

## **Assembling the Assembly**

{This, and the following essay, may seem a break-away from the search of the previous essays, but they weave forward from them towards determining a precise “resolute and effective intervention in this historical process” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, 306) through patterning the July 2019 Conference in Vancouver. The problem is, of course, the actuality of “effective”: I suspect that the conference will not attract the “usual” Lonergan scholars or students, but there is the future of the visibility of decay in the midst of their old-style work and towards that future visibility the focus on the final paragraph of section 5 of chapter 10 of *Method in Theology* seems, at present, our best shot at a wake-up call}.

### **Introductory Comments**

The problem presented to me, leading to this essay, was a problem of deliberation, that zone of minding dealt with all too briefly by the tradition. It must have taken Archimedes a while to get his Screw-up of Water. The screw-up that is suggested here took quite a bit of messing and muddling: “How do I get the attention of the stale Lonergan school?” was a central issue. My eventual answer was: focus, and get others to focus, on that brilliant section 5 of chapter 10: “Dialectic: The Structure,” and make the focus precise. My battle-claim is that it is not at all scientific to blatantly dodge the solution to a central problem of a science, the problem raised in the second part of [Æcornomics 3](#): “A Common Quest Manifesto.”

On I go here, then, with my guidance for my team of six—“in order of appearance at the conference”—myself, Sandy Gillis, James Duffy, Terry Quinn, Bob Henman and Bill Zanardi. Our efforts around the first and second objectifications of what I call *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture* will be made available to those attending the July 8–12 Conference of 2019 in Vancouver, and they too will be invited to have their shot at these objectifications. The conference will thus ferment forward to a version of the “final objectification” mentioned there, an objectification that in the cycle gives rise to the baton exchange to foundational people. That it is a brilliant strategy cooked up by a genius is quite obvious to me; that its dodging for 46 years by Lonergan’s so-called followers disgusts me should grow obvious in them.

### **1. A Beginning**

I start, as do my colleagues, with [Æcornomics 3](#): “A Common Quest Manifesto” as the *Assembled* novel piece. I have the advantage of this piece being originated by me, and we shall see as we go along in what sense *advantage* is meant.<sup>1</sup> What I proposed to us as a group is the

---

<sup>1</sup> There is my obvious advantage of being longer on the job. I read page 250 in 1971, when indexing the book. I got serious about it at the beginning of this millennium, as you’ll note from the next footnote. But the advantages swing back and forth between us, as we’ll see throughout this exercise. We will come, this year, this decade, this millennium, to cherish the *a priori* aspect of the challenge. In a profound sense the exercise is like the television program, *Chopped*, (which began in 2009), a cooking show where what is *Assembled* for the participants is an odd basket of cookables. The recipes are in the hands and glands of the competitors and

tackling of this without, “out of,” the full context of the other five operations required of the dialectician.<sup>2</sup> The context chosen is, thus, simply that of the three objectifications described in the concluding paragraph of Lonergan’s instructions on the structure of dialectic.<sup>3</sup>

“Out of” is the tricky phrase here, and its trickiness is brought forth by noting that my position is one in which “out of” is heuristically negated by Lonergan’s and my meanings of the first words of chapter 2 of *Method in Theology*: “What is good, always is concrete.” Note, then, that there is a parallel trickiness in the piece of the procedure of *Completion* that “picks out.”<sup>4</sup> It is not really an “outing” but an identification<sup>5</sup> that facilitates “the exactitude with which each minor increment to our knowing is effected.”<sup>6</sup> It is as well to give the entire ending to that chapter nine of *Insight*, from which I have quoted.

All we know is somehow with us; it is present and operative within our knowing; but it lurks behind the scenes, and it reveals itself only in the exactitude with which each minor increment to our knowing is effected. The **business** of the human mind in this life seems to be, not contemplation of what we know but relentless devotion to the task of adding increments to a merely habitual knowledge.

Pause now over that **business** comment and sniff around it in your stretched and strained fantasyland, getting by with a little help from your friends. Are you thinking of Aristotle’s opposition to Peter Drucker?<sup>7</sup> Might you think of Lonergan’s 1934 puzzling in—I quote the ‘inn’ shortly—his straining entertaining of the question, “What is Progress?”<sup>8</sup> Should I type his answer once more, to bump up my neuromolecules? Yes, indeed, momentarily, “a moment in the rose-garden.”<sup>9</sup> Should you read it again, freshly—like von Karajan with the gaps and overlaps of the

---

“being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities” (*Method in Theology* [1972] 53, lines 4–5).

<sup>2</sup> The 5 operations, after *Assembly*, are *Completion*, *Comparison*, *Reduction*, *Classification*, *Selection*. They will be dealt with freshly by me on the morning of Monday, July 8<sup>th</sup>. My previous stumblings in the area, of more than a decade ago, are available on the website in the 8 essays of [Sofdaware](#) and the 21 essays titled [Quodlibets](#).

<sup>3</sup> Cutting off the first three lines of this paragraph leaves me, in the 1972 edition, with lines 18 to 33 of page 250: so did I arrive at the title *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*. Of course, Tchaikovsky’s *1812 Overture* was on my mind, last witnessed by me, canons and smoke and all, in the Albert Hall, London. Might this effort of Lonergan symbolize a stopping of the Napoleonic madness of present Christian theology?

<sup>4</sup> *Method in Theology*, 250, line 4.

<sup>5</sup> See *Insight*, 582, on the problem of identification. I lift the problem into a functional and performative context in Section 3, “Identifications” of [Cantower 3](#), “Round One Willing Gathering.”

<sup>6</sup> *Insight*, 303.

<sup>7</sup> The question can be put simply: was Drucker into a science? How does that fit into Aristotle’s view of science? The question, however, is massively complex and relates to a precise reading of the phrase “bolder spirits” at the beginning of the second paragraph of *Method in Theology*, chapter one. Jump, perhaps, to note 53.

<sup>8</sup> *Essay in Fundamental Sociology*, available in Michael Shute, *Lonergan’s Early Economic Research*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, 20. The essay of 1934 (16–44) is very central to Lonergan’s already clear view of a globally effective scientific effort, one dodged by the vast majority of his disciples. Add here Shute’s second volume: *Lonergan’s Discovery of the Science of Economics*, of the same press and year.

<sup>9</sup> The reference is to T. S. Eliot’s *Four Quartets: Burnt Norton*, but it points to a distant hope of integral aesthetic searching and living, such as I expressed in [Economics 2](#), “The Pedagogy of Trading Between Nations,” which points towards a luminous re-compacting of the consciousness of the first time of the

symphonies of Beethoven—startled with the gaps and the overlap of meanings and leanings of 1934, 1950, 1969? “What on earth is to be done?”<sup>10</sup> to give “is effective” a decent statistical distribution? How conjure up globally a “relentless devotion to the task of adding” to habitual and effective cyclic knowledge?

“But we are not there yet,”<sup>11</sup> and *conjuring* is indeed the name of the game. We need, so to speak, more than relentless devotion to, so to speak, *Æcornomimik*; we need an ache-horn of relentless devotion, blowing Isaiah’s notes.<sup>12</sup> The task of adding increments will, much later in history, become curiously routine, as in modern physics, when the acorn is a vigorous little plant in the global what-soil. Then the rolling stone will gather *nomos*<sup>13</sup> in a hugely smooth and delicate weighing of candidates for refined progress.<sup>14</sup> So we come to type and read again, hungered up now and leaning leanly in and on the end of the ninth chapter of *Insight*, on the end of *Loneragan’s 1833 Overture*.

It is a matter of intellect. Intellect is understanding of sensible data. It is the guiding form, statistically effective, of human action transforming the sensible data of life. Finally, it is a fresh intellectual synthesis understanding the new situation created by the old intellectual form and providing a statistically effective form for the next cycle of human action that will bring forth in reality the incompleteness of the later act of intellect by setting it new problems.<sup>15</sup>

---

temporal subject, beyond axial fragmentations, to an integral rise and rose garden of global care. On the two time of the temporal subject see *The Triune God: Systematics*, CWL 12, 403.

<sup>10</sup> I quote from the end of a relevant 1935 letter of Loneragan to a superior. The letter is reproduced in full in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Loneragan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publishing, 2010, 144–54.

<sup>11</sup> *For a New Political Economy*, CWL 21, 20. The statement begins a paragraph of over a page in length that is pertinent to the present issue. The paragraph ends thus: “That was titanothore’s attitude to brain, and titanathore is extinct” (21). **That** is the counterpositional attitude we are opposing scientifically in the present exercise.

<sup>12</sup> I am referring here to the conclusion of the essay cited in note 8. Loneragan cites the full passage of *Isaiah* 2 2–4, and thus ends, “... Nations shall not lift up sword against nation: neither shall they be exercised any more in war.” Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine, indeed, if it were no figure.” (p. 44). Later here (note 53), in thinking of engineering such a poise, I recall the slogan that emerged in my paper for the Helsinki Conference (June, 2019) on “Sustainability and Peaceful Coexistence”: The PEM is mightier than the Sword.” PEM points to *Progress Effectively Mantelled*. On the way there is the need to dismantle the axial idiocies of the negative Anthropocene.

<sup>13</sup> “A Rolling Stone Gathers *Nomos*” is the title of chapter 5 of *Economics for Everyone* (Axial Publishing, 2017) and chapter 3 of *A Brief History of Tongue* (Axial Publishing, 1998). They point to the full scientific structuring of economics and linguistics. In the latter book there is a relevant discussion in the next chapter, “Thoughts, Tongues and Tides,” in section 4.4 titled “Mos and Nomos”.

<sup>14</sup> Here, clearly, my advantage shows: I have been trying to envisage this dynamics since Loneragan spoke to me of the structure in the summer of 1966. Your advantage is that I have laid a decent trail. The advantage you have fades if you are not tuned to a scientific attitude, one symbolized in note 16 below. There is a post-axial issue here, a positive Anthropocene poise that would be a global ethos of adult growth. Try fantasizing a culture where conversing is dominated by the neuromolecularity of a  $y = x^2$  minding-growth equation ( $y$  being growth and  $x$  being age). I am leaving it thus modest, nothing like a seriously normative growth equation  $y = e^x$ . Imagine you becoming thus enlightened so that you could not explain your self to yourself of a month ago? Think what this does to the inclusion of belief (See *Insight*, 703–18) in the dynamics of science.

<sup>15</sup> The continuation of the text referred to note 8 above.

“A statistically effective form for the next cycle of human action”: where—LOL—does that leave Aristotle or Drucker or the crowd in between, when your context is, yes,  $\{M(W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$ ? Your context? Yes, indeed, if you are in the story mind-search setting of the Nun’s Story as vigorously opposed to the “None’s Story,”<sup>16</sup> sharing thus the sets of sets of genetic sets of equations as first year physics students might share, a glimpse in the I, a sublation of Feynman’s view of **The Principle of Least Action** into a cosmic heuristic.<sup>17</sup> I am talking here about the remote heuristic that would lift the acorn, the ache-horn, the cell of the end-Axial heuristic “from the generic functioning of the initial cell to the flexible circle of ranges of schemes of the mature type”<sup>18</sup> and typer and typing, and symbolizations, that would ground a global chant, “theology possesses.”<sup>19</sup>

I could go on here, sketching our climbing, through four paragraphs on the operator,<sup>20</sup> to a strange situation-meshed “law of effect”<sup>21</sup> that graces our finitude: but I must bear in mind and bare seedingly and seethingly in our minds “the exactitude with which each minor increment to our knowing is effected.”<sup>22</sup>

So, backed by my tortuous—“*Experto crede*”<sup>23</sup>—deliberation and consent,<sup>24</sup> there follows the choice that “picks out” a single piece of my “Common Quest Manifesto”: a precise scientific

---

<sup>16</sup> I refer to [Vignette 20](#), “The None’s Story”, the story of *Haute Vulgarization* (see *CWL* 6, 121, 155) as a poise, a poisoning of present theology, bundled round, not the fiber of symbolizations (see note 38 below), but the delusional geohistorical enriching of initial meanings. The “nun’s story” is introduced early in the *Vignette* series: a true story of a nun in my physics class of 1959–60 who had the psychic reach of a serious scientific searcher. Of course, neither of us knew at the time that we were engaged only in the elementary side of the science of engineering. See note 53 below.

<sup>17</sup> Feynman has a subtle presentation of the Principle early in the first volume of his three-volume *Lectures in Physics*. See also note 17 of the here-relevant chapter 10, “The Dominant Context of Lonergan’s Life,” of the book cited in note 10. There I point to Eddington’s struggle with the Principle. A context for slow ontic and phyletic ingestion of the full project is the series of seven (0–6) website essays on [Tinctures of System](#). The final, sixth, essay might be considered my full positioning in the present essay: *Tinctures of System* 6: “ $\{M(W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$  Converging the Fifth Column: I Crest My Case.” But it needs to be wrapped round, ingestively rapt round, note 53.

<sup>18</sup> *Insight*, 491.

<sup>19</sup> I might claim that the drive of my five essays on *Convergence in Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education* vol. 30, no. 1 (2019), unknown to me as I climbed slowly there, was towards glimpsing the heuristic lift needed, through active global Convergence, of these words of Lonergan, an assertion of possession that was for him, at the time, an ambitious normative hopefilled prolepsis. See note 47.

<sup>20</sup> *Insight*, 490, the last four paragraphs of section 15.7.2, “Organic Development.”

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 492, line 1.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 303.

<sup>23</sup> “To discover such terms and relations is a lengthy process of trial and error. *Experto crede*. To justify them, one cannot reproduce the tedious blind efforts that led to them” (*For a New Political Economy*, *CWL* 21, 112, at the end of four dense methodological pages of 1943). Lonergan saved me lots of detours, but the following note points to a messy area of slow and startling discovery, which found its way into the Helsinki paper presented in [Economics 5](#): “Structuring the Reach towards the Future.”

<sup>24</sup> The key reference here is to the “sixty three articles in a row” (*Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, *CWL* 1, 94) of the *Prima secundae*, of which six are on deliberation (*Questio* 14) and four are on consent (*Questio* 15). For years I have encouraged people to tackle this “run” by dining out. From the time a menu is received to the time it is given back, one goes through the personal data of the sixty-three articles. But recent work, connected especially with Archimedes’ Screw, revealed to me how lightly deliberation has been treated in the entire tradition, right up to *Insight*, where it is skimpily handled in chapter

failure, where the focus is on the generic failure and not on the precise science. The failure is that of the supposed scientific community surrounding Lonergan's *Opera*—should we call it *Fiddler on the Roof*?—when presented with the solution to his problem in *Insight*. Let us pause over the beginning of that page-long paragraph.

It may be asked in what department of theology the historical aspect of development might be treated, and I would like to suggest that it may possess peculiar relevance to a treatise on the mystical body of Christ. For in any theological treatise a distinction may be drawn between a material element and a formal element: the material element is supplied by scriptural and patristic texts and by dogmatic pronouncements; the formal element, that makes a treatise a treatise, consists in the pattern of terms and relations through which the materials may be embraced in a single coherent view.<sup>25</sup>

Might I remind us, and the followers of Lonergan, that “theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view”?<sup>26</sup> That the bent of genetic humanity is to “fuse into a single explanation”?<sup>27</sup>

The reminding, to be effective—to seed global implementation—demands the luminous lift of the cycles of 1934 and the twistings of 1949–53 into the exacting “business”<sup>28</sup> of *Lonergan's 1833 Overture* of the early 1970s. But that effectiveness pivots on “cajoling or forcing attention.”<sup>29</sup> So, I step back from Everest's thin air to a base camp of embarrassment. Humanity's task is a “task of adding increments.”<sup>30</sup> Might it help to think of it as parallel to the task of the acorn or the sunflower seed weaving upwards in early daze?

So, we arrive at the suggestion that we can think forward—about, round and about, vaguely—of the “task of adding increments” as a genetic process, the law of effect nudging one global cluster of lonely molecules towards a lessening of loneliness? But I am leaping again: rather, should I not suggest that knowing the increments of our going and growing is a daily or decadelong growing thing? Then the suggestion has to be to this day and to this decade, given, “the keys to: given,”<sup>31</sup> in a way that so forces the reluctant attention of non-scientific Lonergan scholarship that its embarrassment fires up to effective blushing in some few?

---

18 (but recall the rush to Rome which messed up Lonergan's project: see his letter on the point in the book mentioned in note 10: page 156) and not indexed. *Deliberation* is mentioned in its various forms in Patrick Byrne's *The Ethics of Discernment. Lonergan's Foundations for Ethics*, University of Toronto Press, 2016, and indexed thus, but it does not face the hairy mammoth task: that is a task to be twirled into the forward specialties, reaching for an effective global future of care. As they stand, the last three specialties are a massive cultural weak spot in the *Isaiah* project recalled in note 12 above. Think of Archimedes' scientific climb to engineering water-lifting. We are challenged to lift global culture—ho ho recall Donald Trump's slogan—out of the present swamp of common sense arrogance, ignorance, greed and mismanagement.

<sup>25</sup> *Insight*, 763. The secular issue, the general categorial issue, is a philosophy of the geohistory of philosophies of history.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 442.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 610.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 303.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 423.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 303.

<sup>31</sup> James Joyce, *Finnegan's Wake*, the final lines. The reference is not casual. Are we not poised in this final chapter, seeking a freshening of symbolic words—such as was mentioned before note 16,  $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$ —in

## 2. Shooting at the First Objectification, but Only in Helpful Descriptiveness

### (1) The Immediate Context

The immediate context for all of us is obviously the first half of the page 250 of *Method* (1972), clipped off conveniently so that we, “different operators,” are initially casual about our “different horizons,” ignore the tasks of *Comparison*, *Reduction*, *Classification*, and just do a moody *Completion*—a cousin of consenting<sup>32</sup>—and a skimpy *Selection* that helps us into the first objectification.

My moody *Completion* is neatly captured in the conclusion of the essay, *A Common Quest Manifesto*: “I am tired of your disgusting non-scientific silence.” So, I pick, not “one hundred and one good things” but one bad thing. There are, of course, good things in the story of Lonergan studies, but I need to get down to the “**business**” of effecting, in one grossly bad thing, a “minor increment.”<sup>33</sup> Minor? I leave that quotation as it is merely to remind you that the mature cyclic operation will seldom involve major increments.<sup>34</sup> Here, however, we are, indeed, involved in the pragmatics of a major Anthropocene shift.

My skimpy *Selection* brings you towards seeing that. I select that failure of Lonergan studies to approve of, or oppose, or modify, my centrally-relevant solution to Lonergan’s problem of locating the treatise on the mystical body.

### (2) The First Objectification

I—and I suggest we all—aim at simplicity and bluntness here. **My** positioning regards and guards intellectual conversion, and that in the simple sense that hovers over all half-decent scientific inquiry. No need for me, then, to get into my take on Lonergan’s canons of inquiry or of hermeneutics. I simply note that my identification of the treatise on the mystical body as the

---

our tasks of inventing the mother of all science and care? “Using the device of anastomosis, Joyce attempts, in the last chapter of his last work, to bridge all the great ontological chasms.” (Margot Norris, ‘The Last Chapter of *Finnegans Wake*: Stephen Finds His Mother’, *James Joyce Quarterly* (25) 1987–88, p. 11). It seems fitting to end here as I ended chapter 2 of *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2006)—the chapter has the same title as the book. “The hole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting *Love’s Sweet Mystery* into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of Mother.”

<sup>32</sup> Recall note 24 above and its problems of minding and mouthing. Read now the top of page 250, minding with mouth open Lonergan’s fantasy dance of deliberation. Page 250 then shines forth as the slimmest of hints regarding and guarding, in ever more refined deliberation, the cyclic changes of global menus of schools and governments, banks and ballparks, songs and symbols, bedrooms and headrooms.

<sup>33</sup> *Insight*, 303. The fourth last line of chapter 2. But notice now the lift of your reading, meshed with a new slant on page 250 of *Method in Theology*. Add in the fresh poise that is the remembering of the future which identifies luminously the missing transcendental, “be adventurous,” lurking in the compact chat of Lonergan regarding transcendentals at the top of page 53 of *Method in Theology*: “Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities.” Recall note 1 above.

<sup>34</sup> Let us slowly get into the oddities of the future, e.g., as they lurk in the number 4 of the dense expression  $\{M(W_3)^{0\Phi T}\}^4$  that I have been repeating here. Our problem is to get *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture* effective. But I like to make a point about our stumbling after Lonergan. In the recent *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* article “[Method in Theology: From  \$\[1 + 1/n\]^{nx}\$  to  \$\{M\(W\_3\)^{0\Phi T}\}^4\$ ” you need to detect the oddity of the failure of Pat Brown, Terry Quinn and me to get at Lonergan’s 1954 meaning of  \$\[1 + 1/n\]^{nx}\$ . Is the apparently more complex  \$\{M\(W\_3\)^{0\Phi T}\}^4\$  just a cyclic shadow of a fullness in the genius’s pre-functional vision of 1954?](#)

fruit of *Comparison* has not been “tried and found wanting.”<sup>35</sup> Further, there is no need for me to get into the complex character of integral intellectual conversion.<sup>36</sup> I hold my objectification down to poises that “are incompatible”<sup>37</sup> with normal intellectual honesty.

But details are unavoidable in the real context of this dialectic meeting of minders. “Each investigator proceeds to distinguish” and that proceeding and distinguishing, if they are not already somehow manifestly backed, need here the thematic of an existential backing. One does not ramble into a physics seminar on field theories and remark, “I don’t like fiber-bundle formulations”<sup>38</sup>: one’s credentials have to be shared. So there is a narrative aspect to positioning, adding meaning to “at pains”<sup>39</sup>: it pains people to furnish *voraussetzungen* especially if, up till then, “their inquiry was *voraussetzunglos*.”<sup>40</sup> Positioning requires the implicit bio-addendum, “and I know what I am talking about.”

So, we arrive, or rather I arrive at my one bad thing: “The Lonergan experts’ ignoring of my claimed scientific advance is disgustingly counterpositional, and I know what I am talking about.” That knowing emerges in the next section here, but it can be located in the first objectification if thought of significance there.

### (3) The Second Objectification

Back I must go, then, to “operate on the material”<sup>41</sup> so as to display the heuristics of developing positions and shrinking counterpositions. This is not at all an easy task. Indeed, this is the extreme of the “another sense in which it is quite difficult to be at home in transcendental method.”<sup>42</sup> It is, indeed, functionally, a home-invasion of my foundational neighbors, say, Sue or Slim. But the cyclic task, the leaning, the “Come Thy Kingdom,” cajoles us to give our best shot in fantasy, feeling, Faith-folly. Where is my position to lead, both positively and by exposing effectively the hot shots stuck in old destructive ways and meannesses? I have the advantage here of stuff previously conjured up, all the way to a heuristics of the tenth millennium<sup>43</sup> and

---

<sup>35</sup> *Insight*, 95: I am quoting phrase from the canon of selection. But does it not bring to mind Chesterton, and Lonergan’s reference to him in *CWL* 15 in writing of the dodges of present economics: see there page 95 and note 120. Is my solution to Lonergan’s problem something that fits with “thought hard and not tried”?

<sup>36</sup> The question of such an integral poise is raised in the website series of 56 essays, [Questions and Answers](#), at [Question 36](#), “An Appeal to Fred Lawrence and other Elders.” This series is relevant to identifying the counterpositions. See, e.g. [Question 42](#), “The Shift to Science in Scripture Studies,” and [Question 43](#), “The Parting of the Ways in Lonergan Studies.” There are positional indicators there also: e.g. [Question 51](#), “You Make my Skin Caul”, and [Question 56](#), “Breaking Forward to Global Care”.

<sup>37</sup> *Method in Theology*, 250, line 23.

<sup>38</sup> See section 3.1.1, “The Fiber Bundle Formulation”, pages 64–70 Richard Healey, *Gauging What’s Real. The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, Oxford University Press, 2007. Am I serious, you muse, with such an invitation? Recall Lonergan: “You should be able to read Lindsay and Margenau!” Are we not trying to gauge what’s real, what is to be real? But at least pause now over what is perhaps your objection: “I do not like formulae in theology: who needs  $W_3$  stuff?”

<sup>39</sup> *Method in Theology*, 193, “at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay all his cards on the table”.

<sup>40</sup> *Insight*, 600.

<sup>41</sup> *Method in Theology*, 250, line 25.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>43</sup> See the website article “[Arriving in Cosmopolis](#).”

indeed, of the *Eschaton*.<sup>44</sup> Do I attempt then, in my document of the two objectifications, to elaborate on the heuristics?

Here we must cling as luminously as we can to the huge heuristic poise of “what is good, always is concrete.”<sup>45</sup> Think politics; think committee meetings where sides are taken. There are six of us positioned in different ways against an implicitly opposed large group. We weave forward together, in consultation, our second—and indeed our first—objectifications, to suit cunningly the reach for progress. For instance, is there much point in the first five of us taking up the issue of a genetic control of meaning when our tail gunner, Zanardi, is armed to the tomes?<sup>46</sup>

#### (4) The Third Objectification

This final objectification obviously requires that we each finish the first two, backed later by some of those attending the July conference. But there is a snag here that relates to this being Acorn-daze work and not the mature enterprise that we, with luck, are battling to set up. We are pushing towards the setting up of a new model of theology, philosophy, indeed of the entire academy and its cycling through global common sense.<sup>47</sup> It is to be humanity in the New Key of the positive Anthropocene. It is not a model on the runway, but a mind-model, a “third way difficult and laborious,”<sup>48</sup> to be brought by tottering initiations and imitations into slim—Slim and Sue’s foundational—effectiveness<sup>49</sup> in the next 50 years of crises. “It is a model that can be imitated only by shifting to a new key”<sup>50</sup> of global care among all global institutions.<sup>51</sup> The immediate snag of our conference gathering is that the students of its originator are solidly

---

<sup>44</sup> See section 20 of “Insight and the Trivialization of History,” *Divyadaan. Journal of Philosophy and Education*, vol. 28, no. 1, (2017), 125–28.

<sup>45</sup> *Method in Theology*, 27.

<sup>46</sup> William Zanardi. *The New Comparative Interpretation: A Primer*. Revised 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2014); Clayton Shoppa and William Zanardi. *Cracking the Case: Exercises in the New Comparative Interpretation* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2014); Clayton Shoppa and William Zanardi. *What Is an Environment? A Study in the New Comparative Interpretation* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2015); William Zanardi. *The Education of Liberty: Fantasies about the Future* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2016); R.G. Aaron Mundine, Clayton Shoppa and William Zanardi. *Comparing Philosophical Methods: A Way Forward* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2017); William Zanardi. *Rescuing Ethics from Philosophers* (Austin: Forty Acres Press, 2018).

<sup>47</sup> Recall, recaul, notes 19 and 38 above. This setting up is a matter of graceful courage, stepping into symbolizations of heuristics that are seeded by my  $W_i$  efforts (see [Prehumus 2](#), “Metagrams and Metaphysics”). “Theology possesses a relevance” (*Insight*, 766) only if it climbs into the symbolizations required of its real status as “*regina scientiarum*, not merely a constitutional monarch” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 126), “if we want our philosophy to be queen of the sciences . . . it has to be an open structure that determines the shape of things in which sciences can develop and allows them to develop within those shapes” (*Ibid.*, 130). What, you must ask, is this science, and what are its shapes? See further note 53.

<sup>48</sup> *Method in Theology*, 4.

<sup>49</sup> Foundational people have the task of accelerating, especially through focused deliberation and fantasy, this effectiveness. That task is shared by the tale-spinning of the end of *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*.

<sup>50</sup> *Method in Theology*, 288. It is the beginning of the section of “Special Theological Categories.”

<sup>51</sup> Reaching for this is a shocking strain on the molecules of imagination. This is Isaiah on a *Futurology Express*. Think world government, responsible bankers, self-luminous teachers and preachers, and a global tonality of mystery where “the earth and every common sight take on the glory and the freshness of a dream.” (*Insight*, 556.)

committed to sing off-key in a vulgar “arrogance of omniscient common sense.”<sup>52</sup> They are committed not to participate in our discussion. How is their non-participation to be handled? Partly it is to be handled by each our efforts in the first and second objectifications. That handling is to be wound into a unity by this third objectification. But I would note that these objectifications are articulate and articulated and that, in the New Key, the articulation is not just that of the old ways, but in the new key of engineering.<sup>53</sup> We are to lean into the future as persons among persons, “Dionysian”<sup>54</sup> in a bent to “tear it all down,”<sup>55</sup> “aesthetic”<sup>56</sup> in a fantasy flight that yet “is interested in particular goods and a sensate culture”<sup>57</sup> in an effective waying inn, in truth and life.

We need, thus, to discomfort ourselves into “effective intervention.”<sup>58</sup> In Faith and Hope “one has to postulate that the existential gap must be closed,” but the new key and the new science demands that we expostulate and aggravate. Communally we shall do so, in this next year, by a book or pamphlet consequent to our efforts and to those who add their own essay-version to those six efforts. A broad annoying title such as, *Screwing Up Civilization*, might seem to suit, but our proximate effectiveness requires that we aim initially at the particular audience that is the irresponsible trivializers of Lonergan. Some wit, no doubt, will come up with a decently sick but shingly fish-catching title.

Such a book, emerging in the autumn, would prepare us for the war towards a 2020 vision. “What will count is a perhaps not numerous center, big enough to work out one by one the transitions to be made, strong enough to refuse half measures and insist on complete solutions even though it has to wait.”<sup>59</sup> In present circumstances, however, quarter measures would be acceptable, and for those quarters we cannot wait through 2020.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, “Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response,” *CWL* 17, 370.

<sup>53</sup> Se we have come thus far, so have I tried to lead you in this melody of *Assembly* with it chord notes singing along like the Gibb brothers finding their way out of slumming in Britain and Australia, singing like Robin, “I started a joke” (See [Economics 6](#), “I Started a Joke”). There is the Faith and Hope that “The PEM is mightier than the Slum.” But the might, and the might be, pivots on the emergence of new shapes, a countervailing detailing of heuristics, sublationaly isomorphic with the full symbolizations of all the sciences both in their aspirations for, and their designations of, the full layered topology of global situations. But I am chording and singing to the hearts of future millennia, way beyond such light touchings as Chapter 12, “The Situation Room: The Stupid View of Wolf Blitzer,” of my Amazon book (2016), *Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump*. Need I remind you of the word that led us to this note, *engineering*? The new science is not some modern shape-shift of Aristotle’s blind allaying: it is Futurology, an engineering, a science of global mantelling which seeds and slogans forward Isaiah’s poetry and Lonergan’s dream: **Progress Effectively Mantelled**.

<sup>54</sup> *Topics in Education*, *CWL* 10, 40. We are in the zone of the third line of an early version of the spread of words on *Method in Theology*, 48.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> I am recalling my oft-quoted passage on page 306 of *CWL* 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*. The last two chapters of this volume raise, respectively, the issues of the ontic and the phyletic existential gap.

<sup>59</sup> “Dimensions of Meaning,” *Collection*, *CWL* 4, 245.