

Q & A Session, June 2, 2011 by Phil McShane

30. May 2011 11:11

Greetings All,

you note that I am early with this. Three reasons: [1] it is ready!; [2] I need to get on with Fuse 11 and Fuse 12, to appear June 1st; [3] its seems that many need all the help they can get, soonest, with this impossible seminar!!

Fuses 11 and 12 are to have seven appendices from seven seminar members: these should help and encourage.

bestest,

Phil

Q and A Session, June 2nd 2011.

Q.26 It seems that the major problem in initiating functional collaboration is not functionality but the absence of what you call an *acquis*, a Standard Model, a shared scientific view. Could you please hint, in some decent detail, the pragmatics of the moves towards this in the next decade or century?

I made various attempts at answering this appropriately here. Because of that, I arrive at a final version which is what you may regard as a messy mix. There are, in that final version, three sections. The first section is just the Preface to one of my attempts, which turned out to be a crazy reach for compacting what would be - might be eventually, from some of you - seven books on the issue, "The Issue of the Standard Model", as I titled it. The second section is my own attempt to illustrate functional interpretation of chapters 1, 2 and 3 of *For A New Political Economy*. The third section is a few jottings on the statement, "In the twenty-sixth place, God is personal"(*Insight 691*), jottings again that illustrate a fundamental aspect of the later operation of functional interpretation and collaboration.

I talk of "answering appropriately" and of "illustrations". The tricky problem is that we do not have the beginnings of the mature science of later millennia. So, it would not be helpful for me to move with an attempt at the mature precision of sentences etc that would suit a the scientific collaboration of a mature community. You and I are muddling along here.

A.26 The Issue of a Standard Model

Preface

This is, perhaps, the most important question that I tackle, not only in this series, but in the fifty five years since I encountered the writings of Lonergan. I shall return to this odd statement in the Conclusion. Here I wish simply [a] to sketch where I am going with the answer to this question; [b] to note the luck of my lead into Lonergan's view.

First the sketch, a sketch of seven sections with a concluding section on where we are going. I should, you might think, have used the phrase "where we are going" in [a] above, but no, the "where we are going" of the conclusion is the **we** that I talk of is the human group, perhaps 10 billion, when this dynamic of Standard Model will have shaped up to Bell-Curve performance in seven millennia. That **we** is under the natural and self-seeding dynamic of emergent probability. The we of [a] - where you are omitted! - is problematic. I know where I am going, but you have to discern, literally, where you stand on this matter in order to move on is this mess of the new millennium. To that we return in the Conclusion.

Where I am going here in this sketch is toward, obviously, a sketch. A sketch is something like a table of contents, or better, an incline of contents: pointers on a Himalayan route. There are seven sections leading up to the conclusion, the peak, the peek. [1] Help through parallels in successful human inquiries; [2] the lift in that help through generalized empirical method; [3] the added group-lift of cyclic and sloping performance; [4] a curious half-way sign-post titled "In the 26th place"; [5] the lift that comes from luminous adult growth; [6] that lift is seeding phyletic growth; [7] an open-ended sketching of concrete cycles, slopes, strategies towards 2020 vision, where I mean both the short-term year and the long long term minding. So **we** - you and I towards 2020 A.D, and later the larger **we** bent on a heartier globe - prepare ourselves for the peek and the peak.

1. Parallels from the Artistry of Zone-Living
2. Zone-Living located in Self-Luminosity
3. Merging Horizons
4. Arriving "in the 26th place"
5. Unbecoming and Becoming Adults
6. Phyletic Strangeness
7. The Cycles of Incline

Conclusion

[I leave in, in these next few lines, a beginning of mine, perhaps to inspire a future writer. I had sketched out the sections to follow using metaphors from the fashion runway which weaved up into a great cyclic carnival-stairs in which I enjoyed an echoing but sublating - a feministics of the third stage of meaning - M.C. Escher's odd imagery: ascendings, descendings, metamorphoses:

1. Parallels from the Artistry of Zone-Living

I am thinking seriously - and you could do so with a decade's work - of the zone-living of the likes of Martina Navratilova and of Richard Feynman and of Nadia Boulanger. One's molecular dynamics is tuned to the best edges of the zone, but their vibrations herd the undazed days of walking and loving and nodding to the

tunes of other zones. Each becomes a Standard Model, walking to the end of the runway of their zone-lives, toe-focused. And, of course, taking off without coming back: there is no coming back, but the magic trick of a flight of fancy.....]

Section 2: A Modest Illustration from Economics, and a Contextualization.

The problem is, to illustrate functional interpretation from the first three chapters of *For A New Political Economy*. 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, the top, re context) 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?** - p.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 [even see below, the remaining **QQ. 27** and **28** of this session], as we move along in the seminars.

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.

Section 3: "In the twenty-sixth place, God is personal"(*Insight* 691)

Think of the fourth chapter mentioned above in the outlined book of the Preface. The nudge to put this in came from three sources: [1] from the question at hand being **Q.26**: [2] from people's interest in the possibility that the Standard Model we have been discussing being relatively secular; [3] from the following question, **Q.27**, about Hegel.

Think, then, of the three sets of seminars: sem 1 - 8: general categories; sem 9 - 16: special Christian categories; sem 17-24: special categories of divine cosmic pilgrim speaking.[The final open seminar, sem 25, has an eschatological focus; it is not a topic here].

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". 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. More elementarily one can come back to the problem of clearing up what one means by proof. **Cantower 19 - paralleling *Insight* 19 - is helpful here. The Existence of God is not something connected to deductive proof ... it is in the zone of verified hypotheses. [The same is true of the discussion of "the spiritual" in *Insight* (useful here are chapters 7 and 8 of *Sane Economics and Fusionism*)]. The fuller the inner word**

that is expressed upon a digestion of section 9 of *Insight* chapter 19, the richer is the affirmation related to section 10. (This was one of two debated issues in the in the Florida Conference of 1970: see *Lack in the Beingstalk*, section 3.5, "The Field, Foreign Yet Friendly", on "the two Florida blocks that relate to the axial myth of clarity, of an oxymoronic objective persuasivness"[*ibid.*, 85]) . It would be a lengthy process to relate this to the discussion of "The Question of God" in which Lonergan expressed his view in *Method* as it emerged during the next year of 1970-71).

I am musing here over what really is a non-existent secular context. The issue of God being, and being personal, even in the high Greek period, is tinged with.... concrete tales of the tribes.

So I move to the other two contexts, sems 9-16; sems 17-24.

For sems 9-16 the context comes from the way in which Thomas goes on, in the *prima pars*, from his question 26, on Divine Happiness, to question 27, "The Hypothesis of Intelligible Emanations in God" (the title of my version of it in *Theol Studies*, 1962: this is very much lifted by the 2011 reflections of "The Hypothesis of a Non-accidental Human Participation in the Divine Active Spiration" available in my Website Archives as "Participating in Divine Personalities"). For sems 17-24 the contexts are legion e.g. think of the Hindu context as expressed in *Brahman and Person: Essays by Richard De Smet*, edited by Ivo Coelho, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 2010). This set of contexts are to be tackled in the context of some type of conviction regarding some type of revelation, but all three sets move within the functional dynamic of the first set, and so will have the character of "natural conviction" that I mentioned above re general categorial thinking.

But it seems best to hold that topic till **Q 28**, after the next question on Hegel.

Q 27

: Different people raised the topic of Hegel, but one question gave me a focus on the task of interpretation: making sense of the last footnote of *Insight* chapter 12. So, perhaps I can pose the question briefly as "Give some directions towards the interpretation of the footnote re Hegel on *Insight* 398." From my reflections below you will notice that one questioner was much more expansive, and it is that question on which I focus here. Then I return to the topic of Q.26 in Q.28.

A.27

. The reply to the individual who asked the question about the last footnote in *Insight* chapter 12 had a lengthy preface on broader topics then

I take up the Hegel business. I got into Hegel recently, with Mark Morelli's nudging, because the Hegel question came up in my first conversation with Lonergan Easter 1961 - 50 years ago! - and it was my first choice of topic for the LA meeting this Easter, which Mark organised in my honour [80th year!]. But I shifted focus, indeed, from post-Hegelian objectivity to implementation.

This last footnote in chapter 12 of *Insight*, added late, is an effort of Lonergan to latch into the thinking of those tuned to the Hegelian perspective, and indeed Mark would be the best commentator on the footnote. But the question is one that I could well have picked up on in the first seminar. It is the sort of thing that comes from good researching. "Can the Hegelian scheme '... from *an sich*, through *für sich*, to an *und für sich*' (footnote at the end of *Insight* Ch12.) shed light on Lonergan's definition of (explicit) metaphysics in *Insight*?" Indeed, a serious question to build into the recycling process. But you see, by my suggesting that recycling, how I relocate your question in the full structure of "care for implementation"?

The full structure of implementation is what is at stake in present Lonerganism, and the shocking neglect of that full structure is my present concern. Best note first, though, that Lonergan did not solve the problem of implementation in *Insight*, and knew that. There was *Cosmopolis* as problem and there was the sketchy "deductive stuff" in *Insight* chapter 14, and there was the cry [32 times!] for collaboration in chapter twenty's 10 pages of section 5. His answer emerged, in February 1965, as functional collaboration. That answer has been dodged solidly since the publication of *Method*, forty years ago. I am determined, in my last years, to end that dodging.

But note now the depth of Lonergan's reach beyond Hegel: it is very subtle. Keep the note in the context of the text above it on that last page of chapter 12: instead of the "restricted viewpoint" of Hegel there is a view of understanding and its root of desire, loneliness, as a strain towards an object. so this gives a quite new sense to the footnote phrase "from the objects of mathematical ... etc". The objective of the human desire, in the full factual context of its thematization, "good will wills the order of the universe, and so it wills that order with that order's dynamic joy and zeal" [end of the thirteenth place, end of *Insight* p.722], is the fulfilment of the dynamic of 13.7 years of a cosmic longing. That is just locked out by Hegel. There is no "toppling outwards or inwards" in Lonergan: the "argument" is from the fact of cosmic loneliness at the root of "every little insight" to the powerful thematic of the *an und für sich* which comes in the full definition of generalized empirical method given at the top of page 141 of *A Third Collection*. The reach for "understanding of understanding" in its fullness is what I

symbolize in my "Leaning Tower of Able". This is not only quite beyond Hegel: it seems quite beyond Lonergan. So now you may see, perhaps more richly, where you are reaching and focusing in the identifications that you gave in your question [I quote from the question immediately] :

"1. The integral heuristic structure of proportionate being is initially *an sich*.

This structure is already present and operative in *methodical conscious performance*.

From the actual practice of science

2. Through Conception and Affirmation (and their corresponding instrumental acts of meaning, symbolic indications) it becomes *für sich*.

This is reflection on methodical conscious performance yielding objectification of conscious performance, methodological knowledge.

Through the application of GEM to the practice of science

3. In Implementation it finally becomes in und *für sich*.

This is 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 [Method ch. 14, page 1] of the implementation that is the care of being within the eighth specialty.

*But especially notice the shift in the first line, in the meaning of an *sich*.*

1. The integral heuristic structure of proportionate being is initially *an sich*.

Notice

? A huge effort of positioning that lifts one beyond the simple description of page 413 of Insight, which is not at all a sufficient axiomatics of positioning. Each of us is an integral heuristic structure of proportionate being which asks "what, THEN, is being?" (Insight, 665, midway: the capital THEN relates this to my Cantower V, "Metaphysics, THEN", but now with a richer meaning of THEN as leaning), an asking which has an eschatological reality and destiny. That leads us to many other zones, and in particular to the fuller meaning of "in the twenty sixth place, God is personal" (Insight, 691), which is the topic of the previous question, Q.26, and I wish now to pick it up where I left it off there in a concluding phrase, "all three sets move within the functional dynamic of the first set, and so will have the character of "natural conviction" that I mentioned above re general categorial thinking.

Q 28

What is the character of natural conviction that holds the standard model together?

A 28

Those familiar with my last decade of writing will vibe with the way that I pick up immediately on the word *character*, and draw attention to [a] *character* as it occurs on line 7 of section 1, "Meaning and Ontology" , of chapter 14 of MIT; [2] the beginning of Aristotle's *Magna Moralia* where he talks of the proper treatment of character. "The treatment of character then is, as it seems, a branch and starting-point of statecraft".

That first section of MIT 14 seems to pick up neatly on the Tower-self as the integral heuristic structure, one who incarnates the standard model. I think of models of such a standard model: Socrates poised on the street in the presence of his conviction; Nadia Boulanger prone on her deathbed, answering Leonard Bernstein's question about what music she is hearing. "*Une musique ni commencement, ni fin*". (See *Process*, conclusion of "Afterword").

But the adequate tower person of the mature science, focally and habitually contemplative of being, has a sophistication of The Position (*Insight*, 413) within the poise [recall *Cantower* 9, "Position, Poosition, Protopossession"], and that positioning is to be a genetic spiraling in the kataphatic community of the on-going Towering. These decades, it should take the nudges given by Mark Morelli, but it must battle forward then, communally, cyclically, towards a fuller neural and axiomatic living and leaning. It climbs towards shedding the axial superego (see Zanardi, Appendix D, of *FuSe* 12).

Obviously, I cannot here go into the missing pieces of present axiomatics or the heuristics of the future, both pilgrim and eschatological, but I would note that the conviction is an inner word in each character, holding all the characters together like those mythic angels dancing on the head of a needle, "Eo Majis Unum" (recall the end of *Verbum* and the splendour of Thomas in *Contra Gentiles* 4 : 11).

But the point to notice re The Question of God for Tower Living and Leaning is that if it is not posed in our times within The Position than it just intellectual doodling.

Tags:

[Submit to DotNetKicks...](#)
[Permalink](#) | [Comments \(1\)](#)

Related posts

[Q. and A. Session June 16th, 2011 by Phil McShane](#)Q. And A. Session, June 16th 2011 This Question session has only one question and answer, although ...[Q. And A. Session, Third Seminar August 28th 2011 by Phil McShane](#)Q. And A. Session, Third Seminar August 28th 2011. Q.45 You write of neglected notions as a focus...[Q. And A. Session, Third Seminar August 16th 2011 by Phil McShane](#)Q. And A. Session, Third Seminar August 16th 2011. Not too many questions this time. Rather there i...