, eu, EU? which Greek would have us think of as good.? Indeed, the book of *Genesis*' Earth is a reach for **U**. But each of us, Experiential animal things, is a chemical reach for **U**. **EU**. Does that not somehow put in a nutpun the self-discovery-task expressed in Lonergan's *Insight*, a Lonergan self-discovery that lived in massive loneliness as he sought an effective ways round the pretense, the decay, the mish-mash of theology and philosophy ? Then, finally, **EU** became for him the set of directives published in 1969, extensively but poorly expressed later in a tired book.

So, you surely have leaped, with a groan, to the drift of my pun? The Water People would do well to nudge people beyond a hoped hopeless reading of *Eau Canada* to some sort of push towards a creative involvement with the directives of EU. The Lonergan People would do well to nudge people beyond a hoped hopeless reading of *Insight* to some sort of creative involvement with the directives of **EU**.

The creative involvement of the Water People in EU - the European Union's

⁴⁹See note 67 below.

⁵⁰*Insight*, 626[649].

directives -that I talked of above is a twisted complex enterprise. The twist is due to the fact that EU - the Lonergan directive - is unfamiliar to them. But even if, through this essay or some enlightening contact with those promoting Lonergan's EU, their effort is pointed towards functional collaboration, still that enterprise is novel. Further, of course, EU is not an element in the culture, much less a cultural ethos. Even if there is a successful performance of interpretation followed by some good short-cutting to what would eventually be a piece of Communications' potential, the specialty Communications is non-existent. There is no subgroup versed in the post-modern subtleties of persuasion and pressure that is to lift the citizens and its leaders to acceptance and to action. If such an effective acceptance happens, it will be a matter of luck.

Now let us turn to the Lonergan People. Might they be persuaded by me, by those of a similar view, to become creatively involved in EU? So far, when one considers immediate implementations, it is a matter of hopeless hope. Long-term there is history.⁵¹ "Is my proposal utopian? It asks merely for creativity, for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd, then will be admitted to be true but obvious and insignificant, and perhaps finally be regarded as so important that its adversaries will claim that they themselves discovered it."⁵² Might the Water People - or economists, or students of aesthetics, or whoever - not as adversaries but as desperate and creative, come to claim to discover the need and significance of dividing up their field in sequential functionality? So there might occur "a major

⁵¹I am thinking of actual history, on various levels. There is the recent history of disciplinary fragmentation that I refer to implicitly in note 59; there is the history referred to in my essay, "Lonergan's Economics and the Economic Rhythms of the second million years", *Lonergan's Challenge to the University and the Economy*, 1976: now available on the Website (indeed, photocopied from Lonergan's own copy, with interesting markings by him). Then there is the history I refer to regularly at present: the emergence of the next two billion years or so.

⁵²Lonergan "Healing and Creating in History", *A Third Collection*, 108; *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, 106.

authenticity that condemns the tradition”⁵³ that laid claim to be global queen.⁵⁴ And theology might thus be awakened from its predicamental slumber.

Is it more likely that the Lonergan People lift the Water People to this new EU perspective on their high calling? That depends, of course, on you and me and our honesty about our failure to reach up to Lonergan’s level of the times. And perhaps you and I are at the moment a “not numerous center”?⁵⁵ But it surely is part of the low calling of those who take Lonergan seriously.

So I come to immediate functional strategies for the Lonergan People. First, there is the task just mentioned, to share the perspective on global collaboration that has been lurking all along not only in Lonergan’s sketched discovery but also in history’s reachings, in each discipline, for effective understanding, *EU*. I would note here that history is certainly reaching for the positioning of humans that is the second time of the temporal subject.⁵⁶ But now I begin to see that that effective reaching is not to take systematic effect until the Tower plea of the fourth stage of meaning⁵⁷ is, cuckoo-wise, heard in the academic land.⁵⁸ The reaching to be cultivated now in the minimalist

⁵³*Method in Theology*, 80.

⁵⁴On the issue of queen of sciences see *Phenomenology and Logic*, 126-7, 130.

⁵⁵Lonergan, “Dimensions of Meaning”, *Collection*, 244.

⁵⁶See Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, Question 21.

⁵⁷I recall the discussion in *FNC 44* of the flexibility of the history of stages: anticipations and lags, etc.

⁵⁸Or perhaps, in the mood of the forth stage of meaning, one might think of the “dove” (*Song of Songs*, 2: 14) and “the Tower of Lebanon, sentinel facing Damascus” (*Ibid.*, 7: 4-5)? “My dove, hiding in the clefts of the rock, in the coverts of the cliff, show me your face, let me hear your voice,; for your voice is sweet and your face is beautiful”(*Ibid.*, 2: 14). Is the global collaboration not to be an echo of circumincessional wholiness?

division whose need is pragmatically present now.⁵⁹ So, I would see a need of Lonergan People speaking in these coming decades, more of functional conversion than of, say, intellectual conversion.

That task presupposes that the identification by Lonergan of functional collaboration become a serious topic for his students, not something easily sidelined as some convenient filing system. It is not another predicamental classification but a distant and dangerous explanatory leap to the reach for sets of novel differentiations of conscious intentionality. This is an embarrassing claim, after forty years of the same old same old thesis-writing and paper-writing of the Lonergan community. Do I offend and annoy⁶⁰ or embarrass? “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company.”⁶¹

This is, as some of my readers will know only too well, an old discomfiting sermon of mine. I have backed up that sermon with commentaries on two troubling pages of Lonergan, one in *Insight*⁶² and one in *Method in Theology*.⁶³ The two pages are not mentioned much in polite Lonergan company. And there are many more pages not

⁵⁹This is the point made both in chapter 3 of my *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism* (Axial Press, 2000) and in chapter 1 of my Website book, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*.

⁶⁰In *Lack in the Beingstalk* (pp. 5-6) I drew attention to a text of Shakespeare that impressed me at 16. Sixty years later I feel I can indulge myself. The text is a speech by Prince Henry in *Henry the Fourth, Part One*, Act 1 scene 2. I quote a few lines to give you the idea and the mood: “I know you all, and will awhile uphold, / The unyoked humour of your idleness”, and the speech moves on to conclude, “I’ll so offend to make offense a skill / Redeeming time when men think least I will” (lines 188-9, 208-9).

⁶¹*Method in Theology*, 299.

⁶²The 300-page *Field Nocturnes* series is centred on the single page 464[489] of *Insight*.

⁶³There are about 200 pages on the single page 250 of *Method in Theology* in the two website series *SOFDAWAREs* and *Quodlibets*

mentioned that in fact should be centre stage.⁶⁴ But it seems as well to point again, in this context, but briefly, to two immediately-functional moves, sitting there in plain sight on that brilliantly practical, *Method in Theology*, page 250. There is the issue of self-revelation, that can be done in an amateur fashion through a rambling self-assembly, followed by a narrative self-exposure regarding one's operative view on serious science, and on serious functional collaboration. The full challenge is there, to do the business alone and then, riskily, with one's peers. But perhaps a private self-showing is a tough enough beginning in a zone where cosmically-sensitive genuineness calls neurally for "more or less extensive self-scrutiny"⁶⁵ yet cultured self-protective bone-marrow "keeps some matters entirely to oneself, and refuses even to face others."⁶⁶ What, then, do you really think of scientific understanding; what do you operatively hold about functional collaboration? In these past months I have heard one Lonergan expert wax eloquent about the richness and significance of descriptive understanding,⁶⁷ and another talking of being actually operating within several specialties in a presented paper. What might your take on these be?

My other discomfiting suggestion is a serious reading of the sentence on lines 5-6 of *Method in Theology*, 250: "Comparison examines the completed assembly to seek out affinities and oppositions." Such is Lonergan's mature suggestion about the activity of Comparison. How does that view fit in with what I call the same old same old? The

⁶⁴I think especially here of the pages dealing with the canons of hermeneutics.

⁶⁵*Insight*, 476[501].

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 470[495].

⁶⁷This, as I mentioned already, is too big a topic for the present essay, even for a large book: it relates both to metaphysical myth-making and to problems of popularization, popular cultures, pedagogies, explaining. See *Lack in the Beingstalk* chapter 3 and *Cantower 23* for leads. *Cantower 23* was used as an underpinning problematic text in *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, but I was as yet not clear when I wrote these pieces about the place of the analysis of lower aggregates in the shift from predicamental relating to explanation.

context of his suggestion is of course his thinking in *The Sketch of Insight*.⁶⁸ What is the context of the same old same old that compares Lonergan with some recent wonderkind? And, at all events, who is doing the comparing and with what perspective? So, we are back to that issue of “more or less extensive self-scrutiny”.

But perhaps we could be less brutal and blunt and slide past these discomfort to ask only for a taking seriously of EU directives that parallels the taking seriously by the Water People of EU directives. Then I ask merely that EU be considered as “uniquely probable”⁶⁹ in its promise of a better way. The consideration need not be solemn and scientific and certainly need not be a comprehending consideration: we are considering a creature that, as yet, is not.⁷⁰ If you will, I am shifting back to an apparent comfort zone of simple comparison: is there another candidate on offer that shows promise of getting us out of the mish-mash? Is there another decent answer to the concrete answering of the questions of cosmopolis, of *The Perfectibility of Man*?⁷¹

So, the question of EU becomes a communal question of EU for some sub-group of Lonergan students, and then it becomes a question of EU, leaning into the future in a shabby rescue operation, a first effort at mustering, a mustard seed in stony ground. But eventually there will be *The Brain that Changes Itself* by resting and questing in the real,⁷²

⁶⁸*Insight*, 579-81[602-3].

⁶⁹*Insight*, 441[466].

⁷⁰Chapter 10 of *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations* points to the difficulty of considering the metaphysical equivalents of such realities.

⁷¹The title of an old classic by John Passmore, Duckworth, London, 1970. The frontispiece contains a remark by D.H.Lawrence: “The Perfectibility of Man! Ah heaven, what a dreary theme!” My theme is the reducibility of stupid non-collaboration.

⁷²*The Brain that Changes Itself* is the title of a book by Norman Doidge in which he gives accounts of self-changing patients: a controversial area but, it seems to me, an open topic. I would add the context supplied by the direction of reflection pointed to in Field Nocturnes 20, “Self-Appropriating the Inner Parts”.

I am repeating here the definition of prayer previous given, but it needs the lift of the

placing this axial time of Incarnation and the longer cycle of decline in full finitude, thus cherished and cherishing in a glory of liberty.

I am only opening up again, from another angle, what for me is a worn-out topic. So, I have spent no time on the sound reflections and writings of the good Water People who contributed to *Eau Canada*. They are doing their best with the mess, with hope of penetrating the apathy of citizens and the staleness of politicized bureaucracies. They could learn a new way from Lonergan but perhaps only if the Lonergan People would be willing to learn from Lonergan. The *EU* that I write of is to be, like a letters so typed, a leaning tower of peaceful pressure, a topological union on the globe that is "not a police force,"⁷³ "not a busybody,"⁷⁴ but there "to protect the future"⁷⁵ by facing the "not easy"⁷⁶ task of cultivating *EU* in its most mysterious sense.

What is that most mysterious sense? It is the *Earth* and its *Earthlings* reaching, in cosmic loneliness and in individual hope, for a friendly *Understanding* that is home. To each of the million years of East Africa's bubbling brains, and the descendants of the global trek of 60,000 years ago, a trek that may not end for billions of years, there is to be given everlastingly fresh water and a new name, each trecker glorying alone yet together in the privacy of that privileged name.⁷⁷ "O dearest daughter whom I so love,

context expressed in *Field Nocturnes* 20, "Self-Appropriating the Inner Parts". There are massive problems here, too, of biofeedback strategies.

⁷³*Insight*, 232[263].

⁷⁴*Ibid*, 239[264].

⁷⁵*Ibid*, 240[265].

⁷⁶*Ibid*, 241[266]. The "not easy" is illustrated by a recent article in *Scientific American* (August 2008), "Running out of Water" where a lightweight six-point plan is presented.

⁷⁷Recalling *Revelations* 2: 17.

you who are my bride. Rise above your self and open your mind's eye."⁷⁸

⁷⁸Quoting from Catherine of Siena, *The Dialogue*, and recalling the beginning of section 1 of *FNC 44*. The fourth stage of meaning is to be a luminosity of personal and communal calling, perhaps passing through other mysterious stages towards the hearing of “the music of the spheres” (Shakespeare, *Pericles*, V.1.238: on the maturing of Shakespeare and the personal challenge to adult growth, see the conclusion to chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.)