

### Chapter 3

## A Contexting of First Attempts at Functional Research

This contexting obviously follows the attempts that were the subject of the previous essay. Yet I wrote the first four parts in preparation for the seminar, deciding to hold the proximate contexting till after the seminar-group's first attempt. So, if you are an active member of the seminar, you have already that small advising from FuSe 4. There I pointed towards FuSe 5 and its broad sweep, a sweep that points to distant heights, both ontic and phyletic.

And we are looking for still more from this first seminar. What that something more is, is to emerge in FuSe 7 on March 1<sup>st</sup>: a positioning of oneself regarding this enterprise that should give rise to a re-visioning of the second attempt. The re-visioning is a third attempt on the same topic, the next objective, to be mused over in FuSe 8. Finally, FuSe 9 gives a wider context and fuse 10 paves the way for the second seminar of the series, 'Functional Interpretation' (May 1<sup>st</sup> to July 15<sup>th</sup>). I suspect that some of the fifty-four people who were in this first seminar will wish to participate in that second seminar, but it is a fresh start, and, as we shall see, it has deep troubles of its own quite different from the leap to novel research that we are encountering here.

### *1 Starting Rambling: Ontic and Phyletic growth in Science*

Oddly, I think now, as I type, of that Voegelin beginning quoted in the first of my *Cantowers* eight years ago,<sup>1</sup> but my serious thinking has gone further back this morning to the winter of fifty years ago, 1960-1961, when I began my teaching career in mathematical physics.<sup>2</sup> And it has gone back to that precisely in the context of Lonergan's beginning of *Method in Theology* of about six years later. The analogy of successful

---

<sup>1</sup> The first of the *Cantowers* appeared on Easter Monday, April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002, remembering the Irish Easter Rising of 1916 and also the Fool's Day of April. The first footnote read: "Where does the Beginning Begin? As I am putting these words down on an empty page I have begun to write a sentence that, when it is finished, will be the beginning of a chapter on certain problems of beginning." See Eric Voegelin, *In Search of Order*, Vol. 5, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 13.

<sup>2</sup> My responsibilities reached into mathematics, which I taught to first year commerce and second-year engineering (a class of over four hundred) students!

science was on his mind,<sup>3</sup> but it did not become dominant in the book, and it certainly did not bubble up creatively when he got to saying his few words on the nature of functional research, or rather on research somewhat conventionally considered.<sup>4</sup>

Forty-five years later I have the advantage, in this new beginning regarding—guarding—method, of those years of brooding fairly steadily on his massive leap of an answer to his agonizing about collaboration at the end of *Insight*.<sup>5</sup> Have I reached his answer? I think of his comic statement at the beginning of the last paragraph of chapter five of *Insight*, talking of the answer to the problem of the concrete intelligibility of space and time, “The answer is easily reached.”<sup>6</sup> Functional collaboration is the core answer to the problem of the concrete intelligibility of space and time, to “the problem of general history, which is the real catch.”<sup>7</sup> What is it, what is it to be? I have the beginnings of a half-decent answer, so I suppose that I can bluff along as ‘a master.’<sup>8</sup> The bluffing and the mastery has a certain grounding in age or adulthood in the zone, but here we touch on a deep normative cultural shift which I had best leave till we roam around the analogy of science for a bit.

I am working in this seminar, as I have been indeed, for decades, with a quite precise analogy in mind that comes from that first year of my teaching. There is a sense in which the year was in fact the only decent year of teaching in my entire life: the rest of my teaching—including the workshops with which some of you are familiar—was, with few exceptions, in the problematic zone of philosophy and theology: primitive areas of a mix of good non-science and bad nonsense.

Mathematical physics at the time I began teaching was soundly scientific yet also evolving creatively. My first year honours class knew this, and the ethos was a solid aiding context to our efforts. None of these sixteen bright students would have any doubt about that if they joined my fourth year group of four graduates. In that class we were in the realms of mystery as far as the beginners were concerned.<sup>9</sup> I had obviously done that

---

<sup>3</sup> A central topic in the first two pages of the first chapter of the book.

<sup>4</sup> *Method in Theology*, 127, 149-151.

<sup>5</sup> Twenty-nine mentions of collaboration in *CWL* 3, 740-749.

<sup>6</sup> *CWL* 3, 195. The beginning of the final paragraph of that grim chapter.

<sup>7</sup> *CWL* 10, 236.

<sup>8</sup> *Method in Theology*, pointed to several times in the few pages on Research.

<sup>9</sup> One does not regularly elucidate the mystery, the significance, of advanced work to graduate students. There is an assumed belief structure. I recall one of those graduate students of mine, who had suffered my lectures on certain advanced differential equations, turning to me while listening to a subtle physics lecture in the Dublin Institute of Physics as if to say “so this is what that was all about!”

run myself previously and so make a grounded claim, important for the perspective on adult growth to which I point now, that the pace in the honours program of second year was altogether more hectic, and so on.

Now, and I mean **now** in all sense, but especially herenow with you, the **so on** is problematic. A conventional view of growth in understanding has us imagining—and institutionalizing—that the growth curve levels off, in say, the late twenties of one's living: one then has an essential view of life which carries us on – I do not say forward – till sometime before *rigor mortis*. The normative view of human minding is one that involves acceleration: think of the simple curve  $y = x$  squared, where  $x$  is the time and  $y$  the growth-rate. Or use the helpful image of a balloon expanding at a uniform rate: then the volume is one of accelerating intake. Whatever image you use, the aim is to come to existential grips with the startling possibility that you are becoming—and increasingly so—a stranger to yourself of last week. You could not explain yourself to yourself of last week.<sup>10</sup>

What I wish you to do now is to shift in your musings from the ontic to the phyletic. The mix of the ontic and the phyletic growth dynamic gives a rich and problematic tone to the progress of *genus humanum*. That is a rather bald statement in my ramble, with startling consequences for the potential in us that is a craving for the unknown, an edginess towards excellence in pattern of performance. Perhaps you might help yourself along here by musing existentially over the contrast between the compactness of the earlier first stage of meaning with the mediated compactness of a somewhat mature third stage of meaning. But then again, maybe this is of little help in our present psychic deadness, the captivity of the axial superego.

## 2 *Plane common sense*

My hope is to somehow startle you into a new psychic openness. Is it a silly hope? The hope is lifted in so far as there is a circulation of expectation of the new openness: by the end of the twenty-five<sup>11</sup> seminars

---

<sup>10</sup> There are deep consequences here for communications between generations, way beyond a footnote, indeed way beyond our present generations.

<sup>11</sup> In the past month, the need for this larger discussion emerged. The basic need is for lucid consideration of the different overlapping contexts of the dynamics of *exigence* (see the index of *CWL* 18) in the pilgrim and eschatological states. So, there are three sets of eight seminars: eight on General Categories; eight on Special Christian Categories; eight on what I risk calling *Special Revelatory Categories*. The final seminar simply opens to

the full character of that circulation will be less obscure. But here we are pattering along, yet now with the help of what I call metagrams, metawords. I call in two of them here to aid us. The first symbolization that I introduce is the one on page 163 of *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas* named *Lonergan's Dream*. It is the last page of Part Two of that work, titled *Images of Lonergan*. But the image is in fact a modified version of **W<sub>3</sub>**, available in many places: it is a matter of cutting the flat image properly and pasting into a three-dimensional tower. You notice that the Tower rests in 'the plane of common meanings.' I should say now, rather, that the Tower does not rest; it is to be a community that does not rest but is peacefully restless, as it were a leaning tower, leaning into the pilgrim and eschatological future. I do now wish to pause over that image, but there is nothing to stop you brooding over it at some length, for a month or a decade. However, I wish to expressed the leaning in a peculiar and startling way that brings us to the edge of what may be called new-age research.

First I should recall, invite you to view, the two diagrams that are to be found in *Phenomenology and Logic*.<sup>12</sup> Next I would have you re-read a passage from *Method in Theology* in what I suspect is to be a startlingly fresh way, a way, then, that involves - am I not being discomfoting? - re-reading of oneself's reading for some years. Here is the offending passage: "Progress proceeds from originating value, from subjects being their true selves by observing the transcendental precepts, Be attentive, Be intelligent, Be reasonable, Be responsible. Being attentive includes attention to human affairs. **Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities.** Being reasonable includes the rejection of what probably would not work but also the acknowledgment of what probably would. Being responsible includes basing one's decisions and choices on an unbiased evaluation of short-term and long-term costs and benefits to oneself, to one's group, to other groups."<sup>13</sup> I have bold-faced one sentence of this as a neat homing in on our topic. Research is searching for anomalies, **hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities**. The being intelligent of the researcher includes a grasp of these possibilities, but the grasp includes a grasp of the limitations of the grasp within the operative mind-set, the *acquis*, of the researcher. Such a

---

door to a heuristics of eschatology: *FuSe 79*, related to that last seminar and representing the need for a new series, is to deal with "the dynamics of eschatological integration." The full list of seminars will be available on the BLOG site at the end of January, and, at the same time here, on the usual site, as Part One of *FuSe 80*, "Listing Towards The Future." [Editor's note: *FuSe 79* and *FuSe 80* are presently not available].

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix A of that work (*CWL* 18, 319-326).

<sup>13</sup> *Method in Theology*, 53.

reduplicative grasp is a refined presence in the functional researcher shared with other specialists in the Tower community. It is beyond the plane of common sense. But best leave that stressful fact to the next section.

What I am interested in here is a creative reading of the paragraph sufficient to generate the seed of a mindset of **pragging**.<sup>14</sup> I give the nudge to this creativity by re-ordering the transcendentals thus: Be Attentive, Be Reasonable, Be Intelligent, Be Responsible. A bit of a shock that, eh? And somewhat tricky.

The trickiness relates to giving a neat meaning to the task of research and to the **character** (a word that recurs here, regularly, with heavy meaning!) of the grasp that we are going to get to in the next section. Let me get to that trickiness by us having a re-read of this bold-faced sentence of the quotation from *Method in Theology*: **Being attentive includes attention to human affairs.**

The attention that I write of here is a mediated attention. It is the attention of the plane of common sense or, if you like, the attention that is the common sense on the rough spherical surface of our globe. It is the attention that gets ‘the world’s work done.’<sup>15</sup> That attention leans forward; it is a **pragging**. It is a pragging that can be narrowly effective: the plotting of pundits in the industries of medicine or music, the muddled economic thinking of controlling governments.

Perhaps, more to our point, you might think of the village, of 10,000 with mayors like Clint Eastwood in Carmel in the late 1980s.<sup>16</sup> And you might recall our elementary model of a community of 10,000 researchers, way way less than the community we are seeking for effectiveness in a hundred years or so, or better, a thousand years or so, when it could be a quarter of a billion of concerned citizens. But the point I wish us to catch our attention (that word again!) is that the researcher is **to be attentive to the ‘attention to human affairs.**

---

<sup>14</sup> I don’t expect the neologism **pragging** to enter the language, but it is more than a cute word. It relates, of course, to Lonergan’s struggle with the meaning of *Praxis* (see *A Third Collection*, Part Three), to the Sanskrit, *Prakrit*, to the bent of the notion of being in human living, to the chemical weavings forward of value in history. And the proximate help in this *Fuse 5* for your **pragging** functional research is summarily **bold-faced** in the second half of note 36 below.

<sup>15</sup> *CWL* 3, chapter 7, *passim*, talks of this as the objective of common sense.

<sup>16</sup> How might you think of the village? I recall Eastwood musing over a reform commitment during his time as mayor: “I thought I could come up with a dream philanthropist. The guy I talked into it was me.” See Richard Schickel, *Clint Eastwood*, (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1996), 418.

We need now a pause, a poise,<sup>17</sup> over the bold-faced sentence in the quotation from *Method*: **Being intelligent includes a grasp of hitherto unnoticed or unrealized possibilities**. We are interested in its meaning for the functional researcher, RV: let you call him or her Joe. RV is to be a re-creational vehicle in the village and in the global village of all villages. What is the domain of Joe's interest? It is the sphere, the plane, of common sense, a common sense that is coloured by a network of mediations, some of which types I already mentioned: music, medicine, mayors and MPs. Joe's attention is no ordinary attention. It is the attention of a Tower person to the dynamics of the symphony of history played out, well or badly, by such types. But I am talking here of Joe in a hundred years or so. Joe, as a member of this seminar, is more likely to be only an ordinary Joe interested in Lonergan's promise, an RV in the making, but displaced. Joe is likely to be like a contemporary of Galileo being taught a course of 1960's physics by Feynman, with little or no suspicion that the leaning tower leans towards gauge theory.<sup>18</sup> Joe has no idea that out of a class of twenty in some such first year course there may not be four graduating to the possibility of some eliteness in physics.

But, as I weave in and out and round about lurking difficulties, I can point Joe and you to a key startling point: that the zone of interest of any researcher is the plane - or sphere - of common sense. The village, or the doctorate topic, or the selected quotation from Lonergan, is of a piece with geohistory, a meshed fragment of the cosmic call. Am I here inviting you to fantasy land?<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> "A pause, a poise": the juxtaposition of the two words places us neatly in the analogy of science with which I began. Are we working along here from a moving viewpoint? Obviously so, if we think of a first year venture, which is the relevant present thinking. The poise? That belongs in the achievements of the analogue of the graduate class. Useful here is a musing over the slow climb to that achievement pointed to in Cantower 9: "Position, Poision, Protopossession." At this stage in our stumbling climb, a pause is only to skim past an emergent interest: here, the functional researcher. But might there be a sense in which we all share in functional research, in which "the attention that gets 'the world's work done' is a common global bond? Let us leave that unpoised pause to section 4.

<sup>18</sup> See note 43 below. We return to this and to Richard Feynman in FuSe 16, the first essay related to the fourth seminar (November 1<sup>st</sup> to January 15<sup>th</sup>) on Dialectic.

<sup>19</sup> I return to this paragraph and topic at the beginning of section 4 below.

### 3 *The Tower Community*<sup>20</sup>

What might I say briefly here regarding the Tower community, its distant realization, its genesis? Certainly I could invite you—members of the seminar and later readers of this beginning venture—to head back into previous reflections on this that would lift the skimpy pointers and diagrams of the previous section into a fuller self-meaning. But that lift is to be a communal journey of years or decades, not months. First, then, I go back to my analogy with that first year physics class. Occasionally, there, a question would come up pointing to difficult questions of contemporary physics. Such questions deserved both inspirational treatment and elementary leads. The inspirational treatment I leave mainly to *FuSe 7* and *FuSe 9*, where I also mix in further image-leads. Here, we must be content with a few elementary nudges with an inspirational coloring. So, I swing back to the early pages of *Method in Theology* and invite you to discover that, perhaps, you slipped into a conventional reading of them.

So, immediately we slip into a little experiment in reading.

#### “2. The Basic Pattern of Operations

Operations in the pattern are seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, tasting ...”<sup>21</sup>

I am quoting from the beginning of the second section of the first chapter of *Method in Theology*. The first section is titled, “A Preliminary Notion” and begins with the familiar description, “a method is a normative pattern of recurrent and related operations yielding cumulative and progressive results.”<sup>22</sup>

So: now we have two quotations, and two illustrations of reading well or ill. No need to be embarrassed here; I suspect that both quotations were read by most of you within a comfortable common sense and indeed I suspect that Lonergan shared my suspicion.<sup>23</sup> It is for the set of Tower

---

<sup>20</sup> I would ask you to muse over the relation of this title and the previous section’s title, “Plane Common Sense” in relation to the two titles, respectively, of the first and second sections of chapter 14 of *Method in Theology*.

<sup>21</sup> *Method in Theology*, 6.

<sup>22</sup> *Method in Theology*, 4. The description is repeated in italics at the bottom of the next page. By the final paragraph of the short section we find ourselves thinking of a meshing of logical and non-logical operations and stepping away from Aristotle and Hegel. **We?** Humanity in its pressured - but stumbling and reluctant - search for explanation, for the “fuse into a single explanation” (CWL 3, 610, line 9) that would “embrace the universe” (CWL 3, 442).

<sup>23</sup> Check that terrifying paragraph in the middle of page 287 of *Method in Theology*.

operations to lift the community slowly towards a meaning, for example of hearing, that is heuristically effective. The elementary pointing of this section is to the challenge that the Tower community clamber grimly, in this crippled century, beyond common sense. What is hearing? Its investigation is an ongoing challenge: The Tower person should have that challenge within—within the self that is the heuristik—to be “one the level of one’s times.”<sup>24</sup>

Let us turn now to the second quotation, what is method? I make the strange claim that, unlike the empirics of hearing, the investigative challenge is not an ongoing reach. Yes, the words are there, and the quotation can be repeated. The problem of effective procedure is there, whether one turns to physics or economics or theology, but the method or methods are opaque, and the results are not radiantly cumulative but shabby stumblings, regularly with massively destructive output. I leave that compact and extreme claim to the mercy of your fantasy: but certainly it is not a difficult matter of fantasy when one thinks of economics, consistent in its stupidity and its tolerance for greed.

But I want to turn to hope, and to history’s nudging of the ‘has to’ in Lonergan’s appeal: “the antecedent willingness of hope **has to** advance from generic reinforcement of the pure desire to an adapted and specialized auxiliary.”<sup>25</sup> So - I hazard, to your surprise - I turn to the modest advance of physics towards the adapted and specialized help constituted by dividing up the task of carrying forward the world’s work in an operational identification of functional research.

We will push forward on that topic in the *FuSes* 7, 8, 9 and 10, and so I wish you to savour increasingly what I am suggesting here: that we have abundant and comfortable names, whether for little things like *hearing aids* or large enterprises like *Method in Theology*. We are comfortable in a second axial stage of meaning, happy with the words that suggest a third stage, settled in old ways of a general bias towards readable and audible discourse. Cosmopolis remains a distant fantasy with no serious communal trekking towards The Dark Tower<sup>26</sup>: so we betray the light within us that craves for phylogenesis.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> *Method in Theology*, 350.

<sup>25</sup> *CWL* 3, 747.

<sup>26</sup> Childe Roland’s Dark Tower is placed in a heuristic and feminist context in *Cantower* 4, “Molecules of Description and Explanation.”

<sup>27</sup> The Excursus on the psychological analogy of the Trinity contains magnificent pointers on cosmogenetic light and darkness. See *CWL* 11, 639-685).

#### 4 *The Range of Collaborative Research*

We return now to the startling claim at the end of section 2, “that the zone of interest of any researcher is the plane, or sphere, of common sense. The village, or the doctorate topic, or the selected quotation from Lonergan, is of a piece with geohistory, a meshed fragment of the cosmic call. Am I here inviting you to fantasy land?”

Yes, I am thus inviting you, but only in the inspirational sense mentioned at the beginning of the previous section.

Well, yes, that is what I am at here. The foundational task is two-fold: adding both a normal punch to the dynamics of functional cycling and also a lift of the fantasy within that cycling. This is true whether the foundational talk is in full comprehensiveness or is pedagogic, as here, venturing beyond the Tower: even though the Tower does not exist.

Since it does not exist I must putter round the topic.<sup>28</sup> We can start with that image of the tower rising up on, breathing life into, the **story of the sphere** of common sense. The research community reaches into that plane/sphere in its ongoing story, rising up and leading functionally round in order to lift that plane towards eschatological life. How, so far, have you imagined the little lines in the diagram that arrow out from **Communications**, with mention of *Method in Theology* 132, and arrow in from **Research**, with mention of *Method in Theology*, 127?

Obviously it is worthwhile to pause with this question, for such pausing, when prolonged discomfortingly, can lift us towards an appreciation of the difficulty of fantasy, of grounding serious steps out of old ways. A few moments ago I was in e-communication with a seminar member about the choice of a text—a good text indeed—for the seminar. The problem that emerged immediately was, Where to next? The fact that we are having a shot at functional research cuts off the usual move, which is to venture into interpretation: what does this text mean?

We avoid the usual move by adverting to the research challenge of finding parallel texts. Pedagogically it would be better here to take the illustration of a particular text, but we are in the initial stage of the seminar and I will hold to general comments. However, it is evident that the hunt for parallel texts is governed by the meaning I have for this text. So, what does this text mean? This is a question that has at least two meanings. There is the meaning that is to be discovered by a community of interpreters, be they theoretical physicists or methodologists. I **should** say,

---

<sup>28</sup> What if I were not just puttering, but pushing foundations forward in the company of others? Would we not then be comfortably musing over fibre bundle representations of local occurrences (see the early chapters of the text mentioned at note 43 below), pushing for heuristic and hopeful precisions of the meaning of range in “flexible circles of ranges of schemes of recurrence” (*CWL* 3, 487).

that **may** be discovered: sometimes a successful identification of an anomaly boggles the minds of the interpreters, even shaking the Standard Model with which they work. I think spontaneously of the anomaly regarding the speed of light that gave rise to the suggestion known as the “Lorentz contraction.” The theoretical advance was quite a jump beyond Newtonianism. But that ‘Lorentz contraction’ idea helps us towards the suspicion of an initial meaning reached by the researcher. The text, or the event, nudges up a puzzling in the researcher. The puzzling is about some degree of misfitting, or something lurking there that might stretch the standard model. The something is an X, but the researcher can add a WHY or WHAT to the recognition. That **What** grounds the further hunt, for parallel texts, or for other experimental results, or indeed for other experiments, and for further conversations. But what other experiments, what further conversations? Here is where you are to find an invitation to a large stretch of imagination regarding research and functional research. Might you find it yourself? Worth a try. I wish here to have us climb to the invitation by picking up on four texts of Lonergan, and you might well pause and ask whether these texts are anomalous in the context of the present standard model(s) of Lonerganism. It certainly is an odd question when we pause over the first text, **A**: “Let us say that explicit metaphysics is the conception, affirmation and implementation of the integral heuristic structure of proportionate being.”<sup>29</sup> Surely there cannot be an anomalous reading here: don’t we all agree about this basic description of metaphysics?

I leave that question hanging and add the second text, **B**: “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.”<sup>30</sup>

My third text, **C**, is: “Theoretical understanding, then seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view,”<sup>31</sup> and my final text, **D**, is “the conceptualization of understanding is, when fully developed, a system ... the concept emerges from understanding, not an isolated atom detached from all concepts, but precisely as part of a context, leaded with the relations that belong to it in virtue of a source which is equally the source of other concepts.”<sup>32</sup> **A**, **B**, **C** and **D** point to the manner in which any theoretician is to grip, and be gripped by, the galactic heuristic, or should I say the heuristic of Cosmopolis? I am making here, in the present academic and cultural context, a startling and discomfoting claim. Nor am I going to spell out some defense of it. There are two basic geo-historical consequences, only one of which interests us

---

<sup>29</sup> *CWL* 3, 416.

<sup>30</sup> *A Third Collection*, 141: the top lines.

<sup>31</sup> *CWL* 3, 442.

<sup>32</sup> Lonergan, *CWL* 1, 238.

immediately: the researchers of the Tower are to be eventually identified with all researchers; that identification is to, and will, flow through the common global culture, which of course is never common. One might say, more briefly and more recognizably, that foundational achievement of any era is normatively the possession of, the home of, the cultured community.

For the moment let us skip over the massive problems of the road to this distant culture, the highways and lowways and slowways of education. The problem I wish us to entertain is the problem of generating an adequate effective symbolization, or, if you like, a controlling expression of/in **ABCD**. But before we dabble in that we should note, vaguely descriptively, where this leaves functional researching.

The community of functional researchers in conversation with each other, symbolically **C<sub>11</sub>**, anticipated to become perhaps one in every hundred of the population in the fourth millennium,<sup>33</sup> are to be above the level of the sphere of common meaning<sup>34</sup> reaching out as a group geohistorically into that global sphere,<sup>35</sup> within a “psychic force that

---

<sup>33</sup> Recall the original Preface to the work of the series of seminars, with both its population anticipation and its simple model, 22,220 members, of functional collaboration in 10,000 villages.

<sup>34</sup> The proximate context is the two first sections of *Method in Theology*, chapter 14: “Meaning and Ontology,” “Common Meaning and Ontology.” Add, as best you can, the imaginative lift suggested in notes 35 and 38.

<sup>35</sup> Think of it as **C<sub>19</sub>**, if you like but hold both the **1** and the **9** in a globally-imaged context. Further, the globe is on the move, historically. This is a complex set of images that would require a good deal of technical assistance to bring it into fruitful availability. In a fuller collaboration that would relate to conversations such as **C<sub>51</sub>** and **C<sub>58</sub>**. In an elementary way you can imagine lines radiating from the center of the earth in suitable patterns. Think, for instance of the lift this gives to ongoing, overlapping, contexts in Lonergan’s writings, on a global imaging of oscillations in the economy, and envisage that imaging as needing positioning in the fuller imaging hinted at here.

**All this points to the task of reaching a fuller view of functional research - and having a second attempt at the exercise. It can be intimated to your struggling self and friends by thinking and talking now of a single text of Lonergan that presented an anomaly. Presented?; made present to you?; made better present through your research to the interpreter? Try to lift, or at least envisage the lift, that would place the thinking and talking within the metaphysics (the integral heuristic longing for integral finitude) of the concrete global history of humanity, 7 million years to date out of 13.7 billion, heading for the next couple of billion years. The reference of the text is to that total dynamic. That gives you a massively larger view of 9 above! The heuristics of 1 has already been shockingly enlarged by the norms of generalized empirical method. Think, now, of the range of your conversational searchings for the linked texts and events to which the interpreter has to attend. This is a startlingly new ball-park of global care. The anomaly in Mumbai’s slum-economy has cousins in axial villages and beyond the bounds of that axiality: texts about it range through all the arts, sciences and technologies.**

sweeps living human bodies ... to the intelligently-controlled performance of the tasks set by a world order in which the problem of evil is not suppressed but transcended.”<sup>36</sup> The specific tasks<sup>37</sup> include both the effective sniffing out of lost insight-pointers to progress and curative detectings of warped recurrence-schemes<sup>38</sup> that favour evil or stagnation within the present sphere-belt.<sup>39</sup> The detecting is to be done within powerful interlocked multi-grid information structures: atlated, electronic, symbolic, descriptive, and with both long-term and short-span genetic feedback dynamics.<sup>40</sup>

Interlocking is the present problem, present in the era sense, and present in the sense conveyed by **ABCD** above. In the era sense, “to be of use to science, the data must be correlated, calibrated, synchronized, and updated. *Wired* observed that ‘Earth is peppered with high-tech monitoring hardware from polar-orbiting satellites to instrument-laden buoys. Problem is, they’re all operating in Babel-style disconnect.’ Efforts are under way to link everything in a mutually intelligible way via a Global Earth Observation System of Systems.”<sup>41</sup> In the sense conveyed by intussuscepting **ABCD**, the prior era sense has to be lifted to luminosity, beyond Babel to a Tower-structured collaboration, genetic not only of a system of systems, but of a complex geohistorical weave of local reversed counterpositions, be they macro, meso, or micro. The interlocking is to be a radiant neurodynamic reality.

Have we come some distance now towards a glimpse, table-of-content- or bibliography- wise, of the challenge of the first paragraph of this section? You picked your anomalous text from Lonergan, but the text was a cosmic particle, and its secondary determinations are both global

---

<sup>36</sup> *CWL* 3, 745.

<sup>37</sup> I recall the ordered spread of words that surrounds *tasks* on page 48 of *Method in Theology*.

<sup>38</sup> In *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* (Gill, Macmillan and Notre Dame Press, 1971) I have a chapter on the recurrence-schemes as the units of evolution: not then the conventional units of genes or entities.

<sup>39</sup> Revisit note 35, and add the imaging of economic rhythms, local and global, given in “Imaging International Credit,” chapter three of my *Sane Economics and Fusionism*, (Axial Publishing, 2010). Note 34 talks of the geohistorical imaging out from the globe, and it is a useful strenuous exercise to envisage the heuristic imaging of the much-later economic agricultural structure of the billion half-acre gardens of, say, the forth millennium. (See note 132, on page 104 of *Sane Economics and Fusionism*.)

<sup>40</sup> One may think here immediately of various types of economic rhythms but rhythms are a reality of the dynamics of both nature and social constructions.

<sup>41</sup> Stewart Brand, *Whole Earth Discipline. An Ecopragmatist Manifesto*, (Atlantic Books, 2010), 279. This book is obviously symbolic of the challenge on a basic level, but that basic level is intimately intertwined with full foundational globality.

and galactic.<sup>42</sup> Research, a common task of that group of cosmic careers, reaches towards an ordered hold on the total front slice of human progress, *Gauging What's Real*<sup>43</sup> in an intussuscepting of burdens within that slice that are deemed as needing cyclic care, a care with a variety of cycles in which “fruit is to be borne”<sup>44</sup> by effective rhythmic nudgings in the plane of common meaning.

---

<sup>42</sup> More on this topic and on the implied analogy in *FuSe 7*.

<sup>43</sup> Richard Healey, *Gauging What's Real. The Conceptual Foundations of Contemporary Gauge Theories*, (Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>44</sup> *Method in Theology*, 355. The **bold-faced** paragraph in note 35 is not just our project, or a project for this century: it is the project of humanity.