

## Moving Towards JMDA Volume 14

Philip McShane

I note at this get-go that I am writing to those who are participating in the scramble for new controls of meaning that is to be this volume. Perhaps it, and its pressures towards the effective engineering, will reach others. Indeed, slowly it, and its companion volumes, may seed the new culture of the positive Anthropocene age. But the modest aim here is to seed a shift of competence in this volume of the *Duffy Exercise*.

The curious fact about the so-called *Duffy Exercise* is that it is so comically obvious.<sup>1</sup> Two serious scientific colleagues meet casually and one remarks to the other, "Have you seen that book/paper of X in last year's journal of [their zone]." If the answer from both is positive and they are up-to-scratch on the area in question, then off they go, and indeed perhaps in detail, "each picks out the one hundred and one 'good things' and their opposites,"<sup>2</sup> and push on to detect and speculate.

Pointing to scientific illustrations helps little with those in what I might call "pure" theological and philosophic cultures. But scientists know the messiness: if the two colleagues are on opposite sides of some present venture, then they usually quickly slide away from the topic.<sup>3</sup> Think of Max

---

<sup>1</sup> My essay weaves round this comic obviousness, but I opted to give the focused relevant comment on it to the two footnotes, notes 3 and 10, below. Of course, you can skip to them now for a laugh.

<sup>2</sup> *Method in Theology* 250, line 4; CWL 14, 235, line 2.

<sup>3</sup> We are going to be chatting, in what follows, about three colleagues, Tom, Dick and Mary. You might think of Dick and Mary as pushing along in physics within the usual Standard Model, but Tom is off in the realms of String Theory. Sometimes they don't slide away from the topic but squabble round the problem e.g. of adequate empiricity. In our zone of Lonergan studies, alas, Tom does not squabble: he strings along as he is led, ignoring and avoiding Mary and Dick. There is apparently nary a suspicion in Tom that "the old game is done for." CWL 21, *For a New Political Economy*, 21, line 3. The *Duffy Exercises* aim at making it discomfortingly obvious that the new game, invented by Lonergan, involves Tom breaking forward to meet his Foggy self and Mary. Foggy? See note 10 and the text at note 30. The really shocking fact sits in the question: Was it not obvious from the

Planck; think of Thomas Kuhn: the old view will die off with those who presently cling to it.

Here then is where Lonergan of the late 1960s slips brilliantly into the formalities of science, which do not yet include the formality of a luminous by-pass *nomos* of leaning and cleaning forward. The non-inclusion is a matter of a shocking millennia-long cultural gap of truncated subjectivity that I skip past now.

AND further I skip past—as does Duffy—the brilliant tricky “italicized words”<sup>4</sup> that are intended weaves of the *nomos* into the cycle of full maturity of positive Anthropocene science. The skipping past is limited in strategic ways. It seems like a simple skip to that last piece of section 5 which I still call *Lonergan’s 1833 Overture*, and I print it below, a couple of pages on, in a way that I usually do. Might it, in the present context, get a fresh read from you? As Heraclitus tells you, “you never step into the same quotation twice”. Immediately there is the freshening of my wishing you to read it by having you put it within the context of the two scientists in their particular zone. Ho ho: think of two mathematics scholars coming out of Andrew Wiles final talk of June 23, 1993. The topic was “Modular Forms, Elliptic Curves, and Galois Representation.”<sup>5</sup> The lecture concluded a dazzling presentation of a solution to Fermat’s Last Theorem, so easily stated to common sense: you have the simple equation for integers  $x, y, z$ :  $x^n + y^n = z^n$ . It probably reminds you of Pythagoras and a right angle triangle: with  $n = 2$ , if  $x = 3$ , and  $y = 4$ , then it its no great leap to figure that  $z = 5$  fits the bill. But what if  $n = 3$ , or 4, or .... 4 billion? The genius Fermat claimed that he had figured out that the neat relation did not work beyond  $n = 2$ .

---

beginning in section 5 of *Method in Theology*? In its fullness, of course, it is as yet not obvious: think, now, of the long history of reviewing. Think of the New Testament in its reviewing of the Old; think of Thomas Aquinas reviewing Aristotle. All that prescientific stumbling is to be replaced by the overarching science of luminous geogenetic horizon detecting. More on this in the Article of this volume written by Bill Zanardi.

<sup>4</sup> The key tricky word here is *Comparison*. Nor indeed do I skip past that word, for weaved into it is the full meaning of *horizons*, which in the layout on page 18 below gets a full paragraph prior to the three paragraphs on the three objectifications.

<sup>5</sup> The final version of Wiles’ work, titled “Modular Elliptic Curves and Fermat’s Last Theorem,” is in *Annals of Mathematics* (1995) 141 (3), 443–551.

Keep your musings, as best you can, within that “horizon about horizons.”<sup>6</sup> The two people, Dick and Mary, are decently comfortable in the areas named in the title. On they go into chatting through their version of the second paragraph, puttering through points noted during the three days. Positions? Was Wiles right on all the way through, in Dick’s view, in Mary’s view? There are certainly a hundred and one good things, but perhaps there were odd wobbles? {There were, in fact}.

Still, Fermat’s hypothesis seemed to be finally tumbling into truth, so on the pair go, “indicating the view that would result,”<sup>7</sup> etc.: and depending on their background and talents they could range into physics, even into fresh twists on chemical structure and biodynamics. How reliable are these fresh twists? Let’s assemble them, say Dick and Mary, over the next week or decade, etc. Their fresh twisting thus carries them into their version of the third paragraph. Indeed, the fresh twisting could carry them into a shockingly discontinuously new culture of mathematics and science.

And now, let you do some fresh twisting as you read those 16 concluding lines of what, I suggest now, we should try hard to think of—pushing the parallel<sup>8</sup>—as *Loneragan’s Last Theorem*. That suggestion offers a layered bundle of twist to your musing, twists I do not wish to follow up here. I wish rather to go back to the “comically obvious” of the first sentence, adding a quaint reminder of the first lecture of Loneragan I attended.<sup>9</sup>

Dick and Mary have been at the stuff all day and carry the problem-complex to their dinner, where they meet Tom, perhaps a keen student of 17<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> This “as best you can” must be cherished with a smile, since “it puts Tom, Dick and Harry in unfamiliar roles.” CWL 3, 649. “Horizon of horizon”? Might we think of that as (horizon)<sup>2</sup>? What about (Horizon)<sup>n</sup>? The genius Loneragan weaves forward differently than Fermat: yes,  $n$  can be 3, or 4 or ... I am recalling Loneragan’s scribbled notes of February 1965, where he scribbled about upward layerings of interiority. Interestingly, he also paused to review, with shocked and shocking freshness, Thomas’ muddled review of Aristotle’s muddled view of science.

<sup>7</sup> *Method in Theology* 250, line 26; CWL 14, 235, line 21.

<sup>8</sup> The real discomfoting push is Loneragan’s bridge-theorem of the beginning of chapter five of *Insight*. Tom might have said “this is a hard thesis and who can grasp it?” (see note 30 and the text there) had Tom been reading that page 163 properly. I put the discomfort in a fuller context through layering (pp. 8, 62, 70, 74, 87, 92, 118, 140, 141, 150, 169) eleven bold-faced notes through *Interpretation from A to Z*.

<sup>9</sup> I am recalling the first lecture, not recorded, of Loneragan’s Easter 1961 lectures in Dublin.

century law, Fermat's ballpark. Tom wishes to tune in, encouraged by his own familiarity with those times: thus ends the climb of Dick and Mary into the understanding of elliptic curves!!<sup>10</sup> The story Lonergan told, that fits Tom's poise, was of someone inviting Einstein to tea, and getting round to asking "please tell me what this space-time stuff is, in my own simple words: I was never good at equations."

And now we come to the reading I have been postponing. Lonergan has invited his followers to tea. He cuts the equivalent of Andrew Wiles' 100 pages down to the simple words of these next lines. Are you Tom, Dick or Mary? Read on, through Lonergan's own simple words.

### Horizons.

The results, accordingly, will not be uniform. But the source of this lack of uniformity will be brought out into the open when each investigator proceeds to distinguish between positions, which are compatible with intellectual, moral and religious conversion and, on the other hand, counterpositions, which are incompatible either with intellectual, or with moral, or with religious conversion.

A further objectification of horizons is obtained when each investigator operates on the materials by indicating the view that would result from developing what he regarded as positions and be reversing what he has regarded as counterpositions.

There is a final objectification of horizon when the results of the foregoing process are themselves regarded as material, when they are assembled, completed, compared, reduced, classified, selected, when

---

<sup>10</sup> I already introduced you to the character Tom, who in the Fermat story is highly competent in mid-17th century law. The Tom we pause over, in the Lonergan story, is highly competent—and indeed entrapped—in mid-20th century theology and-or philosophy, weaved nicely into the world of "academic disciplines. Clearly enough these approaches do little" (*Method in Theology*, 3-4; CWL 14, 8) to engineer global progress. Tom arrived piously or lazily into Lonergan studies around the mid-century, "never bitten by theory" (CWL 6, 155) but fogged along with illusions of theory by spreads of name-droppings. For every Mary and Dick there are a 100 Toms. Tom has less inkling of an integral science of care than had 13th century Thomas, but he is cosy in adding to patches of Thomas some tags from Lonergan, like conversions on Tom's common-sensically identified five levels, layered with 20th century truncated intellectualism. And, recalling Kurt Vonnegut Jr's *Slaughterhouse Five*, "and so it goes."

positions and counterpositions are distinguished, when positions are developed and counterpositions reversed.

You are surely now up to pausing with me, with yourself, with some little group, daft enough to have a fresh shot at “scrutinizing the self-scrutinizing self,”<sup>11</sup> a bent quite beyond the present culture of mathematics. Is it beyond, and how far is it beyond, your present bent?

So we arrive at another twist on the “comically obvious.” First, is it not comically obvious, that, Like Tom joining Dick and Mary, you may have been overrating your competence in some way that parallels Tom’s confidence in his familiarity with mid-seventeenth century culture? There is no question about this, and perhaps no embarrassment for you, when you pause over the long climb to the proof of Fermat’s Theorem. But what now of Lonergan’s talking to you, in your own simple words, since the mid-twentieth century? There was his scrutinizing of the self-scrutinizing self that led him, in 1942, to propose, in an apparently solid common shared cultural context, “that the old game is done for.”<sup>12</sup> But he was, in fact, in “the more difficult fields of speculation”<sup>13</sup> when he wrote that, and had been there since he wrote his 1934 *Essay in Fundamental Sociology*.<sup>14</sup>

His worldview then was drastically and discontinuously beyond the culture of the old game. And now we come to the peace of resistance. The core “comically obvious” of these exercises should be that we are playing the old game. Might we come, disarming resistance, to an effective peace with that comic aspect of these exercises? Might we come to a peaceful climbing commitment, ontic and phyletic,<sup>15</sup> about being as far away from Lonergan’s Last Theorem as we are from Fermat’s Last Theorem? Might we come to pause and cherish and chortle over the shocking historical reality that we

---

<sup>11</sup> *Method in Theology* 167; CWL 14, 158.

<sup>12</sup> CWL 21, *For a New Political Economy*, 21, line 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 20, line 33.

<sup>14</sup> The broadest context I provide for the discomfiting (see note 8 above) reality of this existential gap is that of chapter 10, “The Dominant Context of Lonergan’s Life,” in Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan. His Life and Leading Ideas* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2013). Later notes here (e.g., notes 22 and 23) hover round Lonergan’s massively elusive musings on matter, energy, and finality. See, *ibid.*, 178–88.

<sup>15</sup> My end quotation in this little essay is from the conclusion of my Introduction to CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*. Climbing to a beginner’s grip on that nudge requires that one battle inwards to the ontic and phyletic demands being made in the final two chapters of the book. See note 17 below.

move into the mess of this new millennium with “the arrogance of omnicompetent common sense?”<sup>16</sup> Certainly that is what the standard followers of Lonergan are doing.

Our problems with the exercisings of Lonergan’s 1833 Overture are problems of misreading, mangling, its first word, *horizons*.<sup>17</sup> But could the mangling really be a strict parallel to Tom’s mangling of the conversation of Dick and Mary? Even involving a larger existential gapping and gaping than it? What might I do to raise effectively the molecular rattling of your W-enzyme poise?<sup>18</sup>

But let’s back off from this rattling and gaping stuff to, yes, the second paragraph above and the “comically obvious.”

Two serious scientific colleagues meet casually and one remarks to the other, “have you seen that book/paper of X in last year’s journal of [their zone].” If the answer from both is positive and they are up-to-scratch on the area in question, then off they go, and indeed perhaps in detail, each “picks out the one hundred and one ‘good things’ and their opposites.”<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> CWL 17, *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, “Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response,” 370.

<sup>17</sup> What is it to sniff the advances ahead in future millennia of our meaning of horizon? Noticing—what a word!—at the end of this terrible truncated ending of the negative Anthropocene age, that there is the core existential problem of that sniffing in “distinguishing the successive stages of this, the greatest of all works,” (CWL 12, *The Triune God: Systematics*, 491). That is the task of the whirls in and round those who cherish Lonergan’s Last Theorem.

<sup>18</sup> The effective molecular rattling grounding the sniffing is a topic of my *The Future: Core Precepts in Supramolecular Method and Nanochemistry*, (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2019), a weaving together our noetic collecting of ourselves as Supermolecules, beginning the slow move inward that reveals our integral W-enzyme, a structure that twists us to chemically locate wonderment, in fresh mystery, (CWL 3, 569–72) in a panoply of other wants (see pp. 2 ff. of *The Future*). We must slowly move so-called intellectualism into neuromolecular “dynamic joy and zeal” (CWL 3, 722, line 39). More loftily I think of the last chapter of the book mentioned at the end of note 23 below. That final 14th chapter “Communications” (pp. 148–236), weaves a “fundamental incompleteness theory” (ibid., 233) round songs of Sinead O’Connor. The lights of logic (chapter 1) find a self-luminous existential reality in the lyrics of loneliness (chapter 14).

<sup>19</sup> *Method in Theology* 250 line 4; CWL 14, 235, line 2.

There: are we not back into the cosy prospect of expressing a present, pretty spontaneous view, triple or not, of whatever is our Assembly?

A couple of weeks ago I myself did such a thing regarding the two Assemblies with which I am involved in this volume of *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*.<sup>20</sup> I weaved forward in less than a week into two “triples.” I make them available to all the participants in this volume 14, and they open up options in our divine comedy.<sup>21</sup> They are an invitation to the option of cheating creatively. But should we think of it as cheating? Back we go to Dick and Mary in Wiles’ audience of 1993, a mixed audience of experts and decently-mathematicised enthusiasts. Dick and Mary chatting would include nudges to some levels of upgrading, perhaps recollective upgrading in a world of richly layered symbols.<sup>22</sup> So, they help each other along. How

---

<sup>20</sup> I am involved with the first Assembly of Lonergan’s odd claim, “to speak of the dynamic state of being in love with God pertains to the stage of meaning when the world of interiority has been made the explicit ground of the worlds of theory and of common sense.” *Method in Theology*, 107; CWL 14, 103. The final Assembly is CWL 21, *For a New Political Economy*, page 20, line 22 to page 21, line 26.

<sup>21</sup> So I come to the LOL part of my nudging. You are presented with an Assembly and asked to comment. You have a perspective: so go ahead, comment!!! Do you dare? Wisely, you hesitate, perhaps since there is this chatter about a Standard Model, but more broadly because you appreciate at various levels that you have not got, well, not got a luminous inner word of, on, your perspective and an isomorphic spread of outer words. (Recall CWL 7, 151, on that zone.) The exercises push you to notice this. Think: my first paragraph of the four-paragraph exercise is the single word *horizons*. Why was I able to toss off, so to speak, versions of a reaction to two Assemblies of the volume? Because horizon-words—inner and outer—have been my ballpark since 1952. The year 1967 brought the leap in the outer word that is associated with Fisher (see *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, p. 237), a word weaved into my symbolization  $\{M (W_3)^{\Theta T}\}^4$ , embedded in which is the geohistory of the Symphonic geogenetics of Jesus skimpily pointed to in *The Road to Religious Reality*. But is it not comically obvious that you could do the same kind of “toss off” from your present perspective? And, finally, is it not comically obvious that there is a gap in your present perspective: what, pray, is your equivalent to my  $\{M (W_3)^{\Theta T}\}^4$ , especially in its inclusion of a heuristics of the Eschaton? Philip McShane, “*Insight and the Trivialization of History*,” *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy & Education*, vol. 28, no. 1 (2017), section 20, “Eschaton,” pp. 125–28.

<sup>22</sup> We are in the zone here of Gödelian incompletenesses mentioned at the end of the last note. One would do well here to revisit that brilliant neglected essay of Lonergan, “A Note on Geometric Possibility” (CWL 4, *Collection*, 92–107), with the lift of the logic of layered symbolization complexes that is hinted at in CWL 18,

tuned in were they, e.g., to the Shimura-Taniyami Conjecture? It seems cheery and useful to recall Wiles' wind up of his three-day climb.

"There was only one possible climax, only one possible end to Wiles' presentation," Professor Ken Ribet of the University of California at Berkeley later told me. Wiles was finishing the last few lines of an enigmatic and complicated conjecture in mathematics, the Shimura-Taniyami Conjecture. Then suddenly he added on a final line, a restatement of a centuries-old equation, one which Ken Ribet had proved seven years earlier would be a consequence of the conjecture. "And this proves Fermat's Last Theorem," he said, almost offhandedly, "I think I'll stop here."<sup>23</sup>

No, indeed: Mary and Dick, applauding in slim comprehension but truncatedly comprehending that slimmness, would not have been happily in tune, but would happily struggle. Wiles had spent seven strange years moving through "a dark mansion,"<sup>24</sup> bumping his way through the furniture of a first dark room, illuminated after six months and "then you enter the next dark room."<sup>25</sup> I think of you now as paralleling Mary or Dick, in a different world from Tom. Let yourself carry that parallel, as best you can, indeed with geohistorical continuity, from Fermat's world to the world of Lonergan.

I am asking here for Tom, Dick, and Mary, to move very seriously from flitting round the Fermat context to the presently impossible task of a W-enzyme foraging in altogether stranger dark mansion, Interior Castle, of

---

*Phenomenology and Logic*. Your core problem of theology is that "you have to find another street. What are the implications of this looking for another street?" *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>23</sup> Amir D. Aczel, *Fermat's Last Theorem. Unlocking the Secret of an Ancient Mathematical Problem, Four Walls Eight Windows*, New York, 1996, 3-4. Might you muse now, with growing amazement, at Lonergan, almost offhandedly, ending his presentation of his Last Theorem, with its massive (horizon)<sup>n</sup> Shame-u-all Tan-tara-time Conjecture of splaying cards and mirror-shards of self on table? This is a distant Isaiah 2:2-4 meaning of "a self-scrutiny that can lead to a new understanding of oneself and one's destiny." (*Method in Theology*, 253; CWL 14, 238). The simple symbol (horizon)<sup>n</sup> has lurking behind it a sublated Gödelian Theorem of Incompleteness. An elementary lead into Gödel in this context is chapter one, "Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem," of *Lonergan's Standard Model of Effective Global Inquiry*, pp. 2-64. The book is available at: <http://www.philipmcsane.org/website-books>.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, xi.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

Loneragan's climb. I concluded my Introduction to, I would say, the two most brilliant weeks of talk by Bernard Lonergan, with a relevant nudge about horizons, the core pointing of that mad flourish of meaning. Let me repeat it here in conclusion: perhaps you will find that I have succeeded in bringing you to read it freshly? For it comes from the push in me of "a vivid imagination that puts a familiar Tom and Dick and Harry in unfamiliar roles."<sup>26</sup> Might the belly of your w-enzyme rumble with humor? My imagination and its flower of "speculation"<sup>27</sup>

questions neither aspirations nor ideals nor high seriousness nor earnest purpose nor self-sacrificing generosity; but it knows the difference between promise and fulfillment, and it refused to calculate without men as they are, without me as I am. For if satire becomes red with indignation, humor blushes with humility.<sup>28</sup>

Men and women as they are in these times, even if in self-sacrificing generosity, romp round Lonergan's words like *understanding*, *conversion*, *horizon*, and are just "not there yet,"<sup>29</sup> and would find themselves—if they broke forward into, and stumbled along in, these exercises—"in one big hazy fog. And from the fog a wailing is heard: this is a hard thesis and who can grasp it?"<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> *Insight*, 649. This need for vivid imagination is not a uniform thing. How vivid an imagination do you need to see the sloppy deceit of carrying on for sixty years the ugly but "highly specialized" (*Insight*, 604, line 3) tradition of puttering along vaguely and non-genetically in this intellectual corner and that, in spite of having surely read, though obviously in gross slimness, Lonergan's heuristics of the proper procedure. *Ibid.*, the paragraph crossing from 609 to 610.

<sup>27</sup> CWL 21, *For a New Political Economy*, 20, line 33. For me the word "speculation" is the key problem word of the text. I poise you now with it over the darkness of the future's policy, planning, executive reflection, daily global care.

<sup>28</sup> CWL 3, 649.

<sup>29</sup> CWL 21, *For a New Political Economy*, 21. Freshen this paragraph's drive through adding its luminous haunting by the Eschatological heuristics pointed to at the end of note 21 above.

<sup>30</sup> CWL 8, *The Incarnate Word*, 605, end. Think of the range of prevalent fogginess: from the pettifoggery mentioned in note 14, to the fog about the Incarnate word that is to be breezed away—a hard thesis and who can grasp it—by the geosequencing of theses regarding the dynamics of Jesus' symphonic possession of His Kingdom. "Do you know His Kingdom?" See the conclusion to Lonergan's 1934 "Essay in Fundamental Sociology."

But might we few, either in risky spontaneity or in creative cheating, not venture forward in these exercises, knowing the feeble seeding that they invite is on rocky global ground and in the stalk of Jesus battered now for two millennia?<sup>31</sup> “There have to be people in whom the horizon is coincident with the field. If they are not then all they can do is increase the confusion and accelerate the doom.”<sup>32</sup> We are not there yet, but might we not reveal slowly to ourselves and slowly slowly to others, especially the tribe of earnest misled followers, that the Sonflower beckons the little battered stalk?

So we conclude this fresh beginning with the nudge towards reading and breathing and breeding the first word of *The 1833 Overture*, “horizons,” in such a way that, by the tenth millennium, “the earth and every common sight take on the glory and the freshness of a dream.”<sup>33</sup>

Certainly, Lonergan’s presentation in these lectures is somewhat accessible to the ordinary cultured reader. But my concern is with the inaccessibility of the content and perspective that mediated his words. It is with the further obscurity of a functional specialist perspective that crowned his life’s achievement and that would replace Husserl’s search for a rigorous science with a collaborative empirical humility. The seriously cultured reader should not miss the challenge to grapple with the existential gap,<sup>34</sup> the existential distinction, between Lonergan’s comfortable presentation and his discomfiting pointing to horizons quite unfamiliar to the cultures of the new millennium. Those horizons are needed to meet the desperations of our modern and postmodern times.<sup>35</sup>

Philip McShane (February 18, 1932–July 1, 2020) was an Irish Canadian mathematician, philosopher, economist, and theologian. He earned an M.Sc. in relativity theory and quantum mechanics with First Honors from University College, Dublin (1952–56), where he also lectured in mathematics. Later he did his D.Phil. at Oxford (1965–68), where he wrote a dissertation on “The Concrete Logic of Discovery of Statistical Science, with Special Reference to Problems of Evolution Theory.”

---

<sup>31</sup> Getting to grips with the strange meanings involved here requires the adventure of ingesting slowly the poise of Chapter Y, “Stalking Jesus” in *Interpretation from A to Z*.

<sup>32</sup> CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, 306.

<sup>33</sup> *Insight*, 556.

<sup>34</sup> {The note in the text is: “see below, CWL 18, 281–84”}.

<sup>35</sup> CWL 18, *Phenomenology and Logic*, conclusion of my editor’s Introduction, xxiv.

Once describing himself as “a dabbler, a mathematician gone astray, rambling in the worlds of economics and literature, music and physics,” McShane published works ranging from the foundations of mathematics, probability theory, and evolutionary process to essays on the philosophy of education as well as introductory texts focusing on critical thinking, linguistics, and economics. In the area of methodology, McShane wrote *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* (1970), *The Shaping of the Foundations* (1976), *Lack in the Beingstalk* (2006), and *Futurology Express* (2013), and in the area of theology *The Road to Religious Reality* (2012) and *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (2015). Among his introductory works are *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations* (1975), *A Brief History of Tongue* (1998), and *Music That Is Soundless* (2005, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition).

McShane edited Bernard Lonergan’s *For a New Political Economy* (1998) and *Phenomenology and Logic* (2001), and is considered by many the leading interpreter of Lonergan’s *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, a compendious work that lays out both a genetic method for studying organic development and canons for methodological hermeneutics.

For over sixty years, McShane fermented forward towards a solution to the steady decay of global culture and its abused Gaia. In the last years of his life, he wrote about the negative Anthropocene age in which we live and a future positive Anthropocene age of increasing methodological luminosity and collaboration. In *Economics for Everyone* he indicated pivotal ways to seed the positive age when the “cultural overhead” of leisure will be understood, taught, and implemented, and thus human life will be more livable for an increasing number.

Cyril Orji, systematic theologian at the University of Dayton, Ohio, wrote this in a tribute to McShane: “What I find remarkable about Phil is not just that he’s a scholar, a genius, an archive, an icon and much more. Phil actually does not care about such adulations.” (This and other tributes are available at: <http://www.philipmcshane.org>.) McShane himself wrote the following regarding adulations: “My elder colleagues will no doubt gather, as usual, at the end of the Boston workshop the year I die. I do hope – and is this not a neat blocking strategy? – that they will not get into laudatory nonsense at my passing. That, I think, would be somewhat dishonest. Better by far that they consider mentioning to their classes in the following autumn that they suspect they have not only missed the point of Lonergan but have also missed that strange post-Aristotelian pointing towards a science of global redemption given by the compelling genius of history.” *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History* (Vancouver: Axial Publishing, 2015), 253.

