In the first seminar, I addressed Lonergan’s notion of the universal viewpoint (UV) as "potential totality of genetically and dialectically ordered viewpoints" (ch. 17; 3.2).

Phil noted that my study of the UV touched on issues relevant to the second seminar partly because the UV and GEM itself involve theoretical understanding. “Theoretical understanding, then, seeks to solve problems, to erect syntheses, to embrace the universe in a single view.” (Insight, 442). Such an understanding refers to being in the making.

Seminar 2 is meant to show how Section 3 of Chapter 17 of Insight (esp. its canon of explanation) helps sublate Method in Theology’s Chapter 7 on Interpretation.

In my essay for Seminar 2, I explore the following points. First, I touch on how Phil (particularly in his latest writings) has stressed that the universal viewpoint is to be complemented by the functional specialties (FS) and a genetic systematics (GS). Second, to this rather heady topic of FS + UV + GS I add some suggestions as to how the heart (spirituality) must never be lost sight of in the GEM movement. Third, in conformity with the canons of relevance and of explanation, I explore how GS and interpretation should lead us to the UV—a stance which Phil has taken over the years. In all three parts, I keep in mind Phil’s advice as to the needed Standard Model in the Lonergan Movement and as to the equally needed move beyond Axial Age presuppositions.

1. Phil McShane on the UV as complemented by FS and GS[2]

Phil is helping us address the lack of understanding of Lonergan’s spelling out of the UV and the FS. He urges us to engage in a GS to overcome present shortcomings in “Lonergan studies”. [3] Lonergan “studies” are to be more than study. Lonergan called for a normative ethics and a spiritual foundation to serve as underpinnings for FS + UV + GS. Such, I argue is partly what Lonergan meant by understanding as “being in the making.”

In the face of shortcomings in the Lonergan Movement, McShane urges us in these seminars to engage in a collaborative FS which will show a way for the future. He nudges to go beyond the so-called Axial Age and into the Post-Axial age.[4] This would involve our coming to grips with what Lonergan writes in Insight Chapter 17 on “Metaphysics as Dialectic”: “The interpenetration of knowledge and expression implies a solidarity, almost a fusion” (Insight, 577). Although knowledge and expression differ, Lonergan follows up this contention “with no less insistence on the genetic interpenetration of knowledge and language” (578-579) since the two are inseparable. The chapter calls us to appropriate the truth, making it one’s own (581). This includes a “moving from lower to ever higher viewpoints”. “In a somewhat looser fashion, cognitional appropriation of truth is solidary with volitional and with sensitive appropriation” (584).

Seminar 2 is thus meant to help focus on how the chapter “Metaphysics as Dialectic” and its section on “The Truth of Interpretation” (as briefly alluded to here) sublates the discursive nature of MiT’s ch 7 on Interpretation. In the latter, Lonergan recalls (165) the long and complicated series of steps which e.g. Aquinas took in his theology of grace. The interpreter is to reconstruct such a series with an overall view
and a nest of questions and answers. Still, Lonergan recalls the difficulties of an interpreter finding in his/her “own experience elements of meaning, how these elements can be assembled in ancient modes of meaning” etc. He concludes MiT Chapter Seven by urging us to go back to Chapter Three and the stages of meaning.

In another recent writing, “Arriving in Cosmopolis”, Phil recalls Ortega y Gasset’s view in The Revolt of the Masses that moderns live under a dictatorship of the common place. In a world of settled Western staleness (from which Lonergan students are not exempt), McShane recalls his own essay “Systematics: A Language of the Heart” (1990, Lonergan BC Workshop). Such a language which is one open to global realities involves norms. We must not avoid the normative implications of Cosmopolis nor the role of spirituality—sometimes summarized with the phrase “the workings of the heart”

2 Not Losing Sight of the Heart and of Spirituality:
(“Data of the Heart” and the Apophatic which Underlies the Kataphatic)

If we are to truly understand and communicate we must never lose sight or lose touch with the heart—one’s own and that of others. This is taught by all the world’s spiritual leaders and writers as reflected in MiT’s foundations. To contextualize how Lonergan and GEM stand on this issue, let me cite a review of Mark J. Doorley’s The Place of the Heart in Lonergan’s Ethics: The Role of Feelings in the Ethical Intentionality Analysis of Bernard Lonergan (UPA, 1996). The review notes that “Doorley begins by reflecting on how ‘uneducated’ people often were able to teach him more about an existential and moral commitment to God than any of his intense philosophical and theological studies had done. “How did they arrive at such a profound knowledge of God?” he asks in the Introduction. “Each spoke from the ‘heart,’ as they said. It was in their ‘guts’” (xiii). The question of how one could know “in the heart” or “in the gut” is the driving question of this book” one guided by Lonergan’s insights.

“Lonergan was interested in the human good and the way in which that good is to be realized through the cooperative efforts of human beings under the sway of the grace of God. His reflections on such a cooperative effort led him to wonder about human feelings. Moral effort is not merely a rational exercise. Feelings are involved as well” (xv)…..

For example, if I choose not to eat a “steak out of concerns that go beyond my own pleasure, I am forming habits necessary for moral self-transcendence: The judgment of value... plays a pivotal role between the intentional activity of the subject and his moral activity. (Such a judgment ... presupposes the process of deliberation which allows further questions to arise, discerns the movement of one’s feelings, and grasps the sufficiency of evidence for a judgment of value. The judgment of value is presupposed by a further process of practical reflection which issues a number of alternatives for action... Action realizes the value in question (77).[5]

Speaking from the heart and acting on our hearts’ genuine convictions underly much of ethics—even that of a secular atheist. The “heart”, its judgments of value and action also underly the genesis of the world’s spiritualities—such a reality helps us underpin a UV.
I want to further contextualize this point by alluding to Lonergan’s rather interesting relationship with the Irish Jesuit, William Johnston an expert in East-West spiritualities.[6]

One will recall MiT’s favorable citations of Johnston’s *The Mysticism of the Cloud of Unknowing* (New York, Desclee, 1967), e. g. in section 3 “Pluralism in Religious Language”, (chapter on “Foundations”) Johnston stands out (if only implicitly) as ably expounding religious love and the traditional kataphatic-apophatic distinction in religious language. It is rather surprising that Johnston in his *Mystical Theology: the Science of Love*, faults Lonergan for "excluding love and grace from scientific methodology" (115). How can we understand the Lonergan-Johnston relationship?

Following the anomaly I discovered in my Seminar 1 exploration, I now appeal to what one might call the “data of the heart”, the apophatic data to which Pascal alludes when he says that “the heart has reasons which reason cannot know”. Lonergan cites Pascal’s dictum when he refers to faith as the knowledge born of religious love. “By the heart’s reasons I would understand feelings that are intentional responses to values” (*MiT*,115). For Lonergan being in love puts one in a dynamic state. Lonergan concludes that besides factual knowledge, “there is another kind of knowledge reached through the discernment of value of a person in love” (ibid). God is originating value and the world is terminal value. “Without faith, without the eye of love, the world is too evil for God to be good...” But for Lonergan: “faith and progress have a common root in man’s cognitional and moral self-transcendence”(117).

Lonergan’s stance prompts me to ask whether in GEM we can speak of or postulate “data of the heart” which are to be interpreted with Lonergan’s just quoted view on a dynamic state of being in love. Such personal “data of the heart” are not at all “irrelevant” to a person’s actual functioning whether in private life or in his/her scientific life. One may think of what motivated a Pasteur (not a devout but a convinced believer), a Newton (an Arian but nevertheless a Christian inspired by his faith) or a Mendel (a devout experimenter).

Johnston writes: “Now the original and almost shocking thing in Lonergan is that he looks on mystical love as the goal and climax of human living” (ibid 114). Still, it seems from his negative comment on the following page, that Johnston does not adequately understand GEM and its implications. GEM does not “exclude” love and grace but sees it (as indicated above) as having its own set of reasons. Explicitating those reasons and being clear about the apophatic and the kataphatic in our lives may be part of the goal of seminar 2. This may also help us “fill out” a vital element of the UV in the FS + UV + GS thesis.[7]

3. How GS and the FS Interpretation Help us Reach a UV[8]

In his *Field Nocturne 22 on “Aggreformism”*, Phil moves us beyond Aristotle’s forms toward a *morphē* that holds acts together. He develops “metagrams” that may help us better interpret Feynman. But he adds, taking his cue from Lonergan, that “a concrete plurality of lower entities may be the material cause from which a higher form is educed or into which a subsistent form is infused: examples are familiar.”[9]
Part of the role of GS and how it is to be arrived at is spelled out by Lonergan in *Insight*, Ch. 15, sec. 7.2 “Organic Development”. He writes of the need to link physiology with biochemistry and biophysics. “To this end, there have to be invented appropriate symbolic images of the relevant chemical and physical processes; in these images there have to be grasped by insight the laws of the higher system that account for regularities beyond the range of physical and explanation” etc (*Insight*, 464, [489]).

Phil keeps reminding us that “the first set of general categorial seminars is to have, in the maturity of its FS Standard Model, a shared version of “the twenty-sixth place” in *Insight*, Chapter 20 where Lonergan speaks of a solution of faith which “is a harmonious continuation of the actual order of the universe.” Phil adds “It is identifiable as fundamentally a genetic sequence of versions moving asymptotically towards refinements of certainly, certainties that can be considered to be less than the achievement of Faith-certainly” (Q & A for seminar 2).

Phil then adds “A Modest Illustration from Economics, and a Contextualization”, suggesting that the present problem of functional interpretation can be gleaned from the first three chapters of *For A New Political Economy*.[10] He specifies that through the application of GEM to the practice of science there is effected an implementation of the FS that finally becomes *in und für sich*. It is an “application of the results of reflection yielding a new, methodologically controlled, methodical conscious performance. To the (explicitly) methodologically controlled practice of science,” there needs to be a larger filling out of your “interpretation”, a lift into the context of functional interpretation [the second seminar], to revamp our functional history, and so ground a fresh cycling round towards fresh fruits [*MiT* ch. 14, page 1] of the implementation that is the care of being within the eighth specialty. And I would ask you to note the struggle forward. We are struggling with neglected clues in Lonergan’s own work, so as to improve the communal *acquis* and thus ground a more serious attempt at functional collaboration. There is no simple or deductive road to the new science.”

**Conclusion**

In this brief essay, I have kept in mind Phil’s advice as to the needed Standard Model in the Lonergan movement and a needed move beyond the Axial Age. Among the many “invented appropriate symbolic images” which Phil has himself suggested and developed, there stand out his *FS + UV + GS* formula upon which I have focused.

---

[1] In *Fuse* 10, “Contexts of Functional Interpretation” in his pointers for Seminar 2, Section 3, McShane writes of “the odd symbolic title, *FS + UV + GS*, (which) gets us to the beginning on the analogy with a glimpse of chemistry and its periodic table...”

[2] McShane, in *Fusion 10* notes his own breakthrough in understanding GS: “The break-through is still fresh in my memory: reading the text of De Intellectu et Methodo brought me to the startling lift of the passage on the competence required of a historian of mathematics: mastery of mathematics’ genetics. The relevant text is too long to reproduce here, but it is available in *Cantower* 7, “Systematic and General Systems Theory”, at note 29, in the translation of Michael Shield (1990), “Understanding and Method”, 130-32. In the original Latin text it is on page 55.” Phil began to think “of pure formulations in these terms, and of theological systematics in terms of a genetics of systems.” He refers us to Lonergan's “dense brilliant paragraph (*Insight*, 489) that begins with “Study of the organism begins...” GS is a matter of sequencing of complexes of ideas.

[3] McShane concludes his recent “Sane Economics and Fusionism” by noting his methodological differences with Robert Doran and Fred Lawrence. For McShane, Doran and Lawrence, despite their well-received efforts, have avoided the group collaboration that the GEM movement “desperately” needs (p 120).


[6] For an example of the complexities in interpreting East-West spiritualities and their cultural, historical contexts see Matteo Cestari’s article-- https://mail.google.com/mail/?shva=1#inbox/1302c938d54bb849
Cestari refers to “the original, classical Buddhist notion of sūnatā (J. kū, C. kong 空) or “emptiness.” The importance of this relationship lies in its being the only theoretical feature that, according to Maraldo, typifies the philosophers of the Kyoto School. Cestari lists Maraldo’s several criteria for defining the Kyoto School’s identity, but it is significant that “absolute nothingness” is the only genuinely theoretical one. In fact, the other criteria are historical and biographical (the relationship with Nishida--founder of the Kyoto School--and Tanabe or the academic position at the University of Kyoto), political (conservative political positions, and notably the rejection of Marxism and a certain attitude toward the Japanese nation and the Pacific War), or cultural and religious (a positive attitude toward Asian culture—particularly the Japanese tradition—and the relationship with religion in general and Buddhism in particular).” Nishida was ambiguous toward Buddhism. “Unlike Nishida, other thinkers of the school like Nishitani Keiji, especially after the end of the Pacific War,… return to a more classical, if philosophically revised, idea of kū. It is my conviction that the relationship with Buddhism is not simply a biographical datum but may be seen to have exerted a deep influence on Nishida’s theoretical views. Attention to this notion leads into a discussion of the Kyoto School texts and how they are interpreted. Obscurities require that interpreters and critics be aware of the cultural context within which these writings were composed and read.”

[7] Phil notes: “Re functional interpretation, a useful point (is that) in its maturity it is to be like present physics … There is to be an agreed perspective which grounds research, picking out anomalies that are related to small adjustments [this is true even of paradigm shift…..]. At present the problem is competence in an agreed explanatory [including heuristics] perspective: THAT is what is really holding up collaboration. Amateurism rambles descriptively round the specialty-zones like the chaps doing physics before Galileo’s time. At present research meshes with interpretation and regularly turns into immature comparative work, comparative work which regularly goes nowhere …. “no fruit to be borne” [MIT, 355]. What I am pushing for in the seminars is research into Lonergan, blossoming into interpretations and, next, the story of Lonergan studies in the past 70 years. The research reveals anomalies in the sense that the main body of Lonergan studies have skipped over pointers in Lonergan, indeed some brutally obvious critical of Lonerganism. But this is to emerge out of the third, forth and fifth seminars.

[8] I myself have developed the notion of a “spiritual genome” to advance GEM as UV in three volumes, A Buddhist-Christian Logic of the Heart, (2003 Empowering the Lonely Crowd,) (2005) Empowering Philosophy and Science with the Art of Love (2008). The first of these unfortunately overserves an “alphabet soup” which has discouraged readers. The “Empowering” books seek to partly remedy this deficiency.

[9] Quoting Lonergan, “Finality, Love, Marriage” Collection 1, 20. Phil adds (in Nocturne 22): “Our interest is in both beginner and amoeba, according to the mandate of the second definition of generalized empirical method. Our interest is in advancing from the generic struggle with what is here to a struggle that pushes forward to some beginner’s appreciation of the way in which an aggregate of chemical reactions can, in a flexible manner, have a form that makes non-chemical sense to us. This is difficult to do in any serious manner without some grip on chemical forms and their actual reaction-equations: the sort of stuff that one finds in chemistry texts, but not at all presented in the context of generalized empirical method. What, one may ask are the forms that define chemical elements and compound and what are the complexes of acts, activities, that can be identified in the details of reaction-equations? Such questions are bewildering to both present chemists and present philosophers. So, what
does one do, then, for the amateur? It is a matter of stirring imaginations, both for experts and amateurs. More at http://www.philipmcshane.ca/Field%20Nocturne-22.pdf

[10] Phil continues: “Let me make it as easy as possible by simply homing in on a single word, the first word of the title chapter three of the book: ‘Transition to Exchange Economy’. So: we are poised over the word transition, each of us in our own way.

In the mature cyclic science I, as functional researcher, would notice, in my Model-contexted (see Verbum, 238) reading of the word transition, fresh possibilities of meaning. Please recall our early talk of physics and observers on the look-out for odd track or particle behaviour. What track is the particle transition on? Go back to the end of chapter 2: ".... when we have applied our general analysis of the pure process to a particular case of the exchange process. To that we now turn

So we turn the page to the title. But now it is I who am talking about my turning the page and reading, with a fresh suspicion, the word transition, and talking to you - but in the mature science talking to an interpreter, suggesting that, since Lonergan is talking about a "particular case", would not the Mature Standard Model give a larger reading of transition, thus locating Lonergan’s meaning in fuller context? What is that fuller context? It is the present attainment - by me, the present reader - of what was described in section 3 of Fuse 10, introducing this seminar. The title there was/is UV + GS + FS. But can I give you hints of its meaning, a haute vulgarization? We are talking about an object - really a massive range of actual and possible objects, reaching from something like what Shute describe in the transition of a primitive community deciding that "we'll have to make a note of this"("Real Economic Variables," Divyadaan, 21, 2010, No. 2, - titled “Do You want a sane Global Economy?”,194) to the remote state of a much later culture where the transition is a genetic move to a New Covenant of Promise, where the note is somehow swept up into a culture that MANAGES TO "clear away finance and even money" (FNPE, 20).

We are talking about an object better known now than in the then-Standard-Model within which Lonergan knew the object in 1942. Yes, he had grappled with the meaning of decision in Grace and Freedom, but was he not the better in meaning when he rose to glimpse more fully the Verbum Practicum, so leading us to a larger Standard Model? It is that later standard model that dominates my reflections on transition above. It is the standard model that is pointed to and aspired to in the seven appendices of Fuse 11 and FuSe 12 [See note 7 of FuSe 11; Appendix F of Fuse 12 gives a much fuller answer, relative to the area of economics to Q.26 ]. Further elements of it are pointed and aspired to as we move along in the questions ...[the remaining QQ. 27 and 28 of this session], as we move along in the seminars.
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