XII. SELECTED WORKS ABOUT PRINT CULTURE

NOTE: See Orality and Literacy: 115-35.

(XII.1) Achebe, Chinua. No Longer at Ease. London: Heinemann, 1960. Also see Achebe (I.2; III.1); Conrad (XII.22); Obiechina (I.127); Ong (I.131; I.137; XII.137); Pachocinski (VII.24a). Classic novel about young Nigerians who have been acculturated in print culture through formal education living in the midst of older Nigerians in a residual for of primary oral culture. Over the course of my teaching career, I taught Chinua Achebe’s novels Things Fall Apart and No Longer at Ease more often than I taught any other works of imaginative literature of comparable length. In The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History (I.140), the expanded version of his 1964 Terry Lectures at Yale University, Ong discusses Achebe’s No Longer at Ease so perceptively that it is worth quoting at length here: “In his sensitive novel No Longer at Ease, concerned with the acculturation of his native Nigeria, Chinua Achebe cogently portrays (126-27) the awesome impression which knowledge of writing has made on a thoughtful elderly man, who is fascinated by its order and stability and rather given to explaining this order and stability to illiterate kinsmen. He urges them to meditate on Pilate’s words (which he quotes in oral fashion, that is, thematically, not verbatim, suppressing Pilate’s ‘I’): ‘What is written is written.’ The same man is even more impressed by print. He never destroys a piece of printed paper, but in boxes in the corner of his room saves every bit of it he can find. Order so assured as that of printed words deserves to be preserved, whatever the words say. It appears reasonable that such experience of this spectacularly ordered environment for thought, free from interference, simply there, unattended and unsupervised by any discernible person, would open to the overstrained psyche the new possibility of withdrawal into a world away from the tribe, a private world of delusional systemization – an escape not into violence or tribal magic, but into the interior of one’s own consciousness, rendered schizoid but once and for all consistent with itself” (136-37). Yes, Ong here does explicitly characterize the interiorization of literacy and literate modes of thought as delusional systemization, rendering the consciousness of those of us who have interiorized literacy and literate modes of thought schizoid. Digression: In the posthumously published book The Way to Love (I.42), the Jesuit spiritual director from India Anthony de Mello urges us to cultivate awareness in the hope that by cultivating awareness we will eventually be freed from our cultural conditioning and programming. For those of us who have learned through our formal education to be functionally literate, our Western cultural conditioning and programming includes our
interiorization of literacy and literate modes of thought. As a result, if we were to undertake to cultivate awareness, as Anthony de Mello urges us to do, we would in effect also be seeking to be freed from the schizoid consciousness that the delusional systemization that our cultural conditioning in literacy and literate modes of thought has engendered in us. But we should also note here that Ong explicitly describes the psyches of people in primary oral cultures as being “overstrained” (his word). As a result of their psyches being overstrained, people in primary oral cultures might welcome the measure of relief to their overstrained psyches that interiorizing literacy and literate modes of thought would give them. However, when we turn our attention to the kind of awareness that Anthony de Mello urges us to undertake, we should note that people in primary oral cultures, and perhaps also certain people in residual forms of primary oral cultures, would have a decided edge in cultivating the mystic awareness that he urges us to cultivate, because they do not have the schizoid consciousness that Ong says accompanies the interiorization of literacy and literate modes of thought. In short, mystic awareness comes more naturally to people in primary oral cultures than it does to us Westerners whose cultural conditioning in the print culture of the West has solidified our schizoid consciousness. End of digression. In an interview published as “Named for Victoria, Queen of England” in the journal New Letters 40 (1973): 14-22, which is published out of the University of Missouri - Kansas City, Achebe revealed that his own father, who was an Anglican catechist, had served as the real-life model for the elderly man he portrays in the ways that Ong describes above: “‘My parents’ reverence for books was almost superstitious. . . . My father was much worse than my mother. He never destroyed any paper. When he died, we had to make a bonfire of all the hoardings of his life’” (20).

(XII.2) Alter, Robert. Pen of Iron: American Prose and the King James Bible. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010. For other studies of the English Bible, see Bloom (XII.15); Bobrick (XII.16); Bullinger (VII.4); Campbell (XII.18); Crystal (XII.24); Hamlin and Jones (XII.64); Harrison (XII.65, XII.66); Jeffrey (VII.11); McGrath (XII.93); Nicolson (XII.105); Norton (XII.106); Ryken (XII.149).

(XII.3) Anderson, Amanda. The Powers of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2001. Topic: Cultural Studies. Ong liked to say that we need both closeness (proximity) and distance to understand something. Part of his claim and of Eric A. Havelock’s claim about the impact of ancient Greek phonetic alphabetic literacy on the development of abstract philosophic thought from the pre-Socratics onward to Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle is that the written texts supplied distantiation that enabled the development of the more abstract conceptual constructs with which philosophic thought works. When we come to Peter Ramus (1515-1572) and his followers in
early print culture, we should note that their trademark, as it were, involved the construction of elaborate arrays of unfolding dichotomies (usually; occasionally, we find a triple branching). By constructing these arrays of dichotomous terms, Ramus and his followers were distancing themselves from their visual constructs. Of course printed books themselves are visual constructs, just as handwritten manuscripts are. With respect to storage and retrieval, both manuscripts and printed books provide distance. Distance in turn frees up the human mind to move on to new adventures in learning, because the old is now safely stored up in written manuscripts and printed books. Independently of Ong and of Havelock, Amanda Anderson explores the potential of cultivated distance by examining certain Victorian writers in detail, including George Eliot, John Stuart Mill, Charlotte Bronte, Matthew Arnold, and Oscar Wilde. For a deeply thought-provoking defense of the cultivation of learning about the past as the way to establish the kind of distance that is needed for intelligent and insightful understanding of major cultural developments, see Ong’s “Communications as a Field of Study” in The 1977 Multimedia International Yearbook, edited by Stefan Bamberger (Rome: Multimedia International, 1976: 7-25).

(XII.4) Appleby, Joyce. Relentless Revolution: A History of Capitalism. New York and London: Norton, 2010. Also listed as Appleby (III.4). Topics: Economic History; Cultural Studies. Also see Acemoglu and Robinson (III.1a); Beinhocker (II.3); de Sota (XII.25); Diamond (III.38b); R. H. Frank (III.60a); R. H. Frank and Cook (III.60b); Freeland (III.71a); Friedman (XII.48); Hacker and Pierson (XII.63); Krugman (XII.82; XII.83); Landes (III.111b); Marmot (III.117b); Mokyr (XII.103); Warsh (XII.165); Wilkinson and Pickett (III.171a). Joyce Appleby discusses what she refers to as the culture of capitalism (4, 20-26, 119-20). I consider what she refers to as the culture of capitalism to be a specific subset of print culture as it emerged historically in Western culture. In The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism. 2nd ed. (Lanham, Maryland; and New York: Madison Books, 1991), Michael Novak discusses the certain social dimensions associated with modern capitalism in print culture. In The Universal Hunger for Liberty: Why the Clash of Civilizations is Not Inevitable (New York: Basic Books, 2004: 33-35), Novak discusses cultural systems and moral ecology. Also see de Sota (XII.25); B. M. Friedman (XII.48); Habermas (XII.61); Mokyr (XII.103); Ong (XII.132); Poovey (XII.142); Stark (XII.157); Warsh (XII.165).

(XII.4a) Barry, John M. Roger Williams and the Creation of the American Soul: Church, State, and the Birth of Liberty. New York: Viking/Penguin Group, 2012. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Vowell (XII.164c). Ong’s family ancestors left East Anglia on the same ship that brought Roger Williams to Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1631. At that time, their
family name was spelled Onge; it is probably related to the English name Yonge.

(XII.4b) Benoit, Raymond. Single Nature’s Double Name: The Collectedness of the Conflicting in British and American Romanticism. The Hague, Netherlands; and Paris: Mouton, 1973. Topics: Literary Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Farrell (XII.37b); Hoeveler (XII.68b); Ong (XII.135); Veeder (XII.163b).

(XII.5) Bercovitch, Sacvan. The Puritan Origins of the American Self: With a New Preface. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2011. Topic: American Studies. Also see P. Miller (XII.100); Ong (XII.132); Vowell (XII.164c). Sacvan Bercovitch’s lengthy preface to the 2011 edition of The Puritan Origins of the American Self (orig. 1975) is a gem. It’s worth the price of the book. In it Bercovitch recounts his life as a secular Jew and Canadian immigrant to the United States and his life as a distinguished scholar in American studies. According to Bercovitch, the New England Puritans were the first colonists to refer to themselves as Americans (xxviii). At the time, all other colonists used the term to refer only to Native Americans, not to themselves. Among other things, Bercovitch shows that Barack Obama was a copy-cat. He copied the expression “change we can believe in” from a July Fourth orator in 1850 (xxvii and xxxix). Obama’s stated desire to “restore our image as the last, best hope on earth” was copied from President Lincoln (see pages xxviii and xxxix). In short, in his presidential campaign, Obama was calling on us Americans to renew our American identity, the identity of the American Self that Bercovitch ably explains in the preface to the 2011 edition of his book. After reading Bercovitch’s preface, I have come to the conclusion that certain New England Puritan writers were extremely imaginative. The imaginative spirit of the Homeric epics lived on in those writers. The imaginative spirit of the biblical author known as the Yahwist (author of J) lived on in them. The imaginative spirit of St. Paul and the anonymous authors of the four canonical gospels lived on in those authors. Of course the imaginative epic spirit also lived on in the Puritan poet John Milton, most notably in Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained. As is well known, Caesar Augustus (Octavian), who is rightly considered to be the founder of the Roman empire, commissioned Virgil to write the epic that is known as the Aeneid. Evidently, Virgil was not satisfied with his completed draft and planned to revise it further. However, before he could undertake to revise it, he died. He had stipulated that his draft should be destroyed. But Caesar Augustus over-ruled him and published his work. He seemed to understand that people do not live on bread alone. Certain New England Puritan writers also understood this as they composed their imaginative epic. Collectively, they are the founders of the American Self, as Bercovitch puts it. For better or worse, those writers are the founders of the manic-depressive American culture that Americans have lived in both before 1776 and after
Bercovitch himself does not emphasize the term manic-depressive as I plan to do here, even though he uses the term in passing (page xxxiii). I am the one using this term to emphasize what Bercovitch ably describes. However, in emphasizing this characterization, I do not claim to be making an original observation that nobody else has made. See, for example, John D. Gartner’s book *The Hypomanic Edge: The Link between (A Little) Craziness and (A Lot of) Success in America* (New York and London: Simon & Schuster, 2005) and Peter C. Whybrow’s book *American Mania: When More is Not Enough* (New York and London: Norton, 2005). In his fine book *Bush on the Couch: Inside the Mind of the President* (X.20), Justin A. Frank, M.D., psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, contends that George W. Bush manifested the symptoms of megalomania, which Dr. Frank differentiates from simple mania. It strikes me that Gartner and Whybrow are discussing simple mania in their books, not megalomania. In any event, according to Bercovitch, the strategy of the New England Puritan jeremiad, as he styles the genre that emerged as an integral part of their emerging imaginative epic, became the strategy of the typical jeremiads in American civil religion. The strategy was to sound the alarm at the possible prospect of the terrible failure of the meaning of America — that is, the meaning of America in their imaginative epic. A failure would deny hope itself of the meaning of America. For all practical purposes, the meaning of America for those writers was connected with their imaginative epic regarding the covenant, an idea they borrowed from ancient Hebrew scripture. The strategy of sounding the alarm about the possible terrible failure was a summons to covenant renewal. The summons of renewal was a call to draw back from and avoid the abyss of the failure of the meaning of America as envisioned in their imaginative epic — an abyss the depths of which no man or woman knows (xxxiv). When I characterize their way of thinking as manic-depressive, I mean that the abyss they imagined represents the depressive polarity. Whereas the imaginative epic about the covenant represents the manic polarity. In my estimate, what Bercovitch described as the American Self (his capitalization) is manic-depressive. It’s in the American cultural DNA as it were to be manic-depressive. Now, once you catch on to the abyss that is lurking out there at the prospect of failure of the meaning of America, then you will be able to understand how and why “American optimism” is designed to be a strong check against plumbing the depths of the abyss. Granted, Charles Dickens’ character Mr. Micawber in *David Copperfield* was not an American. Nevertheless, Mr. Micawber’s optimism can be understood as related in spirit to “American optimism.” Now, despite Obama’s rhetorical efforts to try to revivify the American Self and the American sense of the covenant, I have to wonder if the American civil religion has died and is therefore beyond being revivified. After all, Jonathan Kozol has published one jeremiad after another calling attention to illiteracy in America, but to no avail. So what’s wrong? is Kozol simply not skilled enough as a jeremiad writer to evoke a suitable response? Or
has the American civil religion of old died? I know, I know, I myself may be speaking from the depths of the abyss regarding the lack of response to Kozol’s jeremiads about illiteracy in America. Nevertheless, illiteracy in America is a problem that should be addressed. But enough about the failure of the American covenant! Bercovitch explains how later writers contributed to the imaginative epic that the New England Puritan writers had started. But Bercovitch does happen to mention the spirit of epics in oral tradition, a spirit that Virgil imitated in writing the *Aeneid* and Milton, in writing *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. According to Bercovitch, later American writers worked out a model of the American Self that had two distinctive parts: (1) a figure of spiritual commonality whose uniqueness lay in his or her determination to do his or her “own thing” in his or her “own way” and (2) individualism enshrined as self-interest to signify a cultural ideal of personal self-fulfillment (xxxvi). When you put these two features together, how is this model supposed to work out? Here’s how Bercovitch puts it: “And rhetorically, success in America was available to all. Examples of success were to be identified with, not envied or submitted to, and through identification they were to be celebrated as confirmations of equality, proof-texts of your possibilities” (xxxvi–xxxvii). Remember that we humans form our individual personal identities through our identifications with certain persons in our lives. But individual persons have different talents. According to Bercovitch, “The exceptional talent represented an exceptional nation” (xxxvii). Inasmuch as we produce exceptional talents, we can celebrate those exceptional talents as evidence of our exceptional nation that enable such exceptional talents to be developed. In theory, all of us have some talents that we can develop and thereby make our own social contribution (i.e., the American covenant). In short, we may not all be equal in talent, but we are all equal in the sense that all of us in theory can develop our talents so that we can make our own social contribution. As Bercovitch notes, in the evolving American imaginative epic as developed by later writers, “Failure was un-American” (i.e., the abyss) and “Success was the American Way” (xxxvii). Ah, but what all may be understood as success, eh? For example, is money the only measure of success, so that the more money you have, the more successful you presumably are? But couldn’t you have a lot of money and be a miserable example of a human being? If you have a lot of money, what else can you do with it besides spend it? In theory, you could hoard up your money. But you cannot take your hoard of money with you when you die. So you might as well spend it, or you will have to pass it on to others through your will. So accumulating money alone does not seem like the best measure of success. But this brings us to the next step. Besides making a lot of money, what other kinds of things do we Americans admire people for doing? If we as individuals have different talents, then we should be “measured” (as it were) with respect to our talents and how we have used our talents to make a social contribution. As perverse as this may sound, this way of measuring people would allow us to evaluate
Kozol as a talented writer of jeremiads, even though his jeremiads about illiteracy in America have failed thus far to produce any concerted action to combat illiteracy in America. In short, we can give him credit for fighting the good fight against illiteracy in America, even though he has not slain the dragon against which he has been fighting for so long. In effect, Kozol has called attention to the positive potentiality of literacy and to the potentiality of our emerging American culture to have more functionally literate citizens in our country than we have at the present time. The American cultural theorist Ong whose English family ancestors left East Anglia on the same ship that brought Roger Williams to Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1631, also worked diligently over the years to call attention to the positive potentiality of literacy, most notably in his book *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (1.139), which has gone through more than thirty printings in English and has been translated into eleven other languages. In later publications Ong repeatedly emphasized the positive potentiality of literacy: “Writing is a Humanizing Technology” (1983), “Writing and the Evolution of Consciousness” (1985), “Writing is a Technology that Restructures Thought” (1986), “Orality-Literacy Studies and the Unity of the Human Race” (1987). But like Kozol’s jeremiads about illiteracy in America, Ong’s claims about the positive potentiality of literacy have not turned the tide of our contemporary American culture toward combating illiteracy in America in positive ways. But perhaps events during Ong Centenary Year in 2012 will help call new attention to his emphasis on the positive potentiality of literacy. I hope so. I also hope that President Obama’s speech in Osawatomie, Kansas, on December 6, 2011, helps turn the tide of our contemporary American culture toward a renewal of the American covenant. Thus far, President Obama’s performance as president has not been exactly inspiring. He has a well-established track record of making big-sounding speeches and of talking a better game than he plays as president. People do not live on bread alone, but they also do not live on big-sounding speeches alone. Big-sounding speeches should be followed up with meaningful action. In his book *Obama on the Couch: Inside the Mind of the President* (X.21), Dr. Frank has offered a detailed analysis of Obama’s personal psychodynamics, including a perceptive analysis of why Obama talked a better game as a presidential candidate than he has played as president. It should come as a surprise to no one that Dr. Frank does not find the symptoms of megalomania in Obama that he found in GWB. Even though Dr. Frank himself does not spell it out explicitly in his book about Obama, it strikes me that Obama manifests simple mania, not megalomania, as Dr. Frank defines and explains these two kinds of mania in his book about GWB. Now, in his book about Obama, Dr. Frank spells out more explicitly the psychological tendency to resist change than he does in his book about GWB. If Dr. Frank is right about our psychodynamic to resist change, then the psychodynamic that he identifies as central to megalomania is the same psychodynamic that leads us to
resist change. In terms of the American Self defined and explained by Bercovitch, what Dr. Frank describes as simple mania is the central psychodynamic of the American Self, on the one hand, and, on the other, the central psychodynamic not only of the American jeremiad but also of the American civil religion, both of which emphasize the American covenant. But what Dr. Frank describes as the central psychodynamic of megalomania is also the source of our resistance to change.


(XII.6) Berman, Morris. *Social Change and Scientific Organization: The Royal Institution, 1799-1844*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978. Topic: History of Science. Modern science is at home in Western culture, especially in the United States. As a result, when I taught the introductory-level course Literacy, Technology, and Society at the University of Minnesota Duluth, I used to tell the students that the course was about them and their cultural conditioning. In the twentieth century, Nobel Prizes were awarded in the following numbers: (1) Medicine or Physiology: the United States 45; the United Kingdom 18; and Germany 14; (2) Physics: the United States 42; the United Kingdom 19; and Germany 17; (3) Chemistry: the United States 37; the United Kingdom 22; and German 14. Concerning the history of modern science, also see Bird and Sherwin (XII.8); Blackwell (XII.9; XII.10); Ferris (XII.43); Frasca-Spada and N. Jardine (XII.46); Gribbin (XII.59); Harrison (XII.65; XII.66); O’Malley, Bailey, Harris, and Kennedy (XII.110; XII.111); Ong (III.65; XI.9; XII.114: 72); Saliba (XII.150); Stark (XII.157); Whitehead (XII.167); Wills (III.172); Yeo (XII.172).


(XII.8) Bird, Kai and Martin J. Sherwin. *American Prometheus: The Triumph and Tragedy of J. Robert Oppenheimer*. New York: Knopf, 2005. Topics: History of Science; American Studies; History of Technology. Also see Monk (XII.103a); Wills (III.172). Unfortunately for everybody in the world, but most especially for the people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, J. Robert Oppenheimer had to learn the hard way the point of Mary Shelley’s cautionary tale about the spirit of modern science, *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus*. Thus far, only one nation in the world has been so barbaric as to use atomic bombs.


(XII.15) ---. *The Shadow of a Great Rock: A Literary Appreciation of the King James Bible*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2011. Accessible. Topic: Religious Studies. This new book will probably not become a best-seller, as Bloom’s *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (X.6) did. However, Bloom’s new book really should be read in conjunction with his book on Shakespeare. But also see Alter (XII.2).


Buell, Lawrence. *The Dream of the Great American Novel*. Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap P/ Harvard UP, 2014. Topics: American Studies; Literary Studies. Also see Hochman (XII.68a); Ong (XII.127a); Reynolds (XII.145a); Scholes and Kellogg (I.163). Figuratively speaking, Lawrence Buell is juggling a lot of balls in the air in his fine book *The Dream of the Great American Novel*. He is a skilled juggler. He doesn’t drop any of the many balls he is juggling. In addition, he sings and dances along as he juggles his many balls. He’s a one-man show – a delightful showman. I have not read all of the American novels or all of the literary criticism that he has. But he explains himself with admirable lucidity about each novel – and about everything else he discusses. Had he been performing his juggling act in the Winter Olympics in Sochi, he would have won the gold medal because of his style and artistry and because of his technical execution in his muscular intellectual athleticism. Buell candidly says that “the GAN idea itself is and has always been more a demotic than an academic enthusiasm” (387). But he is obviously an academic, and he conspicuously draws on the thought of other academics about the various American novels that he discusses. He is enthusiastic in his own scholarly way about certain American novels, and at times, he even seems mildly enthusiastic about the idea of certain American novels being worthy candidates for the Great American Novel. To establish a sense of order for his undertaking, he works with four scripts, as he styles them, for how certain novels might become candidates for being considered the Great American Novel. However, the American novels that he singles out for extended discussion in connection with one of the four scripts are usually referred to in numerous other places throughout the book. If you are interested in American novels, you will almost certainly find his book rewarding to read. Buell discusses a wealth of topics regarding American culture. If you have grown up in American culture, or have lived in it for a few years, you will almost certainly find topics in this book that resonate strongly with your own experiences of American culture. I did. Nevertheless, I would note that our American experiment in democratic government emerged historically in print culture in Western culture – in the centuries following the emergence of the Gutenberg printing press in the 1450s. For example, the New England Puritans included a good number of college-educated people who read books and wrote books. They had been educated at Cambridge University. They founded Harvard College in 1636. When we flash forward to the American Revolution and the founding of this country, we find a good number of educated people were involved in both. To spell out the obvious, the American novels that Buell perceptively discusses were written by functionally literate Americans to be read by other functionally literate Americans. In other words, both the writers and the readers have had the benefit of enough education and enough leisure to write and read novels, even if some of them were autodidacts. By contrast, people in primary oral cultures (i.e., pre-literate cultures) usually participate in a living oral tradition of
storytelling. Indeed, it seems likely that African American slaves brought to the United States against their will had participated in oral traditions of storytelling in their native cultures. For example, the Nigerian novelist Chinua Achebe highlights the native tradition of oral storytelling (narrative proverbs) in his widely read novel *Things Fall Apart* (I.2). In addition, Native Americans participated in living oral traditions of storytelling. In a similar way, many ethnic European immigrants may also have participated in living oral traditions of storytelling in their countries of origin. But what connections, if any, are there between these various oral traditions of storytelling and the traditions of storytelling in the American novels that Buell discusses? As we know, newer forms of storytelling have emerged to compete with American novels – most notably movies and television. Arguably, many movies and television shows are escapist in spirit. Nevertheless, their appeal to the American people is undeniable. But American novels will no doubt continue to be written by and to be read by the literati. However, their impact on American people may be limited – except for those comparatively few novels that can make a claim to being the Great American Novel, or at least a plausible candidate for this claim.


(XII.18a) Caputo, John D. *On Religion*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. Topic: Religious Studies. Also see Bloom (XII.14); Cox (XII.22a); Critchley (XII.23a); Derrida and Vattimo (XII.26a); Dorrien (XII.27; XII.28); Gelpi (XII.50a); Habermas (III.78a); James (XII.74c; XII.74d); Kristeva (XII.81b); Marty (III.118); P. Miller (XII.101a; XII.101b; XII.101c); Ong (I.140; I.142); Rotenstreich XII.147a); Vattimo (XII.163a); Wills (XII.168); Worthen (XII.171b); Zizek (XII.173a).


(XII.22) Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness: A Norton Critical Edition: Authoritative Text, Backgrounds and Contexts, Criticism*. 4th ed. Ed. Paul B. Armstrong. New York and London: Norton, 2006. Also see Achebe (I.2; XII.1); Ong (I.131; I.137; XII.137). This Norton Critical Edition of Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* includes Chinua Achebe’s controversial essay “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*” (336-49). Despite my enthusiasm for teaching Achebe’s two novels *Things Fall Apart* and *No Longer at Ease*, I was not impressed with Achebe’s revised 1988 version of his 1977 essay criticizing Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* for alleged “racism” (Achebe’s term). In the Norton Critical Edition of Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* (I.2), edited by Francis Abiola Irele, we find reprinted (200-08) the published interview of Achebe conducted by Caryl Phillips, the British-educated novelist of African descent who was born in 1958 in St. Kitts in the West Indies. It was originally published in *The Guardian* on Saturday, February 22, 2003. In his interview with Achebe, Phillips questions the aging Nigerian novelist closely about Achebe’s charge that Conrad is a thorough-going racist in *Heart of Darkness*, which is set in the 1890s in King Leopold’s Congo empire. At one point in the interview, Achebe faults Conrad for not being bigger than his times because he did not have a benevolent view of Africa. When pressed by Phillips to give an example of somebody of Conrad’s time who was bigger than his times, Achebe gives Livingstone as an example. But what exactly shows that Conrad did not have a benevolent view of Africa? Phillips ventures to say, “Conrad does present Africans as having ‘rudimentary’ souls.” Achebe replies, “Yes, you will notice that the European traders have ‘tainted’ souls, Marlow has a ‘pure’ soul, but I am to accept that mine [as an African] is ‘rudimentary’?” So there we have it. Achebe’s charge that Conrad is a racist comes down to Achebe taking wording in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* personally as though the wording characterized him and all other Africans. However, as others have pointed out, the wording in question comes from Marlow. Nowhere in the text is there a suggestion that Marlow’s views are above being questioned. In my estimate, the best argument about textual evidence that should lead us as readers to question Marlow’s statements is J. Hillis Miller’s 2001 essay “Should We Read *Heart of Darkness*?” Miller’s essay is reprinted in the 2006 fourth edition of the Norton Critical Edition of Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (463-74), where Achebe’s revised 1988 version of his 1977
essay is also reprinted (336-49). It’s great and commendable for Achebe to question Marlow’s statement about the supposedly “rudimentary” souls of Africans. But Achebe should also question certain other statements that Marlow makes. As to the condition of Marlow’s soul, why does Marlow lie to Kurtz’s Intended (her name is not given) back in Europe when he tells her that Kurtz’s last words were her name? Elsewhere, he has tells us what Kurtz’s last words were. In addition, Marlow has tells us that he detests lies. But what he tells Kurtz’s Intended is a straightforward lie, not the truth about Kurtz’s last words. After Ong visited Kinshasa and Lubumbashi and made friends with certain Africans in 1974, he wrote a penetrating essay about Marlow’s lie to Kurtz’s Intended entitled “Truth in Conrad’s Darkness” that appeared in Mosaic: A Journal for the Comparative Study of Literature and Ideas (XII.137). Because Ong’s perceptive and thought-provoking essay about Conrad’s admittedly tricky novel appeared in the same year that Achebe’s article originally appeared, Achebe did not have the benefit of reading Ong’s insights about Conrad’s novel. Nor did Ong have the benefit of reading Achebe’s thought-provoking essay about Conrad’s novel before he published his own views about it. But I have had the benefit of reading both essays – and J. Hillis Miller’s 2001 essays as well as essays by other authors who responded to Achebe’s charges against Conrad. In addition, I found Caryl Phillips’ careful 2003 interview of Achebe, mentioned above, informative and instructive. In conclusion, if Marlow supposedly has a “pure” soul, perhaps this is best understood as meaning that there is a certain kind of innocence about Marlow.

(XII.22a) Cox, Harvey Gallagher. The Future of Faith. New York: HarperOne, 2009. Topic: Religious Studies. Also see Bloom (XII.14); Caputo (XII.18a); Cox (XII.22b); Critchley (XII.23a); Derrida and Vattimo (XII.26a); Dorrien (XII.27; XII.28); Farrell (I.61); Gelpi (XII.50a); Habermas (III.78a); James (XII.74c; XII.74d); Jenkins (III.93; III.94); Kristeva (XII.81b); Marty (III.118); P. Miller (XII.101a; XII.101b; XII.101c); Ong (I.140; I.142); Rotenstreich (XII.147b); Vattimo (XII.163a); Wills (XII.168); Worthen (XII.171b); Zizek (XII.173a). In light of the vociferous anti-1960s rhetoric of certain American conservatives that Jenkins (III.93) has discussed, it is important to note here that Harvey Cox sees a new age of the spirit as emerging from the 1960s onward.


(XII.26a) Derrida, Jacques and Gianni Vattimo, eds. *Religion*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998. Topic: Religious Studies. Also see Caputo (XII.18a); Cox (XII.22a); Critchley (XII.23a); Habermas (III.78a); Kristeva (XII.81b); Ong (I.140; I.142); Rotenstreich (XII.147b); Vattimo (XII.163a); Zizek (XII.173a).


(XII.29a) Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Knopf, 1977. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see G. Collins (III.29); Coontz (III.33); de Beauvoir (III.37); Farrell (XII.37b). The strident feminism of the late 1960s and 1970s is best understood as a further advance in the already ongoing feminization of American culture. Drawing on Erich Neumann’s description in *The Origins and History of Consciousness* (III.128) of the higher femininity in stage seven of the eight stages of consciousness, I see the feminization of American culture as related to the emergence of the higher femininity of stage seven of the eight stages of consciousness. However, the stridency of feminists in the 1960s and later resulted in a predictable backlash, most notably among
conservative white men who seem to be resisting the challenges of stage seven in the eight stages of consciousness. At the same time, most self-described American feminists seem to be resisting the challenges of the higher masculinity of stage eight. Ong (III.140) claims that personalism (e.g., Martin Buber’s I-thou encounter) represents an expression of the higher masculinity of stage eight (11).


(XII.32) ---. The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe. 2 vols. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1979. Topics: Early Modern Studies; History of Technology. A classic study of print culture. Other classic studies of print culture include Altick (VIII.1); Febvre and Martin (XII.40); Habermas (XII.61); McLuhan (XII.96a); Ong (XII.132; XII.133).


“Secondary Orality and Consciousness Today.” *Media, Consciousness, and Culture: Explorations of Walter Ong’s Thought*. Ed. Bruce E. Gronbeck, Thomas J. Farrell, and Paul A. Soukup. Newbury Park, CA; London; New Delhi: Sage, 1991. 194-209. Also see Bakan (III.6); Benoit (XII.4b); G. Collins (III.29); Coontz (III.33); de Beauvoir (III.37); Douglas (XII.29); Hoehler (XII.68); Huntington (XII.72); Ong (XII.135); Veeder (XII.163).

“The West Versus the Rest: Getting Our Cultural Bearings from Ong.” *Explorations in Media Ecology* 7 (2008): 271-82. Topics: Cultural Studies; History of Technology. Also see Clemens (XII.21); Ferguson (XII.42); Huntington (III.88); Kupchan (XII.83); Landes (III.111); Morris (XII.103).


Feingold, Mordechai and Joseph S. Freedman and Wolfgang Rother, eds. *The Influence of Petrus Ramus: Studies in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Philosophy and Sciences*. Basel, Switzerland: Schwabe, 2001. Topic: Early Modern Studies. Also see Freedman (XII.47); Hotson (XII.69; XII.72); P. Mack (XII.88); Milton (XII.102); Ong (XII.132; XII.133; XII.135); Sharratt (XII.153; XII.154; XII.155).

Ferguson, Niall. *Civilization: The West and the Rest*. New York: Penguin P, 2011. Topic: Cultural Studies. Also see Clemens (XII.21); Farrell (XII.38); Huntington (III.88); Kupchan (XII.83); Landes (III.111); Morris (XII.103).


(XII.50a) Gelpi, Donald L. *Varieties of Transcendental Experience: A Study of Constructive Postmodernism*. Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier Book/ Liturgical P, 2000. Topics: History of Philosophy; Religious Studies. Also see Bloom (XII.14); Buell (X.8a; X.8b); Caputo (XII.18a); Cox (XII.22a); Critchley (XII.23a); Derrida and Vattimo (XII.26a); Dorrien (XII.27; XII.28); Farrell (I.62a); Fixico (II.8); Habermas (III.78a); James (XII.74c; XII.74d); Kristeva (XII.81b); Lloyd (III.112); Marty (III.118); P. Miller (XII.101a; XII.101b; XII.101c); Ong (I.140; I.142; I.143); Rotenstreich (XII.147b); D. M. Smith (I.168); Tracy (XII.161b); Vattimo (XII.163a); Wilshire (XII.169); Wills (XII.168); Worthen (XII.147b); Zizek (XII.173a). In this learned study Donald L. Gelpi, S.J., regularly works with the contrast of the dialectical imagination of American Protestants and the analogical imagination of the Roman Catholic tradition of thought (82, 132, 164, 172, 174, 192, 193, 206, 223, 224, 280, 281, 282). Briefly, he characterizes the dialectical imagination as displaying a uniform preference for disjunctive, either-or thinking (82). By contrast, he characterizes the analogical imagination as seeking “as much as possible
to think in both-and rather than either-or terms” (132). Concerning the analogical imagination, Gelpi refers us to David Tracy’s *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (XII.161b), but not to Lloyd (III.112). Unfortunately, Gelpi does not mention either Perry Miller’s discussion of Ramist dialectic in New England (XII.100) or Ong’s far more extensive discussion of Ramist dialectic (XII.126; XII.132). Concerning the later influence of Hegel and Kant on the dialectic of ideas in American Protestant theology, see Dorrien (XII.27).


(XII.56) Greenberg, David. “Agit-Prof: Howard Zinn’s Influential Mutilations of American History.” *The New Republic* (March 25, 2013): 44-49. Topic: American Studies. Also see Duberman (XII.30); Fish (III.65); Jacoby
In this review essay about Martin Duberman’s *Howard Zinn: A Life on the Left* (XII.30), David Greenberg concludes that Howard Zinn “never seemed aware of” the responsibility to his “readers to include the bad with the good, the ignoble with the noble . . . in the pursuit of intellectual honesty” (49).

Gregory, Brad S. *The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society*. Cambridge, MA; and London: Belknap P/Harvard UP, 2012. Topics: Religious Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Gauchet (XII.50); Gillespie (XII.51); Ong (II.14: 104-25; II.17); Roy (XII.148); Taylor (XII.160).


---. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. 2 vols. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon P, 1984-1987. Topics: History of Rhetoric; Rhetorical Theory. Also see Rehg (III.149; III.150; III.151). A classic study about communicative action in print culture in Western culture. Habermas does not happen to advert explicitly to Ong *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (III.138). In effect, Habermas centers his attention on what Ong refers to as the art of reason, not on what Ong refers to as the art of discourse. For Ong, the art of discourse involves pro-and-con debate with a real or imagined adversarial position(s). By contrast, Ramist method is monologic in spirit because in theory, it involves concentrating one presenting one’s own line of thought without any reference to a real or imagined adversarial position(s). In theory, Ramist method eschews the kind of explicit pro-and-con debate that Thomas O. Sloane (III.158; III.159) champions.
After reading Jacob S. Hacker and Paul Pierson’s new book about the great expansion of income inequality in recent decades, *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class* -- and on the lower class as well, I have come to the conclusion that we should paraphrase scripture to read as follows: “From everyone to whom much has been given [in income], much will be required [in taxes]; and from the one to whom much has been entrusted [such as the money manager of other people’s money], even more will be demanded [in taxes]” (Luke 12:48; NRSV). In his 1939 State of the Union address, Franklin D. Roosevelt famously said, “To us much is given; more is expected.” So there is a famous precedent for invoking the spirit of this biblical passage in our political discourse. Hacker and Pierson see FDR’s New Deal in a very positive light because of its commitment to redistributing material wealth through legislative interventions. Because of their strong interest in redistributing material wealth through legislative interventions, Hacker and Pierson work with the terms “nonmaterial” issues/grounds and “postmaterialist” to characterize various issues that would do little to help redistribute material wealth to the middle class and lower class. For example, they characterize both pro-choice and pro-life advocates as being concerned with nonmaterial issues. Regarding nonmaterial issues, the authors’ neutrality about them can be summed up by their rather crudely worded statement, “We have no dog in this fight” (page 204). Other nonmaterial issues include affirmative action, women’s rights, civil rights, and environmental concerns, which the authors see as upper-middle-class issues that would do little to help redistribute material wealth to the middle class and lower class. In plain English, “the Democrats lost their capacity to speak of the economic concerns of the little guy” (184). Whether they understand it or not, most Americans have been the losers in the rise of winner-take-all politics, except for the tiny percentage at the top who have been winners. In the authors’ view, both Republicans and Democrats begat the great expansion of economic inequality in recent decades, because both groups contributed, but not necessarily equally, to the legislative rise of winner-take-all politics. Their book is remarkably readable and even mildly entertaining at times. No doubt we should cultivate a sense of humor about the grim rise of radical conservatives in American politics. To jolt us into greater awareness about legislative developments, Hacker and Pierson start with the obvious superficial media coverage of politics, which usually is characterized as treating elections of political candidates as horse races (i.e., whose ahead in the polls and by how much, and the like). Because the rise of television has also produced a phenomenal rise in professional-sports on television, perhaps it is not surprising that media coverage of electoral contests
decidedly resembles media coverage of sports contests. The media do cover electoral contests as horse races. How many American adult have not noticed this? But contests are contests, eh? Well, no, not exactly, Hacker and Pierson point out. After all, there are many legislative contests that are not all that well covered by the media because they usually unfold in a very slow process and the details are often hard to understand unless you understand the technicalities involved. Granted, the media usually do cover the outcomes of the legislative contests, the actual final legislation that gets enacted into law. But not the boring details of the legislation, or the boring details of the legislative contests themselves, which is where real political combat occurs. The well-known saying has it that the devil is in the details, and this is certainly true of legislation. The details of legislation are the central focus of Hacker and Pierson’s book. In their view, the contests about the details in legislation involved are real political combat, not the electoral contests. Hacker and Pierson set out to rectify the situation a bit by bringing us up to speed about the legislative details that cumulatively over recent decades, roughly from 1978 onward, have produced the winner-take-all politics highlighted in the title of their book. Even though I was familiar with the general pattern of political developments that the authors detail, I learned about a number of legislative details that I had not known about previously, perhaps because of my own inattentiveness to certain matters at the time of their unfolding. In one of their many attempts to be entertaining, Hacker and Pierson tell us that there have been no good guys in white hats in the sad story they recount of the seemingly inexorable rise of winner-take-all politics. Radical conservatives such as Phil Gramm and Newt Gingrich have been the bad guys in the black hats, not moderate Republicans such as Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon, both of whom seem liberal compared to the radical conservatives. But the Democrats have not been the good guys in the white hats. As Hacker and Pierson recount the story of the rise of winner-take-all politics, no good guys in white hats emerge. Both Republicans and Democrats begat the deregulation that culminated in the economic crisis of recent years. Let us be clear here. From Hacker and Pierson’s account of the rise of winner-take-all politics, Presidents Carter and Clinton do not emerge as bad guys wearing black hats. The bad guys wearing the black hats are the radical conservatives. But Hacker and Pierson see the decisive rise in winner-take-all politics as occurring from the late 1970s onward. In their recounting, both Republicans and Democrats begat winner-take-all politics. Hacker and Pierson refer repeatedly to the Christian right and the religious right (139, 146-49, 160, 201-04, 205, 234-35). But the authors do not discuss Catholics, except to note that John F. Kennedy was a Catholic (page 202). However, as Garry Wills discusses his fine book *Head and Heart: American Christianities* (XII.168: 523-30), conservative antiabortion Roman Catholics have worked closely with conservative antiabortion evangelical Protestants in recent years to strengthen the voter turn out for the Republican party.
Nevertheless, Hacker and Pierson do point out that in the 1980s and 1990s the Republican party “[a]ttract[ed] a huge new GOP voting block brought to the party for cultural reasons” (211). One of those cultural reasons was the antiabortion movement, and many conservative antiabortion Catholics were among the new voting block brought to the GOP in the 1980s and 1990s and later. I should point out that Hacker and Pierson themselves suggest no possible way to break up the appeal of radical conservative Republican candidates. However, it strikes me that Wills has set an important example for other liberals to follow by lining up arguments against the different antiabortion arguments advanced by the different Christian groups. The potential payoff to debating with antiabortion Christians is to get them to stop voting for Republican candidates on the basis of this one issue alone. No doubt debating with antiabortion Christians will be a slow and arduous undertaking. Has anybody else advanced any ideas about how to combat the well-funded radical conservatives? As I stated, Hacker and Pierson haven’t. Finally, as is well known, FDR has long been considered a traitor to his class for helping the little guy. In light of his example, perhaps the Democratic party should try to cultivate more traitors to their economic class to help the little guy. In any event, Democratic politicians should figure out more ways in which the Democratic party might help advance the economic interests of the little guy.


(XII.68a) Hochman, Barbara. Uncle Tom’s Cabin and the Reading Revolution: Race, Literacy, Childhood, and Fiction, 1851-1911. Amherst and Boston: U of Massachusetts P, 2011. Topics: American Studies; Literary Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Buell (XII.17a); Reynolds (XII.145a).

(XII.68b) Hoevele, Diane Long. Romantic Androgyny: The Women Within. University Park and London: Pennsylvania State UP, 1990. Topics: Literary Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Benoit (XII.4b); Farrell (XII.37b); Ong (XII.135); Veeder (XII.163b).

(XII.69) Hotson, Howard. Commonplace Learning: Ramism and Its German Ramifications, 1543-1630. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2007. Topics: Early Modern Studies; History of Education; Cultural Studies; History of Technology. Howard Hotson argues that Ong’s understanding of Peter Ramus’ thought is illuminating in many ways, but inadequate for understanding the Ramist pedagogical movement and its successors. In the process of criticizing and correcting Ong’s apparent misunderstandings of the Ramist pedagogical movement, Hotson does not diminish Ong’s stature as a cultural theorist regarding the aural-visual shift in cognitive processing. Moreover, after setting forth his supposed critique of Ong’s thought in his introduction, Hotson then proceeds to sum up Ramus’ achievement, or lack thereof, in the following statement, with which Ong would not disagree: “Historians of philosophy, first of all, generally agree that Ramus, far from being revolutionary, exercised little philosophical originality and that in replacing the rigorous demonstrative logic of Aristotle with the topical logic derived from Agricola he [Ramus] abandoned a tool capable of dealing with scientific problems for a humanist dialectic of little use beyond merely literary pursuits. The appeal of Ramism within German has been related by one leading historian to an ethos marked far less by Puritanism than by late Renaissance humanism, ‘a cultured milieu which aimed to broaden rather than restrict the basis of intellectual inquiry’” (17-18). Also see Ong’s “Humanism” (XII.122). As Hotson points out Ramist dialectic (or logic) was not “capable of dealing with scientific problems,” as Aristotelian logic was and is (see Lonergan [IX.48]; Nussbaum [IX.55]). However, even though Roman Catholics were the custodians of the Aristotelian logic, they did not set the world on fire in dealing with the scientific problems involved in the Galileo affair. See Blackwell (XII.9; XII.10).


(XII.71) ---. Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism. Dordrecht; Boston; London: Kluwer Academic


(XII.72a) Houston, Jean. Lifeforce: The Psycho-Historical Recovery of the Self. New York: Delacorte P, 1980. Topic: Cultural Studies. Also see Farrell (XII.37b); Neumann (III.128). In this highly imaginative work, the ever-clever Jean Houston basically follows Gerald Heard’s The Five Ages of Man: The Psychology of Human History (New York: Julian P, 1963) – his 47th book to be published. Heard’s and Houston’s fifth human age is the post-individual, planetary, ecological human; their fourth age, the individual, humanic, self-sufficient human; their third age, the mid-individual, ascetic, self-accusing human; the second age, the proto-individual, heroic, self-assertive human; their first age, the pre-individual, co-conscious human (Houston: 29). Their first age corresponds with Ong’s primary oral cultures. In Western culture historically, their second age appears to cover antiquity from about the time of the earliest writing systems; their third age, the Middle Ages; their fourth age, the Renaissance and early modern period; their fifth age, the Romantic Movement in literature and the arts down to the present and the Industrial Revolution down to the present – in short, modernity in Western culture. But I prefer to work with Erich Neumann’s (III.128) eight stages of consciousness, rather than with Heard’s and Houston’s five ages. Their first age includes stages one, two, and three in Neumann’s eight stages of consciousness. Their second, third, and fourth ages include Neumann’s stages four, five, and six of consciousness, respectively. But their fifth age conflates Neumann’s stages seven and eight. I prefer not conflate those two stages, but to see each stage as separate from the other. Nevertheless, I enjoyed reading her account of how she encountered an elderly gentleman that she later came to recognize as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. (218-20). When she was 13 years old, she was running with her dog on a street in Manhattan. She literally ran into an elderly gentleman and knocked him down. She helped him up, and they spoke briefly. Subsequently, she encountered him out on a walk, and they walked along together while he spoke with her. Much later in life, she figured out that the elderly gentleman whose name she had learned to pronounce as Mr. Tayer or Mr. Thayer was Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. (II.21; X.48). In this way, 13-year-old Jean Houston and her dog acted out an imaginative journey on the streets on Manhattan that strikingly resembles the imaginative journey of Dorothy and her dog Toto in the 1939 movie The Wizard of Oz. Thus we can see Jean Houston’s future life foreshadowed in this episode in her life – Jean Houston is Dorothy, and the Hollywood movie makers who
made *The Wizard of Oz* foreshadowed Jean Houston’s life. When Ong was based in Paris in the early 1950s, he read Teilhard’s work and thereafter never tired of referring to Teilhard. So both Ong and Jean Houston became life-long Teilhard fans.

(XII.72b) ---. *The Wizard of Us: Transformational Lessons from Oz*. New York and London: Atria Books/Simon & Schuster; and Hillsboro, OR: Beyond Words, 2012. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies; Therapy. Also see Farrell (XII.37b); Masters and Houston (I.108a). In my living room I have a 36-inch-tall figurine made by a local woman artist of a Native American woman shaman with outstretched arms, her open hands facing palms upward, as in a prayer of supplication. I think of Jean Houston (born 1937) as a contemporary American woman shaman. The shaman represents one way to manifest the mature optimal form of the Magician archetype of maturity discussed by the Jungian theorist Robert L. Moore of the Chicago Theological Seminary (I.117). Some background information about Jean Houston is in order. She has previously published a book about the Homeric epic the *Odyssey* and a big book about the ancient Egyptian myth of Osiris. People who are experiencing a mid-life crisis are undergoing a life transition into a new stage of consciousness that is represented by Odysseus’s journey back to Ithaca. But people who are experiencing the later life transition into old age are undertaking a deconstruction and reconstitution of their lives and ego-consciousness that is represented in the ancient myth of Osiris. But Jean Houston’s latest book centers on the 1939 Hollywood musical *The Wizard of Oz*, starring 16-year-old Judy Garland as Dorothy. For the 75th anniversary of the movie, the Judy Garland Museum in Grand Rapids, Minnesota, where she was born on June 10, 1922, is planning a festival for June 10-14, 2014. Perhaps Jean Houston was looking ahead to the 75th anniversary of the movie when she wrote her book *The Wizard of Us: Transformational Lessons from Oz*. In this wide-ranging short book Jean Houston provides (i) plot summaries of certain parts of the movie’s storyline and (ii) perceptive interpretations of each part and (iii) self-help exercises for the reader to undertake, if she or he wishes to, and (iv) wide-ranging commentaries about our contemporary situation. At the end of the book, she uses letters of the alphabet from A to M to construct an alphabetized “Manifestation Plan” (188-193). I will start with a word about (ii) her perceptive interpretations. In her perceptive interpretations of each part of the movie, she draws on Joseph Campbell’s book *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (III.20) to show how his collation of certain key points in myths about the Hero’s journey can help us understand the larger mythic import of each part of Dorothy’s Hero journey. Jean Houston is perceptive enough to figure out that girls and women also experience the Hero’s journey. She says, “In this [her] book we use the term hero to denote both genders. Women have always been [heroic] and continue to accomplish heroic feats with the difference that their emphasis has tended to be on
process rather than product – making things cohere, relate, develop, and grow. While the heroine may be less strident, she is nevertheless courageous and brings a new focus to the inner experience being of equal value to the outer action” (2). The Hero in the Hero’s journey represents our ego-consciousness on its journey through life. In the case of Dorothy’s journey in the movie, she is experiencing the birth of the Hero in her ego-consciousness. Roughly, most of us experience the birth of the Hero around the age of puberty. But if the movie centers on a psychodynamic that most of us experienced around the age of puberty, then the movie might be good for young people around the age of puberty to see. But Jean Houston’s book does not seem to me to be aimed at people around the age of puberty. I suppose that some young people around the age of puberty could read her book. But even the self-help exercises in the book seem to me to be aimed at people who are beyond the age of puberty. Next, a word regarding (iv) her wide-ranging commentaries about our contemporary situation. In her commentaries about our contemporary situation, Jean Houston works with the thesis that contemporary breakdowns are breakthroughs to a new consciousness. Her commentaries do not seem to me to be aimed at young people around the age of puberty. Oh, sure, young people around the age of puberty should be able to read her commentaries and understand them. But her commentaries seem to me to be aimed at somewhat older readers who sense that we are experiencing some kind of societal breakdown in American culture today. As is well known, conservative Americans today tend to see American culture as undergoing various kinds of breakdowns. But how many conservative Americans today would be open to Jean Houston’s claim that we are undergoing a breakdown that is a breakthrough? For many conservative Americans, breakdown is breakdown. Period. Circle the wagons and try to resist the breakdown with all your might. In the final analysis, it strikes me that Jean Houston’s commentaries are aimed at middle-aged (say, over 30) and older Americans who are willing to see themselves as living through a breakdown that is a breakthrough. Now, a word about the details of the story. The theme that there’s no place like home emerges toward the end of the movie. However, this theme also seems to express the longing that Odysseus feels to leave Calypso’s island, where she has enslaved him as her sex provider, and return home to his wife and son in Ithaca. Hmm. Along the way, Dorothy’s companion the Straw Man undergoes a deconstruction as thorough as the deconstruction that Osiris undergoes. Happily, Dorothy’s other companions are able to reconstruct the Straw Man successfully, just as Osiris is eventually reconstructed, except for one symbolic part that is missing in the reconstructed Osiris. Hmm. The Straw Man is best understood as one of the two bipolar “shadow” forms of the Magician archetype of maturity discussed by Moore (I.117). The Tin Man is best understood as one of the two bipolar “shadow forms of the Lover archetype discussed by Moore (I.116). The Cowardly Lion is best understood as one of the two bipolar “shadow” forms of the Warrior
archetype discussed by Moore (I.118). Because of her gender, Dorothy represents the Queen archetype discussed by Moore. However, before Judy Garland played the role of Dorothy in the movie, many Americans had fallen in love with her. As an actress and singer, 16-year-old Judy Garland playing Dorothy in the movie represents the energy of the Lover archetype -- as all artists do, according to Moore. Jean Houston quotes the psychoanalyst David Magder: “The Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion represent syndromes with which most therapists are familiar: low self-esteem based on the sense that one is not intelligent or capable of dealing with the world as one would like to, or a sense of inability to respond emotionally or effectively, and anxiety or fearfulness in dealing with the day to day problems of living” (168). Now, toward the end of the movie, the unmasked Wizard of Oz goes back into his official role and grants each of Dorothy’s three companions something that is supposed to represent what each of them does not have. The Scarecrow receives a diploma, the Tin Man, a heart-shaped watch; the Cowardly Lion, a medal for meritorious conduct and extraordinary valor. No doubt we do need to receive recognition and validation from others in order to develop our potentialities. Finally, my conclusions. Drawing on my understanding of Erich Neumann’s book The Origins and History of Consciousness (III.128), his synthesis and systematization of C. G. Jung’s work into a sequence of eight stages of consciousness, I above suggested that Odysseus’s journey back home to Ithaca can be understood as symbolically representing the Hero’s journey in the mid-life crisis – the journey into Neumann’s stage seven of consciousness. Neumann describes stage seven of consciousness as leading to the rise of higher femininity. Ann Douglas has detailed the historical rise of higher femininity in American culture in her book The Feminization of American Culture (XII.29a). Neumann follows Jung in identifying the deconstruction and reconstruction of Osiris as a symbolic representation of the Hero’s journey into stage eight of consciousness. In certain academic circles in recent decades, our Western cultural heritage has been deconstructed with the same kind of vigor that Osiris was deconstructed. I wonder if the deconstructionists will undertake the reconstruction, as Bernard Lonergan does in Insight: A Study of Human Understanding (X.30). If they don’t, they risk sliding into the disgust and despair that Erik H. Erikson sees as one possible tendency of stage eight in the life cycle. As I noted above, the Straw Man represent one of the two bipolar “shadow” forms of the Magician archetype discussed by Moore. Whenever we undergo a life transition such as the birth of the Hero in our ego-consciousness (Neumann’s stage four), we need to undergo certain kinds of new experiential learning. Figuratively speaking, our thought-worlds need to be deconstructed so that they can then be reconstructed with our new experiential learning. In this way, the major transitions in the life cycle involve a breakdown that is a breakthrough, as Jean Houston likes to say. In accord with Jean Houston’s own statements about puberty rites and the
movie *The Wizard of Oz*, I have indicated that the movie is deeply attuned to the birth of the Hero in our ego-consciousness around the age of puberty. As I’ve indicated, the birth of the Hero represents Neumann’s stage four of consciousness. Jean Houston is calling all the people who read her book to revisit the birth of the Hero in their ego-consciousness around the age of puberty. By revisiting the birth of the Hero in our ego-consciousness, we can renew our lives, regardless of our present age. How many among us do not feel a need to renew our lives? Toward the end of the movie, the famous Wizard of Oz is unmasked as just a one-man special-effects operator. Nevertheless, through this book Jean Houston as a woman shaman aspires to be the Wizard of us who read her book and take it to heart. In plain English, she is trying to be a special-effects operator in our lives. In *Get Happy: The Life of Judy Garland* (New York: Random House, 2000), Geral Clarke reports that President John F. Kennedy “sometimes called her for a private concert – a few bars of ‘Over the Rainbow’ sung a capella over the phone” (348) -- her signature song from *The Wizard of Oz*. We have no way of knowing if he was just captivated with the sound of Judy Garland singing this song, or with the lyrics of the song, or with the mythic spirit of the birth of the Hero that the movie captures – or possibly with all three. But we do know that as a young Navy officer, Jack Kennedy became a war hero after his PT boat was destroyed in the Pacific. Then after he became president of the United States, he enjoyed listening to Judy Garland sing a song that would likely have taken him back to revisit the birth of the Hero in his ego-consciousness.


(XII.74b) Jacoby, Russell. “Making It.” *The New Republic* (September 2, 2013): 34-39. Topic: Literary Studies; Cultural Studies; American Studies. Also see Fish (III.65). In this perceptive survey of Stanley Fish’s scholarly career, Russell Jacoby concludes, “He has always defended self-interest. With friends like him, the humanities needs no enemies” (39).


(XII.81b) Kristeva, Julia. *This Incredible Need to Believe*. Trans Beverly Bie Brahic. New York: Columbia UP, 2009. Topic: Religious Studies. Also see Caputo (XII.18a); Cox (XII.22a); Critchley (XII.23a); Derrida and Vattimo (XII.26a); Habermas (III.78a); Ong (I.140; I.142); Rotenstreich (XII.147b); Vattimo (XII.163a); Zizek (XII.173a).


(XII.83a) Kupchan, Charles A. *No One’s World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Coming Global Turn*. New York: Oxford UP, 2012. Topic: Cultural Studies. Also see Clemens (XII.21a); Farrell (XII.38); Ferguson (XII.42); Huntington (III.88); Kenny (XII.80a); Landes (III.111b); Morris (XII.103b).

(XII.83b) Lacy, Tim. *The Dream of a Democratic Culture: Mortimer J. Adler and the Great Books Idea*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Adler (VII.2; IX.1; IX.2; IX.3 X.1). How cultured should American voters be? For Americans to vote, it helps if they can read the ballot. For this reason, formal education in the United States, a systematic form of acculturation, is required by law. But Mortimer J. Adler and Robert Maynard Hutchins and their collaborators who promoted the set of books known as the *Great Books of the Western World* (1952; 2nd ed. 1990) envisioned lifelong learning as the pastime for American adults in their leisure time. In this way, they envisioned the dream of a democratic culture of cultured voters that Tim Lacy examines in his book *The Dream of a Democratic Culture: Mortimer J. Adler and the Great Books Idea*. The approach to the Great Books that Adler and Hutchins championed involved close reading. Indeed, the Great Books Movement that emerged in the 1920s paralleled the emphasis on close reading espoused by the then-emerging New Criticism in transatlantic literary studies as exemplified in the critical works of T. S.
Eliot, F. R. Leavis, I. A. Richards, Cleanth Brooks, and Robert Penn Warren. In Roman Catholic circles, the emphasis on close reading involved close reading of the original texts of St. Thomas Aquinas in international Thomistic studies. Of course international Thomism began to wane in influence after the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). Transatlantic New Criticism began to wane in literary studies in the 1970s. After the expanded edition of the Great Books of the Western World was published in 1990, interest in the Great Books idea began to wane. Nevertheless, the spirit of close reading advanced by the Great Books movement, transatlantic New Criticism, and international Thomistic studies has persisted in academic circles down to the present time. But Adler and Hutchins complemented their emphasis on close reading with a strong emphasis on engaging in conversation with the ideas in the texts – and in conversation with others who had read the texts in small groups. Of course autodidacts working alone with the texts can also engage in spirited conversation with the texts. In other words, for Adler and Hutchins, great books did not represent “a static kind of tradition” (2). Instead, those texts represented living voices from the past that we can engage in conversation. In my estimate, Lacy does not give Adler sufficient credit for compiling the two volumes of the GBWW set known as the Syntopicon (VII.2). Compiling this massive cross-referencing on the themes discussed in the books in the set was an ambitious achievement. The documentation provided in the Syntopicon shows the spirit of conversation that has been carried on in the set of Great Books. In today’s parlance, we could say that the Syntopicon shows the spirit of intertextuality in the books in the set.


Logan, Robert K. *McLuhan Misunderstood: Setting the Record Straight*. Toronto: Key Publishing House, 2013. Topics: History of Technology; Cultural Studies. Also see Levinson (IX.44; IX.45; IX.46); Logan (IX.47a); McLuhan (XII.96; XII.96a; XII.96b; XII.96c; XII.96d; XII.96e); Ong (XII.129a). I am not a fan of Marshall McLuhan. But Robert K. Logan is. My, oh my, he is such a fan that I cannot find one serious criticism of anything McLuhan ever said in Logan’s short book *McLuhan Misunderstood: Setting the Record Straight* (2013). In the spirit of setting the record straight about McLuhan, I would like to discuss a few key points about him here. Logan is a Canadian, as McLuhan (1911-1980) was. Logan holds a Ph.D. in physics from MIT. For many years, he taught physics at the University of Toronto, where McLuhan taught English. Logan met McLuhan in the 1970s, and he’s been writing enthusiastically, and uncritically, about McLuhan’s thought ever since. Logan is Jewish. McLuhan was a convert to Roman Catholicism.

First, let me set the record straight here about what Logan does not undertake to do. On the one hand, he does not undertake to set forth certain critiques of McLuhan that might be based on some misunderstanding of his thought. But Logan does not even advert directly to any critiques of McLuhan’s thought. In this connection, I should mention that Gary Genosko has collected critiques of McLuhan’s thought in the three-volume set titled *Marshall McLuhan: Critical Evaluations in Cultural Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, 2005). On the other hand, of the points of McLuhan’s thought that Logan discusses, he does not discuss explicitly how any of those points were allegedly misunderstood by any specific critics of McLuhan’s thought. In short, Logan is an uncritical McLuhan enthusiast. He is such an uncritical enthusiast that I cannot find one serious criticism of anything McLuhan ever said in Logan’s short book – no criticisms made by his critics, and no criticisms made by Logan. Next, in the spirit of setting the record straight about McLuhan, I would like to discuss a few points about him here. After McLuhan had completed his studies in English at Cambridge University, he taught English at the University of Wisconsin-Madison for one academic year (1936-1937). During the spring semester of that year, he was formally received into the Roman Catholic Church. This shows that his religion was important to him, because by becoming a Catholic he was sealing his fate in academia – as a Catholic, he would never become a professor at Harvard University, because of the anti-Catholic bias in white Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture at the time. Next, from 1937 to 1944, McLuhan taught English at St. Louis University, the Jesuit university in St. Louis, Missouri. He took a one-year leave of absence to return to Cambridge University in 1939-1940, I believe, and worked further on his doctoral dissertation on Thomas Nashe in the context of the learning of his times. He completed his dissertation in 1943. McLuhan’s dissertation has been published as the book *The Classical Trivium: The Place of Thomas Nashe in the Learning of His Time* (XII.96). As Logan notes (181), McLuhan published an article titled “The
Analogical Mirrors” in the Kenyon Review 6.3 (Summer 1944): 322-32. It’s about the Victorian Jesuit poet Gerard Manley Hopkins. (Logan incorrectly gives his name as John Manley Hopkins on page 181.) This article by McLuhan is reprinted in the book The Interior Landscape: The Literary Criticism of Marshall McLuhan 1943-1962, edited by Eugene McNamara (XII.96b: 63-73). McNamara clusters this article with five other pieces by McLuhan under the caption in the table of contents “Part One: The Nets of Analogy” (xi). As this caption indicates, McNamara finds McLuhan working with the nets of analogy in the six pieces grouped together in this section of the book. So let’s discuss analogy. G. E. R. Lloyd has published a perceptive book titled Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought (III.112). George P. Klubertanz, S.J., in philosophy at St. Louis University published the book Thomas Aquinas on Analogy: A Textual Analysis and Systematic Synthesis (XII.81a). Ralph McInerny in philosophy at the University of Notre Dame published the book The Logic of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas [Aquinas] (XII.94a). The Catholic priest and theologian David Tracy at the University of Chicago Divinity School published the book The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism (XII.161b). The Jesuit priest and theologian Donald L. Gelpi at the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley published the book Varieties of Transcendental Experience: A Study in Constructive Postmodernism (XII.50a), in which he regularly contrasts the Protestant dialectical imagination and the Catholic analogical imagination (82, 132, 164, 172, 174, 192, 193, 206, 223, 224, 280, 281, 282). As Lloyd’s study shows, argumentation by analogy was used in early Greek thought. Later on, the analogical imagination became central to Catholic thought – for example, in the thought of Thomas Aquinas. But later still, the dialectical imagination became central to American Protestant thought. Briefly, Gelpi characterizes the American Protestant dialectical imagination as displaying a uniform preference for the disjunctive, either-or thinking (82). By contrast, he characterizes the Catholic analogical imagination as seeking “as much as possible to think in both-and rather than either-or terms” (132). Unfortunately, Gelpi does not mention Perry Miller’s discussion of Ramist dialectic in his book The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (XII.100) or Ong’s far more extensive discussion of Ramist dialectic in his book Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason (XII.132) – both of which McLuhan was familiar with. In his own 1943 Cambridge University doctoral dissertation, McLuhan was concerned with detecting the influence of Ramist dialectic on Elizabethan prose styles. Historically, what Gelpi refers to as the American Protestant dialectical imagination was based on Ramist dialectic. Evidently, McLuhan became a convert to Roman Catholicism, at least in part, because he preferred the Catholic analogical imagination over the Protestant dialectical imagination. Now, in a letter to Jacques Maritain, the famous French Thomist philosopher, dated
May 6, 1969, in the Letters of Marshall McLuhan (XII.96c: 369-71), McLuhan says, “My first encounter with your work was at Cambridge University in 1934. Your Art and Scholasticism was on the reading list of the English School. It was a revelation to me. I became a Catholic in 1937” (371). McLuhan also says, “Analogy of proper proportionality . . . is a mode of awareness destroyed by literacy, since the literate man insists on visual connections where being insists on awareness” (371). Now, regardless of the beauties of the Catholic analogical imagination, I do not expect to see the analogical imagination catch on among American Protestants. In a wonderful subheading Logan refers to “McLuhan’s Anti-Academic Bias and Academe’s Anti-McLuhan Bias” (141). So here’s my take on these two “anti” biases: McLuhan was fascinated with the Catholic analogical imagination. But many academics are not fascinated with it. Logan also refers to McLuhan as a trickster figure (44). This is a really apt characterization of McLuhan. However, I would suggest that McLuhan assumed the role of a trickster figure because he understood that he was intrigued with the Catholic analogical imagination and that many people were not. In any event, McLuhan-the-trickster shifts his point of view in dazzling ways in his books The Mechanical Bride (XII.96d) and The Gutenberg Galaxy (XII.96a). In other ways, McLuhan also cultivated the trickster role as part of his public persona. (In contrast, Ong never played the trickster role. Then again, he was not as intrigued with the Catholic analogical imagination as McLuhan was. Nor was Ong an old-fashioned Thomist, as McLuhan was. Nor was Ong a technophobe, as McLuhan was. Basically, Ong was a technophile, but not an uncritical one.) Next, I want to turn to Logan’s discussion of emergence and complexity theory (113-118; 123-131). I would like to point out to Logan that in the late 1950s McLuhan read Bernard Lonergan’s book Insight: A Study of Human Understanding (X.30), in which Lonergan discusses emergent probability. But Logan does not mention Lonergan’s discussion of emergent probability. Incidentally, Lonergan also famously shifts his point of view in certain chapters – that is, he shifts from the point of view he had maintained in previous chapters. In a similar way, McLuhan famously shifts his point of view from essay to essay in his experimental books The Mechanical Bride (XII.96d) and The Gutenberg Galaxy (XII.96a). Next, I want to mention Logan’s discussion of Aristotle’s four causes (124-125). It’s fine for Logan to quote Aristotle. However, Logan does not even mention Thomas Aquinas. But we know from McLuhan’s letter to Maritain that McLuhan claimed to have read Aquinas. For an accessible account of Aquinas’s appropriation of Aristotle’s four causes, see Edward Fesser’s book Aquinas: A Beginner’s Guide (Oxford: Oneworld, 2009: 16-23). In his bibliography Logan also lists McLuhan’s article “Joyce, Aquinas, and the Poetic Process” in the journal Renascence 4.1 (1951): 3-11. But Logan does not list the book Joyce and Aquinas by William T. Noon, S.J. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1957). From the 1930s onward, the two leading centers of Thomistic philosophy in North America were Saint
Louis University and the University of Toronto. Thus for the better part of his adult life, McLuhan taught English in one or the other of the two leading centers of Thomistic philosophy in North America. Arguably Thomas Aquinas was the leading medieval Aristotelian in Western culture. As a result, Thomistic philosophy is also known as Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy. So for Logan’s purposes, it is relevant for him to examine Aristotle’s thought about the four causes. However, because McLuhan had studied Aquinas’s thought, it would also have been relevant for Logan to examine Aquinas’s thought about the four causes. In any event, McLuhan’s interest in the four causes shows that he was an old-fashioned Thomist like Maritain. However, after Vatican II, old-fashioned Thomist philosophy has been on the wane in Roman Catholic circles. In contrast to Maritain and McLuhan, Lonergan was not an old-fashioned Thomist, but a newfangled one – best described as a Lonerganian. (Teilhard and Ong were not old-fashioned Thomists, even though each of them had been trained in old-fashioned Thomist philosophy and theology as part of their Jesuit training years before Vatican II. But they were not Lonerganians either.) In his bibliography Logan does not list McLuhan’s 1943 Cambridge University doctoral dissertation, which was published in 2006 (XII.96), as noted above. Logan does list McLuhan’s article “Bacon, Ancient or Modern?” in the journal Renaissance and Reformation 10.2 (1974), but without giving the inclusive page range. But I should point out here that McLuhan served as the director of Maurice B. McNamee’s 1945 doctoral dissertation at Saint Louis University titled Bacon’s Attitude Toward Grammar and Rhetoric in the Light of the Tradition. But enough! In conclusion, Logan offers an extremely selective and uncritical view of McLuhan’s thought. A more adequate account of McLuhan’s thought would have to be more inclusive – and better informed. In addition, a more adequate account of McLuhan’s thought would have to be less uncritical. Figuratively speaking, McLuhan did not get a base hit every time he stepped to the plate. But Logan makes it sound as though McLuhan hit only grand slam home runs. Because Logan’s enthusiasm for McLuhan is so uncritical, I suspect that his book will not help rehabilitate McLuhan among academics today. But I could be mistaken about that. We’ll have to wait and see.


of the psyche). For this reason, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* could also be listed in the category on agonistic structures, as is the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius Loyola. But I prefer to list *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* in the present category on print culture because historically the Jesuit order emerged in print culture and because the Jesuit order was and is a bit different in orientation from medieval religious orders such as the Benedictines, the Franciscans, and the Dominicans. The Basque soldier and courtier Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556) was the founder of the religious order in the Roman Catholic Church known as the Society of Jesus (known informally as the Jesuit order). He is also the compiler of the minor classic work in spirituality known as the *Spiritual Exercises* (III.113). He was roughly contemporary with the French logician and educational reformer and Protestant martyr Peter Ramus (1515-1572). In his 1967 encyclopedia article titled “Humanism” (XII.122) Ong sees both the Jesuit educational movement and the Ramist educational movement as parts of the larger educational movement associated with Renaissance humanism. Concerning the Jesuit educational movement, see Pavur (XII.139); concerning the Ramist educational movement, see Hotson (XII.69; XII.72).

(XII.87a) Lynch, William F. *The Image Industries*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959. Topics: History of Rhetoric; Cultural Studies. Also see McLuhan (XII.87a); Postman (XII.143).


(XII.94a) McInerny, Ralph. *The Logic of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1961. Topics: History of Philosophy; Religious Studies. Also see Klubertanz (XII.81a); Lloyd (III.112); Tracy (XII.161b).


(XII.96) McLuhan, Marshall. *The Classical Trivium: The Place of Thomas Nashe in the Learning of His Time*. Ed. W. Terrence Gordon. Corte Madera, CA: Gingko Press, 2006. Topics: History of Rhetoric; History of Philosophy; Early Modern Studies. Also see Bercovitch (XII.5); P. Miller (XII.100); Ong (XII.129a; XII.132; XII.133). This book contains the text of Marshall McLuhan’s 1943 Cambridge University doctoral dissertation. When he was teaching English at Saint Louis University, he was working on his doctoral dissertation. At that time, Ong was in graduate studies in English and in philosophy at Saint Louis University, as part of his Jesuit educational training. McLuhan called Ong’s attention to Perry Miller’s discussion of Peter Ramus (1515-1572) and Ramist logic in his book *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (XII.100). Several years later, Ong proceeded to graduate studies in English at Harvard University, where he did his massively researched doctoral dissertation on Ramus and...
Ramus logic under Perry Miller. Ong’s dissertation, slightly revised, was published in two volumes by Harvard University Press in 1958: Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason (XII.132) and Ramus and Talon Inventory (XII.133). Ramus and Talon Inventory includes the dedication, “For Herbert Marshall McLuhan who started all this.”

(XII.96a) --- The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1962. Topics: Cultural Studies; History of Technology. A classic but flawed study of print culture. Also see Ong (XII.127a; XII.134a). Ong reviewed McLuhan’s book in the Jesuit-sponsored magazine America 107.24 (September 15, 1962): 743, 747. Ong’s review is reprinted in An Ong Reader: Challenges for Further Inquiry (XII.131: 307-08). For understandable reasons, McLuhan and Ong are often thought of as espousing similar and indeed compatible ideas. But it is important to understand that Ong is not McLuhan, just as McLuhan is not Ong. For example, in The Gutenberg Galaxy, McLuhan repeatedly refers to “retribalization” as though this hypothetical possibility were a realistic possibility. However, following a centuries-old pattern of defining something by saying what it is not, Ong famously defines secondary orality as not primary orality. He associates secondary orality (i.e., orality fostered by communication media that accentuate sound) with literate forms of thought, because literate forms of thought were involved in developing the communication media that accentuate sound. If secondary orality were the same as primary orality, then there would presumably be no point in dubbing it “secondary orality.” Moreover, if secondary orality were the same as primary orality, then McLuhan’s hypothetical “retribalization” would seem likely to occur as a matter of course. However, Ong also works with the contrast of cyclic thought versus evolutionary thought. But even the hypothetical possibility of “retribalization” would seem to imply a form of cyclic thought (i.e., return to the original oral cultural conditions that Ong refers to as primary orality). That said, McLuhan was far more widely known in the 1960s and into the 1970s than Ong was at any time in his lengthy lifetime. For a time in the 1960s and 1970s, McLuhan seemed to be ubiquitous. However, a tsunami-sized backlash of hostility among academics emerged against him. His hostile critics threw out the baby with the bath water, as they say. The backlash against McLuhan among hostile academics opened the way for Jacques Derrida, who had published three books in 1967, and deconstruction to rise to widespread popularity in certain academic circles. Moreover, just as McLuhan had been more widely known in the 1960s and 1970s than Ong was, so too Derrida became more widely known in certain academic circles from 1967 onward than Ong was at the same time or later. In short, Ong’s thought was never lionized as McLuhan’s thought was for a time or as Derrida’s thought was at a later time. Ong’s thought has never been fashionable. Perhaps Ong’s thought has never been swept
up in the spirit of the times up to the present time because he really hoped to usher in a fresh new spirit of the times. The present classified bibliography of selected works is designed to help advance this hope for a fresh new spirit of the times to emerge.


The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1939. Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies. Also see Ong (XII.132). In this classic work in American studies, Perry Miller shows that educated New England Puritans were Ramists, followers of Peter Ramus’ work in logic (also known as dialectic). Among other things, Miller reports that he found only one self-described Aristotelian in seventeenth-century New England – everybody else was a self-described Ramist. As Ong shows, before the advent of the French logician and educational reformer and Protestant martyr Peter Ramus (1515-1572), the arts course of studies in the medieval university was dominated by what was referred to as the Aristotelian tradition of logic, even when new additions were added that were not found in Aristotle’s writings about logic. The influence of the arts course of studies in the medieval university emerged before the development of the Gutenberg printing press in the 1450s. After the development of the Gutenberg printing press in the 1450s, the extensive Ramist educational movement and the extensive Jesuit educational movement and other educational developments associated with Renaissance humanism emerged that were decisively different from the arts course of studies in the medieval university. See Ong (XII.126; XII.132); Hotson (XII.69; XII.72); Pavur (XII.139).


Milton, John. A Fuller Course in the Art of Logic Conformed to the Method of Peter Ramus (Artis Logicae Plenior Institutio, ad Petri Rami Methodum Concinata). Ed. and trans. Ong and Charles J. Ermatinger. Complete Prose Works of John Milton: 1666-1682. Ed. Maurice Kelley. Vol. 8. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1982. 206-407. Topic: History of Philosophy. Also see Ong’s historical introduction (139-205). Because John Milton had studied Peter Ramus’ logic extensively enough to write a textbook based on Ramus’ work, perhaps it is not surprising that Milton announces the “logic” of his purpose in Paradise Lost as being to justify the ways of God to man, as Ong has noted. However, if it is “logical” for Milton to state his purpose in Paradise Lost, as Ong has suggested that it is, then we should note that Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), who did not
study the logic of Peter Ramus (1515-1572), states the purpose of the religious believer in this life in the section of the *Spiritual Exercises* (III.113) titled “Principle and Foundation” (standardized section number 23).


(XII.109) --- *What Happened at Vatican II.* Cambridge, MA; and London: Belknap P/Harvard UP, 2008. Topics: Church History; Religious Studies. Also see Blanshard (XII.13); James Carroll (III.21a); Jenkins (III.93). Ong completed his lengthy Jesuit training long before the Second Vatican Council in the Roman Catholic Church took place (1962-1965). Before Vatican II, the Roman Catholic Church was strongly committed to contending with modernity, as Philip Gleason (XII.52) puts it in the title of his book about Catholic higher education in the United States before
Vatican II. For a critique of the pre-Vatican II church, see Blanshard (XII.11; XII.12). Vatican II formally switched the Roman Catholic Church to taking a more irenic stance toward other religions and certain other aspects of modernity. As a result of his Jesuit training, Ong was undoubtedly equipped to join his co-religionists in contending with modernity. No doubt he had to struggle within himself to adapt to the more irenic stance taken by Vatican II. An example of Ong’s anti-Protestant zeal can be found in his spirited 1951 essay “The Lady and the Issue,” which he reprinted in 1967 in In the Human Grain: Further Explorations of Contemporary Culture (XII.124: 188-202). But Ong (II.14) was also capable of criticizing certain tendencies in the pre-Vatican II church. However, in time, he did adapt to the more irenic stance – most notably in “Voice and the Opening of Closed Systems” (XII.125: 305-41). In the systems terminology that Ong uses in this essay, the pre-Vatican II church was a closed system. But Vatican II announced that the church would move toward being an open system, or at least more open than it had been in recent centuries. Toward the end of this essay, Ong advances open closure as the ideal position that individual persons should aim to work out in their lives. According to Ong’s way of thinking, open closure would allow a person to cling strongly to his or her principles, but still be able to engage in open discussion with others. But his idea of open closure can also be extended to the church and to other organizations.

(XII.110) O’Malley, John W. and Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris, and T. Frank Kennedy, eds. The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540-1773. Toronto; Buffalo; London: U of Toronto P, 1999. Topics: Jesuit History; Cultural Studies. For other works by and/or about Jesuits (including some by Ong), see Copleston (III.34); Crowe (I.41); de Mello (I.42); Doran (X.15); Gelpi (XII.50a); Henle (IX.4a; IX.36); Klubertanz (XII.81a); Lonergan (X.30; X.30a); Loyola (III.113; XII.87); P. Mack (XII.88); McNamee (III.121); Nixon (II.12); O’Malley (XII.107; XII.108; XII.109); O’Malley, Bailey, Harris, and Kennedy (XII.111); O’Malley, Bailey, and Sale (XII.112); Ong (II.15; II.16: 99-126; VIII.12; X.39; XII.115; XII.118); Phillips (IX.63); Tade (X.46); Teilhard de Chardin (II.21; X.48); Wimsatt (I.198).


(XII.121) ---. *Hopkins, the Self, and God*. Toronto; Buffalo, NY; London: U of Toronto P, 1986 (paperback 1993). Also listed as Ong (II.15; X.40). Topics: Literary Studies; Jesuit Spirituality; Cultural Studies; Evolutionary Theory. Also see Buell (X.8a); Ong (XII.130a).


Grain (XII.124: 52-59). Topics: American Studies; Cultural Studies; History of Technology. Also see Skinner (XII.155a).


(XII.127a) ---. “Literature, Written Transmission of.” The New Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. 8. Ed. William J. McDonald et al. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. 833a-838b. Topics: Literary Studies; Cultural Studies; History of Technology. Also see Buell (XII.17a); Ong (XII.134a); Scholes and Kellogg (I.163). Reprinted as “Written Transmission of Literature” in An Ong Reader: Challenges for Further Inquiry (XII.131: 331-44). In the bibliography accompanying this encyclopedia article, Ong comments as follows on McLuhan’s The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man (XII.96a): “a racy survey, indifferent to some scholarly detail, but uniquely valuable in suggesting the sweep and depth of the
cultural and psychological changes entailed in the passage from illiteracy to print and beyond” (838b).


(XII.129a) ---. “McLuhan as Teacher: The Future is a Thing of the Past.” Journal of Communication 31.3 (1981); 129-35. Topic: Cultural Studies. Also see McLuhan (XII.96; XII.96a; XII.96b; XII.96c; XII.96d; XII.96e). When Walter J. Ong (1912-2003) was a young Jesuit scholastic in graduate studies in philosophy and in English at Saint Louis University, he encountered the talkative young Canadian Marshall McLuhan (1911-1980), who taught English there from 1937 to 1944. Not everybody was willing to listen to McLuhan, who tended to deliver monologues. But Ong listened to him willingly. Subsequently, Ong supported and promoted McLuhan’s work, at least up to a certain point. But Ong was not uncritical of McLuhan. In any event, both were part of the ferment of the 1960s and 1970s. McLuhan’s breakthrough book Understanding Media (XII.96e), along with his book The Gutenberg Galaxy (XII.96a), made McLuhan one of the more widely known intellectual figures in the 1960s and 1970s. Ong never had a breakthrough book, and he was not as widely known as McLuhan was in the 1960s and 1970s. But McLuhan’s celebrity status generated a growing number of critiques of his thought by other academics. By the time of his death, this critical reaction was strong. Nevertheless, Ong’s loyalty to his former teacher and life-long friend comes through resoundingly in “McLuhan as Teacher.”


(XII.130a) ---. “Newman’s Essay on Development in Its Intellectual Milieu.” Theological Studies 7.1 (1946): 3-45. Topics: Religious Studies; Cultural Studies. Reprinted in Ong’s Faith and Contexts: Volume Two (1992: 1-37). Also see Ker (XII.80b); Jost (XII.79a); Newman (X.36e; XII.104a); Ong
In the early 1940s, Ong was very interested in Newman’s thought.

---


---

**Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason.** Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958. Also listed as Ong (III.138; IX.59; XI.9). Topics: History of Education; History of Philosophy; History of Rhetoric; Rhetorical Theory; History of Technology. Also see Boethius (VII.3a; VII.3b); Cicero (VII.5a); Hotson (XII.69; XII.72); P. Mack (XII.89; XII.91); McLuhan (XII.96; XII.96a); Kretzmann et al. (IX.39a); Ong (XII.126; XII.133); Peter of Spain (IX.62a); Stump (IX.81b). This work is Ong’s classic study of print culture. Reprinted with a new foreword by Adrian Johns by the U of Chicago P in 2004.

---

**Ramus and Talon Inventory.** Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958. Also listed as Ong (IX.60). Topics: Early Modern Studies; History of Philosophy. Also see McLuhan (XII.96; XII.96a); Ong (XII.132). Bibliographic listing and brief description of more than 750 volumes by the French logician and educational reformer Peter Ramus (1515-1572) and his followers and related works. With the financial assistance of two Guggenhein fellowships, Ong was able to live abroad for about four years, staying in Jesuit residences. He worked in more than 100 libraries in the British Isles and Continental Europe tracking down the more than 750 volumes (mostly in Latin) listed. Concerning the verbal art known as rhetoric, see Lawrence D. Green and James J. Murphy’s *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue 1460-1700* (XII.55). For studies of Ramus and Ramism, see Feingold, Freedman, and Rother (XII.41); Freedman (XII.47); Hotson (XII.69; XII.72); P. Mack (XII.88); Milton (XII.102); Sharratt (XII.153; XII.154; XII.155).
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observation about the general import of McLuhan’s overall project in his programmatically experimental book of short exploratory essays with colorful captions: “If the human community is to retain meaningful possession of the knowledge it has accumulated, breakthrough to syntheses of a new order are absolutely essential. McLuhan aids one such breakthrough into a new interiority, which will have to include studies of communications not merely as an adjunct or sequel to human knowledge, but as this knowledge’s form and condition.” Of course Ong’s overall body of work aids another – alternative and competing -- breakthrough synthesis of a new order. In short, we should see Ong and McLuhan as engaging in what Ong terms agonistic behavior toward one another as each pursues the trajectory of the development of his own thought. In this regard, Ong is not McLuhan, just as McLuhan is not Ong. At times, the trajectory of each man’s thought appears to be parallel with the other man’s thought – and perhaps even at times complementary with the other man’s thought, so that a reader might be understandably tempted to blend one man’s thought with the other man’s thought. But I am in favor of keeping Ong’s thought separate and distinct from McLuhan’s. However, I understand that in his review of The Gutenberg Galaxy Ong was trying to give McLuhan credit where credit is due. But in the spirit of giving credit where credit is due, I want to call attention to what Ong claims in the above-quoted passage about how the human community needs to work out new syntheses of thought in order to “retain meaningful possession of the knowledge it has accumulated.” Shortly after both Ong and McLuhan had each worked out his new synthesis, it became fashionable for certain people to refer pejорatively to supposedly “dead white males” and also to supposed “male patriarchy.” Apart from being handy ways to excuse oneself from studying any of “dead white males” and from carefully examining the psychodynamics of “male patriarchy” (as Ong [III.132; III.134; III.135; III.136; III.137: 192-286], to his credit, examined with respect to male agonistic tendencies), those two expressions strike me as also obliquely expressing something of the spirit that Ong himself refers to in the above-quoted passage -- the spirit that the human community needs to work out to “retain meaningful possession of the knowledge that it has accumulated” – thanks in part to “dead white males” and also even thanks in part to “male patriarchy.” Yes, to be sure, male agonistic tendencies have tended to produce “male patriarchy” as a byproduct in the past. But we should try to avoid throwing out the baby with the bath water as we examine male agonistic tendencies. After all, when we decry examples of “male patriarchy” in the past and in the present, we are engaging our own agonistic tendencies. Now, because Ong’s own extensive examination of male agonistic tendencies is a key part of the overall new synthesis that he has offered us through the body of his work, I would suggest that he is one dead white male whose thought still deserves our attention -- and even our careful study.
(XII.135) ---. *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1971. Also listed as Ong (III.140; VII.24). Topics: History of Rhetoric; Cultural Studies; History of Technology. Reprints two important studies by Ong about Ramus and Ramism (142-64 and 165-89). Regarding the Romantic Movement in literature and the arts, also see Benoit (XII.4b); Farrell (XII.37b); Hoeveler (XII.68b); Veeder (XII.163b).


(XII.139) Pavur, Claude, trans. *The Ratio Studiorum: The Official Plan for Jesuit Education* [Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Iesu]. St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005. Topics: History of Jesuit Education; Early Modern Studies. In his 1967 encyclopedia entry titled “Humanism” (XII.122), meaning Renaissance humanism, Ong sees the Jesuit educational movement as part of the larger educational movement of Renaissance humanism, just as he sees the Ramist educational movement as part of Renaissance humanism. Over 50 years of collaborative Jesuit effort went into producing this 1599 document, which was preceded by earlier versions in 1586 and 1591. Concerning Jesuit higher education in the United States, see Kathleen A, Mahoney’s *Catholic Higher Education in Protestant America: The Jesuits and Harvard in the Age of the University* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003).


(XII.143) Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin Books, 2006. Accessible. Also listed as Postman (I.151). Topics: Cultural Studies; History of Technology; History of Rhetoric. Also see Lynch (XII.87a); McLuhan (XII.96d; XII.96e); Riesman (XII.147a). This book includes two fine chapters on the historical development of print culture, plus a cogent analysis of what Ong refers to as secondary orality today.


As is well known, Sigmund Freud discusses three stages of psycho-sexual development: (1) the oral stage; (2) the anal stage; (3) the genital stage. Freud’s point is that all humans at all times have had the three psycho-sexual stages to traverse on a personal level. But Erich Fromm’s counter-point is that at different times and in different places social conditioning has worked to shape the character types that have emerged around each of the three stages of psycho-sexual development. In *The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the Changing American Character*, originally published in 1950, Riesman discusses three character types: (1) the outer-directed character type (also known as tradition-directed); (2) the inner-directed character type; (3) the other-directed character type. As Riesman shows, all three of these character types have been represented in American culture in the twentieth century. In effect, this makes American culture a microcosm of world today, but not necessarily a microcosm of the percentages of each character type in various cultures around the world today. However, from colonial times onward, the prestige culture in American culture has been dominated by inner-directed character types. Both Riesman and Fromm were inner-directed types, and both worried about the emerging other-directed character types. But to understand the emerging other-directed character types better than Riesman and Fromm did, I would suggest that each of Riesman’s character types builds on one of Freud’s stages of psycho-sexual development: (1) Riesman’s outer-directed character type builds on Freud’s oral stage of psycho-sexual development; (2) Riesman’s inner-directed character type builds on Freud’s anal stage of psycho-sexual development; (3) Riesman’s other-directed character type builds on Freud’s genital stage of psycho-sexual development. Riesman’s outer-directed character type is the default character type of all humanity at all times. This character type basically lives in and is oriented by what Ong (I.143) describes as the world-as-event sense of life. For example, the world-as-event sense of life permeates the Hebrew Bible and the ancient Hebrew conceptual construct of the covenant. Arguably, the spirit of the covenant expressed by the ancient Hebrew prophets Amos, Isaiah of Jerusalem, and Hosea is the most enduring conceptual legacy of the Hebrew Bible for the world today. Of course good and evil and admixtures of them can be found among outer-directed persons at all times, including the ancient Hebrews. Riesman’s inner-directed character type emerged historically in the Western world with the advent of ancient Greek philosophy as exemplified by Plato and Aristotle. This character type basically lives in and is oriented by what Ong describes as the world-as-view sense of life. In Ong’s estimate, the world-as-view sense of life was enormously expanded in Western culture by the development of the Gutenberg printing press in the 1450s, which had a powerful impact on the development of American culture from colonial times down to the present. Arguably, modern capitalism capitalizes on inner-directed character types,
and so does modern science. Of course good and evil and admixtures of them can be found among inner-directed persons. The other-directed character type is a more recent development in Western culture. With Ong, we can see Martin Buber’s I-thou communication (I.24) as desirable and perhaps as the optimal form of expression of other-directed persons. In conclusion, the central challenge we Americans face today culturally involves learning how to access and actuate the powerful genital stage of psycho-sexual development not just in our personal lives, but also in our social lives. I do not see this challenge as an invitation to engage in orgies or in serial hook ups, both of which have been around for centuries regardless of the character types in the cultures. On the contrary, I see this challenge as calling for deeper and more personal relationships than orgies or serial hook ups typically involve. In short, we should work toward optimally forms of other-directedness involving I-thou communication.
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