

## FuSe 1

**The Functionally-Specialized Study of Lonergan**

Where might I possibly begin this experiment, or this essay about an experiment? The original invitation was for a group of us on Skipperweb to spend the week, November 4<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010, puzzling over how to apply the division of labour called functional specialization to, well, to Lonergan's *Complete Works*. I promised to share the results of my own efforts at the end of that week, at 11 a.m. New York time, on the eleventh day of the eleventh month. So here, I am, in remembrance mode, Proust or the Irish Revolution of the First War.<sup>1</sup> But I do not wish to comment on that mode here, except, perhaps, a little in the Conclusion at the end of the essay. I wish to plunge in immediately.

So I invite us to think about **research**, but now in a functional manner. What does this mean? I lean here, as *Method in Theology* suggests in its first pages, on a parallel with the successful simple science of physics. Instead of the *Collected Works*, think of the Collected Data of present high-energy experiments, as they are conducted in the new European facilities. It is a massive collection, being sifted through steadily by teams of competent data-readers. Note that the sifting is directed. The function of the sifting is to find anomalies, quirks in the output that point us towards additions to, revisions or modifications of, the standard model with which we are working. The full direction of the sifting is towards enriched communications, saner street smarts.

It is important to grasp that the group of researchers share the standard model and that they are challenging it, seeking to lift it forward. One must be realistic about the sharers: some are doctorate candidates, some are elders. But they have a pretty

---

<sup>1</sup>The first of my *Cantowers*, "Function and History," appeared on Easter Monday April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002, and I recalled in it the Easter Rising of 1916 in Dublin, led by a school teacher who read out a proclamation outside the main post-office in O'Connell St, taking a stand against the British empire. Proust, of course, was taking a stand against the failure to maintain a molecular dynamic of growth, something close to our present experiment.

decent competence in the standard model and how it leads to the expectation of certain patterns in the data. The watch is for deviant patterns, patterns that would nudge the community towards improving the standard model that is communally accepted, the model of the elders, or more accurately the model of the competent theoreticians who are not doing this research but, as it were, waiting in the wings.<sup>2</sup>

Switch now to us, and to thinking of us, say, 7 of us, settling into researching Lonergan's *Complete Works*, assuming for the moment 21 volumes of them. Yes, there are other works,<sup>3</sup> just as beyond the drive of cyclotron experiments there are other zones of data being pitched up by astrophysics and by strange subterranean observations. But let us think restrictedly of these 21 volumes. What do we 7 do? Do we divide the 21 volumes so that each of us takes 3 to research?

We must keep tuned, in vague descriptive self-attention, to what we are doing here, and what we bring to that doing.<sup>4</sup> We each bring our individual SM, standard model. Yet, in our openness, we bring also a suspicion, a curiosity: this is an odd exercise that is pushing us on. Note that the parallel with particle research holds: a problem of being alert to unusual, puzzling tracks.

Further, in so far as we have a slim notion of the division suggested by Lonergan we can detect another key aspect of the parallel. The research is simply that: hunting for relevant tracks. The result of the hunt will be a collection of anomalous tracks (or texts).

---

<sup>2</sup>I would note, in passing, that I have in mind a bigger cycling than that of pure physics: a cycling, for example, through teaching and technology. The cycling of physics also includes sloping toward and merging with the concrete multidisciplinary flow of history, a large topic we dodge here, but see *Cantower 8*, "Slopes: An Encounter."

<sup>3</sup>I think now especially of scattered suggestive stuff about refinements in the heuristics of history, yet think also of the absence of serious scribbles regarding functional history, and so also of the manner in which the chapters on history in *Method* just don't reach out into the new collaborative dynamic. The story of the inclusion of those chapters on history remains to be written. Indeed, the story of the entire book remains to be written.

<sup>4</sup>I talk later, but only briefly and by referencing, of deeper doctrinal or policy pointers, of what we incarnately bring of metadoctrines. See below, note 63.

But the hunt is an open hunt of characters<sup>5</sup> who are creative not only each within their SM but each also reaching creatively in the activity of collecting.<sup>6</sup> That activity can nudge the thinking, so to speak, to move outside the box of one's SM.. So, the eye, I, of the physicist finds a network of tracks that suggests "Higgs activities".<sup>7</sup> I, eye, checks back to similar contexts from similar tracks that eye might have missed. How similar are the tracks that I tentatively collect? Do the sets of similarities push me to novel suspicions? In so far as you have some illustration of such activity in any area, science, art, technology, common sense, you will be able to note how the collecting twines round the suspicions to generate refinements of the collecting. But what is the collecting for? It is for, so to speak, the absent people, who pick up on the collections and head into their own zone of brooding, perhaps for a month or a decade, on the possible lifts to a new broadly-acceptable physics SM.

But back to our focus on the research team. Do they divide up the data, 7, say, each taking one seventh of the data-output? Yes, such divisions occur, but they are astutely done: Jane's thesis was on M, Ahmad's on N, etc. Jane scans related data, but always alert both to anomalies in other zones, always attendant to the context of the whole, always open to the whole team's efforts. Perhaps a commonsense illustration

---

<sup>5</sup>I regularly draw attention to the occurrence of the word *character* in *Method in Theology* chapter 14, section 1, and also regularly recall Aristotle's beginning of the *Magna Moralia*. Consider, in fantasy, the collaborating characters of the future as self-luminous "at the level of the times" - recalling Ortega y Gasset. See also note 38.

<sup>6</sup>The full context of the reaching and collecting, a positional "fuse into a single explanation" (*Insight*, 610, line 8) is the lift of the meaning of *character* into the aspirations of finitude hinted at in note 38. More pragmatically, the road is the light-focused steps required by generalized empirical method as described in the top lines of *A Third Collection*, 141. That lift is to become the Tower Community's mediation of directed global mystery, the solution to "the problem of general history, which is the real catch." (*Topics in Education*, 236)

<sup>7</sup>This whole Higgs business is probably beyond most of us, but it does fit in as a good analogue of not-too-clear outreach within a standard model. You must find analogues that help, but always of the type that is a reaching for relations of things to one another.

helps: think of a soccer team - goal-keeper, striker, etc etc watching the same video of a recent game, honing for an improved next game.

And now we return to our 21 volumes. How do we divide up a first round of researching? Jane's thesis was on the problem of history, Ahmad's was on objectivity, etc etc. Yet we might well start with 3 volumes each, with some attention to taste, talent, and thesis. What are we after? We are seeking tracks that suggest to us expansions and corrections of our present SM: positive and negative anomalies.

How are we doing in the reading of the results of my experiment? That very much depends on whether you, reader, tried this alone during the week between.<sup>8</sup> Here I find it useful to pull in another analogy, indeed the recall of an amusing sequence of events in another experiment of mine. The experiment occurred in a graduate seminar: where and when is not here relevant. What is relevant is my presentation of a puzzle to the group one Friday afternoon near the end of a three-hour session. I promised to tackle the puzzle in the next session. But three people competent in the area burst out enthusiastically with the suggestion that they would like to solve the problem in that following session.<sup>9</sup>

In the following session the three stumbled around the problem for two hours, providing entertainment for the rest of the class and, indeed, good humoredly, for themselves. Eventually I had to rescue the gallant trio.

---

<sup>8</sup>You were not in on the invitation of that week? Well then, could you not take a week to puzzle, and come back a week later to continue reading with a more refined SM?

I wrote this prior to pushing forward in the conclusion to a larger experiment, so you may skip on and think of a later pause in which you join the searching.

<sup>9</sup>The problem posed had to do with the number of ways of seating  $N$  married couples around a table so that no man is beside his wife, and men and women are not sitting beside each other. I discuss it at length in "Undermined Macrodynamical Reading", *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, vol. 1, 2001, 70-100. Think, say, of 8 couples. The problem seems a matter of simple combinatorial analysis: people can then plunge in optimistically. As hinted above, there may be a lesson there for those who think that the 8-fold way of functional collaboration is a simple matter.

What was their difficulty? They were quite competent in the traditional viewing of the zone, yet still did not creatively anticipate the new level at which they needed to tackle the problem. It is a problem that I have given to groups even less competence than those three, who had graduate degrees in mathematics. Regularly people in such groups, when offered the problem, volunteered to push forward, even confidently, towards a solution.

At all events, in the present experiment, those who have given the present problem a decent shot have an advantage over sideliners: they - you, perhaps, who, having read thus far, showed magnificent control in taking a week off to contemplate and fantasize? - have had their run at the problem of creatively researching Lonergan's *Complete Works*. What did you come up with? You may have found that the problem was somewhat like the couple's problem?

Present physics research is a massively complex organized international affair. The reach is of a global community into the output of the latest cyclotron in Europe, and all other such outputs in this physics-world around the globe. Did you come up with some such global view of researching Lonergan's world, with your own bundle of details? Furthermore, while researchers get bright ideas, and indeed modify their SM collecting in the light of such ideas, only very rarely does someone - like Bell<sup>10</sup> - come up with a bright idea that shakes the SM. How did you fare in the analogous task? Were you clear on what was the *per se* objective of the effort, to pass the organized data on to the interpretative community **so that**<sup>11</sup> they might lift their own and the community's SM to a new level of effectively creative progress? I am here touching on an old topic of

---

<sup>10</sup>The Irishman John Bell (1928-1990) is an oddity in that he went to CERN in 1960 and stayed there for the rest of his life, but had a powerful theoretic and methodological bent. Richard Feynman, too, for all his theoretics, kept in touch with the output of experimental work. But these are exceptions.

<sup>11</sup>You have to brood over the entire dynamic unity of the *Praxisweltanschauung*. Think of the poise in the "pen world" along an analogy with the "pin world" of Adam Smith.

mine, the baton-exchanges between the 8 runners in the race around the specialties, and a zone worthy of serious fantasy is the analogue of those few shared strides where the baton is weaved elegantly - or inelegantly: should I remind Americans of the last Summer Olympics?! - into the hand of the next runner.<sup>12</sup>

As yet, I have not mentioned the analogue of positive anomalies in physics. I must do so now, but with a cautionary indication of a major distress that emerges in the indicating. "Many of you will find this picture too bleak."<sup>13</sup> Our experiment is ours, here and how, each with her or his partly-thematized SM. It is, for most of us, indeed all of us I would say, not an up-to-date SM. What do I mean by that? I am pointing to the discomforting contrast with the SM of physics. That SM of physics is, in the main, a post-graduate possession of the community. One is pushed forward, in undergraduate and graduate work, to some serious level of mastery, so that one is up to reading intelligently the content of the discoveries of the past decade of physics. This is not true of present Lonergan studies: nor, indeed, should one expect it to be so. Lonergan's world is a much more discomforting reality than the corner of the world of physics that emerged with twentieth century physics. "The introduction into physics of tensor fields and eigenfunctions raised a barrier,"<sup>14</sup> but that barrier is nothing to the one introduced by Lonergan's work in the zones of meta-physics. The result is a horrid and horrifying "existential gap."<sup>15</sup>

Were there a community tuned to Lonergan's "general categories" then indeed that community would be happy in the memory of the bright-eyed smiling Lonergan

---

<sup>12</sup>Add this to the images of the last note. The image here of the relay-race is given on page 204 of "The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*," *The Importance of Insight*, Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin, edited by John J. Liptay Jr and David S Liptay, University of Toronto Press, 2007. The context given there is helpful here.

<sup>13</sup>"Dimensions of Meaning," *Collection*, 244.

<sup>14</sup>*Insight*, 603.

<sup>15</sup>On *Existential Gap*, see the index to *Phenomenology and Logic*.

typing, “one can go on.”<sup>16</sup> The community would point to the shelves of books and the functional divisions of labour representing “the inception of a far larger work,”<sup>17</sup> that eventually would effectively shift global care. And that community would especially bubble with the difficult task of the communal fantasy of a global village that is also 10,000 villages and a billion gardens,<sup>18</sup> envisaging green sunflower shoots breaking out of the axial mud, reaching towards that distant Sunflower Grin.<sup>19</sup> But there is no such community, nor even the slimmest of communal fantasy about it. So, the *Complete Works* of Lonergan are too easily lined up with the other meta-works of the twentieth century to be picked from randomly, effectely, ineffectively.

Functional research into those *Complete Works* would promise a new front, a new edge, to the study of Lonergan’s works. It would be a community tuned to the suspicion expressed in the previous paragraphs. It would hold hands humbly in noting, and layering heuristically, what is lacking in the present reading of Lonergan, not by disputation, but simply by identifying untrodden tracks. So, it would shift the statistics of the appreciation of what is lacking, “and knowledge of all that is lacking, and only gradually is that knowledge acquired.”<sup>20</sup> Research itself shifts the statistics by naming creatively the untrodden tracks, tracts, but the knowledge gradually acquired can be acquired in no other way than through the work of a community of serious interpreters.

I am very deliberately dodging naming the research achievements to be handed

---

<sup>16</sup>*Method in Theology*, 287.

<sup>17</sup>*Insight*, 754.

<sup>18</sup>I have been using the image of a billion gardens in recent years as a counter-goal to the idiocy of the profit motive. A billion gardens of one half acre - the size of the average Chinese farm - would only occupy one sixteenth of the earth’s arable land.

<sup>19</sup>The image allows me to draw attention to *Cantowers 2*, “Sunflowers Speak to Us of Growing,” a crisis zone in both our thinking and our living. Recall the first footnote’s mention of Proust. But one needs now to stretch the image into an eschaton on endless flower-bursts.

<sup>20</sup>*Insight*, 559.

on to this second group of collaborators, the interpreters. But, turning to them broadly now, it is evident to me that this second group will need to face the discouraging task of creative learning, which is quite different from the vastly more difficult task of creative discovery, but still a difficult process of character-growth in scientific appreciation. Later, I hope, we will envisage how that learning is to be facilitated by teaching.<sup>21</sup> But I would emphasize here the difficulty of that learning, a difficulty due to its unfamiliarity to many that have been attracted to Lonergan as a thinker. It is a difficulty that colours the concluding paragraph of my little book *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, which ends by noting “our settling for rich description, and comparison of rich descriptions, in place of the desperate global need of the exercise of either of Lonergan’s canons of explanation” It is a difficulty more bluntly contextualized by Lonergan: “they are lost in some no man’s land between the world of theory and the world of common sense.....”<sup>22</sup> “..... never bitten by theory, with no apprehension, no understanding, for example, of the fact that Newton spent weeks in his room in which he barely bothered looking at his food, which he was working out the theory of universal gravitation.”<sup>23</sup>

That creative learning is the task of this and the next generation of those interested in a genuine effectiveness of the *Complete Works* of Lonergan. There is no doubt that shimmerings of genuine advances in creativity may occur in these generations: but they will flash forth in the absence of the supportive theoretic and metatheoretic context that would make them effectively operable. The baton-run to that, however, is a later question. Meantime, I have raised the question, perhaps even the

---

<sup>21</sup>This is a key topic relating to our concrete efforts in the next generations. It ties in with the short-term projects listed below under FSR [a] - [e]. Those project should eventually give rise to lengthy pedagogical treatments of the topics involved, but such efforts need to be in symbiosis with classroom performances. How lengthy the treatments? Well, think of the 200 page commentary on the single paragraph of *Insight*, p. 489, “study of the organism begins ...” that is contained in the 41 *Field Nocturnes* on the website [www.philipmcs Shane.ca](http://www.philipmcs Shane.ca) . See also note 35.

<sup>22</sup>“Time and Meaning”, *CWL* 6, 121.

<sup>23</sup>“Exegesis and Dogma”, *CWL* 6, 155.

puzzle for you, of two types of interpreter.<sup>24</sup> There is the coming community of interpreters beyond the next mid-century, the proper analogues of present front-line theoreticians in physics. But there is the community of the present, who are to be nudged into grimmer slow and sweaty climbing by the baton-exchange of functional researchers.

There are many directions in which I might venture now, in my ramblings round this task. But it is as well to keep in mind those two meanings of interpretation, roughly - but only roughly - related to the two phases of functional collaboration.<sup>25</sup> The one of interest here, in the second specialty, is a listening mode bent on speaking to the community of functional historians. Here is certainly not the place to attempt a serious communication of the subtleties of that baton-exchange as it is to occur later in this century. It is to be a tricky matter of meaning sliding into ongoing meaning to change future meaning, yet also to change the story of past and future ongoing meaning: a taste of "Burckhardt rather than Ranke,"<sup>26</sup> but lifted from subtle description to a refined explanatory world foreign to our time.

Perhaps here I might put in my first piece of precise research product, especially

---

<sup>24</sup>I raise the question in a plain elementary fashion in *Lack in the Beingstalk*, chapter 1, section 5. So, one may simply puzzle over the questions, Is an interpreter a talker or a listener? But above I am thinking of the long journey to a mature science of global care.

<sup>25</sup>The issue is extremely complicated, and perhaps best thought through initially in terms of runners in a relay. First, the runners are psychologically in the entire race. Then, obviously they look before and after and pine for perfect transfers. What is needed here is the expansion into a book of *The Sketch* - two pages of *Insight* (602-3). The expansion must lift the treatment of **pure formulations** and **hypothetical expressions** into a functional context that is concretely normative. Think, for instance, of the lift into a full chapter treatment of the statement, "they are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint" (*Insight*, 602) The lifting requires that one think through the modes of construction in each specialty - sentence by sentence within that differentiated specialty's control of meaning - and the manner in which such expression moves - baton-wise, as it were, in a pure form - into the next specialty.

<sup>26</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250.

since it has its amusing story. Back, then, to the late mid-1960s. Lonergan is scheduled to present his draft of the chapter on meaning for the prospective book. Fred Crowe and I sit among the interested group as he reads - such was his way then - what later becomes chapter three of *Method*. I still recall asking at the end about the dynamics of the ordering in the chapter: to anyone reading now there is a clear climbing. Lonergan's reply was casual: it was just a handy way of introducing the topic.

After the lecture Crowe and I paced round the grounds in frustrated puzzlement. This was not what we had been expecting. We had both been tuned, from our struggles that began in the nineteen fifties, to expect something like the beginning of that missing second volume of *Insight*.<sup>27</sup>

But let me focus that surprise empirically by talking of the present experiment, the present group envisaging, in this odd week, anomalous tracks in the *Complete Works*. Might some of our group not share a surprise like Crowe's and mine when reading the instructions for interpretation in chapter 7 of *Method*, recollecting the dense complexity of the instructions in chapter 17, section 3, of *Insight*? My first precise research product, then, is this discovery of two tracts, or tracks, as it were, generated by the same particles. Is my research on that topic now finished? By no means; the hunt reaches out to other zones in the *Complete Works* and finds a parallel ambiguity. Nor is this reaching out an easy matter: so, one cannot rely on indices,<sup>28</sup> and, besides, the divergences on the meaning of interpretation can come cloaked in other words.

I ramble here around the task of research, interpretation and history. But surely my illustration makes it obvious that, even in this single illustrative case, the tasks are

---

<sup>27</sup>A letter to Eric O'Connor in 1952 expresses this possibility and hope. The latter is produced in full on page 156 of Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas*, Axial Publications, 2010. This work is to be referred to below as **Lambert and McShane**.

<sup>28</sup>I draw attention here to an important missing reference in the index of *Insight* to interpretation as it occurs in the problem of the Lorentz Contraction (*Insight*, 186-87).

way beyond the competence of a single, or a few, talented scholars?<sup>29</sup> I recall now a gathering in Montreal on the topic of Lonergan's hermeneutics in the late 1980s.<sup>30</sup> We did not even arrive at the above question, and certainly did not get near the canons of hermeneutics. We moved in the style of the same old same mold scholarship that prevails still. What a serious effort at functional research - one way beyond the present groups week of puttering - is to do is to shift deeply the statistics of focused scientific attention to data. There is a sense in which I should go no further here. I have made a disturbing claim: that collaborative functional research on Lonergan's *Complete Works* is the heart of the matter, of what is the matter in present Lonergan studies.

Detailed research into chapters 7, 8, and 9 of *Method in Theology* would reveal much more, and indeed would turn this article into a set of research volumes. My present effort is restricted to illustrations that may blossom into invitations to a turn for the better in our communal reading of Lonergan. I am reaching, in my fantasy, for "a new and higher collaboration of the pursuit of truth,"<sup>31</sup> and an honest stumbling

---

<sup>29</sup>A broad observation may help here. The old style of thinking and writing is supported by a non-advertence to the full aggregiform heuristic that both history and Lonergan invite. We need to be dominated by adequate diagrams, the central one of them being **W3** (See Lambert and McShane, 161: the diagram is also available in other places e.g. my *Music That is Soundless*, 130). The issue is raised clearly and precisely by Lonergan in *The Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, page 150: "In this life we are able to understand something only by turning to phantasm; but in larger and more complex questions it is impossible to have a suitable phantasm unless the imagination is aided by some sort of diagram. Thus, if we want to have a comprehensive grasp of everything in a unified whole, we shall have to construct a diagram in which are symbolically represented all the various elements on the question along with the connections between them." On the diagram **W3** see further note 55 below.

<sup>30</sup>The proceedings of the conference were later published as *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.

<sup>31</sup>*Insight* 740. This is the first of 29 mentions of **collaboration** in that 5<sup>th</sup> section of chapter 20 of *Insight*.

“Resumption of the Heuristic Structure of the Solution”<sup>32</sup> that lifts that hurried ending to *Insight* into the seed of a massive global reach eleven and a half years later in Lonergan’s life. I present an embarrassing doctrine, as embarrassing as telling a historian that he be “at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay his cards on the table.”<sup>33</sup> Yet such a telling is built into the cute strategy of the stumbling book, *Method in Theology*, for the telling comes out in an icy nakedness lurking in the second half of page 250 of the book. “Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company,”<sup>34</sup> but the suffering billions of our times cannot afford polite delicate dancing round the pretenses of muddled thinkers.

So, I have arrived herenow at that page that screams for research - has anyone else noticed it? It patterns particles of meaning in a fashion that points to new galactic structurings of the universe of physics and philosophy. But I have certainly drawn sufficient attention already, as researcher, to that single massive research project.<sup>35</sup>

Yes we might well think of the task of this week as an elementary version of the tackling sketched in that single page. Indeed, there we are, at the bottom of the previous page, paused at, over, in, the word *Assembly*. We turn the page on that word: “*Assembly* includes the researches performed”, and then we, here and now, are invited to move through our own version of the top half of that page, which we hurry through now: for my eyes are on line 18 and what follows. “The results will not be uniform.” The grounds of that non-uniformity are to be discovered by two twists of method. We not only share our suggestions, we share a naked positioning in our attitudes towards a life

---

<sup>32</sup>The title of the 5<sup>th</sup> section of Chapter 20 of *Insight*.

<sup>33</sup>*Method in Theology*, 193.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>35</sup>The commentary on the page in the Website essays **SOFDWARE** and *Quodlibets* run to a few hundred pages.

of serious contemplation, *theoria* in a serious Greek sense.<sup>36</sup> Not only do we do this but we start all over, in a “final objectification of horizon” where we struggle to be brutally luminous about our choices. Are you up to this, for this?

In the film *Shalom Bombay*, the doctor invited to participate in slum-medicine in Mumbai eventually has to face the Irishwoman’s question about whether he is “cut out for this”. There is no problem in not being “cut out for this”, not being up for heroism or even for serious understanding. There is no problem of not being on track, in tennis, for Wimbledon. And perhaps some of us struggling here are not up to high performance. Still, we are a beginning group, having a shot at an impossible dream, companions of Quixote, far from Wimbledon. May I suggest here, that “if something is worth doing, it is worth doing badly”?<sup>37</sup> Let us, then, see how it goes in these next weeks - or years, or decades.

And here I must move abruptly on to my envisaging of the four forward specialties. Oddly, that brief envisaging can bring us closer to the heart of our realistic challenge. What follows is primarily fantasy, yet that is the character of this essay: indeed, the issue of “characters of fantasy”<sup>38</sup> might well be a slogan for my hope.

So, let us home in, be at home in, some fantasy about foundations. We are here meeting personally the core of the problem that Lonergan and I talked of in the summer

---

<sup>36</sup>“In the Greek patristic tradition *theoria* became the name of contemplative prayer” (Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit,” *A Third Collection*, 27. Contemporary uses of the word regularly reduce its meaning to rich complexities of description. The issue here is serious incarnate understanding, within the integral context of hugging the universe, the goal of serious minding. “Theoretical understanding, the, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view” (*Insight*, 442)

<sup>37</sup>A quip I shared with Fred Crowe around 1980, much to his amusement. I am told that it is from Chesterton.

<sup>38</sup>This is a large critical issue of the present, tied in with adult and eschatological growth. One must come to grips intimately with the “zeal” (*Insight*, 722, last word) heuristics of molecular-patterned finitude that each of us is, immortal diamonds flexed forward by the effort of 13.7 billion years.

of 1966. He was resting a great deal that Summer, getting used to breathing with one lung, lying by the Bayview<sup>39</sup> Regis College swimming pool, occasionally telling me off-colour jokes. But in his room he paced over the challenge of writing *Method*. He did not recall his early ambition of a second large volume to follow *Insight*,<sup>40</sup> but his musings with me centered on the troubling remark, "What am I to do? I can't put all of *Insight* into the first chapter of *Method*!" When I came to index the book five years later, I was on the look-out for his handling of the problem, and I still recall my first reading of the typescript corresponding to those pages 286-7. Read them and groan: especially the brutal humour of his "one can go on".<sup>41</sup>

So, here I am, and you are, at the heart of our realistic challenge. What of the list of research-identifications that was our initial topic? These two pages give us some marvelous discomfoting pointers. The researchers need to envisage the subsections of these 9 groups in a strategic manner, and then push into the more discomfoting pointing in that brief central paragraph of page 287. Perhaps it is worth quoting here, in all its horror. It is a large part of the horror of Lonergan's personal life, the horror expressed in his 1935 letter,<sup>42</sup> of the non-support of his work throughout his life, of his last years. The one that "can go on" and did go on was Lonergan. "From such a broadened basis one can go on to a developed account of the human good, values, beliefs, to the carriers, elements, functions, realms, and stages of meaning, to the question of God, of religious experience, its expressions, its dialectical development."

---

<sup>39</sup>Bayview is the name of a highway going north in Toronto, with no view of the Bay. That Regis College was where Lonergan lived during his convalescence from his lung operation until he moved to Boston.

<sup>40</sup>See note 27 above.

<sup>41</sup>I note that he has given, prior to this, references to *Insight*. Perhaps it was this focus on *Insight* that distracted him from adding a tenth section, (10), identifying the foundational significance of functional collaboration.

<sup>42</sup>The full letter is available on pp. 144-54 of **Lambert and McShane**.

He had wanted to go on in 1952 and 1953, in a non-functional effort that yet might have turned functional in the effort of his creative writing. But his superiors needed a victim for the Roman mob.<sup>43</sup>

This essay is not about Lonergan, of course, but about you and I in history, picking up the challenge of history and of Lonergan's pointers in it, and picking it up with elan. The sad story of the origin of our problem, if ingested, helps us on our way. "Popular tradition, whether it be poetry, fiction, or acceptable history, is something essential to human living. It is what an existentialist would call an existential category. It is a constitutive component of the group as human. It is an aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin. The aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides, or acts - especially in a crisis."<sup>44</sup> AND we do face a crisis.

But, practically, what is our way? One key component of the way suggested here is to take up the foundational core task, the task of fantasy. It is a brutally difficult slow personal molecular task. What we are doing here, in this exercise, is a very simple stumbling start. Add to the *ethos* of that start in Lonergan's lonely struggle the present struggle of the earth for air. "The most common statement of an achievable goal for dealing with climate these days is leveling off at 450 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere .... we have to do it in about twenty-five years or we will be out of time."<sup>45</sup> Fantasy is not fairyland: it is imagination strenuously reaching out pragmatically into the proximate and remote future, the post-industrial days to come in our present lives as well as in our long-term common "destiny."<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Lambert tells to story of the transfer, **Lambert and McShane**, 67-68.

<sup>44</sup>*Topics in Education*, 230.

<sup>45</sup>Stewart Brand, *Whole Earth Discipline: A Ecopragmatist Manifesto*, Atlantic Books, London, 2010, 13-14.

<sup>46</sup>*Method in Theology*, 292.

The fantasy I am suggesting here certainly does not lift us clearly into the great movement advocated by Stewart Brand,<sup>47</sup> but it is a component of that movement that involves a tough turn of interest in Lonergan to Lonergan's lonely interest.<sup>48</sup> At the end of the last century I recalled Ezra Pound's praise of Flaubert effort as shaking up the beginnings of the twentieth century before it began - our present times, indeed - with "every fellow mousing round for his liver and his lights,"<sup>49</sup> and I went on to conclude "And is there not, in Lonergan studies, signs of such mousing, a neurotic hurry to absorb the Canadian stranger into the tale of the century as the Athenian strangers were absorbed by fourth century Greece?"<sup>50</sup>

See, seize, then, the present invitation to fantasize as wonderfully pragmatic, "A Fresh Pragmatism,"<sup>51</sup> a pause to ask ourselves, What are we doing? And "What on earth is to be done?"<sup>52</sup> The pause, of course, could throw us back to brood on two tasks of functional history and of dialectic that I slipped over: the story of Lonergan studies

---

<sup>47</sup>Integrally presented in the book mentioned in note 45 above. Add the writings of James Lovelock, e.g. *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth Is Fighting Back - and How We Can Still Save Humanity* (2006) and *The Vanishing Face of Gaia: a Final Warning* (2009).

<sup>48</sup>Especially important to him was his lonely climb into the world of physics. Chapter 10 of **Lambert and McShane** deal with this. The climb must move, in us, towards a fresh technology of physics, a nano-technology meshed with bio-mimicry.

<sup>49</sup>Forest Read (ed.), *Pound/Joyce: the Letter of Ezra Pound to James Joyce, with Pound's Essays on Joyce*, Faber and Faber, 1967, 194-5. See also the index under *Flaubert, Bouvard et Pecuchet*.

<sup>50</sup>This is a basic theme of Eric Voegelin, *Plato and Aristotle. Order and History*, volume 3, Louisiana State University Press, 1957, where he writes of the shrinkage of Plato's Stranger (234) and of Aristotle's *Spoudaios* (300).

<sup>51</sup>I am recalling the title *Past Keynes Pastmodern Economics: A Fresh Pragmatism* (McShane Axial Publishing, 2002). In this essay I say little about economics but it is in fact to be centre-stage in the climb into the future. Theologically it meshes with a full treatment of the Old and New Covenants in terms of a theology of promise, of the promises that constitute money.

<sup>52</sup>I quote from the end of Lonergan's letter of 1935 to his superior: **Lambert and McShane**, 154.

and its honest naked self-assessment. But I am interested here in a realistic bent to the future among us. I am interested in that bent as it could be expressed by some group making a noise, “making conversion a topic,”<sup>53</sup> where the noise is about the topics that are at the heart of a serious cherishing of the earth in its empirical gasping, human and non-human, for air, for heirs.

I am talking, then, primarily about the group of researchers, who find that they could have a function, indeed a vocation, to be the beginning, finally, of functional collaboration: 7 people seriously asking “Where are the other seven, where ought they to be?” The second seven are the seven specialties to follow, though we might well think of 7 members struggling to get a focus in each of those specialties.<sup>54</sup>

But the talking is an invitation to concrete fantasy, to take one’s eyes off the page and into one’s molecules. I have asked for such fantasies from others this week. Will there be a coincidence, an overlapping? Here I would ask you and me - 7 of us, perhaps, more or less - to note, as an exercise in getting to grips with the on-going story, that we are a group struggling, in these lines that wrap round our neuromolecules, to envisage - loosening those very molecules towards new patterns - on-going foundations, an on-going Standard Model. To do that envisaging we have to, as it were, move our molecular selves around through each specialty. We are grappling with the meaning of

---

<sup>53</sup>*Method in Theology*, 253.

<sup>54</sup>To help the fantasy of the future I sometimes use the number 22,220, or a multiple of it, to give a sense of the later collaboration. 10,000 each in FS1 and FS 8; 1,000 each in FS2 and FS7; 100 each in FS4 and FS6; 10 each in FS 4 and FS 5. The number 10,000 comes from Gandhi, and a specialist in each village comes from Lonergan. Also, there are near enough to 10,000 university-like structures on the globe. Multiples of 10, 100, help toward a more realistic image of a community of global care. And here is as good a place as any, as we move to two lists of research projects, to note the gap between the present messing and the powerfully effective global metascientific orientation of a later time in this millennium. The mature global reach will have a solid luminous consensus, so that the cycling will be of refinements, delicacies of meaning. Then the notion of “cumulative and progressive results” (*Method in Theology*, 4 ) will be a firm presence in this **Cosmopolis**.

FS in the formula that I gave for the standard model, UV + GS + FS.<sup>55</sup>

That grappling is tentative fantasy, but I am going ahead now towards being more concrete in my envisagement of, say, 8 groups who might take the suggestion serious regarding the type of functional research that could pass on round in a first flow of batons.

So let me go on to illustrate the functional research that occurs to me as I write; something that we "7" might consider together AS DIALECTICIANS, so as to reduce my list, or add, correct, etc.

It seems useful to make two lists, one minimalist and more related to our immediate humble ventures, labeled FSR 2011 - 20. Then there can be the second list FSR: 2011-2111.<sup>56</sup>

### **FSR 2011 - 20**

We need to collect pointers on

[a] **implementation**, especially in its relation to the eighth specialty.

Note here that I really mean *collect, not think out* and this is the case with all items on the list. Functional researcher do have clues and hints, and some of these show up in the presentation of the research and its ordering. It is thus that the baton is handing on to

---

<sup>55</sup>The standard model that I have in mind requires that the community have a solid grip on UV and FS: this is explicit in the diagram **W3**. (See note 29 above). The symbol **GS** is not in that diagram, which diagram, incidentally, I invented the morning of my lecture at the meeting mentioned in note 30. For the sake of clarity and continuity I have not modified that diagram since its invention. GS - genetic systematics - is an enrichment of the heuristic through reversal of counterpositions. It is a highly complex geohistorical heuristic that sublates the view of genetic systematics as more than a genetic sequencing of systems within history. It requires, rather, a recognition of the locality or personality of systems in history [Alexandria or Antioch, Luther or Lainez, whatever] and so caters diagrammatically for what Lonergan talks of in terms of overlapping, merging, etc horizons.

<sup>56</sup>A context for this list is my Website book, *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, written in 2008. In that book I introduced the heuristic nudge of thinking in terms of 2111.

the next group, who have to face the difficult work of creative learning. How are they to face it? That is an issue that points us towards and beyond the larger project named at the end of the Conclusion, but so far I have mentioned the significance of teaching and of pedagogical writing.

[b] **aggreformism**: the modern equivalent of what is the Aristotelean frontispiece of *Insight*.

[c] **probability** and the other bits of the definition of emergent probability. THIS is an embarrassing point. Most Lonergan scholars are nominalists in the matter. E.g. how many of us could speak intelligently of even one probability distribution? One could start with Ken Melchin's pointers in *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability*.

[d] tracks to coming to grips with the concluding phrase of the second chapter on common sense

in *Insight*: "our account of common sense relates it to its neural basis and relates aggregates and successions of instances of common sense to one another." The tracks here will gradually reveal how far-reaching and significant this hunt is. It reaches, backed by [a] and [b], for the development of a symbolism that would lift studies of Lonergan's work out of its present tendency towards nominalism and even lift it on towards not always "arriving on the scene a little breathlessly and a little late" (*Insight*, 755). A single illustration helps: what do you and I and the Lonergan scholars normally mean by *phantasm*, and is it not time to move to a normative meaning that includes a heuristics of neurodynamics?

[e] in line with the last remark in [d] there is the lifting of chapters 2 and 3 of *Method in Theology* out of descriptiveness. The lifting involves a hunt through such works and *Insight* and *Phenomenology and Logic*.

#### **FR 2011 - 2111.**

The primary purpose of this list is encouragement, a glimpse of the distant view, but it also relates to present talent: there are people round about who could tune into these

zones for the sake of the long-term future. AND if their work is thesis work, they can surely bluff along compactly to arrive, as an aside, at the standard thesis, knowing that they are really only doing research to which they add words of Lonergan and of the general academic world.

[1 ] collect stuff on “the position” in order to reveal both the horrid challenge and yet the simplistic descriptiveness of Lonergan’s statement of it in *Insight*. We have so much loose talk of intellectual conversion, and Mark Morrelli’s discomfoting addition of Hegel to the problem does not seem to have made an impact. I have written here and there about the needed additional axioms to the statements in *Insight*, but here I just add an illustrative nudge: check *Verbum*, 162, on “intentionality” and hunt for related texts. Is there not “evidently” a missing track in Lonergan’s presentation of the position, one to be caught in an axiom of intentionality? Let me put the issue with nice bluntness: as both pilgrims and in the hereafter we are brutally alone!<sup>57</sup>

[2] range around seeking Lonergan statements on **incompleteness** [there is a positional axiom there too, but enough for the moment!], “further questions that arise, but cannot be answered” (*Insight*, 596). He is talking of Goedel’s theorem there, as he did earlier on pp. 18-19, [see also, of course, *CWL* 18) but it is a broad rich issue that reaches out to a serious treatise on eschatology, on the incompleteness of “infinite surprise” ( the concluding words of the Epilogue of my Website *Wealth of Self*).

[3] I have already commented at reasonable length on the debate about grace and Lonergan’s suggestions regarding participations in God’s Persons: the comment is on the Website as Bridgepoise 9, “The Hypothesis of a Non-accidental Human Participation in the Divine Active Spiration. ” The need here is to search out tracks - and it will required functional collaboration - towards a fuller functional aggreformic

---

<sup>57</sup>A context here is Mark Morelli’s work on Hegel and Lonergan. See his “Lonergan’s Debt to Hegel and the Appropriation of Critical Realism”, 405-421 of *Meaning and History in Systematic Theology. Essays in Honor of Robert M. Doran. SJ*, edited by John D.Dadosky, Marquette University Press, 2009.

heuristics of the issue and the reality.<sup>58</sup>

[4] there needs to be an effort to track the road from the “comeabout” text of *Insight 16* (537) to the “fuse -ing” text of *Insight 17*, (p. 610, line 9) which is half-way through the second canon of hermeneutics.

[5] A recent research discovery of mine serves to finish this random list. I happened to notice, a year or so ago, that Thesis 12 of Lonergan’s *The Incarnate Word* - not yet published - has the remark, “the natural desire to know is ineffable”. Wow.... should we not rummage round his *Collected Works* to see how this “ties in”? It catapults us into a darkly luminous ball-park, where no one has trod before: “Grace: The Final Frontier.”<sup>59</sup>

I have kept my lists to five in each, but they could well be extended way beyond that number, indeed, may be so extended by my co-experimenters of this week of November 2010. But that extending is to be the topic of *FuSe 2*, an essay to appear on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011, pushing forward out communal effort. Meantime, our focus should be fantasy, an incarnate focus, a character business that is not busy but quietly going about the self-as-subject, badly named thus by Lonergan in *CWL 18*: since *as* does not at all have its usual meaning. It is the totally concrete, culturally and historically trapped self that is you and I, surrounded and infested with “the monster that has stood forth in our time.”<sup>60</sup> The fantasy must be a therapy reaching to the marrow and molecules of our bones, and it needs be thus recognized as communal, as a terrible blinding.

The blinding is not helped by the final three chapters of *Method in Theology*. It is

---

<sup>58</sup>There is no adequate account of emergence to be reached outside Lonergan’s invited analysis. For a compact presentation of present muddles see Part 6 of *Science and Ultimate Reality. Quantum Theory, Cosmology and Complexity*, edited by John D.Barrow, Paul C.W.Davies and Charles E.Harper Jr, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

<sup>59</sup>The title of the concluding chapter of my Website book, *The Redress of Poise*.

<sup>60</sup>*Method in Theology*, 40.

almost as if the paragraph in the middle of page 287 both satisfied Lonergan and exhausted him. He finished the chapter skimming over mountainous points from *Insight* and later work and towards the unwritten book that he had hoped about 20 years before. Then he went on, in the chapter on doctrines, not to envisage policies of a total future, but to brood over an old concern: the proper heuristic context of lifting old doctrines into the future. Next he slips through Systematics in an minimalism that dodges saying anything about its full genetic structure: really, all he wanted to say is in a single footnote, a pleading for the avoidance of conceptualism, cousin to nominalism. What of his effort to say something about communications? It was something he did not lecture on previously to any great extent, this “fruit to be borne”<sup>61</sup> but he rose to two powerful and dense first sections, the first about the Tower of Able, the second about the radiance of that Tower into common meaning.<sup>62</sup>

What, then, has our experiment to say about these last three functional specialties? The challenge is to carry the fantasy forward and upward in new strange ways. Here I find myself somewhat at a loss for words because there are too many words. I was in somewhat the same state when I halted the *Cantowers* project at *Cantowers* 41, “Doctrines”.<sup>63</sup> Perhaps I might leave my reaching here incomplete, especially since, as you shall see, this essay gradually led to its identification as, not my answer to the question posed, but a ramble round that question that is an invitation to

---

<sup>61</sup> *Method in Theology*, 355.

<sup>62</sup>The radiance is the problem of sharing that lifts the common meaning in a manner that breaks the grip of *haute vulgarization*. It is a problem of incarnate Tower meanings being shared in vibrant molecularity through myth and metaphor, through all the dancing of the art forms.

<sup>63</sup>Part of the reason for halting the *Cantowers* series, which was to continue to *Cantowers* 117 ( the number of Pound’s *Cantos*!) was the opportunity to collaborate with an Australian group in a study of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. The output from that study was the two series of essays mentioned earlier: SOFDAWARE (8 essays)and *Quodlibets* (about 25). That series was later integrated into the *Cantowers* series. On the content and structure of the Completed *Cantowers* series, see *Field Nocturnes Cantowers* 43.

others to take up, with me, a struggle towards a heuristics of the answer.<sup>64</sup>

## Conclusion

In conclusion, then, it is necessary to pause over the place of this essay, a week's work left with many of the oddities of a first draft, in the enterprise of functional collaboration.

It is most easily identified as what I call - in the metaword W3 mentioned above<sup>65</sup> - C9. It is an output from the eighth specialty. It is an attempt to speak in popular fashion to the community of people interested in the study of Lonergan. I wrote in both a tolerant and demanding fashion. Tolerant, in that interest may be limited to a light-weight effect in one's own life, such as I expected from my students during my twenty years of teaching young ladies in Mt.St.Vincent University in Halifax.<sup>66</sup> And that is O.K. There may be an equivalent readership here. Still that readership can reach out mildly, showing some effective interest in **implementation**, in the changes that Lonergan invites. Such is the lowest-level invitation of the SGEME group, and it has been directed, in this past year, towards nudging people on the matter of moving towards **Sane Economics**,<sup>67</sup> a matter which I now tie to the apparently

---

<sup>64</sup>A context for musing on the last two specialties is P.McShane, "Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts", *Boston Workshops* 7 (1987), 143-174.

<sup>65</sup>See notes 29 and 55 above.

<sup>66</sup>I discuss the strategy of this teaching in *Bridgepoise* 10, "The Liberal Arts and the Future of Science: Part two". *Bridgepoise* 3 is the first part of that treatment. Both papers were presented (September, 2010) at St.Thomas University, New Brunswick, in a Conference on the future of liberal arts.

<sup>67</sup>The bold face is a reminder both of the book, *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, Axial Publications, 2010, and of the August (2010) volume *Divyadaan: Journal of Education and Philosophy* which is devoted to the question, "Do You Want a Sane Global Economics?"

simple and harmless slogan “There are two types of firm.”<sup>68</sup>

But there is the demanding and disconcerting side of what I have written here. It is not easy to receive the message that Lonerganism - and you - have been on the wrong track, especially since the publication of *Method*, but really from its beginnings. That is a large piece of my message: but was it adequately expressed? Certainly not: that is one more research project that hovers over *Method*, page 250. The message has to emerge slowly in its fullness through *Assembly*, *Completion*, etc etc. The story of Lonergan and Lonergan studies must be told in that refined and challenging fashion, and met with counter-stories in the existential tensions of the second half of that famous page.

Now (and I mean now in the sense perhaps of these next years or perhaps this next decade - the journey, as I humorously suggest, towards a 20/20 vision) we cannot wait for that slow emergence. THAT brings in the significance of the message of this essay and its discomfiting bluntness. It presents a loose illustration of something that I have suggested for decades: that we could have a stumbling shot at the bottom half of page 250 of *Method*.

This gets you, perhaps, to do some serious musing about lines 18-33 of the page, beginning “the results will not be uniform”. My effort in this week was to express loosely, compactly, my stand on taking a shot at researching creatively Lonergan’s *Complete Works*. It is my stand, a blunt honest and, likely, an annoying stand. Nor should it be otherwise on this page: that is the genius of Lonergan’s suggestion: one is not in this dialectic ball-park if one does not speak bluntly and incarnately. Your results are, I suspect, different, but I hope blunt, even if expressed more briefly.

What are we to do? I must be strategically realistic here. I doubt if many took seriously my casual invitation to attempt this week’s experiment. Who could, on the

---

<sup>68</sup>This relates to the effort to break through in the media, but it is an analytic short-cut for popular presentations of Lonergan’s economics. It brings out neatly the flaw in the text-book diagram of flows between households and firms. Distinguishing the two types of firm - those for consumer goods and those for higher-order goods - blossoms into an identification of normal and normative oscillations etc.

nonce, take a week off in November 2010 to contemplate the application to Lonergan's *Collected Works* of his sketch of functional collaboration? So, here's the deal.

I would like those vaguely curious about this possible application to join me in these coming months at the last word on page 249 of *Method*: conjure up your own sketchy *Assembly* of what is mentioned in the first four words of page 250, "includes the researches performed", but, by adding two words, lift the hunt into a fantasy of the next decade, "includes the researches to be performed." Notice that I am skipping us down the page towards line 19: "indicating the view that would result ...". I am not even, at this stage, pushing the embarrassing challenge of each of us stating our positions (roughly, lines 20-28). I am interested simply in moving to a very shabby version of the "final objectification of horizon" (line 28): an expression by each of us of our view on all the participant's views, those views conveniently gathered and circulated by some convenient date, so that we try a second round of self-exposure. I would be happy to let someone else do the gathering, but it seems less trouble if I do the gathering and the circulation, with January 6<sup>th</sup> as a festive deadline for contributions and the circulation to be done in the week following. Then I would envisage the personal expressions coming to me by, say, mid-February, so that I would have the new communal effort available for recycling shortly after that. **THEN**,<sup>69</sup> those still with interest and energy and time might do that second recycling.

**THEN?** I am thinking concretely and proleptically especially of the new society<sup>70</sup> with its focus on fostering a more integral effort to bring functional specialization to bear on our global problems. Here, certainly is one place to begin. The society started

---

<sup>69</sup>I am recalling a previous effort to broaden horizons towards effective praxis: *Cantowers* 5, "Metaphysics THEN"

<sup>70</sup>As I finish this, the New Society, bubbling out of Skipperweb communications, with a focal interest in Functional Collaboration, is as yet lacking in a specific name. I might call it, for the moment, *Cosmopolis*.

with the appearance of the *Minutes of the Boston Meeting* of June 26th, 2010,<sup>71</sup> and would, it is hoped, have a contribution to make at the next meeting. My original question, after all, is surely central to that meeting's concerns.

At all events, the best I can personally do is give my own attempt at that fresh recycling, and I shall do so, under the title *FuSe 2*, on March 1<sup>st</sup>, both on my own Website and on Websites related to the new society. Will others participate? [nothing happened; but I leave the follow-up sequencing below as I presented it: ... better luck in 2011 : ) ]

Here, then, is my sequencing of events:

[1] The Initial Project-Invitation, "Functional Specialization on Lonergan's *Complete Works*", suggested on Skipperweb, November 4<sup>th</sup>.

[2] The present essay as part of that project, becoming a fuller invitation: November 11<sup>th</sup>.

[3] Participations in that Project to result in personal suggestions of strategies for "FS and LCW", e-mailed to me [ [pmcshane@show.ca](mailto:pmcshane@show.ca) ] before January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

[4] A circulation of the collection by January 15<sup>th</sup>, towards a new recycling. The results of that recycling e-mailed to me by February 15<sup>th</sup>, and then circulated.

[5] My commentary on the situation to date, on my Website as *FuSe 2*, March 1<sup>st</sup>, with other's comments to be included there or to follow later: this final personal expression being an option of each participant.

---

<sup>71</sup>The Boston Minutes and the out-reach for the New Society are both posted as *Sgeme 15* on [www.sgeme.org](http://www.sgeme.org).