

Fusion 5:

What Collaboration Might be Achieved in 2010-2015?

This essay was initially envisaged as a lift towards a Grand Fantasy.¹ It was most recently to be titled “A Future Culture of Effective Collaboration,” though an earlier title was that of an old classic, *The Perfectibility of Man*.² Gradually I was led away from that towards making this more elementary effort to encourage a largeness of imagination in this (2009) Summer’s two shots at collaboration: a gathering at Seton Hall University, New Jersey (June 19-21) on Lonergan’s economics, a gathering at St. Mary’s University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, in July, with focus on functional collaboration.

As I grappled with the beginnings of that task in the context, and conclusion, of a previous essay,³ I realized that it was too early for my intended individual

¹I have been asked to enlarge earlier versions of this essay in various ways. But I have resisted enlarging, e.g., the 26 sections of Part One. I have, however, added references to previous writings and essays of mine that could be helpful. I have resisted also the temptation to add references to other Lonergan scholars, whether they be for or against functional collaboration. (See, pray, my final comment of this paper: the second paragraph of note 6 below). You might think of this essay, then, as a foundational statement, and such a statement - whether as part of Dialectic (see *Method*, 250, lines 20-33) or Foundations - needs to be direct speech but with biographical specifications, a narrative context. So, here, it is worth noting that my first serious envisaging of a Grand Fantasy was when taking the year 1988-89 in Oxford to write the book promised - for the end of the 1980s - on the last page of *Wealth of Self*, titled then *Process: a Paedeiad*. Certainly the book climbs towards fantasy, especially in its final sixth chapter, “Total Process” but it is primarily an introductory book, available on the Website, and titled *Process: Introducing Themselves to Young (Christian) Minders*. Fittingly, my third-last note in this essay recalls that strange effort.

²John Passmore, *The Perfectibility of Man*, Duckworth London, 1970. Lonergan’s functional globalization is a massive shift in the beauty and efficiency of human perfectibility.

³The present essay was to have been a later *Fusion*, but I moved it up, so that the previous essay I refer to here, written earlier, becomes, much-revised, *Fusion 11*. Further I would note that the present essay is trimmer than it might have been, due to the maturing of Fusion 6, now titled “The Emerging Beauty of Functional Collaboration”. Initially *Fusion 6* was titled “The Emerging Beauty of Economic Collaboration”, with a focus on economics, dealing with the promise of functional specialization in economics that lies in the five-year plan for the

consideration, fantasy, of the functional specialty **Interpretation**. So, here I move to the broader task, with Lonergan's two meanings of *interpretation* as, perhaps, a way, a mindset, of holding our efforts together our beginning this adventure.⁴

Part One is the adventure, a strange alphabet adventure. That adventure's 26 pointings sit before a second shorter part, and indeed its reading could be placed after the reading of that short part, Part Two. There is a way in which Part Two echos Lonergan's first effort, of forty years ago, in 1969, to give us his spin on global loneliness, his cosmo-pull-it-on cycle.⁵ Then Part One is seen as yet another sketch by me of the collaborative project, my first sketch being from that same year of 1969.⁶ Do I

development of the eighth specialty. The dynamics of this maturing, and its curious reverse feedback through the specialties, would over-complicate the present essay. You will still find the "planning" in the present essay obscure; what is important is the mood of reaching into the unknown together, decisively, dodger-free. Notes 81 and 133, below, are central to that mood and that planning.

⁴I wrote previously of the two meanings in *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causeway* (Axial Publishing, 2007), a book written before that strange million-word venture of 117 *Cantowers* (2002-2007), but written with a large reach in "a way that spirals forward so that later generations can arrive at the challenge of interpretation in its two basic senses with fresh and communal hope" (*Lack in the Beingstalk*, 25). My suggestion here, however, is simpler and yet more subtle, older and wiser: How might you begin bringing together *Method* chapter 7 and *Insight* chapter 17? *Method* 7 can be paralleled by the seemingly elementary reaching for the meaning of a friend in conversation. *Insight* lifts that reach into biography and common story and friendly collaboration. Thinking thus you would slowly - oh so slowly - find your existential way into the comeabout intussusception of the second canon of hermeneutics. Then you may face the task of lifting that poise of the *moi intime* into the mind- and molecule- set of functional collaboration as it invites an ongoing *intime* transposition of the stance of creative dialogue: the invitation of this essay.

⁵I might twist this further to talk of the push-it-on psyche of Lonergan's view of *Praxis*. You may glimpse that better through brooding over the alphabet entry below on History, under [O]: On-words! That the insight of February 1965 solved the problem he wrote of in 1953 is something I take for granted, though it may not be familiar to some readers. See *Joistings* 22: "Reviewing Mathews' *Lonergan's Quest*, and Ours", where I apply the characteristics of cosmopolis to the dynamics of functional collaboration.

⁶"Meta-Music and Self-Meaning" was a paper showing the relevance of functional collaboration to the present mess of musicology. It was one of two papers offered at the

have any reason to think that this sketch will be any more successful than Lonergan's sketch of 1969, than Lonergan's larger stumbling sketch of 1972? Perhaps the times are a little riper, like in Hamlet's state of Denmark, both in economics and in Lonergan studies.

The stumbling blocks become stepping stones.

Whatever way you approach Part One I would hope that you find it strange, a molecular finding, a dream-weaving.⁷ We are dealing with two startling strangenesses that, so far, have not been felt as such: the strange democracy of global minding in economics that was Lonergan first decade-long invention; the strange *nomos* of a cyclic cosmopolis the search for which Dark Tower occupied him in the decade round 1960. In February 1965 he heartily sketched a discovery page, ending with a doubly

International Lonergan Conference in Florida, Easter 1970. See the following note, and further in note 131.

As I concluded this paper, it came to me that I should add a final comment here about the slogan of the Florida Conference, "Ongoing Collaboration" and its ongoing abuse. There isn't much difficulty in accepting the fact that Lonergan's discovery of 1965, published in the *Gregorianum* of 1969, was of no interest in that Florida Conference: it was all too recent. Forty years later Lonergan conferences, national and international, continue to gather under that banner of collaboration or at least within a commitment regarding the relevance of Lonergan's work. What is ongoing? [or, as I would like to say, with my twisted meaning of **what: what** is not ongoing!] I recall now, sadly, Ivo Coelho raising his solitary voice in favour of trying functional collaboration during the 2004 centennial gathering in Toronto. His plea went unheard. The Conference, of course, was an abusive week of thirty minute papers packed end-to-beginning. I paced round my old haunt, Dublin, for the next week, brooding over the sad failure of Lonerganism, generating in my walk what became a favorite *Quodlibet* of mine and others: *Quodlibet 8*: "The Dialectic of My Town: *Ma Vlast*". It is an invitation to take a stand in one's own street. On pacing the streets with psychic adequacy, see note 36 below.

⁷The second paper for that Florida conference was on the philosophy of botany, titled "Image and Emergence: towards an Adequate *Weltanschauung*." In the second half of the paper I wrote of the need for what I called philotherapy, a psychic reorientation of academic consciousness, something I associate at present with the escape from an axial *superego*, especially through the neurodynamics of the aesthetic (on the axial *superego*, see *Field Nocturne 2*: "Lonergan's Obscurest Challenge to His Followers"). A fuller reflection is to be provided in a lecture at St. Thomas University in Autumn 2009, "Liberal Arts: the Heart of Future Science", which I will make available in a future *Fusion*.

underlined mine. But the mine remained hidden in his tired old bones and in his late interviews with Val Rice he settled for the hope that his mine-field of explosive creativity would find effective cycling among later disciples. Those interviews were almost thirty years ago. Might we begin again, wake?

What then am I doing here? It is part of my contribution to collaborative planning and practice of these next years, the fruit of my forty years of solid failure and sometimes success in nudging others towards at least the idea of the functional collaboration. Who are the **us** that I write about? I would claim that the **us** includes all who are even vaguely interested in Lonergan's work as a guide to the future.

A final preliminary point, re lack of diplomacy, is worth pausing over. I foresee being undiplomatic. At 77 I am not out to please, and I am not averse to offending. There are buyers and sellers in the temple of Global Care: I would like to kick their essays out of there. At my age, I have nothing to lose: I am not looking for a job, or for approval, or for publications - in the latter zone I have been a solid failure in the past thirty years. However, I would note that some of the potential participants in this enterprise are vulnerable, and so when suggestions come to me about collaboration, or some collaboration occurs, I intend to watch out for, protect, such vulnerability, especially the vulnerability of thesis writers or tenure seekers. Many of you are familiar with Lonergan's advice to me in 1968 regarding the Oxford thesis that I was having trouble with, "give the guy what he wants ... its just a union card". So, some of the suggestions that come to me may well need to be kept anonymous: 'the guy' may be reading this essay or another Fusion effort in which your name and suggestions might appear. It will so appear only with your consent.

2. The Alphabet Soupsong.

[A] An obvious first point for me - is it for you? - is an undiplomatic point, which I pose bluntly: all of us interested in Lonergan must take an explicit stand on functional specialization. The posing and the taking are, of course, a slice of the task of page 250 of

Method, paradoxically the most brilliant page of the book, yet one that is oddly neglected. But we shall come back, and round again, to that. My main point is that I am asking all to take sides. Further, I ask you, who take sides with me, to ask - but diplomatically - those who dodge taking sides to come off the fence. The character of the asking will emerge as we enlarge the context, but here I recall the disconcerting questions of two nudgers: Fred Crowe's old question, "What specialty are you working in?", and Tom Halloran's more recent pointed question, "To whom are you talking?"

[B] Taking sides, of course, requires some grip on the nature of the collaboration involved and I would note that there is a surprising ignorance of that nature. So here we have a second task of the next five years: sharing with each other light on the dynamics of the specialties. At present there is an astonishing absence or dodging of talk about that, and of course it is not helped by the fact that *Method* is a patchy book. Among other flaws it lacks a focus on what I call the key 'baton-exchange' character of the collaboration. The feeling and thinking and talking of each specialized effort is to be luminously functional, a sentence-by-sentence handing on of a task achieved and a different task to be undertaken.

[C] Cos-mi-c-all.⁸ We - those of us who oppose the dodgers - have to begin to think

⁸It seemed useful to throw in here a hint of a larger commonsense fusion, so the single oddword, *cos-mi-c-all* puts us into the context of a consideration of the adult growth of Shakespeare's writing of *Pericles* at the conclusion of chapter 2 of P.McShane, *Lack in the Beingstalk: A Giants Causway*, Axial Publishing, 2007. The chapter - weaving in Joyce's climb - end's thus: "Skin-within are molecules of co-mi-c-all, cauled, calling. The rill of her mouth can become the thrill, the trill, of a life-time, the word made fresh. Might we inspire and expire with the lungs of history? But the hole story is you and I, with and within global humanity, upsetting *Love's Sweet Mystery* into a new mouthing, an anastomotic spiral way of birthing better the buds of Mother."

globally and multidisciplinary. And “it is not easy.”⁹ “*Experto Crede.*”¹⁰ This is a very important point to pause over, with a pause of fantasy, of flexed molecules, that is necessarily mind-bending.¹¹

I fantasize forward from Richard Branson’s good will in selecting elders to a cyclic selection of elders in a later Tower Culture, so that instead of Bono or Mandela there would be an authoritative group of men and women frightful to Institutions like the World Bank or the UN or small-minding religious and academic groupings.

[D] D for Diagrams. It seems to me that if we are to think globally we need significant diagrams.¹² I would suggest, as central, some equivalent of my own diagram which I call W3. It is to be found in many places, and as imaged in a Tower it has the power to uplift imagination.¹³ Its meaning can be enriched in a variety of ways, for example, noticing and ingesting how its operation solves “the problem of general history, which

⁹*Insight* 241[266]. The remark is made about cosmopolis.

¹⁰A comment of Lonergan on the long haul to his economic theory. But I apply it to my slow climb of 40 years towards a grip on, a begin gripped by, global functionality.

¹¹See note 7 above on therapy. The series of 41 *Field Nocturnes*, with its focus on “the study of the organism” turned towards self-study of the human organism, gives a fuller context for this effort. See note 36 below.

¹²There is solid resistance among Lonergan students to complex diagrams. Fr.Fred Crowe opposed me in this from the 1960s on: but at least he was, in his usual way, honest and open about it. This is an area that demands position-taking within the discomfort of page 250 of *Method in Theology*. There is no doubt about Lonergan’s own position: It is presented at length on page 151 of *The Ontological And Psychological Constitution of Christ.*, quoted regularly by me. See also Philip McShane, “Metaphysical Control of Meaning”, *Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies* **24** [2006].

¹³W3, with other images, including the Tower, is available in Prehumous 2, “Metagrams and Metaphysics”. It is also available in various books, e.g. on page 205 of the work referred to in the final footnote of this essay, or in *Music That Is Soundless. A FineTuning for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Publications, 2007, 130.

is the real catch.”¹⁴ But such ingesting is the very slow process mentioned in [C] and returned to in a summary but suggestive sense in Part Two. This is something phylogenetic that belongs to the whole movement forward: think of the cultural history of ingesting the periodic table or of gear-shift driving.

[E] The mention of cultural history brings up the question of what, in the diagram, I call C_9 . It is the culture that is outside the Tower, the rich variety of common senses. Some of us, maybe at present even the majority of us, are commonsense folks, attracted by Lonergan’s pointing to our lonely subjectivity, our neglected desires. There needs to be a sharing of *ethos* here, even though it may take several centuries to make the global care involved in functional collaboration a global common sense, a fullsome heartfelt human hope, a visible cosmopolis. My first year students in Nova Scotia could get the point e.g. of the benefit of such collaboration in shifting from a dysfunctional family holiday.¹⁵ Obviously, we are all member of C_9 : so it is a matter of “making conversion

¹⁴*Topics in Education*, 236. The remark occurs in Lonergan’s final essay there, on History. How one might beat that problem is sketched in *Field Nocturnes CanTower 50*; “Insight Within a New Global Culture.” This was a lecture given at an Australian Lonergan gathering in 2008. Perhaps a word on the odd general title is warranted. The *Cantower* series was to have been 117 essays - the same number as Pounds’ *Cantos* - emerging one per month from April 1st 2002 until December 1st, 2011, to reach a million words. The series was abandoned at number 41 in favour of a collaborative effort towards understanding page 250 of *Method*. My end of that collaboration is contained in 8 *Sofdaware* essays and the *Quodlibet* series of some twenty essays. Other series followed: *Prehumous*, *Posthumous*, *Humus*, *Joistings*, *Eldoredes*, *Surfs*. Eventually there came the *Field Nocturnes*, 41 essays reflecting on the challenge of the paragraph in *Insight* 464[489] beginning “study of the organism begins”. These essays form another entry point to the remain 76 Cantowers (numbers 42-117) which were retitled *Field Nocturnes CanTower*, and absorbed many of the other series, completed three years ahead of schedule at a million and a half words. *Field Nocturnes Cantower 43* gives a full listing of the final *Cantower* Series.

¹⁵See my *Economics for Everyone. Das Jus Kapital* (Axial Publishing , 1998), 149-150, or *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes* (Axial Publishing, 1998) 100-103.

a topic.”¹⁶ And, by the way, *this* is the number-one-conversion for Lonergan students, the conversion to functional collaboration.

[F] Then there is the number-two-conversion for Lonergan students, in order of importance. Don’t panic about this: you may not be called to anything like a fullness of it. It is the conversion to theory, to serious understanding. That was the central appeal, after the need for self-attention, of the book *Insight*.¹⁷ Again, my first year students got a taste of that by working seriously through chapter 3 of *Wealth of Self*: You should develop your own strategies of teaching or personally struggling. In the first chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, “The Value of Lonergan’s Economics for Lonergan Students,”¹⁸ I pointed to his economics as a way into theoretic thinking.

Theoretic thinking in the second time of the human subject is, however, to be metatheoretic: that is the sense of generalized empirical method as it is practiced with relative adequacy in *Insight* and thematized later.¹⁹ That later sense is a mesh of the

¹⁶*Method in Theology*, 253.

¹⁷I make this point especially in the first chapter of Part Three of the biography *Lonergan’s Life and Leading Ideas*, Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, to appear in 2010 in both French and English. That chapter deals mainly with the dominant influence of Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics, in Lonergan’s life*. I note in passing that neither of the other two biographies mention this book. See note 37 below. Add, in all these considerations of Lonergan’s bent, the aesthetic dynamics referred to in note 7 above. “What then is needed is a qualitative change in me, a shift in the center of my existence from the concerns manifested in the *bavardage quotidien* towards the participated yet never in this life completely established eternity that is tasted in aesthetic apprehension.”(Lonergan, in a review of Jules Chaix-Ruy, *Les dimensions de l’etre et du temps*, p. 209 of *Lonergan Shorter Papers, Collected Works*, vol. 20, University of Toronto Press, 2007.)

¹⁸The book is available on the Website.

¹⁹It is thematized in *A Third Collection* in the top lines of page 141. Best repeat that here: “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”. In *Insight* the expression is looser. “We have followed the common

third and fourth stages of meaning, quite remote from present cultures.²⁰ The later sense gives a distant, even eschatological, meaning to the letter [F]. “The field is *the* universe, but my horizon defines my universe.”²¹ The actual psychic presence of the **Field** is everlastingly yet satisfyingly elusive.²²

[G] G is for Cross-over, the single letter in Lonergan’s *New Political Economy* that best conveys his revolutionary thinking. Now it seems to me - and I mean *now* in both senses - that thinking about economics is a way into (1) personal authenticity as a citizen; (2) a grip on the commonsense relevance of functional collaboration; (3) a first shot of all of us at practicing and thinking out the eighth functional specialty. But let us think of that

view that empirical science is concerned with sensibly verifiable laws and expectations. If it is true that essentially the same method could be applied to the data of consciousness, then respect for ordinary usage would require that a method, which only in its essentials are the same, be named generalized empirical method” (*Insight* 72[96]). The shift described in *A Third Collection* is a shocking thematic shift that is eventually to transform present strategies of cultural reflection in all areas. In particular it is to increasingly expose the general bias that holds sway in Lonergan studies.

²⁰It is as well to clear up my usages here. Generalized empirical method (GEM) as specified in *Insight* is GEM 1; GEM 2 is the version that emerges in *A Third Collection*. GEM 3 is a refinement of GEM 2, in that the focus of the subject is on the subject, a focused search for the self-as-self (see *Phenomenology and Logic*, the index under *Subject-as-subject*). The fourth form of GEM, GEM 4, is that of functional collaboration. GEM 4 guarantees a shift in the statistics of emergence of GEM 2, and both these are associated with the third stage of meaning. But there is an overlap here with the presence of GEM 3, which I associate with a fourth stage of meaning, the identification of which is due to John Dadosky. On Dadosky’s work, and on the fourth stage of meaning, see *Field Nocturne CanTower 44*, “The Fourth Stage of Meaning”.

²¹*Phenomenology and Logic*, 199.

²²*Field Nocturne CanTower 116*, “Desire Undistanced”, opens up the topic of eschatological meaning. It is an astonishingly neglected area to which I have devoted some attention in the past thirty years. I am nowhere near a treatise on it, but like to joke about progress in it, in an echo of Fermat’s marginal comment, as Philmac’s Last Theorem. But I have left more than marginal comments in this and other essays: see especially *Fusion 1*. In the present essay alone there are decent leads e.g., to circumincessional enfleshment (note 52, 91) and to patterns of incompleteness (notes 52, 97, 99).

first shot in tandem with a thinking of the first specialty. There is a variety of rich symbolisms that we could associated with this two-facedness, and with the personal authenticity of citizens gripped by a village culture of functional collaboration. However I am now touching on something that is, perhaps, to be at the heart of the five-year weave of effective planning and, disconcertingly, I leave that heart-plan to Fusion 6. But the heart of that heart-plan has to be vision, and meeting me heart-way here, that is the deeper challenge.

[H] Horizon; a giant topic, but what of it is relevant here, in the pragmatics of a five-year reach? Section [O] below was the almost-end of my alphabet venture, but here I end my writing. Learnedly I might appeal to Buytendijk and the phenomenology of meeting.²³ But the existential issue is the strange reach of my **seen words** into your present neuromolecular patterns.²⁴ Might I **stir the flesh of your world**²⁵ so that you

²³The context is Lonergan's reflections on the significance of phenomenology, where he considers Buytendijk's work on page 270 of *Phenomenology and Logic*. The later *Field Nocturnes* give this a larger and subtler context by following up the work on phenomenology that relates to Merleau-Ponty's final incomplete work, *The Visible and the Invisible*, anticipated by Lonergan in that same chapter (278). Renaud Barbaras follows up Merleau-Ponty's efforts in two recent books dealt with in those *Field Nocturnes*. See, particularly, *Field Nocturne 24*, "Merleau-Ponty and other Mudfish", and *Field Nocturne 36*, "Desire and Distance". I would note that these works are relevant to coming to grips with the story of Lonerganism that I point to in this essay as a component of the five-year plan.

²⁴See the previous footnote and note 28 below. A full phenomenology of meeting has to break through the problem of "desire and distance" illuminated by Renaud Barbaras (*Desire and Distance* is his most recent book) so that there is no distance in the meeting of Jack and Jill. I would note that the stabilization of that no-distance (poosition-stability) requires neuromolecular stabilizations. I quote again - I have quoted the text in other contexts but here we have it as a central issue of objectivity and of the conceiving of **the given** - a relevant passage from Rita Carter: "Episodes that are destined for long-term memory are not lodged there straight away. The process of laying them down permanently takes up to two years. Until then they are still fragile and may easily be wiped out" (Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix Paperback,, 2002, 268). The issue goes radically deeper, if one stretches ones horizon towards the field in a manner that wishes to glimpse the ultimate "laying down" that is to be a neurodynamic reality in the minding incarnate word. There would seem to be an ever-incomplete laying down that is an aesthetic

audit, pattern-changed,²⁶ the call to step out of line, the assembly line of courses and essays, to sniff the scent of a billion distant gardens, beyond your horizon, in the field? I point elementarily towards clues that I have gathered up, in scattered and perhaps scatty ways, an alphabet soup of suggestions. Think of the soup-song as an odd type of functional research, where the scattiness is a strategic way of effectively handing you the baton, the challenge of a discomfoting horizon-shift. It is a simple matter of noticing²⁷ my functional research directed to your interpretative bent towards changing your story-line. That bent, surely is **therenow**,²⁸ a porous vulnerable presence, capable of somehow becoming a member of a new global day, a new they? “To see things as comprehensively / As if afar they took their point of sight, / And distant things as intimately deep / As if they touched them. Let us strive for this.”²⁹ And as I steal this

vibrancy of everlasting life. See *Field Nocturnes CanTower 116*, “Desire Undistanced”.

²⁵**Boldfacing** was used, in the later *Field Nocturnes*, as a strategy of inviting the reader into the psychic state of the Poosition, where you and I are then poised in the seen print’s presence in each of us, leaning towards an equivalence with the ‘Jack and Jill’ reality of Tower presence (see note 98 below). Mature habituation of this stance is the result of a long late-adult climb, at present a rare achievement. It is to be a normal Tower stance in later millennia, an self-identifiable feature of adult growth. See further below on adult growth, in note 80. On the meaning of *flesh*, see note 91 below.

²⁶The same points hold as that made in notes 24 and 25 above. The hearing of the call requires a gentle prolonged effort of fantasy that is associated with kataphatic contemplation, a topic that we touch on further in [P], where we pause over the topic of prayer.

²⁷“simple matter of noticing”? A simple twist here for you. We deal more formally with Research under [R] below, but perhaps you notice already that the four words contain a bundle of problems?

²⁸AS I remarked in note 25, the strategy of boldfacing points to the possibility of the reader being in the **poission**, luminous regarding the presence of the print as a neuromolecular reality. This is a difficult personal achievement, a refinement of the position of extreme realism. See *Cantower 9*, “Position, Poission, Protopossession”. Protopossession is a stumbling search there for what is to emerge later as a refinement of the **Comeabout** position (*Insight 514*[537]), due to the intussusception of the second canon of hermeneutics.

²⁹Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, Book 5, lines 185-88.

quotation from a previous effort,³⁰ a feminist reaching, perhaps I could end by stealing also the ending there, inviting you to glimpse and cherish The Dark Tower, the Tower of Able, the new they, a they of rugged fantasy. “There they stood, ranged along the hill-sides, met / To view the last of me, a living flame / I saw them and I knew them all. And yet / Dauntless the slug-horn³¹ to my lips I set, / And blew. ‘Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came.’”³²

[I] I have placed dealing with one’s own concrete circumstances neatly under “I”: what went before [I] is contextualizing, what come after helps to think out what **I** might do. You may do the preliminary identification either spontaneously or by placing yourself, anonymously, in the middle of page 250 of *Method*. In solitary honesty, you need to figure out whether you are seriously converted to (a) the idea of, if not the personal practice of, functional collaboration (b) the need, again personally or at least communally, for the serious understand of things in relation to each other. The solitary effort, of course, can be boosted if you can find a friend! To that I shall return in section [W].

[J] Joining? If you are not into either the practice of functional collaboration or the search for serious understanding, then you have to consider whether you are up to, up for, promoting either. This is true whether you are just an identifiably commonsense person, or a commonsense person who happens to be a professor. If you are not up to, up for, the promotion of functional collaboration then you are back in the class of

³⁰*Cantower 4*, “Molecules of Description and Explanation”, were I lift forwards suggestions of Candace Pert.

³¹A trumpet.

³²Robert Browning, “Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came”, lines 199-204. A childe is a young knight who has not proved himself. In the Cantower referred to I was thinking of a new age lady, a Nadia Boulanger of meaning.

dodgers. If you are up for such activities in some preliminary sense, then you are into **C₉**.

[K] Let me assume that you are in some sense an academic. Then identify both your obligations and your interests. I put these two together here and below as **IO**. [I owe!] Go further and identify what functional zones these overlap, at least vaguely. If, for example, your obligations, or interests, turn you towards “exposing the past” then you need to consider the first four specialties, and so likewise for the forward four specialties. But please do not do this alone!

[L] Let us say that you have a foundational bent.³³ Then you should try speaking out, to yourself initially, your foundational stand, in terms of yourself, not, then, in terms of Lonergan. The feedback from the speaking out should be a lift in your effort to speak out better in the area of your **IO**. You have the list of general categories on pages 286-7 of *Method*, to which you should add (10), functional collaboration.³⁴ A big help here is to take seriously the next paragraph on page 287, a marvelously cunning paragraph. Can you really go on to rewrite - replacing description by explanation - the first half of *Method* ?

And if your interest is in the special categories, the challenge is to lift the light-

³³Full foundational bending requires a dynamic of creative fantasy and of functional foundational circulatory power, but all members of the Tower need to intussuscept the achievements of current foundational people through that circulation. Incidentally, there is at present a massive need for the cultivation of creative learning as different and more general than creative innovation. That is one of the many benefits of the cyclic dynamic of functional collaboration.

³⁴The hurried and tired Lonergan did not put in this twist: foundations includes the collaborative dynamics treated of in the book itself.

weight descriptions of them given in Method 288-291 into an explanatory heuristic.³⁵ Nor do you do this in some sweeping way: you have to share the burden of promoting the giant cultural shift by tackling some small corner. Whether your foundational interest is in general or in special categories, you have to patiently tackle the details suggested, with doctrinal sweeps, by Lonergan. My own best, if muddled, illustration of this is my search for the meaning of the paragraph on *Insight* 464[489] that begins "Study of the organism begins"³⁶

"Begins". Here, in the first section to formally point to a specialty, and that the foundational specialty, it seems best to invite a pause, a resting in, a fundamental goal of the five-year project: to reveal the massive task of bridging "the gap" that was the life-concern of Lonergan.³⁷

[M] Minding Completely Being Thus Far: *Dialectic*. You may have an **IO** that relates you to dialectic: you are teaching or thesis-writing or essay writing critically about someone or some group in the past, remote or proximate. I suggest that you put your work - but perhaps privately for the present if you are looking for publication or approval by orthodoxy - into the context of the second half (lines 15-33) of page 250 of

³⁵As Lonergan would have, perhaps written that second volume of *Insight* that he wrote of in 1952? See note 129 below.

³⁶See notes 23, 24 and 91. The 41 *Field Nocturnes* are a challenging climb, a self-study of the organism that avails of a mix of contemporary neuroscience and the brooding of serious existentialists. It was only in recent years, in my 70s, that I managed to lift this reflection to a luminous positional self-attention to myself as higher animal, a gorilla in the mist of inner sensing, wonderswung out of the trees into the streets. This, I find, is a strange and illuminating way of traveling by bus or walking the streets in my psychic skin, in the darkness of being.

³⁷Recall note 17. This is the bent that I write of here and there, a psychological need for explanation such as carried him through Lindsay and Margenau. The bent can include a need for metaexplanation, and I found that to be an irritation in my first years of physics as diverting from the direct understanding, or sometimes just retention, required. In the new culture of GEM 2 teacher and student and searcher have to live in a new luminosity of self-searching searching.

Method. [L] invited you to figure out your own foundational stand. Add now a figuring out - shabby stuff, perhaps, but your little own! - of the individual or group with which you are dealing. Your "obligatory work" here probably involves you in content, but the "interest work" I am suggesting is reaching for positional stances.³⁸ Aim at a hermeneutics of suspicion here - how intellectually converted am I? - even if you find it a pain in the asking. Indeed, this is a matter of being "at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay his cards on the table."³⁹

[N] Norms of Procedure, remotely posed: *Doctrines*. Are you interested in having a shot at the sixth specialty? Obviously you should, for starters, battle your way, with fresh present **self-attention**,⁴⁰ through the chapter on Doctrines in *Method*. But, curiously, much of this chapter has to do with strategies that belong to the functional specialty history, a very problem-ridden area in both fact and in Lonergan's writings. Perhaps you might usefully turn to a serious reading of Cantower 41, "Functional Policy", which deals with a broader challenge. There is there, for example, a list of 7 methodological policies, none of which is theological, whereas Lonergan's drive in chapter 12 of *Method* is primarily theological in an old sense.

Here and in the functional specialty history, there are layers of problems that cannot even be mentioned summarily: although I will try for some hints when I eventually put together some pointers on history: where I should wish us, as you will note in the end of the next section, to make a beginning. But what can one say that makes introductory sense about the challenge to generate a pure formulation of pure

³⁸It is worth noting that one reaches also for non-positional or cultural stances that do not find their way into foundations, but carry forwards through doctrinal, systematic and communications considerations into various cultures. One should consider in this light the phrase on page 250 of *Method in Theology*, "dismisses other affinities and oppositions" (line 14).

³⁹*Method in Theology*, 193.

⁴⁰Recall note 25 above, on **boldfaced** type.

formulations that are remote yet intensely practical?

[O] Ongoing genesis of being thus far, leaning forward: *History*. This beginning is perhaps odd for you? I have spent a good deal of time in the past forty years, most memorably poised in grass on various spots of the globe, asking about the asking about that genesis. And yes, I left almost to the end of my alphabet souping the task of writing a half-page - which became a page - on a suggested five-year plan regarding this functional task. Lonergan's two-chapter in *Method in Theology* effort on history is a non-functional patchwork, and Crowe's stab at functional history, as he claims, a tentative venture: "When you have a mountain to move, and only a space and a wheel barrow to work with, you can either sit on your hands or you can put space to earth and move the first sod."⁴¹ a venture that, for me, now, seems more a rich ramble of research.⁴²

My beginning phrase of this section is odd, and points to a need for each of us to lean forward towards the billion-year future, preferably poised in nature, pushed by 13.7 billion years, called in the past seven million, a sunflower seed seeking face: [Y][O][U]. Scattered throughout the Lonergan archives there are subtle pages of his asking about the asking about the ongoing genesis, but he never reached the leisured poise to lift general history into the airy remoteness of the mature comeabout skimpily intimated in $\mathbf{HSf}(p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n)$, when that symbol is reduplicatively

⁴¹Frederick E. Crowe S.J., *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History*, Paulist Press, New York, 1978, 148-9. *Cantower 38*, section 4, "The History of the Christian Word" is a tentative critical analysis of the work., useful in illustrating the struggle to find how a colleague - or oneself! - is doing in attempting a functional specialty.

⁴²I approached Crowe's book again in the *Humus* series, when I was struggling to enlarge my idea of functional research. See *Humus 8*: "Crowe's Theology of the Christian Word"; *Humus 9*: "From Crowe to Ourselves as Researchers"; *Humus 10*: "Fr. Crowe's 'The Christian Message Begins'"; *Humus 11*: "The Word of God as Truth"; *Humus 12*: "Crowe: Possibilities of Functional Collaboration".

incarnated in the functional historian. Here, surely, you can glimpse the need for a big book belonging to a quite new tradition of thinking of history, beyond Ranke but resonant with Burckhardt. Fact yields to ongoing seeding, and the seeding is to have a unity of *artistic, explanatory, prophetic*⁴³ functionality, “purged of its defects.”⁴⁴ “The objects of theology do not lie outside the transcendental field”⁴⁵ and the objects of functional history dance in that word-fleshed explanatory field, solving “the problem of general history, which is the real catch.”⁴⁶

Here, certainly, I seem to wander away from five-year planning. “Parents rarely think of the historical process,”⁴⁷ but do Lonergan students? Thinking and writing freshly, [W][O][W], of functional history is a learning [L] challenge for the next five years. But the learning can be done best with a focus on the definite project of a [R][Y][O][T]⁴⁸ with regard to the piece of historical inquiry that asks What is the discipular going-on of Lonergan’s Care in the past forty years?⁴⁹

⁴³I refer here to Lonergan’s considerations of pre-critical history (*Method in Theology*, 185), but now I am pointing to a fuller retrieval of it in later integral history and its handling of the neurodynamics of subjectivity. It is a difficult future topic that relates to what I remarked on above, especially in notes 23 and 24.

⁴⁴*Method in Theology*, 185.

⁴⁵*Method in Theology*, 23.

⁴⁶*Topics in Education*, 236. See above, note 14.

⁴⁷“Finality, Love, Marriage”, on page 47 of *Collection*, University of Toronto Press, 1988.

⁴⁸I refer, of course, to my alphabet soup, but I would have you note that you are to be a riot in the ongoing life of Lonerganism, the ryot in the short-lived ryegrass. *Ryot*, a word from the Hindi, means a peasant or tenant farmer. See note 133 below.

⁴⁹Relevant here are Lonergan’s reflections on **decay** in various works, but perhaps most relevant to the question is Lonergan’s account of Husserl’s criticism of modern science, the flaws in it, the remedies for it (See *Phenomenology and Logic*, 252 ff). The fundamental remedy is, of course, the process of recycling within functional collaboration. Especially do the existential, brutally-honest, operations of *Method*, 250, shift the statistics of the detrimental emergence of splinter-groups that lean on “the domination of the pragmatic criterion of technique”

[P] It is convenient, under the heading [P], to take up the topic of Prayer. That topic fits nicely into the context of history and doctrines, both zones focused on truth.⁵⁰ My comments here and in the next section may seem at odds with Lonergan's treatment of prayer and religious conversion in *Method*; they are not, but that is matter for a large book. The five-year pragmatics of prayer pivots on giving a centrality to the simple description of prayer as "**resting and questing in the real.**"⁵¹ Curiously, [P] points to questing, while the following section, [Q], pivots on resting.

There needs to be a fresh emphasis on prayer as thinking, obviously thinking within one's position: and one's position, if one is in the Tower, is theist in some sense.⁵²

(*Phenomenology and Logic*, 253). The technique in question in Lonergan studies is, of course, rich comparative descriptive talk, through which "the magician and the gnostic have their day" (*Insight*, 542[566]). Some reflections on the nature and danger of description are given in *Cantower 23*, "Redoubt Description", but a full treatment requires a detailed explanatory heuristics of the second canon of hermeneutics.

⁵⁰This is an altogether trickier question than present thinking permits. "The real issue, then, is truth" (*Insight*, 549[572]) and its self-appropriation is the topic of the seventeenth and following chapters of *Insight*. Were I to carry on the nudging of [O], a concluding section of my soup, I would talk of the task of cherishing truth as being [R][Y][O][T][O][U][S], ending in a system, the Word, "God's concept" (*Insight*, 726[748]). A prayer-context of this would be the pointers on light in the concluding section of chapter 5, "Mystery", of *The Triune God: Dogmatics* (276-298 of the Latin version, *De Deo Trino I. Pars Dogmatica*, is Gregorian Press, 1964: heading towards publication in English at present). But I had best halt my word-constructions here, decisively. Still, you might find it interesting to follow my soup through a dictionary, a way of nudging you towards a richer meaning for the matrix of specialist communications, C_{ij} , i and j running from 1 to 8. See notes 94 and 104 below.

⁵¹This description of prayer emerged at note 10 of *Prehumous 4*, "Foundational Prayer I", the first of series of five essays on foundational prayer: *Prehumous 5*, "Foundational Prayer II. All Saints' Reaching"; *Prehumous 6*, "Foundational Prayer III"; *Prehumous 7*, "Positional Nomology and the Heart of Jesus"; *Prehumous 8*, "Foundational Prayer. Placing Mysticism".

⁵²Certainly, as Lonergan remarks, someone astray in the unreality of non-theism can pursue the first four specialties in some sense: one may think even of their use in supposedly secular realms like mathematics. There are complicated issues here regarding the future population of the Tower of Able that beg for a book not a note. But there are deeper complications regarding the incompleteness of human journeying, in pilgrimage and in

That thinking, normatively, is to be self-luminous, pivoting on the truth that “God is not an object.”⁵³ Withdrawal is a communal affair, and in its W3 diagramming there is a 3P prior to the Sigma of its reach and reaching.⁵⁴ Withdrawing attends to the full concrete world mediated by meaning in its reality and possibilities, and the attending is the straining forward,⁵⁵ “Cosmi-c-all,”⁵⁶ of the 13.7 billion-year-old molecular subject that each of us is, “the principle that can draw people out of that world and into that cloud of unknowing.”⁵⁷ But here I ask for an attending in and to the principle as drawing us into the crowd of knowing. The five year plan asks, self-asks, that we have a shot of establishing a tradition of kataphatic⁵⁸ prayer that twines into all our inquiries.

[Q] The twining is “effective criticism”⁵⁹ at its deepest self-presence. It stands against

everlastingness. The question of legitimate incompleteness points to a fuller solution of global religious dialogue, dialogue based on existential progress in subtle self-possession, “emerging in our consciousness from real, experiential history, not from abstract social theory” I quote here from R.E. Whitson, *The Coming Convergence of World Religions*, as quoted in *A Third Collection* by Lonergan, a relevant context for considering the problem. The issue of legitimate incompleteness could have an eschatological dimension equivalent to a post-pilgrimage poise in the 26th place of section 9 of Chapter 19 of *Insight*.

⁵³*Method in Theology*, 342.

⁵⁴Place this claim of W3 in the context of the conclusion to note 52 above.

⁵⁵The word “straining” calls to mind Lonergan’s own powerful theism expressed in such comments as “God is straining for my heart” that are to be found in his 50+ handwritten notes from his Tertianship retreat in Amiens, 1937. The straining forwards, then, is both active and passive, bracketed by the upper and lower grounds of loneliness. Add the context of note 66 below.

⁵⁶See note 8 above.

⁵⁷*Method in Theology*, 342.

⁵⁸*Method in Theology*, 341. The drive of the essays mentioned in note 51 is towards the emergence of this tradition.

⁵⁹*Insight*, 682[705]..

“the worst of enemies, the one in a man’s own household, that so spontaneously and so naturally tends to adjust and colour the truth one knows to the exigencies of one’s socio-cultural mileau and to the hue of one’s temperament.”⁶⁰ This is the “critical problem”⁶¹ of history, the core of “the problem of general history, which is the real catch.”⁶² The five-year plan asks, self-asks, that we struggle to rest habitually in the dark of the real in our efforts “to protect the future.”⁶³ The resting is for each of us, in our own way, but it is the beating theoretic heart of the *Completion* written of on the fourth last line of page 250 of *Method in Theology*.⁶⁴ Within, wit-in, that resting, the group of dialectic elders are brought “into harmony with the vast but impalpable pressures of the pure desire.”⁶⁵ And all of us, effected by the cycling of wit, can come to sense a little better the dark matter, dark energy,⁶⁶ of bracketing *First Corinthians’* thirteenth chapter with the twelfth

⁶⁰*Insight*, 682-3[705].

⁶¹*Insight*, 684[706].

⁶²*Topics in Education*, 236. See above at notes 14, 46.

⁶³*Insight*, 238[265].

⁶⁴As exemplified by the essays *SOFDAWARE* and *Quodlibet*, there is a central need to attempt to practice, and concomitantly to thematize, the methodological strategies so briefly and brilliantly sketched on page 250 of *Method in Theology*. See *SOFDAWARE* 5: “Care reaching for Completeness”; *SOFDAWARE* 7: “Symbolizing the growth of Care”; *Quodlibet* 9: “Some Foundational Pointings Regarding Completeness”. Note 12 in *Quodlibet* 9 promises a further discussion in *Quodlibet* 12 with title “Completion and Evaluation” but that *Quodlibet* went in another direction. However, that note also points to the need to intussuscept Thomas brilliant self-attentive pointers on care in *prima secundae* qq.6-17, something disconcertingly missing in much of the discussion of care and value.

⁶⁵*Insight*, 723[744]. This entire “27th place” points us all to a relevant context of self-taste.

⁶⁶A nudge here towards a better conception of these muddled features of present cosmic discussion in the light of Lonergan’s powerful suggestions regarding energy and prime matter. Think, e. g., of the molecular infoldings of Paul’s mind, pen, ink and parchment in the cosmic genesis of the display of *I Corinthians*.

and fourteenth. So, cosmopolis, “not a busy body,”⁶⁷ but a “body with many parts”⁶⁸ is seen to yield ever-dark “cumulative and progressive results” that rescue the ordinary that is never ordinary but darkly glorious, giving it “the freshness of a dream.”⁶⁹

[R] An obvious choice of topic here is *Research*. I have written fairly extensively about it in the past five years, so I may refer to those pointers as a help here,⁷⁰ but come now to my suggestion of a five year-focus. The suggestion is that Lonergan’s own works be taken as data for research, much as the output of the cyclotrons of the past century and this are taken for data in reaching into and beyond the Standard Model in physics. We have had far too much Denziger-Lonergy:⁷¹ a good deal of this turns up as doctorate work, but it is a dominant ethos of that mis-direction, comparative studies of Lonergan and X.⁷² Getting the goings-on of Lonerganism into such researching would have the advantage of showing us swiftly how we are kidding ourselves as a group, indeed, dodging - in our soundly established general bias - his triple “strangeness” instead of

⁶⁷*Insight*, 239[264].

⁶⁸*I Corinthians* 12: 12.

⁶⁹*Insight*, 532[556].

⁷⁰The main areas of treatment of this topic are my *ChrISt in History*, Chapter 8, “Research”, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, Chapter 11, also titled “Research” and *Lonergan’s Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, chapter 7, “Hodic Logic”. See also note 42 above, where I relate Crowe’s efforts in regard to history as more pre-functional research.

⁷¹Some of my younger readers may be quite unfamiliar with Lonergan’s complaint about “Denzinger-Theology”, where bits and pieces are selected in order to patch together some view. Denzinger is a compendium of Catholic doctrinal pronouncements.

⁷²Comparative work can be macro - e.g. in a full essay - or micro: e.g. in a sentence. (Let us not get into problems of meso-comparative analyses!) It is not now normatively legitimate except in so far as either [1] it finds precision in the heuristics of *Comparison* pointed to in *Method in Theology*, 250; [2] it occurs as a good creative crutch in the application of the eighth functional specialty.

exposing us to his fundamental bent.⁷³ The initial achieve would be [W][R][Y] or [R][Y][E], even perhaps a mood of cheery humility: have we not misinterpreted Lonergan in both senses of *interpretation*? What is revealed, by the analogy with physics, is the gross lack of the operating context of a serious Standard Model. W3 points to UV as a central and increasingly refined component in that model.⁷⁴ But there is more, to be integrally fantasized about, but too briefly, in Part Two. Part of the more, however, is the Genetic Systematics whose absence is to be brought to life in us in these five years by our having an unsuccessful stab at serious slices of its axiomatic components.⁷⁵

[S] *Systematics* The issue is massively complex, with a complexity that is at the heart of our matter: the complexity of the control of genetic meaning. That is to be an achievement of the next millennium, and it cannot be kept in mind without it being a present - in these five years - focus of strenuous fantasy. We are back at [L]'s identification of an existential an historical gap. How do we work towards this later systematics? First, the cultivation of even a descriptive beginning of genetic context is a core task of me and of thee [I] and of us [W] that needs to become a shared air, and it is has to be focused solidly in a manner that I suggest here. Genetic systematics may be

⁷³See above, notes 17 and 37.

⁷⁴A footnote is not the place for a summary of a missing treatise. We must make do with the analogy of science. "Universal Viewpoint" must be thought of as a growing contentful heuristic, not at all vague in either heuristic or content. Furthermore it shifts in meaning in so far as both genetic system and precisions regarding functionality, regularly recycling, mesh with the Standard Model. This was not something I conceived of when first presenting W3. Instead of UV in that diagram I would now use **UV + GS + F**. But this stuff is a little too far out for the present.

⁷⁵Lonergan talks of axiomatic orderings within scholasticism in *Phenomenology and Logic*, 10-33, 121-24, 127-32, 321. But the shift involved requires moving from descriptive axioms to the control of multidisciplinary explanatory heuristics. At present few scholastic scholars, whether followers of Lonergan or not, are in the ball park of systematic thinking, much less axiomatic thinking. Lonergan remarked to me, of one of his leading followers, "he has no system".

imagined as integrating⁷⁶ slices of systems: e.g., the system of Origen, the system of Aquinas, the system of Popper. Part of the gap-problem is that most of us simply have no serious experience of system: a quite painful journey into Euclid, or Archimedes, or Economics, or even into my little problem of seating 10 couples in a certain way, can help. But messing round in rich comparative description is not helping us forward. The present generation's task, perhaps, is to encourage in the next generation both fantasy and serious "slice work", and to follow up stumblingly, in our present talking and writing, Lonergan's challenge: can we putter towards slices of axiom-systems that will eventually reach the integrity of a tradition called GS?

[T] T is for Teaching and Talking and Typing and Touching! *Communications*. Let us muse over the final specialty in the possibilities and probabilities of its development in these next five years.

My own musings, too uncomfortably complex to articulate, lead me to suggest a very practical short cut, [R][T], connect with the four words mentioned in the text above at note 27: *simple matter of noticing*. I would have us notice, [W][I][T], that generalized empirical method in the classroom translates into The Childout Principle which I originally stated in relation to geometry, but it applies to any talking and teaching: "When teaching children geometry one is teaching children children". The core of that rich and complex specialty, *Communications*, is **giving effective notice to the quest** in the ongoing genesis of history, "the ongoing genesis of method."⁷⁷ The quest that is the child or the graduate student is axially led not to notice the quest in its "native

⁷⁶The geohistorical integration is a lot more complex than the integration that is involved in, say, the single flower or animal as genetic system. It has to handle geographic spread, overlapping contexts etc etc.

⁷⁷The quotation marks draw attention to Lonergan's work in this area e.g. "The Ongoing Genesis of Methods," *A Third Collection*, 146-65. There is a great deal of work to be done in this area, with a fresh psychic turn in functional research.

bewilderment.”⁷⁸ The child and student are to be led, but effectively, in their village, to the “*moi intime*”⁷⁹ by those reaching *pari passu* (but acceleratingly!⁸⁰) for a luminous *moi intime*. But **those** must be increasingly backed by the complexities of the global handed-round systematics. A large guide-book is obviously needed, one quite different from the 2652 page work that Lonergan was stuck with as reference in his chapter on “Communications” in *Method in Theology*.⁸¹ Comically, perhaps, I can only think of the

⁷⁸The first paragraph of *Insight* chapter 14.

⁷⁹*Insight* 470[495].

⁸⁰My neatest expression of the problem of adult accelerating growth is in the **Bacchuspiece** (pp. 161-3) of *Lack in the Beingtalk*. Present pseudo-sophisticated cultures militate strenuous against such growth. The acceleration is, of course, a pilgrim anticipation of the post-pilgrim pace. See notes 8 and 25 above.

⁸¹The book is the *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie*, mentioned on page 355 of *Method in Theology*. The fourteenth chapter of *Method in Theology* is another problematic chapter of the book. I already mentioned the problem of history under [O]. After chapter 11 of the book, he was probably gasping for the end, so the chapter on systematics became minimalist (see the note there on page 336) and the chapter on doctrines a collection of past work. As far as I recall .Lonergan did not make a presentation on the eighth specialty in any of his workshops. In his final presentation of *Method* in the Jesuit Institute of Milltown Park, Dublin, Summer 1971, he left me with the task of dealing with Communications; perhaps there is a record of my shabby ramblings in the tapes of that Summer Institute. I made an attempt later to lift the meaning of the eighth specialty in “Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts” (*Lonergan Workshop*, 1987, vol. 7); it is reproduce as chapter 5 in *ChrISt in History*, and so is available on the Website. I hope to make a further attempt to do so in Fusion 6, “The Emerging Beauty of Economic Control”, which is to **point** to an alphabet soup of short cuts of inter-specialty dialogue that pirouette on the triplet [T][R][Y]. I use the word *point* there rather than the word *present* very deliberately. My footnote 133 is the context of that deliberateness. What is needed is a democratic effort, one that begins, in the zone of economics, with the June 19-21 economic gathering in Seton Hall University, New Jersey. The democratic effort, I am convinced, must begin with organized efforts to communicate with those involved economic practices and educations. That beginning will,

among other benefits, reveal our inadequacies as interlocutors, and lift our sensitivity to the need for division of labour that are luminously functional. The same is to be true of other areas. What, for instance, is wrong with pastoral theology and its performative output? Footnote 133 talks of a no man’s land between theory and common sense. That no man’s land has to be replaced by *die*

value of inviting your *moi intime* to think of an evening I spent with a group of country ladies, in one of my wife's churches, grappling with the meaning of Jesus, for them, to be intussuscepted from the first centuries of Christian thinking. My *moi intime* ranged through the seed-systems of John and Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa to turn their hearts better towards their best Friend. Such, and so much more, is the back-up needed to cut down on the suffering of little children.

My illustration is in Christian teaching, but of course, we reach, effectively victorious, [V], to all zones of meaning. Might I, in particular, note the gap between our rooting round the *moi intime*, our rational expectations, with the rotting ruin of economists' reflections on such expectations as fodder for bean-counting?⁸²

A five-year plan? Taking better note of future [T] and past [R], but with the short-cut, [R][T] mentioned above lifted by interpretation [Y] into a humble slogan, [T][R][Y]: the past may be 2,000 years away or just yesterday's class; the future is a definite or indefinite tomorrow.

[Y] is to grow, handed on to history, [O], a lift of "Oxen of the Sun", towards a new language, a **HOW** language, a [H][O][W] language, placing Jack and Jill effectively in the field with The Little Flower.⁸³ A five-year plan? It seems to me that present Lonergan aficionados of all levels of competence could usefully settle into being the beginnings, beginners, of the functional specialty Communications.

Wendung zur Idee that is functional collaboration.

⁸²A context here is The Editor's Conclusion, "The Hodics of Rational Expectations", *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Publishing, 2002.

⁸³On **HOW**-language, see below, note 97. In note 98 I write of Jack and Jill as members of the Tower community, but here they are the everybodies of James Joyce's reach for the street. *Lack in the Beingstalk* (Axial Publishing, 2007), chapter 3, "Haute Vulgarization", moves towards the problem of a new radiance of human expression to be mediated by searchers in The Dark Tower. The problem of that radiance is posed in the first section of chapter 17 of *Insight*. The Little Flower in the text is both Theresa of Liseaux and the flower in de Saint Exupery's *Little Prince*, "born at the same moment as the sun" (Harbrace Paperback, 1973. 33.).

[U] That beginning, of course, throws us forward into pacing past present philosophy and theology, primarily a world of *haute vulgarization*, of general bias. I write sweepingly here, but my audience among Lonergan students are invited to take to *intime* heart the possibility that “they are lost in some no man’s land between the world of theory and the world of common sense.”⁸⁴ Here I recall the five-year plan of [O] for a contribution to functional history. “Thoroughly understanding what it is to understand”:⁸⁵ this was not taken with **any** seriousness by Lonergan’s followers. The one-sided first description of generalized empirical method⁸⁶ allowed readers of *Insight* and of Lonergan’s writings to dodge the fact that Lonergan was proceeding within an **incarnation of the second description**,⁸⁷ and demanding that such a luminous proceeding be the culture of the future. In that culture, commonsense philosophers and theologians will fade in importance, will, e.g., disappear from the specialty Dialectic. “Augustine, Descartes, Pascal, Newman could make their commonsense contribution to our self-knowledge”⁸⁸ but that is just not enough. The beginning of the second time of the temporal subject, that could come to seed in this millennium, is a cosmic molecular

⁸⁴Lonergan, “Time and Meaning”, Volume 6 of The Collected Works, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958-1964*, University of Toronto Press, 1996, 121. See also page 155 on *haute vulgarization*, and the comment on physics-teaching in *Topics in Education*, 145.

⁸⁵*Insight* xxviii[22].

⁸⁶The description is quoted in note 19 above. Notes 19 and 20 provide a context for developing a genetic-systematic understanding of generalized empirical method.

⁸⁷That incarnation is almost impossible to envisage for someone who has not taken serious Proustian note of their own adult growth, their own leaving of themselves behind, strangers to themselves of last month. That seriousness requires ongoing theoretic conversions. We are back with the strange topic of note 80 above. The word incarnation surely brings to mind the Incarnation of the Explanation of God, and the meeting with the animal-God as gorillas in the mist: Jack or Jill and Jesus. Notes 81 and 133 give a context for reflection on the massive failure here of genuine *theoria* and of kataphatic prayer. We need to come to grips with the **boldfaced Jesus** in the next millennia.

⁸⁸*Method in Theology*, 261.

suppressed “groaning,”⁸⁹ “our arms and legs filled with sleeping memories,”⁹⁰ demanding a fleshed⁹¹ *theoria* quite beyond present fantasy, bringing forth slowly an integral consciousness steeped in mystery. So we, [W], are called, each and all, to echo a new dark global luminosity “that sweeps living human bodies, linked together in charity, to the joyful, courageous, whole-hearted, yet intelligently controlled performance of the tasks set by world-order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended.”⁹²

[V] V for Victory? Only if you turn it upside down, so that you are led towards a heuristics of our multicultural omnidisciplinary climb to “cumulative and progressive”⁹³ foundations. Victory, or a transition to the third stage of meaning,

⁸⁹*Romans* 8: 22. “We know that the whole creation groans and suffers that pains of childbirth together until now.” Might we not nicely mis-read verses 18- 28 in this context?

⁹⁰Marcel Proust, *Remembrance of Times Past*, Random House, New York, Vol. 2, 874.

⁹¹The word *flesh* names the gap in self attention that remains as a present global crisis of minding and living. There is the milder word, **aggreformism**. See *Field Nocturne* 22, “Aggreformism”. In note 3 there I express my indebtedness to a doctorate thesis of Christine Jamieson, *The Significance of the Body in Ethical Discourse: Julia Kristeva’s Contribution to Moral Theology* (1998: St. Paul’s University, Ottawa). From that work I was led to Julia Kristeva’s 3 volumes on Hannah Arendt, Melanie Klein, and Colette. In *Field Nocturne* 23, “Here Hear” I draw particularly on Julia Kristeva, *Colette: the world’s flesh*, translated by Jane Marie Todd, Columbia University Press, New York, 2004. I note immediately Kristeva’s frontispiece quotation from Merleau-Ponty’s **The Visible and the Invisible** centering on “that innate anonymity of Myself that we call flesh Flesh is an element of Being”, but my effort there is toward an invitation to self-attend one’s inner psychic skin within a mediation of scientific understanding. The eventual communal goal can be fantasized as some psychic - but kataphatic - symbiosis of Colette-like searching with, say, the climb of that strange 13th century Beguine mystic, Hadewijch of Antwerp who is eloquent on the topic of **Minne**. “Minne is everything”, she writes. See the essay *Prehumous* 8, “Foundational Prayer 5: Placing Mysticism”. One raises concretely the question of a long-term enlightened dynamics towards the communal circumincessional fusion of everlasting love. See note 99 below.

⁹²*Insight*, 722-3[745].

⁹³*Method in Theology*, 4.

requires that we move from simply philosophy and theology to philosophy and theology **of**. The turning up-side-down has many subtle facets but I ask you to stay with the simple image: if you turn V upside down you get my elementary slopes diagram.⁹⁴ Each discipline has its own research area and focus but they converge: you need, then, the more complex image of, say, different slopes up to the rooftop. What is to be found is that there is not, for example, a dialectic of botanical searchings or a foundations of mathematics: these two specialties of foundations and dialectic are common to all human searching. And the finding of this is not an *a priori* business, certainly not a matter of conventional philosophy as queen. “If you have a philosophy of science that provides the sciences with the foundations they are seeking, and at the same time in no way limits their legitimate freedom of inquiry, then you are doing your job.”⁹⁵ Lonergan struggles here, in 1957, with royal minding, as he does two years later with minding history. Eight years later, in 1965, Lonergan has the seed of a quite new set-up: there is to be no queen, but a global democracy of seeking that includes an invariant Tower of Minding, a cyclic control of meaning “yielding cumulative and progressive results.”⁹⁶

[W] I conveniently associate [W] with We, as I did [I] with I. Obvious we, We, [W], are/is at the heart of the matter. Yet I would hold us to thinking, in this five-year planning, of the issue raised at the end of [I]: can you find a friend, or even two or three

⁹⁴I first introduced this diagram in Cantower 8, “Slopes: An Encounter”, page 13. There are further developments in *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, chapter 7: “An Asymmetry of Slopes”. The slopes of different disciplines are different in indirect and direct communications. The communications I write of here is the full structuring of Systematic Theology (*Ibid.*, chapter 6, “Converging Systems in History”): see *ChrISt in History*, chapter 5, “Communications in General”. The relevant 8 by 8 matrix is diagramed in *A Brief History of Tongue. From Big Bang to Coloured Wholes*, 108. See also, in the text, notes 50 and 104.

⁹⁵*Phenomenology and Logic*, 127.

⁹⁶*Method in Theology*, 4.

gathered together with collaboration in the midst of the minding? Is there leisure in that friendship and that gathering, so that there is nothing pressured in, say, the search-mentioned in the next section - for a sentence that would lift us into the new differentiation of meaning and expression, a flicker of a distant **HOW-language**⁹⁷ that would lift Jack and Jill⁹⁸ and Able's Tower into undistanced⁹⁹ wonder? That Tower is eventually to be, literally, a strange fusion, darkly luminous, grounded in today's meetings but also in the hope of a global climb to humanity's rainbow fusion on, perhaps, a multi-billion year road to a molecular eschaton.

[X] I am thinking here of the full problem of X-pression, expression, as it is raised in *Insight* chapter 17, but now we are envisaging initial shifts of practice. I can only give two brief pointings here, and then conclude with a nudge with regard to getting on the move towards the new culture.

⁹⁷**HOW** language was the answer to the question posed by the title of *A Brief History of Tongue*, chapter 2: "How-Language: Works?" **HOW** is conceived heuristically in terms of the **Home Of Wonder** that human expression actually is. *Distant* refers to the difficulty of the explanatory conception of that heuristic character in terms of **exigence** (see the index under *exigence* in *Phenomenology and Logic*) and to a peculiar **distance** that relates to eschatological incompleteness. All this relates to the oddness of the natural desire to know God, discussed by Lonergan in various places, to its ineffability, and to the claim that "on the primary and fundamental meaning of the name, God, God is not an object." (*Method in Theology*, 342). See further note 99 below.

⁹⁸See "Cognitive Structure," **Collection**, University of Toronto Press, 1988, 219. The lift is characterized by the achievement of the fusion pointed to in the bracketing footnotes here, 97 and 99. It is to place the Tower Community of the third and fourth stages of meaning in a possession of, and a being possessed by, a word-made-fresh psychic presence. I would note that the brief description of the position described in *Insight* 388[413] would then be explanatorily axiomatizable, with the editions of axioms of intentionality, of infinity, of incompleteness.

⁹⁹See *Field Nocturnes CanTower 116*, "Desire Undistanced", which gives pointers on eschatological dynamics. The core element in that dynamics is the truth of Thomas' point that the divine essence is beyond the comprehension of the human mind, even the mind of the incarnate God. This leads to theorems of incompleteness regarding finite being's fusion with the Infinite.

First there is the matter of beginning to imagine - fantasy hard at work again - writing within a specialty, with the control, the child of one of a set of new differentiation of consciousness, reaching into each sentence. Sentence by sentence the differentiated operator steers forward towards the hand-over to the next specialist. This is the new culture that lifts the statement of Lonergan about “audience”¹⁰⁰ into the culture of a later third-stage-meaning cosmopolis, and of that step one can certainly say, “it is not easy.”¹⁰¹ A single word of that Lonergan statement is worth recalling here, to give you a sense of the leap in meaning it gets twelve years after its first typing in 1953. Think, then, of the new meaning of *addressed* in that phrase “addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.”¹⁰²

My second point regards linguistic feedback, which is integral to the cultivation of a mature generalized empirical method or its teaching version, the Childout Principle. **Address** is to achieve a new directness equivalent to a massive shift from discomforting pain to comfortable praxis, not just in the historian but in the person of adequate culture: “the historian has been at pains not to conceal his tracks but to lay all his cards on the table.”¹⁰³

We are nearing the end of my pointing towards strategies, getting more sophisticated yet strangely enough, in XYZ, getting closer to an ABC of what to attempt in these next five years. For example, this “sentence by sentence” business is a definite area of humble, difficult, exercises. TRY it, in the short cut that I represent by the word TRY.¹⁰⁴ You can try it either in your own writing or you can check others’ efforts at it, as

¹⁰⁰*Insight* 580[602].

¹⁰¹*Insight* 241[266].

¹⁰²*Insight* 580[602].

¹⁰³*Method in Theology*, 193.

¹⁰⁴See the concluding sentence of this essay. My alphabet soup song opens up the possibility of exercises in searching out the sets of dialogues possible with the matrix C referred

the hurler on the ditch.¹⁰⁵ How would you, for instance, as researcher in a state of creative discovery, hand on that discovery to the appropriate interpreter?¹⁰⁶ How would you as communicator, discovering a little of this section's meaning, re-Xpress the content of your topic in new teXts and new talk for the classroom?¹⁰⁷

[Y] We come to the Y of [T][R][Y], talked of in [T]: *Interpretation*. We are back, I would have you notice, at where the troubles are compactly but inadequately expressed, in the first note of the chapter on Interpretation in *Method*. But here, with a focus on the next five years, I would have us follow up functionally on the suggestion that emerged under [R]. The effort to operate on Lonergan's *Opera* with some precision of functional research is an effort to identify points that are missed. I would have you come back to this and indeed to [R], when you have mused over the suggestion in [Z] of finding what

to in note 94 above. For instance, muse over the threesomes [L][U][X], [W][R][Y], [H][O][W].

¹⁰⁵This is the Irish version of what in North America is talked of, if I am not mistaken, as Monday morning quarter-backing.

¹⁰⁶There is to be a quite new and strange interrelating of persons. Perhaps a **boldfaced** effort at creativity in regard to the word-spread of *Method in Theology*, p. 48, is in order here. One has to struggle - the context is hinted at in note 98 above - to envisage **personal relations** within a new **liberty** of the mature **institution** of the functional cosmopolis. All this would be far from the present business and busyness of learned articles of suitable length solemnly exchanged, stacked up towards tenure. There would be a "psychic force that sweeps living human bodies to the **tasks** set by world order" an **orientation** of the community that would "intimate its finality, its yearning for God" (*Insight* 723-4[745]), and a wink would be as good as a nod.

¹⁰⁷But this, of course, is a task for generations. I think of my optimism of the 1970s, now to be placed not just in a new century but in the context of, perhaps, the next millennium of our billion year trek. "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 at the end of this century, with consequent changes in operation schemes of recurrence from government to kindergarden," (the first sentence in Chapter 1, "The Psychological Present of the Academic Community", *Lonergan's Challenge to the University and the Economy*, available on the Website. I note that this is a photocopy of Lonergan's own copy, with some interesting jottings by him.)

you consider the most evident missed point: different people have different findings here. The point is to settle on a finding that fits your five year plan, or five day plan, your **IO**. The effort of volume 4 of *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* may be of help here. I invited the contributors to focus on a topic within their work but also to express their own position as best they could. Here, older and wiser, I can give better advice, but there is the tricky problem of readers' receiving my elder flight. I would ask for a larger emphasis on function. You, as researcher, or some colleague, can identify your "gap" in understanding Lonergan on - or in - X. You go about getting that understanding, or at least enough of a glimmer to reveal the horror of your larger gap. But the key thing is that the grasp or the glimmer is to be passed on: how does this understanding effect the present story, the product of the group of historians with a shared grasp of that story. How, for instance, does a fresh understanding of the organism called Jesus or of the permanent incompleteness of his grasp of Being effect the story cherished by the third specialty's *theoria* so that the present *theoria* is enriched and the richness cycled forward to hit the streets running through Faithful vein?

[Z] *Zeal* is the last word on the page in chapter 20 of *Insight* where Lonergan writes of good will willing the order of the universe.¹⁰⁸ It concludes Lonergan's reflection on "the thirteenth place", with the top of that same page asking for a repentant love of neighbour. With that asking, and the asking of the page, I align myself, and I direct the asking discomfortingly at Lonergan's followers, including myself. I cannot afford to be polite in this matter. "Doctrines that are embarrassing will not be mentioned in polite company."¹⁰⁹ Earlier, under [O], I suggested a five-year plan of tackling the history of Lonergan studies in the past. The section ends with the question, What is the discipular going-on of Lonergan's Care in the past forty years? But even prior to that questing we

¹⁰⁸*Insight* 700[722].

¹⁰⁹*Method in Theology*, 299.

can follow Lonergan's lead regarding belief, the analysis of which follows the page on repentance and zeal to which I have drawn your attention. In that analysis he places the modest suggestion regarding his method: "without undue optimism it expects people of even moderate intelligence to be able to discover for themselves at least one mistaken belief"¹¹⁰

I recall now vividly him making a similar point - it was in the economics lectures of Spring 1978, which I attended - regarding the search for perfection: it is not a sweeping thing, but a matter of finding the largest obstacle and working patiently toward its elimination. Might you try the same strategy here? I am asking for belief and I am pointing to a cluster of mistaken beliefs in the present culture and in present Lonergan studies: but now I would ask you to pause over one major imperfection of Lonerganism, one major flawed belief. It has to do with effectiveness. Is Lonergan's rescue of desire and loneliness going out there globally in any significant way? And if not, why not? Obviously, part of the problem is communication, with other disciplines and cultures, with the spectrum of communicative media. Might some of us, might you, face that piece of the problem? Let us say that it might be faced in the manner suggested above, under [E]. I conclude there by talking of "the number-one-conversion for Lonergan students, the conversion to functional collaboration". But I am not talking of that here. I am talking about a genuine drawing of, drawing out of, attention to anything that is deemed worthwhile in Lonergan's spread of suggestions. So, communications becomes a concern and so a clearly-identified topic for a subgroup of those interested in Lonergan's work. The subgroup cannot make sense, to itself or its proposed audience, without the question What emerging. "What are you people trying to communicate to us?" That question throws the group back to the question of missing insights, already raised. It throws us back to research, to the effort to fill gaps that was mentioned in [Y], to the shortcut of a collaboration of three specialties souped up as

¹¹⁰*Insight* 717[738].

[T][R][Y].

2. Conclusion

What, you ask, either after this exhausting ramble or after skipping the first section entirely, is my five year plan? I should immediately say, I suppose, it is more a hope than a plan, but a group of my readers may well collaborate with me in turning it into a plan for ourselves. Two aspects of my hope then: [a] to make conversion to functional collaboration a topic; [b] to have some of us [T][R][Y] it or at least try it.

[a] and [b] coincide nicely when one considers the task of making the “conversion a topic”¹¹¹ to be an initial group-identification as practicing shabbily the eighth functional specialty. That group identification has to have the existential tonality that Lonergan identified.¹¹² In its maturity it has to be a fusion of minding, quite beyond the way of *theoria* and excellence that he writes of elsewhere.¹¹³ But initially it is just art-warmed¹¹⁴ bodies and shared days and daze: ‘why are things like this?’ Lonergan’s paragraph on the matter is worth recalling.

“Now popular tradition not only selects its facts but also simplifies them and groups them about a few striking figures. It provides explanatory links that often are not true. ‘Why are things like this? So and so did it.’ And so on. It loves anecdotes and picturesque stories. And always there has to be a moral. Such 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.

¹¹¹*Method in Theology*, 253.

¹¹²*Topics in Education*, 230.

¹¹³*A Third Collection*, “Mission and the Spirit”, the beginning of section 4.

¹¹⁴I am thinking of Lonergan’s pointers regarding art in chapter 9 of *Topics in Education*. *Initially?* See above, notes 97, 98, 99, 106, 107. Note 66 brings in a deeper perspective.

The aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story becomes operative whenever the group debates, judges, evaluates, decides, or acts - and especially in a crisis."¹¹⁵

Loneragan continues the paragraph by recalling the war years of the 1940s: the Soviet revival of memories of heroes, the speeches of Churchill. A larger recalling would get back to Germany's inter-war crises and the tradition around the Hitler salute.¹¹⁶ 'Why are things like this? So and so did it'. A group gathered in discomfort is led molecularly to ask why? But the answer is, certainly not initially, one of scientific history. We shall return to that shortly.

Meanwhile I return to consider further the hoped-for group as operating on the edge of the eighth functional specialty, asking each their own versions of the questions mentioned at the very beginning: Crowe's question, 'What specialty are you working in?' or Halloran's, "To whom are you talking?' Their versions need to be more effectively discomfiting, and that effectiveness pivots on asking what is involved and what is at stake. If the group believes Lonergan or me, still they need to shift their minding to the hard climb of more subtle identification. It is a matter of inviting; it "proceeds by cajoling or forcing attention,"¹¹⁷ but to **what?** And, significantly **from what?** The more they struggle with that phylogenetic and ontogenetic climb, the more articulate and convincing their functional operation, but always, in the present state of things, their operation is an annoyance, not welcome "in polite company."¹¹⁸ "Is my

¹¹⁵*Topics in Education*, 230.

¹¹⁶The aesthetic apprehension can go towards horrors of decline, in a salute to Hitler, in a salute to Lonergan. I was surprised, looking back now over section 4.5 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, "The Field and its Guardians", to find myself hinting at such a parallel. The section begins by quoting Steiner's subtle "Hitler work", *The Portage to San Cristobel of A.H.*, Faber and Faber, London, 1981, 115: "One Israel, *One Volk*, one leader.... they say I danced there. Only a small dance", but it winds round, discomfitingly to Lonerganism's "strange cult of a shrunken Lonergan."*ibid.*, 116).

¹¹⁷*Insight* 398[423].

¹¹⁸Recalling *Method in Theology*, 299.

proposal utopian? It asks merely for creativity, for an interdisciplinary theory that at first will be denounced as absurd.”¹¹⁹ I went to the Florida Lonergan Conference in 1970 with enthusiasm. Among other things, there was my discovery, in 1969, of how relevant Lonergan’s divisions would be to sorting out the muddles of musicology. Karl Rahner did not arrive, as far as I remember because of flight muddles. But I suspect that what he had to contribute would have resonated with my view. “Lonergan’s theological methodology seems to me to be so generic that it actually suits every science.”¹²⁰ Could I have foreseen that forty years after my reach into musicology, the **what** of the **from what** would hold sway within Lonergan studies? A little perhaps, but I wont go into that. And, ‘Why are things like this? So and so did it’: that is not my present interest, but it seems to me that it should be a future interest of the group and of the Lonergan community. My concern is with the genesis of a common historical consciousness of the difference between “effete”¹²¹ and “ efficient”¹²² in the zone of the implementation of Lonergan’s three startling strangenesses. “That common historical consciousness is not to be confused with scientific history. Scientific history does not aim to please, and it does not always uplift. It is the product of the intellectual pattern of experience. It uses traditional histories as mere materials ”¹²³

¹¹⁹Lonergan, “Healing and Creating in History”, the conclusion.

¹²⁰Rahner is responding to the version of chapter 5 of *Method* published in the *Gregorianum* in 1969. Karl Rahner, “Die theologische Methodologie Lonergan’s scheint mir so generisch zu sein, dass sie eigentlich auf jede Wissenschaft passt”, Karl Rahner, “Kritische Bemerkungen zu B.J.F.Lonergan’s Aufsatz: ‘Functional Specialties in Theology’”, *Gregorianum* 51(1971), 537.

¹²¹“They become effete.”(*Method in Theology*, 99). Add to this “no real apprehension of the nature of these changes”(ibid., 317) of past centuries. Could these pointers be substantially true of the Lonergan community?

¹²²“It is quite legitimate to seek in the efficient cause of the science, that is, in the scientist, the reason why a science forms a unified whole.” (*Topics in Education*, 160).

¹²³*Topics in Education*, 230.

The dots indicate that there is more there to be attended to, and we shall come back to that below. But first I return to the business of [a] and [b], **roles** and **tasks** that intertwine in the **institution** that is to be the group as a sub-group of a fading Lonerganism, constituting a growing reality of discomfoting **personal relations**.

Does Lonerganism claim some identity with cosmopolis? Then its constitutive self-criticism must become luminous. "If cosmopolis itself suffers from the general bias of common sense in any of its manifestations, then the blind will be leading the blind and both will head for the ditch The opinions and attitudes of the present have to be traced to their origins, and the origins have to be criticized in the light of the dialectic."¹²⁴ The light of present dialectic practice does not include, alas, the pointers of that brilliant page on dialectic's method that is page 250 of *Method in Theology*, but the absence of attention to those pointers cannot be forever dodged as a topic. Especially if a counter-story emerges which "does not aim to please."

Here I return to the dots above, to the rest of that paragraph on the doing of scientific history. I would have you focus on the startling possibility that Lonergan's suggestions of 1959 are twirled into an opposing perspective by the blossoming of his later suggestions regarding functional history. Then it would be no longer true that "you cannot use scientific history to set it right. Scientific history cannot fulfil that function, for it is not existential."¹²⁵ Functional scientific history in later cycles of Fusionism is to see and seize and set things right with the energy of the previous cycle's **Completion**. But we are here pointing to a heuristic glimpses of a fusionist science, a vortex science that twirls incarnately round "the reason why a science forms a unified whole,"¹²⁶ a thing of beauty and a joy for ever.

Why do I add that obscurity here? Certainly to annoy, like Chesterton's

¹²⁴*Insight*, 240[265].

¹²⁵*Topics in Education*, 231.

¹²⁶*Topics in Education*, 160.

Irishman.¹²⁷ But also to inspire: the third and fourth stages of meaning - and certainly the eschatological fifth - are a fantasyland quite beyond the Kansas of present Lonergan studies. The later stages of meaning are to breed an integral retrieval that resonates with the manner in which the Explanation of God, the Second of the Three, circumincesses in expectation of a reduplicative molecular everlasting, and everlastingly incomplete, fusion.

Such a strange reach is something too dangerous for Lonerganism: it had best avoid the topic of cosmopolis altogether, as it avoids intussuscepting page 250 of *Method in Theology*. It is a strange reach that is not dangerous but vital to a group who would take the three strangenesses of Lonergan seriously.

I return now to a practicality of trying to be aligned with the eighth functional specialty. That practicality leads me to dodge the issue of the first strangeness, associated with the rare leap to the position on being. I would ask those interested in moving from effeteness to efficiency to promote not just functional collaboration in general, but functional collaboration in the field of economics. It is not a tall order, as promotion of intellectual conversion is. Moreover, it fits with the neat providence of two conferences of the Summer of 2009: one on Functional collaboration in general, one on that third strangeness of Lonergan, his democratic economics. That conference on economics will pose existentially and thematically the question What is to be done? What is to be done is a shabby version of the output of the eighth specialty: a beginning must be made in economic education. But I have said enough about that already: there is the beginning that is a shift in introductory courses in economics; there is the beginning that is the edging into fusionism: both need FS₈ and C₉ nudging. And might I note, discomfortingly, that there are horrid parallels between the orthodoxy of present economics and present Lonergan studies?

¹²⁷“A Dublin tradesman printed his name and trade in archaic Erse on his cart. He knew that hardly anybody could read it: he did it to annoy. In his position I think he was quite right.” G.K.Chesterton, *George Bernard Shaw*, Bodley Head, London, 1961, 16.

Obviously, I could go on, especially to the trying that would give rise to the beginnings of a functional history of Lonergan's achievement, but best to leave that to a sub-group that is up to follow my trail and to fantasize further, cunningly searching out shortcuts that are not cutoffs.¹²⁸ My alphabet soup itself is a shortcut, but not a cut off. There is a way in which it can be considered as a fresh sketch of a book on Method. I look back on that discovery file of Lonergan now, with its sketches of various possible shapes to the book, produced likely enough within the day or the week of his discovery. Then there is the later table of contents of the finished book, not at all measuring up to previous hopes, especially the hope of his 1952 letter to Eric O'Connor.¹²⁹ I could well regard my 26-point ramble as a sketch of a 26-chapter book, a nice mixing - or muddling - of a new shot at **Background** and **Foreground**. But it would not be enough, no more than *Insight* was enough. What is needed is a initial puttering such as was started by Galileo, so that in four hundred years the bony bonny cycle will embrace the globe.

It brings to mind, quite spontaneously, the beginning of my little article of a quarter century ago, when I recalled James Joyce's view of keeping critics busy for three hundred years.¹³⁰ Paralleling Joyce and Lonergan is, of course, an old thing with me: I first did it explicitly in 1971, when I put my two Florida Conference papers together as a

¹²⁸The topic emerges again in *Fusion 6*, but it is something that is to be fully guaranteed only by the maturing of the recycling dynamic of functional collaboration. Notes 3, 81, and 133 provide a fuller context for reflection here.

¹²⁹The letter is dated July 23, 1852. The pressure is on him to prepare to teach in the Gregorian University in September 1953. "If I possible can do it, I must try to finish and arrange for publication of a first part of my work before my departure. It would be entitled, *Insight*, and the remainder could be named, *Faith*, or *Insight and Faith*". There are no italics in the typed letter.

¹³⁰See the beginning of my "Features of Generalized Empirical Method and the Actual Context of Economics", *Creativity and Method*, edited by Mathew Lamb, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, 1984.

small book, *Plants and Pianos*.¹³¹ The first essay allowed me to parallel *Insight* with *Ulysses*, and the second paralleled the forthcoming *Method* with *Finnegans Wake*. There was, and is, method in my madness. If *Finnegans Wake* can be - as it has recently been - translated into Japanese, why should not a cyclic invariant human method be translated into quite strange new language, in any language, of **HOW**-talk? And why should not the multi-lingual strain be softened by the lift of a population of international metagrams, offspring of my muddled Wi?

But I should close here my contextualizing of the soup-song of the future. Did I offer a five-year plan, or the hope of it? My sketch in part two could go and grow either way: Yet might either way not refuse not to fuse, so that there emerge, in five centuries, an integral neuroconsciousness in a Fusion Tower of Care? “Merced Mulde!” “Yessel that the limmat?”¹³²

What might we make of the Joycean word *Ryomlynst*? Does it not bring to mind, within a cloud of linguistic pointings, a royal lens, or a royal sharp-eyed lynx roaming the globe?¹³³ The word is the central unwritten word of my Soup-song, ending in a *t* that

¹³¹*Plants and Pianos* was published by the Milltown Institute, Dublin, in 1971. The two essays were later (1976) built into the four-essay Volume *The Shaping of the Foundations*, now available on the Website. The third and fourth essays there deal, respectively, with Zoology and with the specialties of Dialectic and Foundations. The Epilogue there, “Authentic Subjectivity and International Growth: Foundations” gives another angle - but younger, since I was only 45 - on the present question.

¹³²*Finnegans Wake*, page 212, line 26; page 198, line 13. I am quoting from chapter six, “Total Process”, of *Process: Introducing Themselves To Young (Christian) Minders*, written in 1989, half way between my first written effort to draw attention to functional collaboration and this one. That chapter’s effort concluded with words worth recalling [I omit the footnotes]: “The third stage of meaning, with its mutual mediation of an academic presence, is a distant probability, needing painfilled solitary reaching towards a hearing of hearing, a touching of touching, ‘in a far ear’, ‘sanscreed’, making luminously present - in focal darkdream - our bloodwashed bloodstream. It is a new audicity, a new hapticity, to which we must aspire, for which we must pray.”

¹³³Recall Lonergan’s pointing to the problem of philosophy or theology as Queen, as either effectually constitutional or effective (*Phenomenology and Logic*, 126; see, above, at note

craves the beginagain company of its first letters *r* and *y*, so as to wind on in reverierun.¹³⁴ We are back, or forwards, to the challenge of TRY, [T][R][Y], and the unwritten word spells an entry into the globe's and humanity's eight-fold way: [R][Y][O][M][L][N][S][T].

95). Functional collaboration shifts that problem into a problem of a luminously reflective culture, a democracy of graceful minding. In writing here of my 5-year plan I respect that future democracy: there is a sense in which it is a non-plan. I point vaguely towards doing functional research in Lonergan's works that is to raise questions for interpreters, questions both of interpretation of Lonergan and of the story of Lonerganism. Concretely, however, this is not at all vague: think of such questions as emerging in classes and in conferences. In Fusion 6 I intend to come at the problem from another angle: let Lonergan people start talking, not at, but with and to, people in other disciplines. My different angles on the matter point to the possibility of expose, of self-exposure, of much of Lonergan scholarship as being "the substitution of pseudo-metaphysical myth-making for scientific inquiry" (*Insight* 505[528]). I am weary of this Lonerganesque culture, "lost in some no man's land between the world of theory and the world of common sense." (Lonergan, "Time and Meaning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 121). In this final broad essay on the matter I would note that I have only rambled round some of the seven bridges that **operatively** the Lonergan school deemed too far, bridges I wrote of twenty five years ago. I wrote then, in "Features of Generalized Empirical Method and the Actual Context of Economics" (*Creativity and Method*, edited by M.Lamb, Marquette University Press, 1984) of the parallel between Galileo and Lonergan and the lack of contemporary appeal to experience and *nomos*. "Stillman Drake, in *Galileo Studies*, notes the difficulty of believing this, and so goes on to describe the inadequate strategies of such men as Tartaglia (1546), Cardano (1570), and Ubaldo (1577) in seeking out laws ..." (*Features*, 545). I have not gone on to expose my colleagues' failures: that is to be the ongoing genesis of a luminous honesty in later generations. Might I, in this conclusion of my soup-song, twist the song of the seven dwarfs, attending the sleeping princess, the future queen, "IO, IO, it's off to work we go, [I][O], [I][O] [I][O] [I][O]."

¹³⁴"Reverierun," echoing the first word of *Finnegans Wake*, is the title of the final section, section 12, of my essay, "The Importance of Rescuing *Insight*".pages 199-225 of *The Importance of Insight. Essays in Honour of Michael Vertin*, edited by John L.Liptay and David S.Liptay, University of Toronto Press, 2007. It seems a fitting conclusion to my challenge of ontogenetic and phylogenetic growth. Its central subject is retirement - at whatever early age you can manage it - and its possibility of accelerated climbing into elderhood.