

SOCIOLOGY, SITUATION ROOMS, TOPOLOGIES: ECONOMICS AND RELIGION

My good web-fixer, James Duffy, to whom endless thanks, asked me for an Introduction to the *Tinctures*. I was reluctant: after all, an end is an end, and I had moved to do what I suggested in the last of these essays, helping people here and there with the seeding of the science of Futurology, “a resolute and effective intervention I this historical process” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, 306). Part of that, in this past week, was some musings about a lift towards interiority in religious studies and in economics. Briefly, the time is past for praising or outlining Lonergan’s achievement. What is needed is some equivalent of his eighth specialty, the sublation of his brilliant inclusion in metaphysics of “implementation,” nudging effectively towards interiority. My musings are not polished. They will be polished by others in these next decades.

The whole zone can be brought into focus by musing on the problem of “enlightened self-interest” (*CWL* 21, 232 top: the beginning of the 1944 economics typescript). A decent survey of economics, religion, sociology and psychology shows that neither the self nor the interest is enlightened or lit-up. In the human story the neglected subject has become the truncated subject (*Collection* 2, 73). This, strangely grounds optimism. The venturing into **the task of moving forward into a global heuristic isomorphic with all sociological analyses and their referents** faces shabby analyses: of course, the references are the full geohistorical gather-up of the complex topologies of referents, of sick situations right up to the present rooms in the Vatican, the Kremlin, Westminster, Beijing and Warsaw, etc.

So, pause over the fuller phrase of 1944 again: “of effectively augmenting the enlightenment of the enlightened self-interest that guides exchanges.”

The first sad task, it seems to me, is to see the failure of Lonerganism in the climb to augmenting. To see it and to invite it to climb. But let us leave that aside. Best think, personally and illustratively, of the full goal of the lifting of the meaning of “theology possesses a twofold relevance to empirical human science” (*Insight*, 766, line 29) by a

growing community facing, in fragmentary ways, **the task of moving forward into a global heuristic isomorphic with all sociological analyses and their referents**. A little-more-than nominal grip on this task—got from pondering at your own level my “Cresting of my Case” (*Tinctures* 6) that is $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{0\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$ —gives a communal possibility of unity of the fragments. For instance, think your way forward, even now, to a fuller meaning than Lonergan had when he wrote the next two sentences on that page of *Insight*.

On the one hand it is relevant to the scientist as a scientist inasmuch as the untrammelled unfolding of his detached, disinterested, and unrestricted desire to understand in his own field correctly is open to a variety of interferences that ultimately can be surmounted only by accepting the ultimate implications of the unrestricted desire. On the other hand, it is relevant to the possibility of a correct interpretation of the results of human science.

I am inviting you to read these two sentences with a shocking freshness that indeed is to surge upwards ontically and phyletically in these next millennia. Think, for instance, of the two words, *surmounted* and *interpretation*. Can you struggle to imagine their meaning when we have, as a community—starting with a “not numerous center” (*CWL* 4, 245)—gripped and being gripped by the shaking off the bourgeois poise noted in the second paragraph of *Method in Theology* chapter one? **Surmounted**, then, brings in the spiral and vortex surmounting pointed to in *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*, and **Interpretation** not only places us in the discomfort of the *Insight* paragraph I call 60910, but lifts that paragraph into the 8-fold heuristics that is rescued from the first paragraph of the first chapter of *Method* by the Cosmopolitan $\{\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{W}_3)^{0\Phi\Gamma}\}^4$.

Back now to the optimism of my first paragraph above, and perhaps at this stage it is useful to bring in a serious personal operativeness of the spread of words of *Method* page 48. If you have taken the challenge of *Insight* with even vague seriousness, then the first word *capacity* is nudged, in your reach for meaning, by its heuristic expression in \mathbf{W}_3 : $f(p_i ; c_j ; b_k ; z_l ; u_m ; r_n)$. Try to detect luminously how luminous is the nudging’s fruit. For instance, the semi-colon, ; , points to a grip on aggreformic being.

In so far as you have such a grip in the mesh of other grips of the spread of words, then you rest in optimism. But the rest is a poise prior to the gloom of involvement, of the transition—and it is a transition only if it is effective—from FS₈ to C₉. The optimism grounds a joy in working together towards a patchwork of the countervailing heuristic to sociology and its effect-bent structurings; the gloom points us towards the massive task of moving seriously into what I might call SALES.

I recall, decades ago, moving through a commerce-section of a library and musing about the shocking contrast between the efforts to sell soap and the efforts to sell salvation. We are up against a long, lazy story of lazy effectings. FS₈ is, at present, the central problem of heuristics, and a neat Catch 22 zone: its best data is the gathered instances of success. Oy vey!

It seems to me now—as it did when I wrote the *Compass Festschrift* article of 1984 (available in *Cantower* 33)—that the sociology of economics is the best candidate for venturing into both the full challenge of the heuristics and the challenge of breaking through barriers to the development of FS₈. See the index to *Psychology* in *CWL* 21 (add p. 98, missing in the index: noted here). I note two instances of “strong drink” that we are up against: [a] *CWL* 21, p. 98, lines 4–11; and [b] the strong drink of single circuit analysis. Battling them shifts in probabilities of success when the two zones are interwoven. And I would add a third component to this weave: the possibility and probabilities of a religious mediation of a critique of [a] and a nudge towards the need for [b]. However, that mediation is handicapped in the manner described in my first paragraph. So: in the fields of religion the strong drink is a “single circuit” analysis poise, a mixture of the apophatic and the commonsensical that implicitly denies the existence of the circuit of *theoria*. We are back, then, at the same problem of FS₈ in religion as in economics. In neither zone is there much point in lauding Cosmopolis as it refers to the challenge. We each have to make a local move.