

*Joistings 26***Sow What: Heuristics of the Future.****1. Sow What**

The previous *Joistings 25* ending, in the final footnote, with an appeal to move on, sow on. That *Joisting* was the second of two dealing with the present confusions of quantum mechanics, and while solutions to the ills were “pointed out”, the pointing out does not belong in an adequate metaphysics until the pointing is effective.

Before you halt your reading here, let me assure you that this *Joistings* is not about quantum mechanics. It is about effectiveness, implementation. Indeed, it comes from conference discussions with people who contributed to the August 2006 Conference on “Tackling Local Evils”, with its focus on Research and Communications. It is, in fact, altogether elementary, indeed you might think of it as a fresh beginning, a return to a new version of *Joistings 0* that lies at the beginning of this series.¹ But of course for me it is a re-turning after another year of climbing! And how has your climbing year been?!

It also fits in with the two *Joistings*, that were written in relation to the August Conference, *Joistings 21* and *22*. **And** that Conference, I would like to think, was a fresh beginning. The title to this essay is an obvious pun. The simplest reference is to the remark, “so what?”, which usually calls into question the significance, effectiveness, applicability, of what has been presented. It is a question that I have previously raised at the end of such conferences in other years. Now it moves up front. And again, I would appeal to you not to halt your reading because you are not interested in the doings of the conference. For the question thus posed is a simple blunt version of what is more loftily talked of as the move to *Praxis*: a move more talked of than practiced. Or praxised.

¹*Joistings 27* ends this series.

Sow, let us pause over its bluntness. If and when we get into, get into us, the Praxis mentality that is central to functional specialization, then the question “so what?” will be in our bones, resonating through our gatherings and our thinkings.² Is my paper effective: are we as a group being effective?

Now I would note that I am not saying anything new here, anything different from the message of *Insight*, communicated by Lonergan after 28 years of cranial puzzling about metaphysics. Metaphysics was defined in him to include implementation, (even though the indexing of neither edition included the word.) Is *Insight* part of the new metaphysics? Yes, but in the present culture a crippled part: that is where *Method in Theology* comes in. Or perhaps I should say *Method in Theology and Botany*, where the full power of a minimal use of functional specialization is “pointed to” in the first of the three parts.

But I cannot cover that old ground here. And, in a mature metaphysics, the covering would be unnecessary: the Standard Model of procedure is to be a common a common heritage of the global community of re-cyclers. “In an hundred years or so”, as Patrick Kavanagh used to sing. It is certainly necessary now, when a relatively sincere community of people interested in Lonergan’s work are massively distorting his life’s project. But that is not our, mine and your, concern herenow. The concern that I wish you to consider as worth sharing with me is the concern expressed in my puny³ punning title. That title is to be read existentially, where that existentiality is yours, whether you have the sophisticated poise that he writes of in various places, or are just simply in a state of commonsense concern.

²I would recommend chapter 7 of Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*, Phoenix pb, 2002, to lift your realism [recall Newman’s Real Assent and relate it to molecularization] on this issue of boning up, etc.

³Of course one could pun about this, from the french origin, *puis ne*, of the word. Functional specialization was born late in Lonergan’s life, written of punily by him, in contrast to his first-born.

How then do I wish you to read the title? I could ask you, as Christian, to read it in terms of two parables: the Parables of the Sower and of the Unjust Stewart.⁴ Where is your work and your life going, in the agony of the globe's groaning?⁵ And further: where is our work thus going as we gather, write, communicate, **con-fer**? This is, in the fullness of human meaning, in the fullness of the heuristic notion of being and becoming, the normative heart-quest of all conferring.

The fullness of human meaning is to sow what. On previous occasions I have written of Arjuna's *Bhagavad-Gita* question, "What is man?" and you or I might write and think about its biblical versions or any other reflective tradition's reachings. I have written of it as an answer of whatever Krishna you reach toward; "Yes, **What** is man". And the vocation of God and man is to sow what, What.

The topic expands for me as I ponder it these days, but instead of expanding - it has the reach of a big book - I just nudge a bit here.

Sow? The short-term sowing that is personal, some version of the struggle of *Insight* for all levels of people, beginning with childhood. The long-term sowing that is the task of global functional specialization, and includes now the tricky task of getting that show on a roll. **That** is a central question of these next decades. Both meanings of *sow* will gradually bring forth, keeping close here to the heart of the matter, a deeper suggestive diagramming than the usual diagrams of Appendix A of *Phenomenology and Logic*. Might you envisage such a complexification, one that would build in both Rita Carter's popular reflections and Aquinas reflections on orientation in the *Prima Secundae*, qq.1-17? Might you give fresh meaning to S-O-W by thinking of Sensibility, Orientation, Wonder?

And is not Orientation a somehow-meshing of willing and feeling? And is not Sensibility under the dynamic of the Supernatural? Etc etc. And do you see a replacing

⁴The key verse is Luke 16:8, about the wisdom of the "two worlds".

⁵I am recall *Romans* chapter 8.

of Jung's four-diagram (feeling, intuition, sensing, thinking in a circle) or the Meyers-Briggs enlargement of it?

But of course you need to get to grips with the solution to the Lonerganesque problems of "feeling": and so, now, perhaps, I am landing you back with the task of *Quodlibet 19* which would have you tackle that on an elementary level. Here you may sense that the problem is being lifted to a new level, one that in fact can rescue Lonergan from the simple statements of *Method* and bring you back to the difficult dynamics talked of in the 1943 article, "Finality, Love, Marriage". And perhaps I might leave you there, brooding over what this has to do with our simple August gathering, a lonely gathering of finality, love, conferriage.

2. Once More With Feeling

The problem we face is, I might say, something like the advance from the standard presentation of first year university chemistry to quantum chemistry. I might say, this but as I recall, from my own first year chemistry of 1952-3, that standard presentation was already a muddle of the results of quantum analysis. So it is best to suggest a parallel with the transition from 19th century chemistry to mature 20th century chemistry. And that parallel proves helpful. Perhaps I might say that the issue is the transition from 20th century methodology to 21st century methodology. Then my own efforts so far can be seen as something of a muddle, like the first year chemistry course that I received more than fifty years ago. And thus one can see better the muddle of the pedagogy of *Insight*, or indeed the muddle levels of meaning of the *Opera Omnia* of Lonergan. At all events, one can say that the community was not ready for 21st century methodology. Is the 21st century ready for it?

Now I may push the parallel further, in a manner that even the non-chemist can glimpse. 20th century chemistry was still confused, and one can glimpse this confusion by returning to our considerations of **Feynman III** and **Sakurai** in *Joistings 24* and *25*. Greiner gives a good standard account of the quantum perspective on hydrogen in his

chapter nine, with helpful diagrams of what might be called clouds of probability.⁶ **Feynman III** has a solid chapter on the same topic, but the context is an effort to ground the quantum perspective of the periodic table in his version of quantum mechanics.⁷ The flaws were a topic of *Joistings* 25, and one might suspect that Feynman in a different context would have lifted his doctorate of 1942⁸ forward towards a more sophisticated view of amplitudes, or *aptitudes* as I prefer to call the curious forms that are involved. Loneragan, in 1942, was working, amazingly, on many things, but “Finality, Love, Marriage” would have been enough of an achievement for a revolutionary doctorate. I remember a conversation of the 1970s with him in which he remarked that he “had” emergent probability when he wrote that. And he had much else.

As I remarked in the previous *Joistings*, Feynman’s doctorate has not been available to me. He may well have “had” stuff there that leaped past Eddington’s suggestions.⁹ But I do have “Finality, Love, Marriage” and I can ask, we can ask, what stuff “had” Loneragan there that might belong in 21st century methodology. The difficulty of our asking is the difficulty of breaking forward into a 21st century reading and self-reading: a difficulty of the kind that Loneragan wrote of at the end of his *Verbum* articles.¹⁰

I have written previously about the difficulty of reaching for what Loneragan

⁶See pp.224-5 of Walter Greiner, *Quantum Mechanics*, Springer, 2001, the text I have regularly recommended. Other introductory texts have simpler diagramings of what some call “electron densities”.

⁷**Feynman III**, chapter 19.

⁸Richard Feynman, *The Principle of Least Action in Quantum Mechanics*, Ph. D. Thesis, Princeton University, 1942.

⁹See the text and quotation from Eddington in note 40 of *Joistings* 24.

¹⁰Loneragan’s classic statement on serious reading is in the Epilogue to those articles.

“had” in a variety of contexts, but here I simply recall the last chapter of *Christ in History*, where I compared him to Athanasius in the fourth century and wrote of the dates 335 and 1935. By 1935 Lonergan “had”, and had been “had” by, the cosmos in a manner that placed him in a solitary strangeness. But 1942 was a leap into a new loneliness: he was pushed through to the vision contained in his two unread works: *For A New Political Economy* and “Finality, Love, Marriage.” Are they still unread? Oh yes.

Of course I have been writing about *Insight* and *Method in Theology* as unread for some decades now. But let’s not go there.¹¹ My interest is in pointing towards a reading of “Finality, Love, Marriage” that would help us along here.

Have you read it previously? Did you, do you, as I did and do, find it enormously difficult? Yet the culture - “history is the real catch”¹² - invites you to read it in what I would call lightsome lightlessness. I recall giving the article to a very serious professor of theology in the early 1960s: a few days later he came to me and remarked “that is a very difficulty article: I had to read it twice”. But what of you? Might I suggest once more a comparison with Feynman, but now not his doctorate but simply a chapter of **Feynman III**, say the chapter on the periodic table. The serious in-taking of that chapter is tough work, if you are really in-taking such functions as the spherical harmonics. And the culture of theology invites you to say that, thank God, Lonergan is writing in relatively plain English about the familiar realities of sex and marriage: I only have to read it twice.

In the next section we will be trying together to read bits of the article once more. But it is important that we turn the challenge round in my many senses of those words

¹¹We will be going there in the 2007 August Conference (13th - 17th) on “Insight, Method and 3rd Millennium Education”.

¹²See *Topics in Education*, 236, 250-7.

*round and turn.*¹³ We are, at least I am, trying to turn us towards 22nd century methodology. The world of that hodic, global, turning, methodology is to be luminously discontinuous with the world of common sense. Moreover, the world of common sense is to be tuned into that discontinuity. Is such an anticipation a madness of mind? I recall the dynamics of compact consciousness as illustrated by the old African lady telling the tale of the tribe in the twilight. It is heard as *fascinans* and of remote significance, worth hearing again the next unhearing night.¹⁴ I recall a parallel dynamics of consciousness in the face of genius: for great musicians a Beethoven symphony is always a new symphony. So, I would look to a future in which more than 2% of adults grow, in which it there is a heart-felt rejection of *The Frogs* suggestion that “poetry is to be weighed in the scales” and in which there is a hearty accepting embrace of Proustian re-turning, “ ... over and over / To listen to the song for ever in blessed pain, / To the song that could make me happy, tangled in your delicate hands,”¹⁵ the hands of history, the molecules of mind.

Is such an anticipation my madness? The question certainly comes up now, in the common sense of you and me. But it is to come up within global systematics regularly and regulatedly, in a hundred years or so. That systematics is to include finally a proper

¹³See chapter of *The Redress of Poise*, “Turners. Strategists of Survival”. The chapter includes a experiment in footnoting and in content-structuring that battles and baffles the quick reader, reluctant to meet reader and writer biographically in history. The mood is the mood of the Cantower project, captured in the title that emerged for the four of the ten volumes written: *Roun Doll, Home James*.

¹⁴I am thinking of Rudolf Otto’s work, *The Idea of the Holy*, mentioned in note 2 both of *Insight* chapter 17 and of *Method* chapter 4. The *Insight* note gives more up-to-date references, but the *Method* note is worth recalling. The text there recalls “*mysterium fascinans et tremendum*”. Lonergan adds in the note the remark that “the meaning of *tremendum* varies with the stage of one’s religious development”. I would have you secularize that remark and place it in the context of your own reach for adult growth: is the cosmic mystery growing in you and around you as you struggle towards belonging to Maslow’s “less than 1%”?

¹⁵“To a Chinese Girl Singing,” *Poems*, Hermann Hesse, translated by James Wright, Cape London, 1971, 37.

reading into history of *Method in Theology* page 250, when the “you and I’ of the future are there the dialecticians who face the reach each of their own madness, with mysterious feeling state each their lonely case, and face the tribal system that asks them to re-turn each case-stew¹⁶ to their own molecular minding, and so come round to freshly state their lonely case, once more with feeling.

3. *Ma Vlast*

We are, I would claim - once more with feeling - reaching towards a future heuristic in so far as we reach seriously towards an achievement of the past hidden in print. In another cultural context it might have burst out into a tradition, but it remained hidden, nor was it played forward in *Insight*, which was an elementary rescue job, only compactly nudging towards the metaphysics lurking in “Finality, Love, Marriage”.

Insight an elementary job? Lonergan himself makes the relevant point. “There is in *Insight* a footnote to the effect that we’re not attempting to solve anything about such a thing as personal relations. I was dealing in *Insight* fundamentally with the intellectual side - a study of human understanding - in which I did my study of human understanding and got human intelligence in there, not just a sausage machine turning out abstract concepts. That was my fundamental thrust.”¹⁷ And “Finality, Love, Marriage” illustrates precisely that point. Personal relations are very definitely placed in the fuller context. But they are also placed in the context of a pretty sophisticated metaphysics. Elaborating that metaphysics in a manner that goes beyond it is a later task. What, then, can I do at this introductory stage? *Ma Vlast*, in a hundred years of so, will have the context of the precise specialization of dialectic that yields a concrete

¹⁶See the beginning of chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

¹⁷ *Second Collection* 221-2. The same minimalism dominates the chapter on Systematics in *Method in Theology*: see there note 1 on page 236. Personal relations, as he says in *Second Collection* interview, belong in a deeper context.

plurality of other Vlasts, fertile in a hodic vertical finality that vindicates and transposes Lonergan's effort of 1942. Meantime, it seems a matter of once more, with feeling, urging, cajoling, inviting. Indeed, when I issue the invitation to you to read what follows with a bent towards lifting the text in metaphysical equivalence, I am reaching for the slimly possible. Still, that seems better than a naive presentation of the sophisticated metaphysical stand Lonergan brought to the work of 1942. Anyhow, let us try to read together a sequence of texts that nudge us towards that search for equivalence. Consider thus the following sentence.

"Now towards this high goal it is no small beginning to the weak and imperfect heart of fallen man to be startled by a beauty that shifts the center of appetition out of self: and such a shift is effected on the level of sensitive spontaneity by *eros* leaping in through delighted eyes and establishing itself as unrest in absence and imperious demand for company."¹⁸

This is just a small piece of the invitation to verify a thesis regarding human rationality, "that in man this rational process is embedded in a field of natural spontaneity and infused virtue these three levels are realized in one subject; as the higher perfects the lower, so the lower disposes the higher; and it is this disposition of natural spontaneity to reinforce reason, of reason to reinforce grace - for all three come from and return to God - that is to be found in the ascent of love that gives human marriage a finality on the level of Christian charity and perfection. Such is the thesis. We proceed to verify it."¹⁹

Lonergan proceeds to verify it with the metaphysics of Thomas, enriched by his own transpositions of that metaphysics. Right through he is writing within a minding stance of metaphysical equivalence, and his stated mode, as in *Insight* later, is the mode of the first definition of generalized empirical method. I emphasize that mode by

¹⁸FLM, 31-2.

¹⁹FLM, 30.

boldfacing **empty**.²⁰ “One has to set the complex nature of love in the **empty** categories of vertical finality.”²¹ “On finality is affirmed, besides the absolute reference of all things to God and the horizontal reference of each thing to its commensurate motives and ends, a vertical dynamism and tendency, an upthrust from lower to higher levels of appetite and process; thus are provided the **empty** categories of the ultimate solution.”²²

Nor can there be any doubt about his categorial thinking, developed over the previous two decades. He writes metacategorially of vertical finality’s “four manifestations: instrumental, dispositive, material, obediential.”²³ The third is spelled out and worth quoting here as what may be his first precise summary statement of aggregism: “a concrete plurality of lower entities may be the material cause from which a higher form is educed or into which a subsistent form is infused.”²⁴ Finally, I would note that his categorial analysis is far from empty. As in *Insight*, so here, he is moving within the second definition of generalized empirical method: his heuristic has been enriched by up-to-date theoretic.

Now back to you and me. We should, of course, be bringing the categorial perspective of the second, third and fourth, definitions of generalized empirical method, luminous in our loneliness that we are sliding round specialized interpretation of Lonergan’s searchings of 1942. But, you surely agree, in words from that year 1942, “we are not there yet. And for society to progress towards that or any other goal it must

²⁰See **FLM** 18, 29. One must consider the word empty in the light of Lonergan’s progressive refinements of the meaning of generalized empirical method. See *Joistings* 21 and 22.

²¹**FLM**, 29.

²²**FLM**, 18.

²³**FLM**, 20.

²⁴**FLM**, 20.

fulfil one condition. It cannot be a titanothore, a beast with a three-ton body and a ten-ounce brain. It must lift its eyes more and ever more to the more general and more difficult fields of speculation, for it is from them that it has to derive the delicate compound of unity and freedom in which alone progress can be born, struggle and win through."²⁵

But where are we? Where are you? What is your *Vlast*? " ego or *moi intime* keeping some matters entirely to oneself, and refusing even to face others."²⁶ Have you even got as far as searching out that heart of vertical dynamics that is the operation of the transcendental "be adventurous", the heart of Lonergan's vertical reaching for Aquinas' verticality regarding the meaning of grace? Equivalently, how do you read the metagram about doing?²⁷ Did you read that earlier great effort of Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom*, in that luminous context? Or did you miss that vertical challenge then, earlier, later, merely because Lonergan did not spell it out as context, nor did Aquinas? "Why does Thomas make no mention of the election, consent, will of the means, when he treats of grace as operative and cooperative?"²⁸ Because he was on a particular quest here: the other stuff is adequately dealt with elsewhere.²⁹ We, too, are on a particular quest here, but the quest involves ingesting that personal stuff. Indeed, as I wish to emphasize, the ingesting has to reach new heights of courage and speculation if we are to move into the 21st century in ways that contrast with the shrinkages of the 13th. "It demands discipline of mind and will: a keenness of apprehension that is not tied down to this or that provincial routine of familiar ideas nor yet sunk to the jellyfish

²⁵*For a New Political Economy*, 20.

²⁶*Insight*, 470[495].

²⁷*Phenomenology and Logic*, 323.

²⁸*Grace and Freedom*, 424.

²⁹*Prima Secundae*, qq. 6-17.

amorphism of scepticism; a vitality of response to situations that can acknowledge when the old game is done."³⁰

4. Imaging

If my suspicion is correct, the previous section has left you, most of you, somewhat baffled? Where is all this leading to? Of course, it is intended to lead you to a return to "Finality, Love, Marriage" with a fresh energy of re-turn that has many layers of retrieval and advance. The full return indeed is a communal thing of the future, a piece of the move towards **The Standard Model**. For me, that is the key image here: the image presented in the metagram W3. But I would have you reach fantastically here for a ground-breaking heart-breaking image that would open finality and love towards a fresh global adventure that is deeply personal. Your point of entry is the reading to which I invited you in the previous section, the consideration of sentences such as that given at note 18 above. How might you think, at present, of "delighted eyes"? What is your image, here and now, of those eyes, your eyes? What might you mean, and what might Lonergan mean, by affect-laden images? And, honestly, do you have some decent idea of what I mean by these questions?

You have, of course, been round these questions before. They were there pretty explicitly when I referred you to Feynman's good essays on seeing eyes.³¹ They were lurking in my elementary presentation of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations. Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*, when I wrote of the existential problems that surround - literally - "the sensitive integration,"³² but they were not the sort of questions that one pursues in an elementary text or class. They were not even pursued, when one takes *pursuit* in its fully relevant and serious meaning, in the elementary text *Insight*. So, passages that point to

³⁰*For A New Political Economy*, 21-22.

³¹See note 34 of *Joistings 25*.

³²Chapter 6 *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations* deals with the topic in some detail.

the problem and the task of the pursuit can be breezily read, even with a psychic nod. “Once one enters upon the way of explanation by relating things to one another, one has stepped out of the path that yields valid representative images.”³³ “No man [or woman!] is born in that pattern; no one reaches it easily; no one remains in it permanently; and when some other pattern is dominant, then the self of our self-affirmation seems quite different from one’s actual self, the universe of being seems as unreal as Plato’s noetic heaven, and objectivity becomes a matter of meeting persons and dealing with things that are ‘already out there’.”³⁴ And rejoicing in “beautiful eyes”.

Have no doubts about the size of the challenge at present. *Cantower 9*, “Position, Poosition, Protopossession” was one fairly precise indication of the long climb involved. Yet I may introduced a note of optimism about the future, about the academic mood of the future, that “hundred years or so” of 2111, by drawing attention to the parallel between “Obstacles to Metaphysical Control”³⁵ and obstacles to the control of chemical meaning as that science stood in 1860. A decade later there emerged the now-familiar periodic table. A hundred years later, quantum theory complexifies the image in various ways, lifting both expert and student to a different level of challenge and understanding, indeed a level that is at present a muddle to those working in the area.. I am simply trying to do the same for the present muddled students and experts of minding. Complex imaging will emerge, to discomfort present dysfunctioning.

Yet I write of the effort as heart-breaking. How might that be? Broadly I might say that the axial heart is lovingly - and also hatefully - committed to beautiful eyes that are “really reached” by poets, painters, melodies. But I might narrow our interest in on different hearts. There is the heart of the medical student or neuroscientist, heartheld by the image of a pump, an image massively but hiddenly opposed to his or her love-

³³*Insight*, 250[275].

³⁴*Insight*, 385[411].

³⁵*Method. Journal of Lonergan Studies* **24** (2006)..

making. There is the heart of the expert or student of a philosophy that is subtly committed to common sense, captured or captivated perhaps by pseudo-poets of metaphysics. Further, I would have you note, notice, intussuscept, that by *heart* here I mean the patterned organic reality that cherishes: which has the identifiable beating heart on the edge of its identity. But how would I have you do this except by breaking your heart? Nor is the breaking a metaphor, for the neurodynamics of the axial heart is patterned in ways more sickly and subtly than by its mating with glutamate or endorphins. There is the massage, through beautiful eye and ear and skin, of a general enculturation that is a bias, a general bias, against the heart's real desire. It battles the local dance of molecules for its heart, but only guarantees that "the social situation deteriorates cumulatively."³⁶ How does one, or many, break the hold of that cold, even malicious heart, so as to bring us globally towards a reverence for the "village strangeness"³⁷ of the other, a reverence for the field of being?³⁸

If you are familiar with Lonergan's hearty appeals of the fifty years between 1935 and 1984,³⁹ then you have taken note here that I seem only to be repeating the appeal. Yet you may climb to notice that there is lift to the appeal, dancing precisely on the seven metagrams, W0 - W6, offered over the previous forty years. And you may notice, with a heart breaking forward towards implementation, that I am writing now about a final W7 that would help to bring our hearts to the heart of the matter, the heart of matter.

What is needed is a heartheld-lift of imagery, merging W4k and W4d, but also displacing inwards and upwards the sequence of complementary images, W0 - W6.

³⁶*Insight* 229[254].

³⁷A topic of my contributions to *Searching for Cultural Foundations*, (edited by P.McShane), University Press of America, 1984.

³⁸A context is chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*.

³⁹This is the topic of chapter 10 of *ChrISt in History*.

Where is it to come from, how is it to be heart-breakingly effective? That is the issue of the “collaboration” mentioned 29 times in the second last section of *Insight*. But I would note, as I move to a close, that the collaboration invites you across “a natural bridge over which we may advance from our examination of science to an examination of common sense.”⁴⁰ That natural bridge oddly carries us, and the beautiful eyes, towards a merging of the last section of that fifth chapter of *Insight* with my question in this section of imaging the concrete personal yet global climb. “Such, then, is the question envisaged by this section on the concrete intelligibility of Space and Time. What is wanted is an intelligibly grasped in the totality of concrete extensions and durations and, indeed, identical for all spatio-temporal viewpoints.”⁴¹

Might I end cheekily by adding Lonergan’s next statement, the beginning of his final paragraph of that chapter? “The answer is easily reached”.

It is easily reached if one takes seriously that page that I have referred to so often in the past forty years: “study of the organism begins....”⁴² Then one’s seriousness brings the organism that is the self with its hardened heart - and perhaps beautiful but lost eyes - into that study, reaching to invent “appropriate symbolic images of the relevant chemical and physical processes”⁴³, symbolic of “psychic representation”⁴⁴ and the lonely heart and “destiny.”⁴⁵

But will it be reached? There is the fuller law of effect that I wish to write of in the next and final *Joistings* 27, “In the twenty seventh place”. But here I would have you

⁴⁰The first paragraph of chapter 5 of *Insight*.

⁴¹The second-last paragraph of chapter 5 of *Insight*.

⁴²*Insight*, 464[489].

⁴³*Ibid.*

⁴⁴*Insight*, 469[494].

⁴⁵*Insight*, 471[495].

take note of the written context of your effort in its reference to an indeterminate law of effect. That law stands against the functioning that is dominated by general bias with its cults of the obvious and its shrinkage of minding. "There is the law of effect. One develops through functioning and until one has developed, one's functioning has the lack of poise, of economy, of effectiveness, that betrays as yet undifferentiated potentialities."⁴⁶ One, some few, gradually a towering minority, must reach thus towards a "Redress of Poise,"⁴⁷ a poise of molecular and hearty praxis, with "zest and risk and doing."⁴⁸

⁴⁶*Ibid.*

⁴⁷*Redress of Poise* is the title of a book, a collection of papers from the 1990, which is an invitation to this poise. The book is available on the usual website.

⁴⁸*Insight*, 471[496].