

## Summary Description of the New Culture

Usually description follows occurrence, and is thus aided by visible institutions, recurrence-schemes etc. A filling out, if you like, of the spread of words on *Method 48*, backed by some imagining that reaches for the geohistorical image that is at the heart of Appendix 4 of *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*.

But let's see can we nudge imagination and aspiration with some pointings.

We are familiar with Newtonian physics and the shifts through Maxwell, Einstein, etc. Some of us can happily fit any stage into a decent-looking axiomatics, to which we add a pedagogy for school and university and a technology that regards products, including further research facilities. Let us presume that these are good.

The pedagogy leans on history, and the history is a sort of background, appealed to occasionally by bright people who see that we missed clues to science or technology or artistry. But there is a lack of unity: an organized core, with various clouded contexts. [I make no mention of statistics here, nor trouble you with the realm of secondary determinations and the non-systematic.]

Now suppose we try for a larger unity connected with the question: What is physics? Well, we have it described in the previous paragraph. But we mentioned Newton and a few others, seemingly tying our view to a particular age. Can we get history in there, the full history of the science, messy or solid, and its applications, good or bad? We can, if we think genetically, and add to that genetics a corrective strategy that clears up the messiness and swings round the bad towards progress. Now we have a rather decent view of the goings-on of physics. Note that there is implicit in it a notion of progress, one that can be refined through eons to cherish the progress of the population of whats.

But what of its progress? We are asking now about creativity, unpredictability, the shifting contexts of cosmic accidents and Anthropocene layerings. The science is now a shared business, perhaps familiarly summed up for us at this stage in the symbolism, GS + UV?

We now pause over the shifting of GS + UV, indeed the full panoply of cumulative and progressive results. The pause is, of course, concrete: are we not doing an empirical science of empirical science? The shifting occurs in research zones of science and industry and in the larger world of hit-and-miss applications, large and small. The mood is 'this is worth moving on with'. De facto, this mood and judgment is a local one, in a cyclotron, in an industrial lab, in a garage. Outreach is involved: Jack and Jill in their hut or basement excitement: what next? The outreach is obviously towards their future and the future: "we have just changed a fishing line into a fishing net!". We need new-type weavers, boats, oceangoings, and: might net not be a bigger net gain?!

So there is a reach out to friends and neighbours and foreign and unidentified talents. The first corner of the 48 word-spread disturbs the whole heuristic: indeed it is not the first corner any more, but the last line. [That leap from corner to line needs a bit of brooding, a brooding that might slowly lift the word-spread into the Markov sphere of a new geohistorical era of personal relations.]

The outreach can tumble around for millennia, generating castes and conquerors, pyramids and pens, "helpers, good leaders, those with many languages,"<sup>1</sup> a neat tunnel under Europe to spin new nets within gravitational waves. So, we come to "look before and after and pine for what is not"<sup>2</sup> in increasingly global ways that reveal themselves as battered and fragmented and misdirected and gross in their evil flows.

Then there is the leap, not Jack or Jill in a basement but Bernard in a Roman cell.

---

<sup>1</sup> I *Corinthians* 12:28.

<sup>2</sup> P. B. Shelley, "The Skylark."

He is in the nudging presence of the not-so-magnificent seven<sup>3</sup> crowding out the necessary eighth.

The eighth has been his concern all along.<sup>4</sup>

Going further would be foolish, showing, for example, that physics is an abstraction. There are cosmic whats needing omnidisciplinary slopes etc. etc.<sup>5</sup> Here all I do is hint, outlay, in my base-ment, bits from Lonergan's Roman cells of 1935 and 1965, what for most are at best just strange initial meanings for future climbers to visionary details of flowers and neuropatterns and the separate flows of promise that have never been identified in the muddled selfish moneyed push for power and progress; corporate and legal deadliness a primitive rule, both religious and secular, in a history in which there is a screaming loneliness: "the one Spirit was given to us all to drink."<sup>6</sup>

We may come to drink in penniless joy in ten millennia by lifting the new culture of any one type of inquiry—its home in GS + UV—into the global tower of FS that is to eventually—but starting in this millennium—frighten power and pomposity and

---

<sup>3</sup> See my *The Allure of the Compelling Genius of History*, 85-87, starting, perhaps, at the end paragraph of page 85. The issue raised is the problem of the occult entities that are the present divisions of theology.

<sup>4</sup> "The logic of ideas in the concrete is the logic of fact: it does not work out in pure thought but in the objective situation. Thus, the temple states of Mesopotamia and the city states of Greece had no unifying idea effective in the concrete: they were forced into an empire by the lack of such an idea, but this lack did not work out as a syllogism but by wars. Similarly, the empires were logically bound to fail for the lack of an idea that would integrate the differentials of change and progress in their far-flung territories: but Egypt, Babylon and Rome passed away not by force of logic but by inner decay. On the other hand, the function of the applied dialectic of thought is to anticipate the need of the objective situation." (B. Lonergan in 1935: Michael Shute, *Lonergan's Early Economic Research*, University of Toronto Press, 2010, in the "Essay in Fundamental Sociology," 38.)

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. my [Cantower 8](#), "Slopes: An Encounter", especially page 13.

<sup>6</sup> I *Corinthians* 14: 13. Note how my two quotations from I *Corinthians* are from the chapters bracketing the hymn to charity: an old symbolism of mine regarding the contextualization of charity by Lonergan's solution to the problem of Cosmopolis. See the concluding words of the quotation from Lonergan in note 8.

greed with the surrealism of an aesthetic coherence incarnate in one fortieth<sup>7</sup> of the human population.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> The estimate occurs in the essay "[Arriving in Cosmopolis](#)," available on my website in English and Spanish. The distribution of specializations is also discussed there. Numbers may help imaginings. For a population of a bit under 900,000 the numbers in a specialty would be  $(10^{5-x})$ , where x is the level of the specialty in the usual diagram. Think now of a global population perhaps ten million times larger.

<sup>8</sup> "The function of progress is to increase leisure, that men may have more time to learn; to conquer material evil in privation and sickness; that men have less occasion to fear the merely factual; and that they may have more confidence in the rule of intellect; to struggle against the inherited capital of injustice, which creates such objective situations that men cannot be truly just unless the objective situation is changed; and finally – I am not certain I speak wildly – out of the very progress itself to produce a mildness of manners and temperament which will support and imitate and extend the mighty power of Christian charity." (*op. cit.*, note 4: the end of page 69).