

LETTER FROM PHILIP MCSHANE TO ROBERT HENMAN

June 27, 2020

For the most part, the followers of Lorenz miss entirely the immense  
key challenge of the two major works of Lorenz: for Insight there  
the emergent form is a humiliated formless of process seized and  
the end of chapter <sup>15</sup> Further was brutally marked on the first of pp 69-70.  
In Methods (ch 10 verse 5) There is the ~~completion~~

Revelation of the completion of a full circle (see 1954 question  
"What is program?" and put in circle of genetic left ~~of Lorenz~~ into  
a statistic of success: (see Randomness 237) - the rest of that  
may angles, in case of mutation by the ever most subtle "instinct" of  
the guardianship of M105.

I would note that we were left all-Work-Functional. They are  
Simply rejections of a central and classic descriptive theology: (1)  
its failure to its discoveries into the genetic control requested by  
"understanding the object" (Interpretation "from A to Z"); (2) its failure  
to force meaning (the kindly M) of behavior of exhibiting the  
sculpt-planch into the knitting challenge).

Why the rejections? [1] The shocking ~~stability~~ of the  
monograph post (Insight left) [2] the more-than-stocking  
story of self-expose of M105.

For most of my senior challenge exhibiting is a dash into a psychic  
world of recess potentials, our recess of SKY of the revelation.

## TRANSCRIPTION OF THE LETTER<sup>†</sup>

For the most part, the followers of Lonergan miss entirely the unique key challenge of the two major works of Lonergan.<sup>1</sup> In *Insight* there [is] the emergent focus on a luminous genetics of progress seeded at the end of Chapter 15 and brutally narrated on the turn of pp. 609–10. In *Method* (Ch. 10, verse 5)<sup>2</sup> there is the heuristics of the completion of a full circle (see *1934* question: “What is progress?”<sup>3</sup> and find in cycle of genetic lifts layered into a statistics of success: (See *Randomness* 237)—the rest of that essay dangles, in need of insertion by the ever more subtle “knotting” of the guardianship of M10<sup>5</sup>.)

I would note that both these lift[s] are non-functional. They are simply rejections of a centuries’ old closed descriptive theology: (i) its failure to [lift] its discoveries into the genetic control required by “understanding the object” (*Interpretation from A to Z*); (ii) its failure to face making (The knotting M10<sup>5</sup> business of sublating the Kuhn-Planck [problem] into the knotting challenge.)

Why the rejections? [1] the shocking settledness of the monograph poise (*Insight* 604) [2] the more-than-shocking dodging of self-expose[ure] of M10<sup>5</sup>.

For most of my senior colleagues entering is a crash into a psychic wall of neuro patterns, onion rings of self of the *moi intime*.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>†</sup> Transcribed by Patrick Brown, James Duffy, Robert Henman, and Terrance Quinn. Parentheses and bracketed numbers were used by McShane in the original letter. The bracketed letters, words, and footnotes have been added by the editors.

<sup>1</sup> [McShane had written about the same key challenge in the Afterword to the “The Ontological Structure of the Hermeneutic Circle,” *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 14 (2020): 129–131, <https://journals.library.mun.ca/ojs/index.php/jmda/issue/view/149>.]

<sup>2</sup> [A reference to *Method in Theology*, Chapter 10, Section 5: “Dialectic: The Structure.” In the text that follows in the letter, McShane abbreviates this section using the symbol M10<sup>5</sup>.]

<sup>3</sup> [A reference to Lonergan’s essay “Essay in Fundamental Sociology,” in *Archival Material: Early Papers on History*, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, vol. 25, eds. Robert M. Doran and John D. Dadosky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019) 9.]

<sup>4</sup> [A reference to chapter 15 of *Insight*, where Lonergan writes that “while the dramatic pattern of one person dealing with other persons draws upon all one’s resources, still it subdivides, like successive coatings in an onion, into a series of zones from the ego or *moi intime* to the outer rind of the persona.” CWL 3, 495.]