

FuSe Zero

A Simple Appeal For Functional Collaboration

Introduction

The emergence (January 17th 2011) of this final version of *FuSe Zero* is a complicated story, and in it there are four pieces of that story in four sections. The result of my struggle through November 2010 to January 2011 is the plan to set up 16 Seminars on Functional Collaboration, eight dealing with the general categories, and eight dealing with the special categories: there are to be four per year for four years.

The appeal of section 1 still stands, an appeal for membership in the two related groups. It was written after *FuSe 1* and *FuSe 2*. *FuSe 2* will turn up later in the context of the second and third seminars, which push respectively into the problematic zones of functional interpretation and functional history. But *FuSe 3* is the key expression of the challenge of doing Functional Research, and it is to be followed by essays - *FuSe 4 - 10*, that fit in with the detailed structuring of the seminar given below in Section 4.

FuSe 1 may be considered the beginning of the project, though it has a history going back to 1969, when I first tackled the problem of functional collaboration in musicology, and moving right on up to my struggle in recent years with Frederick Crowe's book, *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, that hovers round the topic of functional history.¹ *FuSe 1* emerged from discussions on Skipperweb, and was written to express a challenge in the week before November 11th (Remembrance Day) 2010. The challenge was not met, but I left, in the Web version, the project as expressed in its final form. The key strategy that slowly matured in my mind was that applying

¹The book emerged from Paulist Press, 1978. The manner in which it led me forward towards my present beginnings with searching for the meaning of functional research is to occupy us later (Autumn 2011), in the third seminar, on *Functional History*. In passing I would note that his later *Christ and History: The Christology of Bernard Lonergan from 1935 to 1982*, Novalis, St. Paul University, Ottawa, 2005, is an obvious candidate for consideration in the context of searching for the dynamics of functional research.

functional collaboration to Lonergan's own works would be a way to get the show on the road: then we could move into the larger world of its omnidisciplinary relevance. I intend - so far! - to stick with that strategy through the 16 proposed seminars.

So, cutting to the chase: section 1 is the original appeal. Section 2 is the idea of a book that emerged in December 2010, an idea that is obviously modified by the gradual emergence of the need for 16 seminars. Section 3 is the basic proposal of a first e-seminar, on *Functional Research*, and Section 4 is a detailed structuring of that seminar. To that structure there are to be corresponding essays on the Websites, my own and the SGEME.org, Website, on the **Foresight** Blog, whatever.² The essays are to continue the *FuSe* series, and no doubt will get into the three figures. The first seminar has already shaped up to carry us to *FuSe* 9, and dealing with the second seminar (May 1st - July 15th), on *Functional Interpretation*, will carry us to *FuSe* 14.

1. The first version of FuSe Zero

My original idea for this essay was that it should be lengthy and theoretically elaborate, following in fact on the effort to point, in *FuSe* 1 and *FuSe* 2, to the initiation of a functional specialization that focused on Lonergan's work. The strategy pointed to in those essays is one that I think would work to get us moving in the direction of creative collaboration. At all events, as I move through my 80th year, it seems best to be as brief as possible in this essay, making, here, a simple 2-page appeal.

The present state of the world, whether we focus on the economy or the climate, or brood on broader issues, is mightily distressful. Lonergan's pointings are towards a massive global redemption of that state of disgrace. Those pointings are towards a comprehensive democratic economics and towards an omnidisciplinary global collaboration. The pointings are there, neglected, in scholarly fashion, for more than forty years. It is sadly evident that present structures of Lonergan studies are not

² <http://www.philipmcshane.ca/> <http://www.sgeme.org/>
<http://www.sgeme.org/BlogEngine/archive.aspx>

globally effective, nor indeed do they even ambition to be.

Yet the Cosmopolis that meshes his pointings has that ambitious goal. Might we not, then, envision a discontinuous shift in present structures that would carry us towards a new effective influence on history?

What I have in mind is not unknown, and it is elementarily objectified in two groups with which I am associated. There is **SGEME**, a group that has a focus on the implementing Lonergan's economics in an effective way. That effective way is the way suggested by Lonergan to me in 1968: "find an economist."³ It requires a precise implementation, an integral piece of his *Insight* metaphysics, but now having the fuller context of functional collaboration and the eighth specialty. The cultivation of this fuller context is the objective of the second group, originally an offshoot of **SGEME**, but now of a quite precise new orientation: **FORESIGHT** is a group of Lonergan scholars⁴ committed to applying Lonergan's functional divisions to the study of Lonergan's own works.⁵

Both groups already have members: SGEME, over 100; FORESIGHT something in the region of 50. My simple appeal is for expressions of interest that might blossom into membership after relevant dialogue with present members of either group.

Obviously, SGEME is the way to go for most people: it simply looks for support, yet that support could well be key to our break-forward from the present doldrums. Some alert member might just be a friend of a friend of a journalist or a grade 12 economics teacher.

³I have focused this search, in recent years, on two issues: [1] somehow invading the media by finding a reputable journalist to pick up on Lonergan's economics in such as a simple fashion as noting that "there are two types of firm"; [2] subtly invading the grade 12 classroom, a strategy enlarged upon in *Prehumous* 1, "Teaching Highschool Economics. A Common-Quest Manifesto."

⁴The group is only slowly taking shape. The e-seminars are an initial move.

⁵How might that collaboration move forward? As I mentioned at the beginning, that task is the topic of *FuSe* 1 and *FuSe* 2.

But the other group, FORESIGHT, is obviously more important in the long run in that it members seek to find a way to take Lonergan with a fresh seriousness that would be functional and collaborative.

I mention doldrums in the last paragraph, but I see no point in elaborating here. Nor do I wish to elaborate further on the two societies and their goals: indeed, it seemed best to relegate comments on them here to a couple of footnotes. What I, and my colleagues, seek is some response to this appeal.⁶ You could contact any member of either group, or e-mail directly Bob Henman - as moderator of both SGEME and FORESIGHT - or myself. The e-mail addresses are rohenman50@hotmail.com , and pmcshane@shaw.ca

2. The Idea of a book.

Galactic Method: Fusionism.

Preface

Introduction

1 Research

2 Interpretation

3 History

4 Dialectic

5 Foundations

6 Doctrines

7 Systematics

8 Communications

⁶The response can, of course, be a request for more information, though certainly the texts mentioned in notes 1 and 3 give decent leads.

Epilogue

Preliminary Preface

A brief preface is in order regarding this peculiar and lengthy book,⁷ the product of eight e-seminars⁸ during 2011-2013, conducted in sequence with each of length about three months. The eight seminars went under the titles “Functional Research,” etc through the eight divisions of global care suggested by Lonergan in 1969.⁹ Membership of the seminars varied, and the members are listed at the beginning of the corresponding chapters. “Functional” is omitted in the chapter titles,¹⁰ since the pointing is towards a normative view of what will replace, by the end of this third millennium, what is now called academic work. [Left thus, poised!]

⁷The mention of a lengthy book may stir thinking of the point made by Lonergan in the Epilogue to *Insight* (p.754) of “a larger work” dealing with what I might now call the special categories. This seminar does not deal with these, or with that longer work. In *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas* I write (pp. 257-8) of the possible rhythms of that larger work that he had envisage in 1952 as *Faith and Insight*. The task of lifting the general categories into a functional specialist context is sufficient for this series of seminars. A second series of 8 seminars, in 2013-16, will handle the twists and turns of the special categories in the new functional context: the series may be expected to lead to that longer work anticipated by *Insight*. I add here, that at the time of writing this anticipatory preface, the book seems to be turning into 16 monographs.

⁸The idea of a seminar conducted by e-mail emerged in December, 2010: I sent out invitations to the Lonergan community then, and the first seminar group took operative shape early in January, 2011.

⁹The discovery was made in February of 1965. It was aired in *Gregorianum* 50 (1969), 485-505.

¹⁰I retain, for convenience, the titles that Lonergan used during his life-time.

Introduction

Galactic Method, or what I would call Fusionism,¹¹ is to be a community of characters¹² embracing the universe.¹³ That short sentence will not make much sense to you until you have worked your way beyond this short introduction into the beginnings of that community. The three footnotes to the sentence remind us of that. I might further try stretching your imagination by asking you to brood seriously over a global humanity stabilized at 10,000,000,000 members, characters, cared for by a subgroup of something in the region of 250,000,000 cultured characters.¹⁴ It is to be the next millennium's answer to the appeal of Stewart Brandt: "Whether it's called the commons, natural-infrastructure maintenance, tending the wild, niche construction, ecosystem engineering, mega-gardening, or intentional Gaia, humanity is now stuck

¹¹I cannot see this glorious global, indeed galactic, movement going forward under such a name as Lonerganism. The name *Fusionism* was suggested to me by a phrase of Lonergan, "fuse into a single explanation," that concludes a powerful paragraph from what I later here call his 'mad scene'. (See *Insight*, 610, line 9).

¹²I refer here both to the first paragraph Aristotle's *Magna Moralia*, where he associates character with the full domain of politics, and to Lonergan's location of the word in his considerations of the basis of adequate foundational realities (section one of *Method in Theology*, chapter 14).

¹³"Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, To embrace the universe in a single view" (*Insight*, 442). This is a shocking normative shift from the present specialist misery. Add to it the equally-brutal norm of empirical attentiveness: "Generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject's operations without taking into account the corresponding objects" (Lonergan, *A Third Collection*, Paulist Press, New York, 1985, 141.)

¹⁴To help the musing I recall a simple model, that I use regularly, of a collaborative group of 22,220 members: 10,000 in functional research (recall Gandhi's 10,000 villages), 1,000 in interpretation, 100 historians, 10 dialecticians, 10 foundational characters, etc. Multiplying by 10,000 brings us to 222,200,000.

with a planet stewardship role.”¹⁵ And there is a sense in which this stewardship has nothing to do with theology or religion and everything to do with cultured self-love.

Why, then, do I turn now to acknowledge the roots of my view and this revolution in a book named *Method in Theology*? It is because that book was a failed effort to communicate the global revolution sketched by its author in 1965. I recall now talking to that author, Bernard Lonergan, 18 months after his discovery, about his problem of communication. In hindsight I can muse over the advice I might have given him: “don’t write a book at all!”. At all events the tired old warrior tackled a book that described badly a solution to the problem of our axial mess.¹⁶ I recall now, too, Professor Sean McEvenue telling me of the day Lonergan finished the book in 1970 and sat with some colleagues puzzling over a possible Introduction. McEvenue remarked: “just write a page”. The advice brightened Lonergan’s eyes: he returned to his room and wrote two pages.

Unlike Lonergan, I write my few pages here before beginning the book That I can do so is made possible by Lonergan’s achievements insofar as I have ingested as best I could, over the past 55 years, his full effort. I can make my own, as I invite you to make your own, his two page Introduction to *Method*, but with fresh twists that emerge in the struggle enlarged on in the book to follow. So, for example, for “a contemporary theology” in his Introduction I would ask you to read “a global care”. Then the corresponding sentence reads: “In such a global care we envisage eight distinct tasks: research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematics, and communications.” But my envisaging leans on history instead of his “grounds of the

¹⁵Stewart Brand, *Whole Earth Discipline. An Ecopragmatist Manifesto*, Atlantic Books, London, 2010, 275.

¹⁶A topic that is to occupy us considerably later. Roughly, one must think of the manner in which Toynbee and Voegelin lifted Jasper’s short Greek axial period towards being a long period of fragmentation and disorientation, at the conclusion of which - that depends on us - stands our present arrogant misery.

division,”¹⁷ and my “we” is not an authorial plural but a community of beginners. For, while Lonergan worked in grim solitude, I proceed with this book through eight e-seminars on the eight distinct tasks.

Other differences will appear as we move along, and the pace of that moving along has to be a topic intrinsic to the moving along. This is an enormous topic of ontic and phyletic growth which weaves into the eight chapters, and it would seem best to leave it at that for now. Yet I cannot resist sharing my present musings regarding Lonergan and his failure to communicate.

There is a sense in which he did not fail: the failure was in the community that was incapable of reading his melodies and his madneses. And here I am eccentric enough to compare Lonergan’s efforts with Donizetti’s, indeed to compare his *Insight* with Donizetti’s *Lucia di Lammermoor*.¹⁸ There is the “mad scene” near the end of that Opera which I like to compare with the madness of Lonergan’s treatment of Interpretation near the end of his Opus. Lonergan’s madness, the heart of his new view,¹⁹ remained unsung throughout the twentieth century. What of Donizetti?

Let me start with great listening, the sort of listening that Lonergan’s madness associated with “pure formulations”²⁰ : “They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an

¹⁷The title of section 3, *Method in Theology*, chapter 5. My own treatment of grounding is in chapter one of the Web-book (2007), *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*. There the grounding is identified with the de facto historical emergence of the problem of the divisions: briefly I claim that history is the mother and Lonergan the foster-father of the future luminous global omnidisciplinary division of labour.

¹⁸I was nudged toward the odd comparison by attending, on December 11th 2010, the Vancouver Opera performance, a magnificent performance which included Eglise Gutierrez as Lucia.

¹⁹The topic will occupy us especially in the second and third seminars.

²⁰*Insight*, 602. A paragraph begins: “Thirdly, there are pure formulations”

audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.”²¹ Switch to Donizetti, and the dress rehearsal of February 1959, with Joan Sutherland in the role of Lucia.²² Maria Callas is in town and attends. “So astonished was she at the physical and vocal virtuosity of the mad scene, that she was heard to comment: ‘That is not good.’ Surprised, her companion asked what was bad about it, ‘It is too good’, came the reply.”²³

The critic Andrew Porter wrote that month in the *Financial Times*, “Her singing was exquisite; particularly notable were the sustained notes, followed by an octave drop. Her decorations were tastefully and justly conceived and beautifully executed. Arpeggios were delicate and lovely, trills were confident. But beyond this there was a meaning in everything she did. A singer who can make florid bursts in sixths with the flute heart-rending in effect has understood the secret of Donizetti’s music.”²⁴

And what of Callas the audience? “”of all the roles that remained active in Callas’ repertoire, it was Lucia with which there was the strongest initial identification and with which Callas wrought her greatest revolution in the operatic theatre. After decades during which the role had been mishandled by light-voiced, self-indulgent sopranos, Callas returned an epic sense of its tragic stature by her penetrating psycho- and musico- analysis of the character.”²⁵

So, we find character interpreted by character to character within a tiny towering

²¹*Ibid.*, the conclusion of the same paragraph.

²²Chapter 4, “Lucia di Lammermoor”, of the book referred to in the next note gives an account of her strenuous and subtle preparation for the part, as well as a sketch of the fate of the Opera since its first performance in 1835.

²³*Joan Sutherland*, Norma Major, McDonald: Queen Anne Press, London, 1987, 50.

²⁴Quoted in *Joan Sutherland*, Norma Major, McDonald: Queen Anne Press, London, 1987, 52.

²⁵*The Callas Legacy. A Biography of a Career*, John Ardoin, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1982, 49.

community. There were no Callases or Sutherlands in the twentieth century to sing, even self-indulgently, the mad scene of “The Truth of Interpretation.” The scene has not been light-voiced mishandled: it has not been handled at all.²⁶ But further comment on light-weight handling and its contrast with the serious arts, sciences and technologies of our times had best be left to the Epilogue.

How are we to get from here to there? That was the issue posed by Lonergan in his view of decay and the need for a strange cosmopolis,²⁷ identified by him in 1965 with a concrete functionality of thinking and living that is quite beyond our present dreams. That is the issue of the present book, yet I would like in conclusion to note a greater urgency conveyed by the title of the book of more that 30 years ago, from which I give the final quotation here: *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*.²⁸ The past 30 years have seen the depths of indecency and misery that the immorality of financial racketeering has brought us. The critique of that immorality cannot be grounded in the present erroneous establishment economics.

We cannot wait for the emergence of an effective Fusionism to be saved from that immorality and stupidity.²⁹ Establishment economics, with all its works and

²⁶We will venture into this strange situation in chapter 2, but perhaps one instance of the non-handling is worth recalling in an Introduction. *Lonergan’s Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C., 1989, resulted from a gathering of scholars in Concordia University. The invitation was to tackle creatively Lonergan’s work on interpretation. In fact, as is usual in Lonergan gatherings, we all did our own thing: Lonergan’s ‘mad scene’ was passed over.

²⁷*Insight*, chapter 7, section 8.

²⁸The book is now available on www.philipmcshane.ca: indeed what is given there is a photocopy of Lonergan’s copy, with interesting comments by him.

²⁹A context is my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publications, 2010. A further context is Volume 21, no. 2 of the Indian Journal, *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education*, which contains a series of introductory articles under the general title, “Do You Want a Sane Global Economy.”

pomps, needs to be eradicated from global culture as soon as possible. But best now conclude abruptly with the hope I expressed at the beginning of chapter one of that little book of 1980:

“If there is to be a massive shift in public minding and kindness and discourse in the next century, there must be a proportionate shift in the mind and heart of the academy and the arts and the end of this century, with consequent changes of operating schemes of recurrence from government to kindergarden.”

3. The Prospect of a Seminar on *Functional Research*

Greetings All Prospective Seminar Members.

The adventure begins January 15th and runs to April 15th, loosely : we’ll see how it goes.

Why *prospective*? Because I wish to clear up immediately the question of privacy. I would like to be able to list us as a group for each other, but some may not like the publicity. For instance, a doctorate-candidate-member might be viewed suspiciously by their *Alma{?!} Mater*. So check back with me, IF YOU DON’T WANT TO BE LISTED PUBLICALLY. [one of my notions is listing members of each seminar at the beginning of the corresponding chapter in the book mentioned immediately.] Anyway, people can opt for various levels of privacy: for instance a listing on a group e-mail would be O.K. talk to me!

I am sending out also, tomorrow, a first longer communication, consisting of an outline of a new book, to emerge sometime after Seminar 8 is finished in the Spring of 2013. I should note immediately, that signing on for Seminar 2 etc, is an option: you may not wish to continue. This is to be an adventure, searching for the dog that has not barked yet in our night. This puts us in a new ball park, compared to the reception of

Method by the Lonergan followers of 1972, who fell into the imagining that they knew what functional specialization “was”, “is”, “is to be,” whatever.

The adventure is to be different for different members. For some few or us, it is a full time reaching, but for most it is a modest demand of time - I keep mentioning a few pages of writing by April - and for some almost an observer status: glancing at the game occasionally to see, in some vague and mysterious way, What’s The Score. And to nudge the players to keep their eyes on the ball!

The starting point of our adventure? The suspicion that **functional research** is not the same as what we now call *research*. I go no further here on that: but those involved may do so as time and energy dictate. You may not have picked a piece of Lonergan as your focus: that’s O.K.

But you still could have vague notions of what you would do in its regard. It would be useful to jot them down, so as to see - ho ho - how simple-minded about the topic you were at the beginning of the seminar. You can forward the musings to me, **Or Better**, to the group. Such musing could find their way into the chapter (signed or anonymous ... again, the privacy thing).

On January 15th the seminar starts, “officially” for you. By then I will have some set-up in place about communication: Bob Henman is working on that. I am, of course, innocent of the mysteries of subtle e-communication.

I am not going to give you further leads in the first two weeks: we need, each or in collaborations, to fumble around till the end of January, when I will send you leads in the form of a substantial beginning of a chapter on Research. But “what,” you ask, “might I do when we start?” IF you have some leisure time, some fantasy time, you could certainly read what Lonergan has to say about Research: just *Method in Theology* page 149 and then (1) on page 127. You will find that it is not of much help, and that he is not talking precisely about functional research. If your want to stretch your fantasy, brood over the following from *CWL 1, Grace and Freedom*, p. xviii: “Lonergan asked Boyer to be his director. Boyer agreed, and they discussed a number of different topics,

only to set them aside. Finally Boyer reached for his copy of Thomas Aquinas's *prima secundae*, pointed to an article that he himself had difficulty in interpreting, and suggested that Lonergan make a study of that article in itself, of its *loca parallela*, and of its historical sources." There is a sense in which functional research is **directing**: now what is that sense?

I wish you to muck around creatively. Recall Lonergan's story about the grandees to whom

Columbus gave the problem of standing an egg on its end he left them with the egg [egging them on, as it were!] and later showed

I intend, in fact to provide a sequence of leads as we go along, communicating with each other, adding our tentative pieces.

So: **New Year's Greetings**, and welcome to our little effort towards a new grip on the 100 billion galaxies and our ongoing - but now, 2011, with the germ of a serious statistical shift in effectiveness - arrival here after 13.7 billion years :)

Phil

4. The final setting-up of the Seminar on *Functional Research*

A January 6th Communication: but this is the sort of communication that belongs to the first day of a seminar or class. Vague indications of where we are going within the seminar, how we get there, where we start from: and might we muse over a broader goal?

The first day of the seminar is officially Saturday January 15th, and at that stage I shall send out the full list - 41 members - of participants, with e-mail addresses. [unless these come under some privacy wish]. So, we will be in potential communication. I shall return to the BLOG issue presently: it is a discomforting issue for some, and I aim to

dodge problems as best I can.

Members have various possible degrees of involvement: chose what suits you, and change it as we go along if you so desire. You may wish for mere observer status, or something close to that. You may wish fuller participation: then you select a text in Lonergan that actually strikes you, in your present mindset, as giving “food for thought and action”, an anomaly. **I would like to be notified of that selected text by January 25th, so that I could share the list as a basis of sub-group exchanges.**

The formal participation involves the following four contributions (or whatever pieces of them suits one’s life and times!):

[1] a one-to-three page (single-spaced) attempt to do functional research “with” the text, due on January 30th;

[2] a second attempt [so, a revision], due February 28th; This will be nudged along by a further contribution from me, on February 2nd, on the meaning of “Functional Research.”

[3] a third attempt due March 31st. Again, a nudge from me on March 2nd.

[4] I would hope that, following the third attempt, an extra page or so could be added, by April 15th, commenting on “the climb” and one’s resulting “position”; that extra page could emerge from conversing with me, and will be helped by yet another component from me, March 25th, on “Positioning in Functional Research”.

This is all very strange, but then the issue of **functionality** is strange. Think of yourself as Boyer talking to Lonergan three times, doing better {?} each time. Recall the previous

quotation: “Boyer reached for his copy of Thomas Aquinas’s *prima secundae*, pointed to an article that he himself had difficulty in interpreting, and suggested that Lonergan make a study of that article in itself, of its *loca parallela*, and of its historical sources.” That was Boyer’s first attempt. It would have been better if he had also given the *loca parallela*, a second attempt? And what of a third attempt, with broader *loca*?

The strangeness of **functionality** is paralleled in my original scientific analogue by, say, the strangeness of **orbital motions**, and the different student attempts to cope with it. The trouble we run into in present philosophy and theology is that regularly there is no serious advance in understanding encouraged or occurring. The series of three attempts are beyond us as we start. Perhaps we are to learn scientific patience: the sort of thing that dominated Archimedes, during the weeks BEFORE he leaped out of the bath!

As I mentioned, between each attempt I am going to add a fresh context: so, a fresh communications from me on February 2nd, March 2nd, and March 25th.

Next some technical points. First, we could avoid entirely the BLOG problem by the block-communication of *FuRes*, [the title of the group in my e-mail!]. Anyone can do this, and to this we can add individual and sub-group communications. Extreme privacy can be ensured, for those wanting it, by communication attempts to me alone, to which I can reply with comments. At each stage I will **collect** the attempts into units [particular attempts anonymous if desired] that I would put on my Website [under a *FuSe* number in that series, the series of our enterprise: this I’ll communicate].

The **collecting** can also be made available on the Blog. More on that after January 15th, when we have a determined common password for all members. There may be possibilities of larger dialogue: we had best determine that as we move along, picking up on members suggestions.

Finally, a little musing over the broad goal, placed in the context of the quotation [thank you Pat Brown!] from *CWL* 22, p. 464 [a 1968 essay]: “And you can have teamwork insofar, first of all, as the fact of reciprocal dependence is understood and appreciated. Not only is that understanding required; one has to be familiar with what is call the *acquis*, what has been settled, what no one has any doubt of in the present time. You’re doing a big thing when you can upset that, but you have to know where things stand at the present time, what has already been achieved, to be able to see what is new in its novelty as a consequence.”

We might well consider this to be a common text of our enterprise. We want to **hand it on** to the Lonergan community for interpretation etc. As a sub-community - like Boyer - we have “difficulty in interpreting” this text. What has Lonergan in mind when he talks of *acquis*, and when he talks of upsetting it? Leaving that question dangling, what we in the seminar are talking about - around and about - is a standard model suggested by Lonergan, one that is opposed to the present *acquis* of Lonergan studies, or to our own present *acquis*. We aim at upsetting both those studies and ourselves.

So, now we can re-read in a preliminary fashion his final sentence: “You’re doing a big thing when you can upset that, but you have to know where things stand at the present time, what has already been achieved, to be able to see what is new in its novelty as a consequence.”

We aim at upsetting the present *acquis*, but in a positive sense of setting UP. It will take 16 seminars to set up the full “novelty as a consequence”. But each seminar will constitute a shift in the statistics of good dialogue. The full shift to the Standard Model that he has in mind, however, requires the cyclic dynamic to be seeded within his followers as a paradigm shift for and towards the Cosmopolis of a global omnidisciplinary collaboration, perhaps by the end of this millennium.