

SOFDAWARE 2

Reading *Method in Theology* p.250

February 2004

You may or may not have read SOFDAWARE 1. No matter. That essay indicated an abrupt ending to one major project, the million word Cantowers cut off at 400,000 words, and the beginning of this series. This is quite a different project, a different effort to “get the show on the roll” as I have been saying, where the roll points to the “roll” of Lonergan’s very practical suggestion of a cyclic way of doing theology. A cycle? The objective is to develop a global community that is committed to a large-scale “turning round the Idea”¹ as that Idea rolls into a richer effective presence in history: so, to use terms familiar to you, research is to follow communication in an ongoing effort to improve human living, village life, everywhere.

That is a pretty heavy beginning. In the first Cantower I raised the question ‘Where does the beginning begin?’, and I was quoting Eric Voegelin’s last little volume². The problem recurs here. Lonergan eventually reached an extraordinary but

¹I am twisting Simmel’s “Turn to the Idea” in a manner suggestive of special Christian categories that related both to the fact (earth-walking participation in paternity) and the vision (mind-boggling participation in filiation) belonging to the divine incarnation. This is rather remote theology at present, a fifty-year-old stance of Lonergan on the structure of the absolutely supernatural. That stance is profoundly relevant and rich pastorally but it has not been ‘cycled out’ into the pews.

It seems strange of me to begin ‘so heavily’ (and my final note returns there) but I would wish to tone our reflection to be street-centered, streetAWARE. My wife, Reverend Sally, and I work in a Parish setting, and like anyone in such a setting are quite aware that there is no back-up mediation of the Idea. It takes a great deal of fantasy to intussuscept the massive sickness of present theology: it will take generations of SOFDAWARE.

²“Where does the beginning begin? As I am putting down these words on an empty page I have begun to write a sentence that, when it is finished, will be the beginning of a chapter on certain problems of beginning”. (Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, Vol. 5, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1987, 13).

remote vision, an answer to his Cosmopolis problem at the end of chapter seven of *Insight*.³ It has not been shared in its pragmatic richness. Where might we start? Where might I start in talking simply about it in the mode that belongs outside specialized work?⁴

First, a comment on the footnotes and how to profit from them. I use, and you should use, the footnotes strategically. I wish to talk plainly to people interested in getting Lonergan's suggestion into operation. Some people are already interested, committed, pushing on: some of my notes provide leads, invitations at different levels: but for those with a beginning interest the notes could be a distraction. A first reading, to get a sense of the challenge, might best be done by gliding past the notes. Secondly, I wish for exchange, collaboration, in this matter, so straight away I give my e-mail number: pmcshane@ns.sympatico.ca.⁵ If your response is overwhelming, then I risk being overwhelmed, but the risk is worthwhile. I shall have more to say about

³That powerful last section is a context for this reflection. I do not wish to enter into discussion about the "lower and upper" components of cosmopolis. My interest here is in the methodological solution provided by functional specialization. See notes 19 and 20 on the efficiency of the solution. Further, there is food for thought in the sad fact of the massive commitment of religious 'thinking' to general bias, something to carry through one's reading of that section. The bracketing of the reading there is, then, the same suggested bracketing as here: the horror pointed to in my first and last footnotes.

⁴These essays can be considered as a fruit of my random efforts within the specialty of communications, an enormously complex meta-theoretic specialty: they are, then, outside the cycling of the eight specialties. You might find useful the essay, "Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts", *Lonergan Workshop 6*(1986), edited by F.Lawrence, Scholars Press, 143-174.

⁵You may find, as we move along, or even immediately, that I am irrelevant, but for some a flow through me may be helpful. But I would note that some may wish for private advice, private leads. This can be done without any danger of "flow-through". The emergence of global subgroups is the aim: loosely interlocking, like the myriad chemical sub-activities that guarantee that the tadpole become a frog. My final paragraph of this essay places this analogy in a fuller context.

collaborative possibilities and probabilities as we move along.

I am not going into, or inviting, detailed debate about any of this, though my use of the singular “suggestion” probably invites it: should it not be plural, with talk of self-discovery, economics, etc etc, and a recognition that the show is already on the road? My focus is on his central contribution to ongoing civilization: an implementable metaphysics that has not been tried. That claim would seem to demand some belief of you. Well, suspend that problem: just come with me through this page. What page? Obviously the one you are reading, but obviously also the one mentioned in the title.

“Come with me”. But I am asking for a strange type of freshness and a strange contemplative pace, a pausing, a poising.⁶ I write of **suggestion** in the singular. What suggestion am I talking about? The suggestion that the work of “thinking progress forward” be divided. I assumed that you are “familiar” with the named divisions: you have a copy of *Method in Theology*. I became “familiar” with those names in the Summer of 1966 in a ten-minute chat with Lonergan: a struggle of forty years has shown me that their meaning is remote, a program for a massive shift in global cultural reflection. “Come with me”? Might I shorten your climb and so lift our climb to larger living? We’ll, let’s see how it goes.

There is then “the suggestion” that is chapter 5 of *Method in Theology*, that was published in the *Gregorianum* in 1969. I was a witness to some of the agonies of lifting it into a book. What I would wish now is that you take a slow look at that book, a failed tired book in many ways. What happened to the suggestion of the *Gregorianum*? You

⁶The new contemplative attitude I am talking about is certainly foreign to present notions of doing science, and oddly absent in traditions of Christian prayer. I write of it broadly in Cantower 21, “Epilodge”, and invite its practice, for example, in Cantower 27, where I invite a cherishing of a volume of water wonderfully balanced within a glass by the surrounding fellowships of nature. Such cherishing can lead to the intussusception of Archimedes’ principle of displacement: but it can lead also to a wonderful balanced displacement of oneself. As I note below (note 21), Cantower 27 parallels chapter 1 of *Insight*.

can certainly say it was contextualized. It was located between a Background and a Foreground.⁷ We are here in a first reading of the page, through a reading of *Method's* table of contents. My reading and yours are clearly different, but, even if you are not fiercely familiar with the full text, you can still come with me through the sub-headings of the chapters to get a sense that Background is a sort of summary of key elements of Lonergan's climb prior to his discovery of the character of a Cosmopolitan division of global labour. What of the Foreground? A patchwork of pieces, many of which - like, for instance, the two chapters on history - make sense even if there were no division of labour. If you are reading these chapters with a keen eye for a development of the notion and mood of **function**, you will be disappointed.⁸ Lonergan is really not connecting the dots of division.

You get a better idea of the "patchwork" quality of the work if you lace together in your brooding the sections on "The Dialectic of Method" (3, in chapter 10 i.e. 10.7, 10.8, 10.9) with sections on "The Discovery of Mind" (3.10.2 and then 12.5 and 12.7). Might you not think of another book that would put them together in a more coherent fashion, and, again, without any essential connection to the division? Then you might pause over the run-down through the last three chapters, where run-down is meant as Lonergan sort-of saying "let me finish this as neatly and simply as possible". And nowhere in these sections or chapters is there much effort to suggest, much less detail,

⁷For the origin of this division and first tentative sketchings of the book in Spring of 1965, see Darlene O'Leary, *Lonergan's Practical View of History*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2004. In *Method in Theology*, Background (3-145) concludes with the *Gregorianum* article; Foreground (149-368) contains 9 chapters on the eight specialties (two on history).

⁸It is very revealing to struggle with *Method in Theology* within the perspective of this question. My own efforts yielded the Cantowers on function and functional specialization: Cantowers 34-41. Cantowers 51 and 52, part of the cut-off project, were to have dealt with "Functional Systematics" and "Functional Communications". On these together see the reference given in note 6 above. On systematics there are further leads below in notes 13, 14, 34.

collaborative sub-structures within a functional whole.

Yesterday I was phone-talking to a colleague around about this topic and I mentioned, as I am doing now to you, that really the only functional and collaborative sub-structure identified in the book is that identified on page 250. It is, I remarked, the only serious addition that the book makes to the *Gregorianum* article. What, my colleague replied, about those great pages 286-7? Well, they really just compact the discoveries expressed in *Insight*. And I added the comment that Lonergan didn't even add into those categories a number (10), about "dividing up the work". I further made the point that those pages on categories really belong near the end of page 250.⁹ And that brings us, you and I, to look in an initial fresh way at that part of page 250.

I might as well note at this stage that I shall be referring to the lines of that page on and off, and you might save some messing if you number the lines, 1 to 33: but you may be like my sister-in-law, thinking that such marking is an abomination! Well, heck, photocopy the page! Anyway, here I am talking about line 20, about the investigator Lonergan who has done the things named in the top half of the page - but not in a written-up, easily identifiable, way - and has done his thing regarding the basis of progress. He has expressed his position, his "here I stand".¹⁰ That is what turns up in the categories of his next chapter. But in the operation that is to emerge in this century or millennium - depending on how slow we are to read the page into history - his stand goes into this mix. But note that you must add what I call (10): that possible addition hovers over the final section of chapter 11 of *Method*, but it lacks punch.

⁹A central invitation right through this essay is the invitation to imagine creatively but concretely forward, to *fantasize*, where that word is primarily related by me to the task of foundations. Thematizing present operative foundations, which is what Lonergan does of himself in the chapter on foundations, is the proper task of dialectic. There are subtleties here that I must skip over e.g. Cantower 41, "Functional Policies", talks about Lonergan's fantasy regarding the proper doing of historical studies of doctrines.

¹⁰I am recall Luther's lonely stand.

But page 250 does not lack punch, as we will slowly - grinfully - gather in our reflections on it that we share in the next few SOFDAWAREs. It seems to me important to emphasize slow contemplative ecstatic contextualizing.¹¹ What I am inviting you into is the hard work of fantasy that is the proper work of foundations. Well, not maybe *you*: but some of you, and this 'some' idea is an important topic for SOFDAWARE 3. Still, come with me in whatever way that you may be able to stretchingly imagine the developments I have been imagining, fantasizing about, for three decades.

Could you, for instance, fantasize about this page 250 within the total history of heuristic programs up to and through the third stage of meaning and on to the *Eschaton*? Wow! Well, let's back down a little. Fantasy pushes us to think of "the formal condition of historical continuity" and "theologians, let alone parents, rarely think of the historical process."¹² Let's try smaller pushes. Lonergan did some gallant fantasizing about the dialectic of progress over the decade before writing *Method*. I am not going into detail: those interested can nudge me for further help: I am lucky enough to have a copy of the unpublished notes of those years, something unavailable outside the Toronto Lonergan Centre, but I see no reason for not sharing them.¹³

¹¹See note 6 above. Cherishing page 250? It could be like cherishing a one-page *Prelude* of Chopin. Indeed, might I not parallel this "last page of *Method*" with the strange little final work of Chopin, Mazurka in F minor, op. 68, n.4? I regularly use such parallels, but you may find your own suitable imagery of wondrous attention. If you venture into the Cantowers you will find that I parallel the first six Cantowers with the six pages of my favorite Chopin Nocturne: Op. 48, no. 1, in C minor. "Biggest in conception, it is a miniature music-drama" (I quote from James Huneker's Introduction to my copy of the Nocturnes: Schirmer's Library of Musical Classics). Page 250 of *Method in Theology* is a miniature musical-drama to be acted out in history.

¹²Lonergan, "Finality, Love, Marriage", *Collection*, 47.

¹³Lonergan donated his notes of the period 1953-65 to the Toronto Lonergan Centre in the early 1970s, and I catalogued them in 1973-4. They are a foot-thick bundle of remarkable scribbles, notes on graduate course, etc. A central problem throughout is the relation of history to system, the core of the answer to which - and stuff towards page 250! - is in the text that I refer to later (see notes 14, 34), *De Intellectu et Methodo*.

A key point is to respect the manner in which that fantasy gave birth to page 250. Are you surprised at my suggestion that it represents the only substructure of collaboration added to the functional structure indicated in chapter 5 of the book? You could find this out better by experimenting: if you are conversant with the book, and with the problems of implementing its program, you might like to face the challenge of pushing for a fantasy of sub-structures that would set up schemes of successful recurrence within other specialties.¹⁴ But: back to Lonergan's fantasy.

The page presents a very definite program of getting from the retrieval of the past that is the work of "studies of the past" - let's skip niceties of specialization for the moment - to some bases for moving ahead. It is not spelled out: so, for instance lines 1-18 are quite obscure. I Invite you to skip them for the present: I am interested in us soaking up the task in its historical possibilities, and that soaking-up question twines round the later lines, and "will be brought into the open", made luminous for us in a preliminary fashion, by weaving round the second half of the page, round the problem of expressing your stand.

But first a little clarification. I keep talking about the page, page 250, starting with the wonderful word, "includes": what is included is, of course, the past, but since the past includes the divine, 'includes' includes the future, as your notion of being (which includes becoming!) does. Worth thinking out a bit, "into the open".¹⁵ But back to my

¹⁴The text that I mentioned in the previous note, to which I return in note 34, could lead one to the missing "program page" in the chapter on Systematics in *Method in Theology*. The communal collaboration pivots on the manner in which a group of thinkers can contribute to determine, so to speak, the integrator-operator-slices of an increasingly richer genetically-structured systematics. I have found it difficult, these past two decades, to communicate this notion to thinkers, possibly because the idea and imaging of static axiomatic system has a firm possession on the molecules of their imaginations. None of this stuff got into the slim treatment of chapter 13 of *Method in Theology*.

¹⁵*Method in Theology*, 250, lines 19-20. I find this a useful clue for people who want a fresh read of chapter 12 of *Insight*, a reading which lifts it out of conventions of

clarification: it simply concedes that what I am actually talking about is section 5 of chapter 10 of the book, titled “Dialectic: The Structure”. That section is a high point of the book, describing a sub-structure within the total functionally-structured operation of reaching for cosmopolitan luminosity of private living and public progress. That describing, aesthetic inscribing, is the focus of the beginning of these essays: so, I am brought to the task of giving some light on the title, SOFDAWARE.

SOFDAWARE. SOFD? “Structure **OF** Dialectic” is a pretty obvious change from the title of the section. AWARE? Simply a capitalized *aware*. The initial psychic inscribing is to gradually become an *ethos*, a global awareness of the TAO, the *hodos*.¹⁶ I would ask you to think of this, not in conventional religious terms, but with the analogy that I have used through these last decades, the *ethos* of the periodic table in chemistry.

So: SOFDAWARE. Makes sense?

And even if Lonergan students challenge me on my view of the failure of discipleship, how many can really claim a SOFDAWAREness in the community that claims allegiance to Lonergan’s perspective? No: I do not want controversy about transcendental method, self-appropriation, all that stuff. Indeed, I wouldn’t mind being wrong about SOFDAWAREness: that would render my efforts here superfluous. But the hard fact is that this high point in his life, this program-page, has attracted no serious attention, and certainly nothing like the reading of it into history for which it cries out. Go figure.

scholastic discussions of being into an existential leaning towards the future. You might find further useful nudging in this direction in section 2, of “Elevating *Insight*. Space-Time as Paradigm Problem”, 19(2001), 203-229. There I related this foundational searching to the life-long search of Dogen(1200-1253) for *Shobogenzo* (truth-law-eye-treasure: “The Fullness of the Vision of Truth” in one translation of this four-volume search).

¹⁶A context for thinking this out is section 5 of the final chapter of *Topics in Education*, which speaks of “The tone, the colour, the way of doing things”, p. 252.

I suppose that one reason why SOFD didn't catch attention is that the global and interdisciplinary nature of functional re-cycling was not noticed, fantasized into incarnate meaning, molecularized. Still, the page on its own seems to me to be a pretty decent formula for collaboration even if one is focused on theology or philosophy, even if one is not thinking globally but only within some narrow Western sub-group of thinkers, such as the so-called followers of Lonergan. So: do you not find it a bit of a puzzle, why the simple brutal method sketched on page 250 has not moved that group to have a serious shot at it?¹⁷ Go figure.

But no, I don't want you to go figure at the end of either of those two paragraphs. I would like you to behave as a naive investigator at line 20. Naive in two senses: no question, first, of any of these conversions; secondly, no question of the massive process of *assembly*, etc. Naive in that I simply invite you to investigate an 'Assembly' of two views on *Comparison*.¹⁸ There is the tricky meaning that *Comparison* had for Lonergan writing this page: it is woven into a complex of operations that even boggles me after a quarter of a century. There is the other commonly-accepted meaning in which students of Lonergan are at home, in continuity with a world of 'effete'¹⁹ scholarly debate and exchange. So, one can compare Lonergan and Rahner, Lonergan and Dilthey, Lonergan and Gadamer, Lonergan and Newman, etc etc, in a thesis, in an

¹⁷I reflect on various efforts at theological functional specialization in Cantowers 7,8,9, and 38. But no point in entering into detail here. On non-theological functional specialization see chapter 3 of McShane, *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2002.

¹⁸*Investigate*: a most suggestive word, related to tracking. We will later elaborate one aspect of that suggestiveness in what I call W5, the fifth word of metaphysics, which I gave first in Cantower 40. This topic is too complex for the moment, but if you are curious you will find a discussion and a listing in Cantower 24, "Infesting History with Hodology". And, of course, if you go to the trouble of digging out that Cantower, you might as well dip into the next, Cantower 25, "Redoubt Method 250"!

¹⁹*Method in Theology*, 99.

article, whatever. And then? Where does it go from there?²⁰

You don't understand the first meaning of *Comparison*, but you do have enough sense of academic goings-on to suspect that a conference of papers comparing Voegelin, Toynbee, von Balthasar, whomever, to each other or to Lonergan just doesn't seed anything, and certainly if it seeds something the seeding is a random event: butterfly wings flapping in the right air. So, investigator: your question is, should you trust Lonergan and encourage a shot at the mysterious way that he suggests? Or carry on in the traditions that have been around since the emergence of a touch of seriousness in Greek and Chinese reflection? Notice that I say, *encourage*: it makes it easier to take a stand, if you suspect that you don't have to do the work yourself!

But I am asking you to take a stand, grounded on your own mix of understanding and belief. Do you think that trying Lonergan's way is worthwhile, as opposed to carrying on in the standard way?

"Taking a stand": in the new context that means more than having observer status; it means encouraging a shift with an encouragement that is somehow - I am not going to enter into the genuine statistics of the matter - a shift in efficiency, in **implementation**.²¹ That word - *implementation* - is a massively rich component of the definition of metaphysics that expresses a haunting problem of Lonergan's life. I do not

²⁰I talk of consciousness-raising. The mood of this question should radiate around our conferences, a psychic presence of the critical beauty of a unifying and efficient metaphysics. The key text here is line 16 of page 160 of *Topics in Education*, where Lonergan writes of a science having unity through its efficiency. But no need for such high flying perhaps to see that a great deal of our talking and publishing has very little effect. Functional specialization sets up quite a different ballpark.

²¹The longing for implementability haunts Lonergan's life-work. Implementation is internal to the definition of metaphysics in *Insight*, and it recurs as a topic in the book, winding into the hope of the Epilogue, but remaining an unsolved problem for Lonergan till February 1965. Since it is not indexed you might find it useful to have the following references: 229[254], 234[259], 236[261], 391[416], 493[517], 507[530], 521[544], 524[547], 685[708], 726[748].

wish for complex distractions here, but you might get a glimpse of that problem by brooding over the question that I pondered for a week as I traveled round New York City: How do you get metaphysics “into” Manhattan?²²

If you take a stand with me, you are obviously not alone. Might there be a crowd, or at worst a “not numerous center painstaking enough to work out one by one the transitions to be made”?²³ (last page of *Collection*). I am not setting myself up as the center of that center, but it seems to me that someone has to make a move against the increasingly-settled conventions - and conferences - that surround, confine, Lonergan’s challenge.

Perhaps you say, “I would need to know more before risking this”. O.K.: but this requires time out to brood, to do something equivalent to my brooding of thirty years, or more recently my brooding through 400,000 words in the cut-off Cantowers. Am I, then, setting myself up as an authority: Well, yes! But a very odd authority, outside the tradition of Lonergan studies, indeed to a large extent unacceptable to that tradition.

Now don’t get me wrong here: I am not outside a tradition that sees a massive enrichment of common sense as possible and probable through Lonergan’s suggestions about self-understanding. That is to be promoted in all walks of life. But what I find quite unacceptable is a sophistication of common sense posing as serious understanding yet with “a very inadequate notion of what theory is, ... lost in a no man’s land between the world of theory and the world of common sense”.²⁴ Again, I do

²²Cantower 14, “Communications and Ever-ready Founders” deals with this topic, and it’s third section focuses on “Founders of New York”: a useful concretization of the rather remote reflection on effective metaphysics to be found in *Insight* Chapter 14, section 3. You may notice the parallel numbering here: it is a beginning of one of my strategies. Cantower 15 to 21 in fact parallel *Insight* chapters 15 to 20 and the Epilogue. Beginners might find it useful to check Cantowers 27-31, which parallel *Insight* chapters 1-5, giving a new slow-paced introduction.

²³I am quoting the final page of *Collection*.

²⁴Lonergan, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 121; see also 155.

not wish to distract you: I dealt with this elsewhere in many different ways: with humour in Cantower 11, "Lonergan: Interpretation and History", with a scalpel in Cantower 23, "Redoubt Description". At all events, I do consider that I speak with some authority, at a minimum the authority of one who has struggled for 45 years with Lonergan's challenge, and finds that it is still in the remote realms of genius, still in the proximate obviousness of subtle rejection.²⁵

So: away with distractions, with these last few pages of interesting and important distractions! My key question for you: do you recognize p. 250 as naming a program? Might you think, judge, value, plunge for it, as worth encouraging?

Now you may think of a problem here regarding personal work, especially if you have read previous reflections of mine on this specialty: it is, if you like, a specialty for "the elders", but certainly not a beginners' zone. So: two points to think of in that regard, the first point perhaps much more startling yet in a way obvious.

First, then, I want you to imagine the unwritten book on *Method* that would have had, not one program page, but eight. Obvious, isn't it? That there should have been a page, a section, in each specialty chapter entitle "the Structure of X", X being any one of the eight zones. So now, the "worth encouraging" extends beyond p. 250 to all the specialties, except that Lonergan did not write pages about how the other groups would somehow collaborate. But didn't he, sez some of you? Well, if you think so, go

²⁵Obvious? Subtle? The obviousness to me grew slowly but within the paradox of discovering, also slowly, that great ugliness is as remote as great beauty: there are seminars and there are symphonies. There is then the subtlety of ugliness, spelled out by Lonergan in a magnificent paragraph that ends with: "the magician and the gnostic have their day" (*Insight*, 542[566]). There is the gnostic magic of a literature that weaves round words like *feeling* and *value* subtly avoiding the obvious fact that "it" can't go on as Lonergan requires "it" "one" to go on beyond description: "one can go on..." (*Method in Theology*, 287) so as to be no longer "late and breathless" (*Insight*, 733[755]). Perhaps we need more ladies in, weighting the search towards molecular loneliness? I think of Candace Pert, *Molecules of Emotion*, Touchstone Books, 1999 and Rita Carter. *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix pb, 2000. On feminist hodic hopes see Sandy Gillis-Drage, *Beyond Present Feminism: Woman What Gives*, Axial Press, Halifax, 2004.

through the relevant chapter (or two, as in the case of history) and sketch out the program, the page, for the rest of us! But the point of this point is that you can have a shot at, or encourage, any specialty in its initiation, development and structuring.

And the second point relates to the meanings of “encourage”. It relates to “making conversion a topic”²⁶: You don’t have to be doing anything more than raising the question of working according to the program, or towards advancing the program. And, I always add, raising it prudently, especially if you haven’t got tenure, or a finished and approved thesis, or the credit in that particular course!²⁷ We need, in any way possible and probably-efficient, what used to be called a “consciousness-raising” about the overall program of functional specialization and about the program within each specialty. Instead of vague notions of consciousness-raising I prefer to use my favorite analogy with chemistry. CHEMAWAREness is simply being in the *ethos* of acknowledging the periodic table: it is printed regularly inside the covers of introductory texts.²⁸ SOFDAWAREness has to be the same. Eventually. Indeed chemawareness has to be lifted up gradually into sofdawareness, but let’s leave that

²⁶*Method in Theology*, 253.

²⁷I have more than once recalled Lonergan’s advice to me when I was struggling to get my thesis through at Oxford in 1967: “give the guy what he wants; its only a union card”. He himself had trouble getting through a course in logic at London University in the late 1920s. Perhaps that birthed in him the slogan, “never try to teach your professor anything”.

²⁸In note 18 I mentioned “Words of Metaphysics”, which are regularly diagrams of integral symbolic structures helpful in mediating a creative control of meaning. You will come across eventually I hope (it is give in Cantower 24 and other places, and also on page 124 of *A Brief History of Tongue*) the sketch of collaboration of the eight specialties which I call W3. For me, W3 is the equivalent in this work of the periodic table in chemistry. It certainly belongs in a first year text on methodology, and if the next note is to be believed, in texts in any cultural area.

aside for the moment.²⁹

Indeed, I think it better to leave a lot of interesting, even key, things aside here, and hold to the main point. Might we make a start? I am leaving myself open to the possibility of being useful either as a resource³⁰ or a participant, but clearly you can get moving on your own, build your own supportive group, raise consciousness.³¹ And I would note that a start has been made in one particular zone, that of the specialty Interpretation: Volume 4(2004) of *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis* contains the essays of a group who were willing to do it badly or not so badly, and Volume 5(2005) may turn out to be the key lift that we need regarding page 250, coming from Australia.³²

So, take a stand. If you take a stand against the above perspective, let it be an

²⁹See the reference in note 17 above. There is further reflection on the state and pedagogy of chemistry in Cantowers 28 and 29. Cantower 8 gives some idea of how all cultural reflection converge, slope, towards a common foundational problematic. "Foundations of X" is then, quite uncomfortably, simply "Foundations".

³⁰Obviously, what I have written on various topics is resourceful, and I would aim at being resourceful further in this way, but in the novel pedagogical fashion illustrated e.g. by my effort (see Cantower 27) to get readers of *Insight* to cherish the principle of displacement that is a doctrine of the first page of its first chapter. My efforts in this SOFDAWARE series of 7 essays is, in a sense, a model for possible reflection and collaboration in any speciality. Such further efforts might profitable be contextualized by the Cantower reflections of **function** (numbers 34-41).

³¹Recall note19 and brace yourself for low flying, fortified with satire and humor and divine patience with history's pace. You may find it difficult to find a group, especially if you are blessed with the agony of a repulsing attunement to "the social situation deteriorating cumulatively" (*Insight* 229[254]): then you have to shelter consciousness, reaching towards the cosmic call and towards artistic "exploration of the potentialities of concrete living. That exploration is extremely important in our age, when philosophers for at least two centuries, through doctrines on politics, economics, education, and through ever further doctrines, have been trying to remake man and have done not a little to make human life unlivable" (Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 232).

³²The quiet revolutionary behind all this must be acknowledged. Michael Shute's fantasy carried him towards the envisagement of *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*.

open rejection of page 250 etc rather than just a silent dissent.³³ If you are open about it, then we might get you onto the page!

But what practical steps can be taken, beyond disturbing classes and conferences? Might you - even secretly - gear essays, lectures, theses, in the direction of SOFDAWARE? And there is the direction that is the focus of my nudging, the direction of collaboration, whether it involves me or not.

What is the unity of all these apparently fragmentary efforts? For one would like to sense a unity, beauty and efficiency that would put it into the ballpark of a genuine revolutionary metaphysics. I do not wish to have a tale wagging our dog here, but there is a unity that relates to a heuristic of evolutionary development. That larger heuristic has its basic analogue in, say, the development of the frog from the tadpole, though it has its richest illustration in the development of your mind.³⁴ There are seeming fragmentary chemical events in the operating integrator of the tadpole that strangely shift it to a thing that swims in a quite different way. We are dealing with a sick tadpole of theology that needs various chemical rumblings at different levels if it is to shake off its sad tale of seven centuries in a shift to collaborative openness in the pond of being and becoming. I recall the first dinner I had with Lonergan in Easter 1961, when he talked about the cutting-off from culture of theology after Trent, giving

³³See note 80 of SOFDAWARE 1.

³⁴The key text that I normally quote in this regard - as I did in Cantower 7, section 1.1.3, less than two years ago - is that rich Lonergan passage about the problem of developing a grasp of one's own development of a developing grasp of the development of mathematics. But I increasingly see that text as quite beyond our present sick culture. So, I recall for you the suggested bracketing of our reflections, between the first and last footnotes. Perhaps the context of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 4, on the slow development of "The Calculus of Variation" might help the imagination here. I do not see the variational-calculus of theology rising up to being a respectable "turn round the Idea", a respectable *imitatio theologica Christi*, in this new century. Can you even vaguely fantasize methodology as queen becoming democratically molecular? (On the queen's possibilities, see *Phenomenology and Logic*, 126-7, 130.)

rise to a system where theologians were, as he said, “just big frogs in little ponds”. My imaging here is of a dinosaurian tadpole, a postmodern freak, kissing-cousin to the titanothore in economics.³⁵

³⁵I am referring to Lonergan’s powerful criticism of society’s neglect of comprehensive understanding, *For a New Political Economy*, 20-21, written when he was a vigorous 37. “It cannot be a titanothore, a beast with a three-ton body and a ten-ounce brain It must not glue its nose to the single track of this or that department. It must lift its eyes Nor will it suffice to have some highest common factor of culture, to accept the physical sciences but not to bother about their higher integration on the plea that it is too difficult, too obscure, too unsettled, too remote. That was titanothore’s attitude to brain, and titanothore is extinct”. I would claim that this harshness, and my concluding harshness is not at all extreme. Theology and philosophy especially have for seven centuries taken the route of a commonsense eclecticism, disguised by sophistications of language and reference. Present economic eclecticism disguises its destructive common nonsense behind a facade of mathematics: theology and religious pronouncements dance to in other ways to the same destructive tune. Kissing cousins all.