

On Functional Research: Introduction

This is, I would claim, a massively important fresh attempt to initiate Lonergan's dream of functional collaboration, of "eliminating totalitarian ambitions."¹ One of my problems is that it is an attempt which is underway in another mode with some success: this volume emerges from a seminar, an e-seminar, on functional research, that occurred in the first months of 2011. We are now at present writing, in February of the next year, in the beginning of the fifth seminar, on functional foundations.² Is the series, heading for 25 seminars of three months each, a success? For the active sub-group of the group of 50 involved I would say yes. We are making stumbling progress towards glimpsing what Lonergan was hoping for. But it is surprisingly slow work. My problem is that the success of that slow work could fade in this 'volume version' of the attempt. It could float dead in the waters of what I could call *normal reading* like those two floating volumes of Lonergan, *Insight* and *Method in Theology*.

Normal reading - are you with me here? - may already object that the two volumes of Lonergan mentioned are not dead in the water but on the high sea of a movement. I won't attempt an answer to that objection for the moment beyond noting that there is little sign of the functional collaboration sketched in the second half of *Method*. And that is our interest in the seminars, an interest that slowly reveals that, yes, *Insight* is dead in the water.

The problem in the case of any of these volumes is the slowness of serious reading, the slowness of the exercises involved. Do you recall Lonergan's comment on such slow exercising in the Epilogue of *Verbum*? But let me illustrate this from the beginning of the seminar on functional

¹ I quote from the Florida (1970) "Interview with Lonergan edited by McShane," *A Second Collection* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), 213 recently republished as *CWL* 13. The paragraph there is worth slow contemplation.

² I place an almost final footnote here to Preface and Introduction as I settle for a partial solution to my problem of presentation. I am keeping the *FuSes* written for the seminar, in the heat of battle, as it were, the way they emerged at that time. There is the mood of messing, of a stumbling search of months. I can only hope that somehow this mood would trespass into the consciousnesses of the readers of the volume, even if it does not come to haunt them, thus fermenting them in the coming years towards a functional poise.

research.

One of my starts was with *CWL* 1, on *Grace and Freedom*, where Lonergan interprets Thomas in the old-style messy fashion: successful, yes, yet not effectively functional. But my point is the neat but rough illustration of functional research provided by his seeking out Charles Boyer in the autumn of 1938. "Lonergan asked him to be his director." Boyer had to get into focus, might I say as functional researcher? Well, no; but let us go on. "Finally Boyer reached for his copy of Thomas Aquinas's *Prima secundae*, pointed to an article that he himself had difficulty in interpreting, and suggested that Lonergan make a study of that article in itself, of its *loca parallela*, and of its historical sources. Thus by a simple accident of history ..."³

I'm sure that most of you have read that already. But in the seminar we came to read it in a new way. I quote here from *FuSe Zero*, one of the lead-in documents of the first seminar. The issue that is most relevant for us now is the three attempts listed as [1], [2], [3]. Having noted these, skip down to the bold-faced print that conclude the quotation, beginning **That was Boyer's first attempt**, and muse over the suggestion there about the second and third attempt. The point about the seminar as exercises is that the musing is backed by the exercise, for we are trying to get to grips, each of us, with our own instance of functional research.

We'll come back to [4] presently, but I would bear witness here to how difficult people found this exercise: doing functional research without deviating into interpretation. Pause and think about it: somewhat baffling, isn't it? I invited different people to mess around, with different pieces of Lonergan, in on-the-move discoverable ways so as to **find themselves** working as a researcher in physics would work, hunting for parallel anomalous tracks.

Such a physics-researcher is working within a contemporary standard model. That research is very close to functional research: but the messing of this seminar is needed to grasp its closeness, and the messing of the full eight seminars is needed to see how far that research, and physics in general, are from adequate functional collaboration. But now the quotation, and then some musing on [4].

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

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

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

³ *Grace and Freedom*, *CWL* 1 (2000), xiii.

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

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

This is all very strange, but then the issue of **functionality** is strange. Think of yourself as Boyer talking to Lonergan three times, doing better {?} each time. Recall the previous quotation: “Boyer reached for his copy of Thomas Aquinas’s *prima secundae*, pointed to an article that he himself had difficulty in interpreting, and suggested that Lonergan make a study of that article in itself, of its *loca parallela*, and of its historical sources.” **That was Boyer’s first attempt. It would have been better if he had also given the *loca parallela*, ... a second attempt? And what of a third attempt, with broader *loca*?”**

I invite you now to keep the focus on Boyer and Lonergan in their conversation as we move to think about [4]. But you do see already the problem noted at the beginning? In the seminar mode, there is conversation and muddling and messing over weeks, whereas here you have moved your more-or-less minding eye down a page or so. I do not want to lose you at this early stage, but my aim is to get you to a fuller but more remote anomaly related to the failure of *Method’s Foreground* as a help in all this. The real help, indeed, is the missing exercises that would get you, and the Lonergan school as a whole, into – get into you! - section 3 of chapter 17 of *Insight*, as the help in reading Background and Foreground and anything else. But we come to that odd claim eventually here in the imaginative Introduction – borrowed from *FuSe Zero* – which I interject here shortly.

What is [4] about? It is about your presuppositions in the messing. But I asked you to focus on Boyer and Lonergan, and their presuppositions. And I ask you now to add to that focus a wee nudge from *The Sketch of Insight* 17.3: “They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.”

Don’t worry about the meaning of *pure formulation*, a tricky business. Next, avoid brooding over puzzles about the universal viewpoint by replacing UV, or, as I prefer, TUV (tentative universal viewpoint), with TSM, Tentative Standard Model.

Next consider a re-write of the quotation, just given, from *Insight*: “They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the Standard Model and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the Standard Model.” Consider the quotation as referring to a classy gathering of first-rate physicists or mathematicians. My own favorite image here is of the four-hour meeting in which Andrew Wiles presented

his solution to Fermat's Last Theorem, but let us not get side-tracked.⁴ The main point is that there is a more-or-less shared viewpoint, a grasp of a standard model. Think, perhaps, of chemistry's periodic table ingested in a decent undergraduate degree. A final help is to think of the teacher that inspired Wiles' interest to 'have a go' at Fermat. We are nearer now to a decent image of researcher talking functionally to a potential interpreter. And I would have you pause here again over the quotation from *The Sketch*. For me it is as near as Lonergan gets in *Insight* to a heuristic of functional collaboration. Just change one word: 'They are pure formulations if they proceed from a **researcher** that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.'⁵ The function of the informed researcher is to find positive or negative anomalies to pass on to the audience that is the group of informed interpreters.

Back now to Boyer and Lonergan. Did they share a standard model, even in 1938? I do not think so. And by the autumn of 1953 no one shared Lonergan's standard model, a massive third millennium accumulation of all his creative shifts away from the shabby standard models present in current philosophic and theological circles. Might I suggest that Lonergan has done a sort-of Andrew Wiles on Thomas's Last Theorem?⁶ At all events I would suggest that it would be quite a neat nudge from me as researcher to point you towards the article that is *Insight* 17.3, "an article that he himself had difficulty in interpreting, and suggesting that [not Lonergan but] you make a study of that article in itself, of its loca parallela, and of its historical sources."⁷ But it is time now to interject the little introduction that was included in *FuSe Zero*, that first venture into the large task intimated by the 80 *FuSe* essays to follow.

Introduction

⁴ I use the image in *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, 12, to indicate the contrast between scientific seriousness and *haute vulgarization* (see note 32, below). For the serious presentation, see Andrew Wiles, "Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat's Last Theorem," *Annals of Mathematics* 142 (1995), 443-551.

⁵ The original reads: "They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint (*CWL* 3, 602)."

⁶ In the archival folder (February, 1965) that contains Lonergan's discovery page of Functionality and his sketch of a first chapter on Method, there are also included references to and extracts from the *Prima Quaestio* of Thomas' *Summa Theologica*. Lonergan was not unaware of his genius leap in scientific method. File 47200D0E060 / A472 V\7\1 is available in [The Bernard Lonergan Archives](#).

⁷ *CWL* 1, xviii.

Galactic Method, or what I would call Fusionism,⁸ is to be a community of characters⁹ embracing the universe.¹⁰ That short sentence will not make much sense to you until you have worked your way beyond this short introduction into the beginnings of that community. The three footnotes to the sentence remind us of that. I might further try stretching your imagination by asking you to brood seriously over a global humanity stabilized at 10,000,000,000 members, characters, cared for by a sub-group of something in the region of 250,000,000 cultured characters.¹¹ It is to be the next millennium's answer to the appeal of Stewart Brand: "Whether it's called the commons, natural-infrastructure maintenance, tending the wild, niche construction, ecosystem engineering, mega-gardening, or intentional Gaia, humanity is now stuck with a planet stewardship role."¹² And there is a sense in which this stewardship has nothing to do with theology or religion and everything to do with cultured self-love.

Why, then, do I turn now to acknowledge the roots of my view and this revolution in a book named *Method in Theology*? It is because that book was a failed effort to communicate the global revolution sketched by its author in 1965. I recall now talking to that author, Bernard Lonergan, eighteen months after his discovery, about his problem of communication. In hindsight I can muse over the advice I might have given him: 'don't

⁸ I cannot see this glorious global, indeed galactic, movement going forward under such a name as Lonerganism. The name *Fusionism* was suggested to me by a phrase of Lonergan, "fuse into a single explanation," that concludes a powerful paragraph from what I later here call his 'mad scene.' (See *Insight*, 610, line 9).

⁹ I refer here both to the first paragraph of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia*, where he associates character with the full domain of politics, and to Lonergan's location of the word in his considerations of the basis of adequate foundational realities (section one of *Method in Theology*, chapter 14). *Magna Moralia* can be found in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, volume 2, edited by Jonathan Barnes (Princeton University Press, 1984), 1868-1921.

¹⁰ "Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view" (*CWL* 3, 442). This is a shocking normative shift from the present specialist misery. Add to it the equally brutal norm of empirical attentiveness: "Generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject's operations without taking into account the corresponding objects" (*A Third Collection*, 141).

¹¹ To help the musing I recall a simple model, that I use regularly, of a collaborative group of 22,220 members: 10,000 in functional research (recall Gandhi's 10,000 villages), 1,000 in interpretation, 100 historians, 10 dialecticians, 10 foundational characters, etc. Multiplying by 10,000 brings us to 222,200,000.

¹² Stewart Brand, *Whole Earth Discipline. An Ecopragmatist Manifesto* (Atlantic Books, London, 2010), 275.

write a book at all!’ At all events the tired old warrior tackled a book that described badly a solution to the problem of our axial mess.¹³ I recall now, too, Professor Sean McEvenue telling me of the day Lonergan finished the book in 1970 and sat with some colleagues puzzling over a possible Introduction. McEvenue remarked: “just write a page.” The advice brightened Lonergan’s eyes: he returned to his room and wrote two pages.

Unlike Lonergan, I write my few pages here before beginning the book. That I can do so is made possible by Lonergan’s achievements insofar as I have ingested as best I could, over the past fifty-five years, his full effort. I can make my own, as I invite you to make your own, his two-page Introduction to *Method*, but with fresh twists that emerge in the struggle enlarged on in the book to follow. So, for example, for ‘a contemporary theology’ in his Introduction I would ask you to read ‘a global care.’ Then the corresponding sentence reads: “In such a global care we envisage eight distinct tasks: research, interpretation, history, dialectic, foundations, doctrines, systematics, and communications.” But my envisaging leans on history instead of his “grounds of the division,”¹⁴ and my ‘we’ is not an authorial plural but a community of beginners. For, while Lonergan worked in grim solitude, I proceed with this book through eight e-seminars on the eight distinct tasks.

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

There is a sense in which he did not fail: the failure was in the community that was incapable of reading his melodies and his madneses. And here I am eccentric enough to compare Lonergan’s efforts with Donizetti’s, indeed to compare his *Insight* with Donizetti’s *Lucia di Lammermoor*.¹⁵ There is the ‘mad scene’ near the end of that Opera which I like to compare with the madness of Lonergan’s treatment of Interpretation near the end of his *Opus*. Lonergan’s madness, the heart of

¹³ A topic that is to occupy us considerably later. Roughly, one must think of the manner in which Toynbee and Voegelin lifted Jasper’s short Greek axial period towards being a long period of fragmentation and disorientation, at the conclusion of which—that depends on us—stands our present arrogant misery.

¹⁴ The title of section 3, *Method in Theology*, chapter 5. My own treatment of grounding is in chapter one of the book, *Method in Theology: Revisions and Implementations*, 2007. There the grounding is identified with the *de facto* historical emergence of the problem of the divisions; briefly I claim that history is the mother and Lonergan the foster-father of the future luminous global omnidisciplinary division of labour.

¹⁵ I was nudged toward the odd comparison by attending, on December 11th 2010, the Vancouver Opera performance, a magnificent performance, which included Eglise Gutierrez as Lucia.

his new view,¹⁶ remained unsung throughout the twentieth century. What of Donizetti?

Let me start with great listening, the sort of listening that Lonergan's madness associated with 'pure formulations.'¹⁷ "They are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint."¹⁸ Switch to Donizetti, and the dress rehearsal of February 1959, with Joan Sutherland in the role of Lucia.¹⁹ Maria Callas is in town and attends. "So astonished was she at the physical and vocal virtuosity of the mad scene, that she was heard to comment: 'That is not good.' Surprised, her companion asked what was bad about it, 'It is too good', came the reply."²⁰

The critic Andrew Porter wrote, that month, in the *Financial Times*, "Her singing was exquisite; particularly notable were the sustained notes, followed by an octave drop. Her decorations were tastefully and justly conceived and beautifully executed. Arpeggios were delicate and lovely, trills were confident. But beyond this there was a meaning in everything she did. A singer who can make florid bursts in sixths with the flute heart-rending in effect has understood the secret of Donizetti's music."²¹

And what of Callas the audience? "of all the roles that remained active in Callas' repertoire, it was Lucia with which there was the strongest initial identification and with which Callas wrought her greatest revolution in the operatic theatre. After decades during which the role had been mishandled by light-voiced, self-indulgent sopranos, Callas returned an epic sense of its tragic stature by her penetrating psycho- and musico-analysis of the character."²²

So, we find character interpreted by character to character within a tiny towering community. There were no Callases or Sutherlands in the twentieth century to sing, even self-indulgently, the mad scene of "The Truth of Interpretation." The scene has not been light-voiced mishandled; it has not been handled at all.²³ But further comment on light-weight

¹⁶ The topic will occupy us especially in the second and third seminars.

¹⁷ *Insight*, 602. A paragraph begins: "Thirdly, there are pure formulations."

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, the conclusion of the same paragraph.

¹⁹ Chapter 4, "Lucia di Lammermoor," of the book referred to in the next note gives an account of her strenuous and subtle preparation for the part, as well as a sketch of the fate of the Opera since its first performance in 1835.

²⁰ *Joan Sutherland*, Norma Major, (London: McDonald Queen Anne Press, 1987), 50.

²¹ Quoted in Norma Major, *Joan Sutherland* (London: McDonald Queen Anne Press, 1987), 52.

²² John Ardoin, *The Callas Legacy. A Biography of a Career* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982), 49.

²³ We will venture into this strange situation in *FuSe 2*, but perhaps one instance of the non-handling is worth recalling in an Introduction to *Lonergan's Hermeneutics. Its Development and Application*, edited by Sean E. McEvenue and Ben F. Meyer, (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America

handling and its contrast with the serious arts, sciences and technologies of our times had best be left to the Epilogue.

How are we to get from here to there? That was the issue posed by Lonergan in his view of decay and the need for a strange cosmopolis,²⁴ identified by him in 1965 with a concrete functionality of thinking and living that is quite beyond our present dreams. That is the issue of the present book, yet I would like in conclusion to note a greater urgency conveyed by the title of the book of more than 30 years ago, from which I give the final quotation here: *Lonergan’s Challenge to the University and the Economy*.²⁵ The past 30 years have seen the depths of indecency and misery that the immorality of financial racketeering has brought us. The critique of that immorality cannot be grounded in the present erroneous establishment economics.

We cannot wait for the emergence of an effective Fusionism to be saved from that immorality and stupidity.²⁶ Establishment economics, with all its works and pomps, needs to be eradicated from global culture as soon as possible. But best now conclude abruptly with the hope I expressed at the beginning of chapter one of that little book of 1980:

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



I return now to the suggestion made before we ventured into that Introduction: my nudge as functional researcher to my audience to home in as interpreter on that text, *Insight* 17.3. It is an extremely tall order. Might I make it a simpler task if I were to say, home in on the "powerful paragraph" mentioned in the first note of that Introduction, the one concluding with "fuse into a single explanation"? Well, not really. It is the crisis paragraph of the standard model, the heart of that whole section 3. But the occurrence of the word *crisis* there leads me to recall the issue of

Press, 1989), resulted from a gathering of scholars in Concordia University. The invitation was to tackle creatively Lonergan’s work on interpretation. In fact, as is usual in Lonergan gatherings, we all did our own thing: Lonergan’s ‘mad scene’ was passed over.

²⁴ *CWL* 3 chapter 7, section 8.

²⁵ The book is now available on www.philipmcshane.ca: indeed, what is given there is a photocopy of Lonergan’s copy, with interesting comments by him.

²⁶ A context is my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, (Vancouver: Axial Publications, 2010). A further context is Volume 21, no. 2 of the *Indian Journal, Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education*, which contains a series of introductory articles under the general title, “Do You Want a Sane Global Economy.”

mood, of *ethos*, of what I wish to conjure up by these seminars, these volumes. It leads me to recall a passage in which Lonergan writes "the aesthetic apprehension of the group's origin and story becomes operative ... especially in a crisis."²⁷

There is a crisis in Lonergan studies which these seminars, these volumes, seek to meet. They seek to meet them in the peculiar manner illustrated by the calling of attention to a section, or a paragraph, or even a phrase in Lonergan's work, that has been missed, skipped, not been read, not been intussuscepted. It is the paradigm followed in this volume, and I would note that it did not come easy.²⁸ I only wish to touch now on one single piece of the trail to the paradigm that should help you to focus on the drive of this volume.

The piece is the first few pages of chapter one of *Method in Theology*, where Lonergan talks of getting clues from the more successful sciences. I would ask you to focus your imagination, your fantasy, on the phrase, "cumulative and progressive results," "*cumulative and progressive results*." The phrase, and the mood, make marvelous sense if held and cherished in the context of the perspective of *Insight* 17.3 sublated into the global collaborative structuring of functional minding. But it makes little sense in the context of present Lonergan studies, indeed one might entertain the suggestion that it does not make sense in the context of the rest of the tired book *Method in Theology*. Cumulative and progressive results belong to the mood and the reach of the "far larger"²⁹ work that might have followed *Insight*: only, however, if it had the lift of the functional context.

But I am raising deeper and discomfoting issues here, when I should be homing in on the problem of "cumulative and progressive results" in the early stages of the establishment of the global science so desperately needed in this new millennium. Still, envisaging those early stages cannot but be discomfoting to some of my readers, for the envisagement requires a turn-about of present Lonerganism which laces into the deeper issues. My immediate trouble here is, recall my pessimism at the end of the Preface, that present Lonerganism is not reading these volumes or generally participating in the seminar effort. So, my actual present readers, you, need to "make functional specialization a topic."³⁰ But only if your

²⁷ *CWL* 10, 230.

²⁸ In *FuSe Zero*, and again in the third seminar on functional history, I indicate the manner in which Frederick Crowe's work, especially his *Theology of the Christian Word. A Study in History* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), inspired me to swing towards functional research as a starting point. His concluding words there adds to the mood of this seminar and volume venture: "When you have a mountain to move, and only a spade and wheelbarrow to work with, you can either sit on your hands or you can put spade to earth and move the first sod (149)."

²⁹ *CWL* 3, 754. The reference is to the second volume, *Faith and Insight*, that he had hoped to write.

³⁰ I am referring to, but not quoting properly, *Method in Theology*, 253:

thesis is finished or your job is secure!

How, then, do I end this Introduction effectively? My risky musings³¹ lead me to a discomfiting mix of pointing both toward deep aberrations and toward possible little steps. The possible little steps I suggest will not be welcome to most of the Lonergan following, but my thesis is long done, indeed I am nearly done with this mortal coiling, and certainly I am beyond looking for a job!

My annoying stand is that there needs to be a luminous and deliberate shift of interest towards functional collaboration, a shift to be manifested in a shift of conference topics, theses, articles, discussions, whatever. A tall order, but surely an obvious one for 2012, forty years after the publication of *Method in Theology*, seventy years after the typing of *For a New Political Economy*?

How honest or moral has the past 40 years of Lonergan studies been? Perhaps it is a matter of blameless invincible ignorance, something understandable of fixed stale unthinking cultures. At any rate, there has been no manifest and serious effort by the Lonergan community to think out effectively the two great Xs of Lonergan's career: The X of Cosmopolis and the X of functional collaboration. My senior colleagues continue in the same old same mold without apparently noticing that the ongoing gatherings and scatterings are not exactly seeding a new world much less a New Jerusalem. Some bluntly claim that they prefer to work on their own, some express the silly view, in papers and talks, that they are moving comfortably from one specialty to another as they write or speak. What is deeply sad about this is that they are misleading the next generations into the same effete³² rut.

My senior colleagues and I are just not on the same page, and that claim goes beyond metaphor in that I am talking about a blunt brilliant page of *Method in Theology*, page 250.³³ A couple of paragraphs ago I wrote of "my annoying stand": my stand is just a popular hint of the stand

"it will make conversion a topic, and thereby promote it."

³¹ My risky talk has increased in recent years, in the mood conjured up in parts of *Lack in the Beingstalk* (see, for instance, the blunt ambition expressed in the Prologue, 5-6). As I intimate in the text here of Preface and Introduction, what is desirable is some aggressive response from serious colleagues: such rough dialogue is a common aspect in the exchanges of serious sciences. Silence on the matters I raise is just a dodge; in its fullness it is a dodging of the scientific method of *Method in Theology*, 250, lines 18-33.

³² "They become effete" (*Method in Theology*, 99). The topic in this section of *Method* is undifferentiated consciousness. It is more bluntly handled in *CWL* 6, 121, 155, where Lonergan talks of *haute vulgarization* (121) and "being lost in some no-man's land between the world of theory and the world of common sense" (155).

³³ See the Essay by Patrick Brown on the topic of *Method in Theology*, 250, part of "*FuSe* 14," also to be a chapter in the volume on Functional History.

pleaded for by Lonergan in the second half of that page. I ask my colleagues to please at least take a clear stand against me, in writing, in lecturing. Indeed, I ask their students to ask them about their stand: though it might be best, for their student future, to do so anonymously!

Enough of that short-term part of my annoyance and my bluntness. The long-term part goes back to a remark of Lonergan in Dublin exactly fifty years ago. We had just finished dinner under that dirty old painting later found to be a missing Caravaggio. Lonergan was enjoying himself, having escaped from the Gregorian University for a week. He talked of the centuries-old staleness and isolation of Catholic minding: "big frogs in little ponds" was his phrase. It was all in *Insight* of course, and also in letters to his Superiors.³⁴ The issue was "the substitution of pseudometaphysical mythmaking in place of scientific inquiry,"³⁵ a current *ethos* of Lonerganism. The way out of that *ethos* is the recycling advocated by functional collaboration, and perhaps that sneaking suspicion is behind the preservation of little ponds?

What the recycling aims at—and the aim includes a lift to global omnidisciplinary collaboration—is the genesis of a Standard Model³⁶ of intellectual integrity that would meet the needs of the future of humanity with a hopefilled creativity "advancing from a generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary ever ready to offset every interference"³⁷ with our finality, our destiny. Such was Lonergan's agony in winding down—and up—the thirty-first place of the last chapter of his little book *Insight*. It took him eleven more grim years to seed that auxiliary. The seed has been sacked by his disciples.

³⁴ See *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, 144 -155 for the full text of one very revealing and impatient letter of 1935 to a superior.

³⁵ *CWL* 3, 528.

³⁶ The topic Standard Model requires lengthy and detailed treatment. It shapes up slowly throughout the first eight seminars. I used the name formally in in the site book (2007) [Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry](#).

³⁷ *CWL* 3, 747.