

Arriving in Cosmopolis

Philip McShane

The need to create sound syntheses and systematizations of knowledge, to be taught in the “Faculty of Culture,” will call out a kind of scientific genius which hitherto has existed only as an aberration: the genius for integration. Of necessity this means specialization, as all creative effort inevitably does; but this time, the man will be specialized in the construction of the whole.¹

I begin this short presentation with Ortega y Gasset for various reasons. On a previous occasion when I was cordially invited to speak south of the Border of the United States - in Bogotá - I gathered energy from Ortega y Gasset’s perspective on circumstances and wrote “Hacia una oscuridad luminosa de las circunstancias: *Insight*, cuarenta años después.”² Now it is a decade later, and I am reaching back fifty years to pick up on the stand of Bernard Lonergan, indeed as he stood with me, at Eastertime of 1961, under an unknown and grimy painting by Caravaggio³ in a Dublin Jesuit residence, the painting later to be discovered and priced in the millions of dollars. Lonergan remains to be discovered and priced.

“Lonergan remains to be discovered and priced.” That surely is a strange stand of mine, and it certainly requires justification. I hope to do so in this essay, but in a positive and hopeful manner, one which is associated with my audience in their reach for a global future. But we shall come to that slowly. Meantime, back to Lonergan and Ortega y Gasset in a homely fashion, in a context that emerges from some preliminary asides.

I think that it is important for us to be clear on this homeliness from the start. This is a sad and homely reflection of my eightieth year on the non-discovery of Lonergan in a world of settled Western staleness. In an essay titled “Systematics: A Language of the Heart,” presented unheard at a Lonergan Workshop in Boston in the mid 1990s, I added in a section from a fictitious Chinese Dictionary of Theology from 2500 A.D. regarding a later oriental discovery of Lonergan.⁴ Below I will add a fanciful account of Cosmopolis in 9011 A.D. - fanciful, yet hopefully closing on and opening to that later global reality.

First, then, I would insist that this is a popular talk, and I leave to a footnote to comment

¹J. Ortega y Gasset, *Mission of the University*, translated with an Introduction by Howard Lee Nostrand, Princeton University Press, 1944.

² *Universitas Philosophica* 32, (June, 1999): 11-41. The English version, “Towards a Luminous Darkness of Circumstances. *Insight* after Forty Years” is available at <http://www.philipmcsane.ca/archive2.pdf>

³The painting was identified as a lost original some decades later, during a house-cleaning. Lonergan’s after-dinner standing stand regarded the sad state of post-Tridentine Catholic studies. See note 18 below.

⁴The fiction is to be found at pages 72ff of chapter 5, “Systematics : A Language of the Heart” of *The Redress of Poise*, <http://www.philipmcsane.ca/redress.pdf>

on that tricky question, especially as it relates to many of Lonergan's lectures.⁵ I would like my talk to lead to effective discussion of shifts in our hopes and attitudes, and I think that in this I am tuning into the mood of our gathering. We cannot, for instance, move along in these few days as if we were not surrounded by problematic government, mismanaged finance, poverty, drug cartels. We each have our own local versions of what Lonergan wrote of sixty years ago, when he brooded over the longer cycle of global decline and what might be done about that "monster [- or should I say mobster?! -] that has stood forth in our day."⁶

You find it strange now that, in this popular talk, I shift to what seems a remote question, the question "What is Physics?" But it loses its remoteness in popular conversation, in the talk of "the masses,"⁷ since the reply there is more about results - energy, travel, gadgets, war - than about academic progress in that simplest, yet apparently most difficult, science. For the academic specialist at present, the focus is on the Standard Model. We would have that focus lifted into a pragmatic realism of human history. Physics, then, is the reality of that zone of inquiry within history. It is something that is taught and applied, and the teaching and application is measured by local needs. What am I suggesting here? I am suggesting that realism is with the masses and not with the masters, and the issue of popular talk is one of "the integral heuristic structure of proportionate"⁸ physics. So, one is led to place the usual Standard Model within a larger

⁵Popular talk is, to a large extent, in the eye of the beholder. I treat of the challenge of such talk in the conclusion of chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, Axial Publishing, 2007. How does a community of serious understanding mediate a rhythmic lift of daytime talk? My paper can be read foundationally of course, but I refrain from technical complexities. From the Halifax lectures on, most of Lonergan's public lectures were popular talk in this sense, vulnerable to *haute vulgarization*, something he condemned strongly (see e.g. *CWL* 6, 121, 155). *Method in Theology* is vulnerable popular talk; *Insight* is vulnerable doctrinal talk. See, further, note 7 below. Positive fantasy bubbles out below from notes 9, 10, 11.

⁶*Method in Theology*, 40.

⁷There is an obvious reference here to Ortega's *The Revolt of the Masses*. But I would note that Ortega's notion of the masses was quite complex. Chapters 6 and 8 of the book are directly on the topic, but also chapter 12 on "The Barbarism of Specialization." Saul Bellow, in his Foreword to the translation, neatly sums up Ortega and also the problem of the changes in the meaning of *mass man* since Ortega's time. "Ortega when he speaks of the mass man does not refer to the proletariat: he does not mean us to think of any social class whatever. To him the mass man is an altogether new human type. Lawyers in the courtroom, judges on the bench, surgeons bending over anaesthetized patients, international bankers, men of science, millionaires.... differ in no important respect from TV repair men, clerks in Army-Navy stores, municipal fire-inspectors, or bartenders. It is Ortega's view that we in the West live under a dictatorship of the common place." (*The Revolt of the Masses*, translated by Anthony Kerrigan, edited by Kenneth Moore, with a Foreword by Saul Bellow, University of Notre Dame Press, 1985, p. ix). Much of Lonergan scholarship is done by mass men inviting Lonergan into such a commonplace, not at all the talk envisaged in note 5 above. The problem of that talk is raised in profound doctrinal fashion in the first section of *Insight* chapter 17.

⁸*Insight*, 416, the final lines. Here I am sliding past the challenge of the full definition of meta-physics, which includes effective implementation. Indeed, I am doing so right through this paper: my focus is on the explanatory conception and scientific affirmation that is pre-required for global effectiveness. The statement in functional terms helps: "It is in this final stage that theological reflection bears fruit. Without the first seven stages, there is no fruit to be borne. But without the last the first seven are in vain, for they fail to mature." (*Method in Theology*, 355).

standard model, one that holds the full dynamics of physics within a dynamics of human progress.

What is that dynamics of human progress? In an era of decline, of human fragmentation and stupidity and malice, the question seems to have no answer. Indeed, is that not the state of play with this question whether one entertains the thinking of *Mission of the University* or the thinking of *Insight*? In between the writing of those two works we had the physics of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Within these two works there is no developed answer to that question of physics.

We could, were this a large book, spread our interests to chemistry and zoology, to human studies, literatures, technologies, arts. At least in the core of the arts that survive decline, the question seizes and seethes, “What is the dynamics of human progress?” And the answer is **there**, in that first word, **What**: but let us not go **there** for the moment.⁹ Even if we could: go there, and BE there - *Da Sein* - asking the question about - about about about¹⁰ - the question, “Die Frage nach der Frage”¹¹ - Lonergan, Heidegger, Coreth, and a host of others, poets, peasants and philosophers, all are helpless now and for the foreseeable future. D.H. Lawrence has it right: “The Perfectibility of Man! Ah heaven, what a dreary theme!”¹² The seething can take to the streets and seize cities, as in North Africa this year. But what is to sustain that seething and seizing, when, after and before all, that seething’s inner sustenance is boosted by axial physics and chemistry weaved into economic myths of democracy carved out by axial superegos: sick mixes of arms and demand.

⁹“Going there” raises, as do the next two notes, the issue of a massive cultural shift which certainly is beyond popularization. **WHAT** points to the incarnate unknown quest that you are: every schoolboy’s nose, and every eldergirl’s. How are we to turn about that ineffable mystery in coming millennia? The turnabout is to involve a new language. We must reach, in attending to The Question, somewhat like the Korean poetess did in her poem on *The Question* that I quote in *Bridgepoise* 3, “Liberal Arts: The Core of Future Science: Part One.” <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/bridgepoise-03.pdf> (*Bridgepoise* 10 is “Liberal Arts as the Core of Future Science: Part Two,” <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/bridgepoise-10.pdf>).

¹⁰ (about)³, a phrase of the *Cantower* series, express this with frightening remoteness. Might we envisage a rich linguistic feedback (see *Method in Theology*, 88, note 34) that would seed a new talk, a **HOW**-Language that would solve the problem posed in *Insight* 17, section 1.

¹¹“The question about the question.” A regular refrain in in Emerich Coreth, *Metaphysik. Eine methodisch-systematische Grundlegung*, Innsbruck-Vienna-Munich: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1961. Lonergan’s critique of the book is in chapter 13 of *Collection*. But we must fantasize a quite new and strange *Grundlegung*, a radiance of talk that would make talk, and its molecules, the **Home Of Wonder**, edging towards the eschatological reality of the Word made fresh, homing among us, everlastingly.

¹²Quoted as frontispiece in John Passmore, *The Perfectibility of Man*, Duckworth, London, 1970.

The press, taken in its fullness, were all over this crisis for a week or so, and then came the earthquake in Japan: better news, stormy images of death. And so on, “so it goes,”¹³ into the 21st century. And so we can come to the sad tail and tale of Ortega y Gasset’s hopeless flight of hope into his imagined university. It is, it seems to me, worth reading that sad ending fully, not now of Europe, but of Mexico and Columbia and their dozen cartels, their myriad hovels and hells.

Ortega y Gasset has moved in these last pages from the mission of the university to the mission of journalism, a mission that he talks of as forsaken when in fact it was never there. But he is wonderously pessimistic of the supposed mission. Even rescued from money as motive, “kept chastely aloof from any influence of money in their opinions - the press would still, of itself, forsake its proper mission and paint the world inside out.”¹⁴ So now, let us read his conclusion to the book, marveling at his naivety, which in subtle self-deception we, in this room, share. But I return to that discomforting point after our reading.

“Not a little of the grotesque and general upset of our age - (for Europe has been going along for some time now with her head on the ground and her plebeian feet waving in the air) - is the result of the unchallenged sway of the press as sole ‘spiritual power.’

It is a question of life and death for Europe to put this ridiculous situation to rights. And if this is to be done the university must intervene, as the university, in current affairs, treating the great themes of the day from its own point of view: cultural, professional, and scientific.¹⁵ ... The university must assert itself as a major ‘spiritual power,’ higher than the press, standing for serenity in the midst of frenzy, for seriousness and the grasp of intellect in the face of frivolity and unashamed stupidity”¹⁶

Is this not sadly comic, then and now? “The university must intervene.” About fifteen years later Lonergan reads this paragraph and continues his brooding on being, on being himself with others, “What in earth is to be done?”¹⁷ As the 1940s turned into the 1950s he moves towards articulating the problem at a quite different “level of the times,”¹⁸ and reaches darkly for

¹³A phrase used regular by Kurt Vonnegut Jr. to end chapters. Does it not echo the ethos of mass man? (See note 7 above).

¹⁴*Mission of the University*, 98.

¹⁵An Author’s Note is added here by Ortega: “It is inconceivable, for example, that in the face of a problem such as that of foreign exchange, which now preoccupies Spain, the university should be offering the serious public a course on this difficult economic question.” In our time the inconceivable is the failure of academic economics to arrive at a clear view of the gross immorality of derivatives etc. But it cannot arrive at that perspective without correcting its own gross yet simple error in the beginning of all texts on economics: there are two types of firms - not the one type assumed in standard diagrams - in any economy beyond the primitive’s fruit gathering. The error leads all the way to the present financial shambles.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 98-99.

¹⁷I quote the conclusion of a lengthy letter of 1935 to his superior. The letter is reproduced in full in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010

¹⁸*Method in Theology*, 350. As with the notion of “the masses”, so Ortega’s notion of “The Level of the

a solution that would be way beyond the reach of the university, way beyond the desperation of his own minding in 1953.¹⁹ How much beyond him, tired and sick at 64 when he began to think of the book he needed to write, was the global fantasy that I am to indulge in shortly here? Not an easy question to answer. Even after 55 years of struggling with his meaning, I am astonished at his reach. He wrote the book *Method in Theology* tiredly and, as it were, closed it from himself when finished. In the Rice interviews he remarked that he was leaving that work to his disciples. I take a sad risky stand in claiming that his disciples - including myself - have failed him outrageously.

So I return, as I promised, to Ortega, “marveling at his naivety, which in subtle self-deception we, in this room, share.” In his work, *Historical Reason*, he makes the blunt remark, “Philosophy died a long time ago - although its mummy and its skeleton, for generations past, have been on display at certain regular hours in the Faculties of Philosophies.”²⁰ Nor did he resurrect the Greek or Medieval surge: a topic we slide over here. But our topic, circumstantially,²¹ is raised just before that statement:

“The question is, Why are you here? I mean why is each of you here now? This is not a joke. The question is more serious than it appears.” It is more serious because there is a serious crisis. I would like to think that within us, as, in his own way, in the Spanish Celt,²² Ortega,

Times” (the title of chapter 3 of *The Revolt of the Masses* : see note 7 above) is quite a complex business. That complexity does not appear in *Mission of the University*, which, likely enough, would seem to be the only book of Ortega that Lonergan read. [Interestingly, according to Fred Crowe, the copy I have on loan from him is likely the actual copy Lonergan read in the late 1940s]. Lonergan made the phrase his own, without the complications Ortega had entered into in the previous book (*The Revolt* was written before the lectures given in *Mission*, though both have publication dates 1930. See note 1 on page 35 of *Mission*.). Lonergan would have picked up Ortega’s phrase from such a compact expression as “each generation takes its place not in some chance location, but directly and squarely upon the preceding one. This comes to mean that man lives, perforce, *at the level of his time*, and more particularly *at the level of the ideas of his time*” (*Mission*, 57: the italics are in the text). My conversations with Lonergan in Easter 1961 touched on this problem. He spoke heatedly of the backwardness of theology that took hold especially after the Council of Trent: his neat phrase at the time still echoes in the neuromolecules of my hearing, “big frogs in little ponds.” A discomfiting part of his own view came out quite bluntly in a question session of the mid-1970s at a Boston workshop. When asked how much physics a theologian should know he replied, “Well, he should be able to read Lindsay and Margenau.” That book, *Foundations of Physics*, was a book of which he had his own copy, digested and cherished. On this, see chapter 10 of the Lambert-McShane Biography.

¹⁹I regularly symbolized the desperate plea by referring to 29 references to collaboration in the ten pages (740-50) at the end *Insight*. Recently Bob Henman, to whom thanks is due, did a recount, finding 34 occurrences of *collaboration* and 2 occurrences of *collaborate* in those ten pages.

²⁰*Historical Reason*, translated by Philip W. Silver, Norton, New York, 1984, 193.

²¹See note 2 above. For an account of Ortega’s view see Julian Marias, *Jose Ortega y Gasset, Circumstances and Vocation*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1970, 353-365. Ortega’s notion is rich, but it is not at all in the same ball park of Lonergan’s view of providence, luck, the coincidental. I make this remark in passing, anticipating the comments below in note 65.

²²Ortega’s self-identification occurs in the context of his reflection, relevant here, on the University of Jena, 1790-1825: *The Dehumanization of Art*, Princeton University Press, 1968, 171-72. “I, who am a little Celt-Iberian, born on the arid Mediterranean plateau at an altitude of 2,400 feet above sea level (the average altitude of Africa) - I cannot hear that name without trembling. The Jena of that period signifies a fabulous treasury of lofty mental

there is “an aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origins. The aesthetic apprehension of the group’s origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides, or acts - and especially in a crisis.”²³ Our topic and our crisis is the forty years of neglecting and dodging the final great insight of Lonergan. No doubt some of you came here with other agenda, but that is mine and I would have you share it. So I pose the question of our purpose here, and, to quote Ortega again, “I hope you will not find it impertinent since I myself am going to try and answer it as best I can.”²⁴

But I wish to answer it in the strange manner of identifying a terminal value: why are you here? Could it be that our hearts reach out to the realm of Cosmopolis? And if that is the case, might we not envisage that realm, however distant? But now I write in strenuous chemical foundational fantasy, infested with complex schedules of recurrence-schemes, of a later time in the longer cycle of incline. The tenth millennium, perhaps,²⁵ will be refinedly effective in its efforts “to protect the future against the rationalization of abuses and the creation of myths.”²⁶ Is this fantasy totally off the wall?

Let us return to that agony of *Insight* chapter seven, section 8. Cosmopolis was there given characteristics,²⁷ and here I wish us to push our fantasy so as to breed in our psyches images of character statistics, regular occurrences of patterns of neurochemical patterns that are to be an inner dynamic towards making our human pacings on “the earth, and every common sight, take on the glory and the freshness of a dream,”²⁸ a vivid anticipation of the eschatological life of “Infinite Surprise.”²⁹

So, to the agony we may add an ecstasy of envisaging “Common Sense as Object” of concern of subjects-as-subjects.³⁰ But I would note that the adding is no mean task: it is a task of kataphatic contemplation, not mystical but molecular, and it will take generations to sense and taste.

incitements. Is it not a terrible symptom of Weimar’s impenetrability that, though it is not a dozen miles from Jena, Jena never managed to affect Weimar in the slightest?” We might shift the context for our self-identification to universities of 1990-2025 with which we are familiar.

²³B. Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 230.

²⁴*Historical Reason*, 193: just prior to the question above, posed by him.

²⁵I think especially here of the transformed New Covenant when money is luminously a promise, cherished globally as an interpersonal loveliness. See my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, chapters 3 and 4.

²⁶*Insight*, 265.

²⁷ In *Joistings* 22, “Reviewing Mathews’ *Lonergan’s Quest and Ours*” I bring out the identity of the reach of Cosmopolis and the reach of functional collaboration. <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/joist-22.pdf>

²⁸*Insight*, 556.

²⁹The final two words of the Epilogue, “Being and Loneliness”, of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations: Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*, <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/wealth.pdf>

³⁰See *Phenomenology and Logic*, the index on *Subject*.

I have regularly, in recent years, written of “a hundred years or so”³¹ and once of five hundred years after the fading of Lonergan’s pointers.³² But I have also written of the past of 13.7 billion years, of a human future under the sun of 2000 billion years hence, of an eschatological future that is limitlessly surprising for all of us, and of an all of us that could go on increasing, an open road to an infinity of humans. Such suggestions require neurodynamic ingesting to reach lodgment, and it is slow, blossoming from such an Episode as that of the emergence of “the genius for integration” mentioned in the initial quotation. “Episodes that are destined for long-term memory are not lodged there straight away. The process of laying them down permanently takes up to two years.”³³

I would now have you fancy, and indeed that for a couple of neuro-maturing years, not the micro-time of a century or the macro-time of an eschaton, but the meso-time of the climb to the tenth millennium, to the year 9011.

The suggestion relates to the book I outlined, Prefaced and Introduced in the essay *FuSe Zero* that began my 25 seminars on functional collaboration.³⁴ But let me elaborate a little here, road-mapping towards a psychic vortex. Let us imagine, THEN³⁵ and then, a population of 10,000,000,000 on the earth at that later stage of meaning, and push on with my optimism to fancy that there would be roughly 250,000,000 Tower People, people who embrace the world “theoretically” in its full sense,³⁶ integral **characters**.³⁷

First I invite you to muse over the model I have used in teaching, these past years, where I was led by thinking of Gandhi’s India of 10,000 villages. Suppose that there is a functional researcher in every village:³⁸ so, 10,000 researchers. Correspondingly I think of 10,000

³¹A regular theme in the poetry of Patrick Kavanagh. It dominates my website book of 2008, *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*. <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/lonergansmodel.html>

³²I am repeating the point made at note 4 above. *The Redress of Poise*, Chapter 5, “Systematics: A Language of the Heart” contains this imaginative reach, beginning in the text after note 8.

³³Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix pb, 2002, 268.

³⁴Four seminars per year, ending in 2018: the first eight, sequentially in the usual list of specialties, on general categories; the second eight dealing with the special categories of Christian thought; the third eight focusing on the special categories of global religiosity. The final, 25th, seminar, is a seminar of unscheduled length, to deal heuristically with the integral pilgrim and the eschatological reality of our communal effort. *FuSe 0 “A Simple Appeal For Functional Collaboration,”* <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/fuse-00.pdf>

³⁵*Cantower 5* is titled “Metaphysics, THEN”, pointing to a lift of fantasy needed to rise to a new paradigm of global thinking. It begins with the two final poems of Samuel Beckett. [1] “go where never before / no sooner there than there always / no matter where never before / no sooner there than there always” ; [2] “go end there / where never till then / till as much as to say / no matter where / no matter when “ <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/cantower5.pdf>

³⁶See *Insight 442*.

³⁷Recall the beginning of *Magna Moralia* and section 1 of *MIT*, chapter 14, to which I have referred too often on the nature of **character**.

³⁸Recall *For A New Political Economy*, 37: “it will make the practical economist as familiar a professional figure....” and ditto the functional researcher.

members of the eighth specialty, mediated executives of meaning. Then we have to imagine, with some realism, the other communities of the Tower, and in my model I settle for less people as we fancy our way up in the cycle to dialectic: so, 1000 Interpreters and 100 functional historians per 10,000 villages, and then a dialectic community of 10 dialecticians. Correspondingly, I envisage 10 foundational persons, 100 people focused on policy, 1000 people modifying the standard model of a genetic system of Pragmatics. At the end of the cycle we arrive again at the 10,000 villages each with their glocal³⁹ meaning-executive. The numbers estimated add up to 22,220, the number of people caring, in Cosmopolis fashion, for the 10,000 villages. Is this enough structured care? But that question needs a more concrete context to which I return shortly.

Before that I now shift the image from village to population and up-scale the proportions: 222,200,000 tower people caring cyclically for 10 billion. A simple matter, this, of upping the number of Tower people to a quarter of a billion or 250 million. That gives 250 Carers - recall Plato and his guardians of Athens - per 10,000 people or, with a little mathematical juggling, what comes to 1 functional researcher per 100 people.

We could and should push for a more realistic number, so that the Tower Community would be increased for fuller effectiveness. We are looking for a solution to “the problem of general history, which is the real catch,”⁴⁰ and we arrive at the heuristic notion of the topologically-complex Tower moving upwards on the plane of the Standard Model.⁴¹

Identically we are looking towards the methodological solution to the problem of *Cosmopolis*: the functional collaboration adequately populated, in a culture of care and leisure.⁴² To get further in our push for a more realistic view of numbers, we need various shifts of perspective, treated elsewhere at greater length.⁴³

One has to envisage, Tower-WISE, in a concrete schedule of probabilities, the shift to a novel format of specializing that is to be generated by fully luminous generalized empirical method,⁴⁴ and its educational equivalent, the Childout Principle, “when teaching children geometry, one is teaching children children.”⁴⁵ First there is the tandem process in any discipline; then there is the metaphysical context of each endeavour. The standard Model of UV

³⁹Not a new word of mine: it has been around for some time, bringing together the view expressed in the slogan “think globally, act locally.” The slogan has a much more refined meaning in our context.

⁴⁰ *Topics in Education*, 236

⁴¹See Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, (Axial Publishing, 2010): the last of the Lonergan Images 160-163.

⁴²See *For A New Political Economy*: the index on *leisure*.

⁴³Perhaps the neatest reference I can give here is to the recent (2010) book from Axial Publishing, *Sane Economics and Fusionism*.

⁴⁴See *A Third Collection*, 141, the top lines, a massively important shift from the simpler view of *Insight*.

⁴⁵See *Cantower* 41, “Functional Policy.” <http://www.philipmcschane.ca/cantower41.pdf>

+ GS + FS is to be a presence in the tower community: again, a topic requiring much larger treatment than is possible here.⁴⁶

We next need to build these shifts into a major creative shift in our imaging of the plane of common meaning.⁴⁷ The creativity especially relates to the divisions of labour of the academy that “matured” into disciplines especially in the 19th and 20th centuries, a “maturity” in conflict with the normativity of *Insight's* “theoretical understanding seeks to embrace the universe,”⁴⁸ but, more deeply, in conflict with the pilgrims’ progress.

We seem to be talking here of a subgroup of humanity within a culture of serious understanding, be it Towering or somehow in the plane of common meanings. BUT that culture of understanding is to be, minimally, such a cultural presence as is the periodic table in present culture, and more generous musings are to see and seize on, effectively, a global psychic resonance that lifts town-and-gown into the psychic presence of mystery talked of in the first section of *Insight* 17. There is, then, THEN, a movement towards, as *Insight* chapter 20 has it, “living human bodies linked together ... in the intelligently controlled performance of the tasks of world order.”⁴⁹ How strange that control will be is quite beyond our present fantasy: a billion half-acre gardens, perhaps, with nano- and micro- and bio-mimetic- technologies giving the average ten occupants of each garden a global intimacy and a local sufficiency? Will money have disappeared, as Lonergan suggests in *For A New Political Economy*?⁵⁰ What certainly will be established globally is a **New Covenant of Promise** : so, we have to innovate a deep new meaning of *Transition* in the title of chapter 3 of *For A New Political Economy*. **Concomitance**, the key word in the index of that book,⁵¹ becomes an operative democratic reality.⁵²

This is altogether too compact a naming of the fruit of eight millennia of dedicated creativity. And there are a legion of other aspects to this dynamic of progress, but I should halt abruptly, and, as I move to a conclusion, turning briefly to a need of our time.

⁴⁶A decent introductory account is given in section 3 of *FuSe* 10, “**FS + UV + GS**”
<http://www.philipmcshane.ca/fuse-10.pdf>

⁴⁷It is useful to think of this shift as going from section 1 of *Method in Theology*, ch. 14, “Meaning and Ontology”, to section 2, “Common Meaning and Ontology”

⁴⁸*Insight*, 442.

⁴⁹*Insight*, 745.

⁵⁰“Nor is it impossible that further developments in science should make small units self-sufficient on an ultra-modern standard of living to eliminate commerce and industry, to transform agriculture into a superchemistry, to clear away finance and even money, to make economic solidarity a memory, and power over nature the only difference between high civilization and primitive gardening.” (*For A New Political Economy*, 20)

⁵¹See, there, the Introduction to the Index, which may yet lead us to read, breed, and breath that entry, and savour the conclusion of that Introduction in a global poesis borrowed from Wordsworth: “And now I see with eye serene, the very pulse of the machine”

⁵²Grapple with the sophisticated image of oscillations of global credit in *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, chapter 6.

That need is expressed as the effective envisagement of a diagrammatic support system, one we cultured folk must strain fantastically to live by and accept as identifying scandals of our entrapments. a geo-historical imaging of an ongoing, overlapping, intertwining land-zones and sea-zones and mind-zones that sublates Lonergan's talk of ongoing contexts, the ongoing genesis of methods, the unyielding operative presence of the two canons of explanation.

And I would emphasize again, and finally, the task of fantasy. Not at all enough has been dreamed or thought or said about the towering task of foundational fantasy required : dreamed and thought and said within those diagrammatic icefields, in terms of realistic heuristic schedules of probability of recurrence-schemes, and of a heuristic realism that is to be ongoingly concretized by the three specialties that follow foundations, that feed into communications of the C₉ type, that give spherical⁵³ feedback to the functional researchers, in and out of the Tower, so generating, through baton-exchanges in the cycle of specialties, "cumulative and progressive results."⁵⁴

These may seem dense ramblings for a popular talk, but their commonsense intussusceptions can generate a mood, an ethos, an ethic of hope and effort. Might we, gathered here in Puebla, pick up on the "genius for integration" of Ortega's quotation, as I have identified that genius both in its originator and in the genius of future millennia? So, we are back with Ortega's question, "Why are we here?" but now with the intimation of a larger context and a global future.

Here is not just us in Puebla today but within the doings of Lonergan studies in this summer of 2011 and in the next million years.⁵⁵

But my here of writing was Vancouver Canada on St. Patrick's Day 2011, and my circumstances were the finishing that day of my seminar answers to questions posed.⁵⁶ I paused

⁵³I use the word *spherical* here to recall the concrete heuristic needed, minded, but obviously the full heuristic of the groups would be tuned to real detailed asymmetries: the thinking is geographic, land-sea, city, mountains etc. Think, in tentative heuristic, of structures of fixed communications over the land mass (30% of total surface area of the earth) of 150 million square kilometers (or 57 million square miles).

⁵⁴*Method in Theology*, 4, 5. I note that I have minimized mention of religion here, natural or supernatural, and continue to do so throughout the first eight seminars, though it is not easily avoided. There is a growing ethos of a psychic acceptance of "a friendly universe" (*Method in Theology*, 117, line 13) which is not just *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*, (Robley Whitson, New York, 1971)

⁵⁵That Lonergan was sympathetic to my longer view is not readily acknowledged. I cannot resist noting his sympathy being edited out in *Caring for Meaning* (p.56), where he speaks of McShane's long-term optimism of a million years. His remarks were replaced by words more palatable to the editors. I introduced the million-year notion in Chapter 6 of Lonergan's *Challenge to the University and the Economy*, titled "An Improbable Christian Vision and the Economic Rhythms of the Second Million Years". Incidentally the copy of the text on the Website is a photocopy of Lonergan's own copy, now in the Archives in Toronto. There are some delightful markings in it. I particularly like thinking of his minding as he marked Beckett's comment on the reception of Joyce's *Work in Progress*: "Here is direct expression, pages and pages of it. And if you don't understand it, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is because you are too decadent to receive it.... the rapid skimming and absorption of the scant cream of sense is made possible by what I may call a continuous process of copious intellectual salivation."

⁵⁶On the seminars, see <http://www.sgeme.org/BlogEngine/>

and poised over how to envisage our here of three months later, and a concluding asking about where we might intend to go from that later here. Circumstances provided the beginning of an answer from me, the same answer as I give today to the group involved in the first seminar. So why not just place that answer here, to be here-there, later, on James Joyce's's Bloomsday of 2011. I therefore do that: placing Question 9, with its answer, in the text immediately between star-lines. I do not modify the text, so you find repetitions, for which I do not apologize: a second reading is a fresh beginning. Nor do I apologize for my bluntness regarding the movement with which I am - should I say mistakenly? - associated. I have been silent too long.

9. Might I ask where we are going, not just in this seminar, but in the series? It just does not seem to fit in with the general drive of Lonergan Studies.

This is the central question that should in fact be emerging in each of us in growing luminosity. "Where are we going?": that was the question that hung over Lonergan through the decades from 1930 on. "What in earth is to be done?" was the version that he posed, vigorously, to his Jesuit intellectual community in 1935.⁵⁷ He posed it with equal vigour regarding modern life in Insight 7, section 8. He got the basic heuristic of the answer in February 1965.⁵⁸ Where are we going? We are trying to get a grip on that page in its broader reach towards an integral global science that is to be effective. Such effectiveness is to be in massive contrast to the putterings of present philosophy and theology. "Philosophy died a long time ago - although its mummy and its skeleton, for generations past, have been on display at certain hours in the Faculties of Philosophy."⁵⁹ And by chance, by circumstance,⁶⁰ that quotation about philosophy is preceded in his text by the following:

"The question is, Why are you here? I mean why is each of you here now? This is not a joke. The question is more serious than it appears." It is more serious because there is a serious crisis. I would like to think that within us, as in the "little Celt-Iberian," Ortega, there is "an aesthetic apprehension of the group's origins. The aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides, or acts - and especially in a crisis."⁶¹ Our topic and our crisis is the forty years of neglecting and dodging that final great insight of Lonergan. No doubt some of you came here with other agenda, but that is mine and I would have you share it. So I entertain the question of "where we are going" and ask you to do the same, and, to quote Ortega again, from the same place "I hope you will not find

⁵⁷The question is posed at the end of a letter to his superior, reproduced in full in the Lambert-McShane biography, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, 144-154.

⁵⁸Lonergan's brilliant scribbled page is reproduced in the Lambert-McShane biography, p.160.

⁵⁹Ortega y Gasset, *Historical Reason*, Norton, New York, 1984, 193.

⁶⁰A word of significance for Ortega: see note 21 above.

⁶¹Lonergan, *Topics in Education*, 230.

it impertinent since I myself am going to try and answer it as best I can." Each of us has his or her destination, and I would like to think that, even those who are primarily observers, will sympathize with my answer, even wave it about.

Where are we going? We are going to disrupt the settledness of the Lonergan community in its neglect of functional collaboration. How are we to do that? Well, first of all there is the modest proposal of Lonergan about "the crucial experiment": "it will make conversion a topic," where the conversion is to the implementation of functional collaboration.⁶²

I pointed out the power and significance of functional collaboration in Musicology at the Florida Conference of 1970, and was optimistic about a follow-up to Lonergan's Gregorianum Article of 1969 on functional specialization. Nothing happened, nor did the appearance of that article as chapter 5 of *Method* cause a stir. I gave similar pointers in the following decades regarding various zones like economics, ecology, law, linguistic, aesthetics, physics, sports. My colleagues moved gaily - or grimly - on their same old same mold. In my eightieth year I have tired of this silence, so I make a beginning in this 25-seminar reflection on Functional Collaboration that is to continue through the next six years.

But might we expect side effects to this effort? I would be interested in suggestions about this. Obviously, voicing the challenge could be effective, especially if it also voices a request as to the reason why no attempt of consequence has occurred. Was Lonergan wrong in this suggested division of labour? Or is it really only a convenient division of one's own labour: a sort of filing system? It would be nice to hear either claim made publically, coherently, or better still: made in the context of a personal venture down through *Method*, 250.

Lonergan did not make a mistake, nor did he invent a filing system. Indeed, one can see his achievement as one that makes him foster-father to something the history is at present mothering. Moreover, the mothering is axiomatically independent of the "Grounds of the Division"⁶³ and it provides a dynamic towards the discovery of those grounds. When the dynamic is implemented across disciplines, it will slowly lead to common foundations relatively identical to those named on *Method* 286-8, or doctrinally presented in *Insight*.

Might there be something done to hasten that implementation? Perhaps Lonergan students might try for some dialogue on the matter with friends in other disciplines? But then they would surely have to have some conviction about the relevance in their own areas of interest. Still, what about you? We are back to Ortega's question. "The question is, Why are you here? I mean why is each of you here now? This is not a joke. The question is more serious than

⁶²*Method in Theology*, 253. I note that Lonergan does not include functional collaboration in his list (1) - (9) of categories of *Method*, 286-7. I regularly add to that list a number (10) that does this. Also I regularly point out, discomfotingly, the paragraph that follows the list, in which Lonergan points out that, with a grip on these categories, "One can go on" to re-write the first half of *Method* in explanatory terms, a most discomfoting nudge to his present followers.

⁶³The title of *Method in Theology*, chapter 5, section 3.

it appears." If you have a flicker of a conviction, might you not reach out to convince others? Indeed, even if I only annoy you, you might reach out: "Do you see what that crazy Irishman is doing now? Twenty five seminars to end after his 86th birthday! Let's hope he doesn't last the first year :)!"

There are lots of other pointers and suggestions, but perhaps they could come from someone else in richer fashion? Or they are made elsewhere by me in these seminars, with its concomitant series of 80 FuSes: for instance, there is the answer, That we are going to be "Arriving in Cosmopolis" in the 10th millennium, a view to be presented in Puebla, Mexico, meeting of June 16th - 18th. An equivalent point is made in the concluding half of FuSe 9, "What is Functional Research?" Then there is the problem of developing a perspective on directing the next generation where we did not venture ourselves: into genuine theory and into functional collaboration. There is the task of building a sane perspective on economics slowly into the global dynamic. And so on.

At any rate, this would seem a good place to end the question-session for the Feast of St. Patrick.

Such was the providence of my Celtic day and the open breaking of my silence. I have of course, written and spoken out over these past five decades, especially since the Florida Conference. I was indeed, on the edge of openness when I completed my little book, *Sane Economics and Fusionism*. The final chapter, "From Florida (1970) to Fusionism (2010)" move to suggest pressings needs, but I diplomatically cut the reflection short.⁶⁴ Here, also, I cut my reflections short, but now in the hope that my audience would pick up on envisaging effectively the task of salvaging the globe, each in their own little way, like our "little Celt-Iberian." I would note, however, that my use of the Ibero-Celt Ortega was not in any way a pointing towards learned comparison: Learned comparison of Ortega and Lonergan is no more relevant than comparing James Joyce to Lonergan.⁶⁵ So it pleases me to end my St. Patrick's Day writing

⁶⁴Of course, I have been undiplomatic before this. The concluding paragraph of *A Brief History of Tongue* (Axial Publishing, 1998: but the chapter was written in 1994 and published in the *Method Journal*) reads as follows: "Lonergan is now ten years dead: we could do him honour by burying Lonerganism and moving in dread filled detailed seriousness towards the inner foothills of positional and positional being in a concrete concern with the luminous flow of consciousness." Since then I have come up with various suggestions for the name of a movement in history: *Fusionism*, *Lobbyism*? Perhaps some neat title could emerge from Spanish, Korean, Zulu? But, yes, *Lonerganism* needs burying.

⁶⁵This is a large and difficult topic. Perhaps it is a help to note that *Comparison* in its scientific sense is a component of the work named on *Method* 250. Comparison, as I have done above, is a matter of effective popularization. Comparison, as it is done in Lonergan studies, has to be replaced by the precise detection of positive and negative anomalies, a detection that is a central topic of the first seminar, on Functional Research. See *FuSe* 9, "What is Functional Research?" <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/fuse-09.pdf> Ortega never reached a viewpoint that resonates with Lonergan's Position. He showed no sign of advancing seriously on his early *Psychological Investigations* (translated by Jorge Garcia Gomez, Norton and Co, New York, 1987. The original lectures stem from

with the end of that short book, and the abrupt end of its final chapter. There I list needs and comment briefly on them. They may help orientate our searchings.

“[1] there is the need for an honest effective acknowledgment in the present and the next generation of Lonergan teachers that our background just did not prepare us for this shocking shift;

[2] there is the honest research into Lonergan’s work that would reveal, within Lonergan’s full Insight-paradigm-shift, stuff that cuts off light-weight comparative work;

[3] there is the lifting of that research into the context of the functional paradigm shift;

[4] there is the revelation to be had from the effort to implement concretely the fruits of that functional shift.

Should I comment on these? I resist the temptation: I have been eloquent about all of these needs at various stages in the past fifty years. Nor do I see any value in enlarging on the sad, if subtle, commitment to non-explanatory meaning that pervades the volumes I mentioned. The sadness reaches destructively into the next generations, for the legitimate unexpressed desire in so many for a viewpoint at the level of the times is frustrated. I can only appeal to each of us to ask, “Is it I?”, in relation to my dialectic and foundational accusation of our settling for rich description, and comparisons of rich descriptions, in place of the desperate global need of the exercise of either of Lonergan’s canons of explanation.”⁶⁶

the period of the 1st World War). Might I dare claim that neither Ortega nor the multitude of writers that are pulled in for comparative work by Lonergan scholars is positionally self-luminous?

⁶⁶*Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publications, 2010, 93.