

Introduction to the Series (Volume 1)

This series follows an organic development that is understandable only in retrospect. Over a period of fourteen or more years it had been a case of concentrating on the immediate issue that was often not fully realized until the workshops had been going on for some time. But one thing followed another and here we are.

Because of this reflective mode of exploration combined with limited resources, this work suffers not only from a lack of academic rigor but a lack of comparison with what has already been accomplished in many fields. There are two reasons for this. The first is that we believed that it was more important to establish the question, itself a reflective processes rather than the application of intelligent investigations; this involved questions of value and discernment rather than the drawing out what could be learned from existing disciplines. The second is that we consider Lonergan's twin works of *Insight* and *Method* as foundational, in the sense that together they inaugurate a third organum in Western history—the first being the Greek theory of mind and the second the scientific revolution). In other words, we were starting on a very different foundation indeed.

What follows is a detailed summary of each of the five volumes arranged around the idea of constructing a new building on new land. So the first task is to prepare the land (working out our own foundational stance), followed by laying the foundations (establishing a common language). After that came the dedicated design of the building (a cosmopolis institute), installing the equipment for the occupants to use (cosmopolis related tools), and finally opening the doors for business (relating to the world at large).

Volume 1

Tilling the Soil: Objectifying One's Foundation

Any foundational work undertaken within a Cosmopolis Project has as its primary objective exposing any and all individual and/or cultural blind spots. This requires continual attention to one's own foundational stance, upgrading and enhancing when necessary. So the first step in any cosmopolis work is to objectify one's own foundations, not as the first set of principles in an axiomatic system but only the initial starting point open to subsequent development. The reason for doing this is quite simple: foundational work involves being able to discern between positions and counter-positions and unless one is very clear about doing confusion may insure to the point that any subsequent work is bound to contain defects that may well negate any positive achievements.

There were several things that had to be laid down before this encounter could take place. The first was to set the intellectual context within which this particular study has meaning, delving into key contemporary socio-political conditions that make such an endeavor not only necessary but essential, and highlighting the importance of an encounter with another if one is to attempt to objectify one's own foundational stance.

From this broad stance we then had to work out the starting point for the encounter. This part deals with elemental meaning and its demands upon the subject after which we move into the notion of a moral horizon that includes an invitation to join in the communal life of the Triune God before considering the notion of Friedman's professional practice as a means of giving significance and responsibility to such an invite.

Now we shift to the encounter. Thomas Müntzer was selected as the primary protagonist, chosen at random from a detailed volume on Church history with the proviso being that this person not only had to be a recognized individual but one with at least a body of writing he or she had left behind. Famous, but not *too* famous.

The first thing to establish was the historical and geographical conditions of his time. This turned out to be a time when church reform was in the air, control over meaning was shifting from scholarly manuscripts to a print culture, the "good of order" of the Roman Church was being challenged, and a shift in power from Popes to Kings was reflected in the architecture of the times. In short, his mind was shaped by a culture far different from our own.

Having worked out the general context within which Müntzer was born, lived, and died, we move on to a consideration of Müntzer himself. He was in many ways a proto-reformer, a precursor to Luther who might have emerged as one of the fundamental reformers of his age. A well-read and highly motivated clergyman, he sought among other things to bring the mass out of incomprehensible Latin and into the common language—and did so with great success. But his life was brought to an early end when he was executed for his involvement with the Peasant's War.

Now came the time to reflect on both Thomas Müntzer and his times. Like any historian, the task was to sift out the significant from the non-essential, and while much of the material had been pre-selected by others the way in which certain points leaped out while others faded into the background was due to my own foundational stance. So this led to a series of post-encounter reflections in which the object of study was my own understanding of the understanding of others including Müntzer himself.

The whole point about an encounter is that it changes one in some fundamental way. So the question that lay before me was this: How did his life challenge mine, for clearly it did? But that challenge came not from him, but from my attempt to understand him. What did this reveal about my own foundational stance?

Curiously enough, the answers had a lot to do with Friedman's notion of professional practice during times of fundamental institutional change—a situation though different in detail was remarkable the same for both him and I. So the last

part was spent on how this encounter would play itself out in this notion of professional practice. The thing is, professional standards supersede the desires and intentions of the client, expressed by Müntzer in his attempt at Church reform. What then might be my own normative standards for orienting myself in the world? Such practice always takes place in unique time-and-space-specific social-political circumstances, uses the social science paradigm of social interaction, and follows a general methodology designed to enhance the possibility of rational action during times of fundamental institutional change. Müntzer took his stance based on what was known at the time. But I had two advantages: the notion of professional practice developed by Otto Friedman and a practical if yet untested means of exerting control over meaning without the application of power, authority, or influence.

What then was mine to be? And so the idea of working on giving Lonergan's notion of cosmopolis depth came into being.

Volume 2

Pouring the Foundations: Establishing a Common Language

Having heightened one's awareness of one's own realm of interiority, the next major task turned out to create a common technical language for engaging in any cosmopolis work. This initial attempt to control meaning represents a shift from a Tower of Babel to a Tower of Able, as Philip McShane put it, or in other words the clarification of a common meaning for critical concepts and operations applicable to any cosmopolis project suitable for professional practice.

In the end, creating a common language involved more than setting the horizon with its general and specific concepts and operations united by interest and intentionality. But we started with the foundational aspect, a project that ended with a graphic representation of both language and operations in what we called "The Schematic."

The schematic is a visual reference tool similar to any schematic that describes the basic elements of processes of a nuclear plant, a building, or even an ecosystem. As such it lays out the key components of any recurring scheme of operations involving human proportionate being as the initial starting point for the development of a technical in-house language for professional practice.

It became obvious that before all else came world process. If we didn't understand how the universe functions over time, then our understanding of ourselves and our tasks would be incomplete, deficient in one way or another that would affect all that follows. For this we turned to Lonergan's world process of emergent probability. This acknowledges the reality of a world process combining the universals of recurring schemes of operation with the probabilities of emergence and sustainability of said schemes in time-and-space-specific situations.

But how were we to come to know such a universe? It was also obvious that any human understanding would be proportionate to being human, but within these

constraints came a method of controlling meaning that contained within it the possibility of transcendental knowledge. So we turned to Lonergan's transcendental method (individual) & functional specialization (communal) as the best way of understanding the universe of emergent probability.

Human intelligence is intentional. Unlike plants that stay in one place for their entire lives, human beings are on the move, changing things while be changed by them. We carry out our lives on a playing field of good and evil, or in non-theological charged terms, of progress and decline. For this we again turn to Lonergan and his invariant structure of the Human Good where he not only distinguishes between three levels of the human good (particular, good of order, terminal value) and the social relationships typical of each, but the need for individuals to actualize their potential for operating within each level of the human good.

Interesting enough, the encounter described in Volume 1 is an example of actualizing one's potential for freedom through personal relationships at the level of terminal value.

The final layer takes up the process whereby each individual moves through the different levels of the human good. The point is that there is a general process whereby we start our lives as animals and may end it under the influence of the Spirit. As such it provides a useful tool for assessing the level of development of any prospective team member.

Part 2 of this volume expands upon this final layer by working out an explanatory theory for what it means to be human. This is not a question of the nature of being human, but of how individuals can become human by working through the different levels of the human good. It is in effect an emergent probability theory of human development from conception to post death resurrection. This theory postulates that humans are a unity of complex non-linear recurring schemes of operations recorded in both physical and spiritual mediums that start in the purely physical world but reach their fulfilment as part of the Kingdom of God. Furthermore, the shift from a worldly control moderator to a spiritual one follows the innate drive toward transcendence incorporated in the transcendental injunctions when combine with the unrestricted desire to know.

It may come as little surprise to those following this line of development to realize that an equally important element of a common language has to do with a general theory of history. Our initial probe into such a theory picks up the idea of different levels of intelligibility at play in any given period of human existence, with higher levels subsuming lower while the lower levels conditions what can emerge at higher levels. The three key levels seem to be:

1. energy-material schemes of operation grounded in nature but modified by ever more complex civilizations as they grow adept at harnessing greater amounts of energy and matter when it comes to providing a steady stream of goods,

2. the institutional structures that exist at the core of any civilization, and
3. the realm of the transcendental, of God, and in this case the Christian Triune God as the fundamental over-arching subsuming effects of a truly universal perspective on transient human affairs.

The point is that our understanding of history—of progress, decline, and the potential for reversal—is quite different when one starts with the world view of emergent probability. Now one speaks of recurring schemes of operations with their associated probabilities of emergence and survival in time-and-space-specific socio-political circumstances. Progress is possible but not assured; cul-de-sacs and devolution are often waiting in the wings. The three-level set of intelligibilities enhances our understanding of institutional change, for it not only brings in the conditioning/subsuming effects between a culture's institutional structure and its ability to utilize available resources to enhance the good of order, but incorporates equally real subsuming/conditioning effects between the transcendental realm of God and the human level of institutional organization.

Finally, we consider the key element of institutional change: terminal value. The good of order of any civilization is organized around whatever has been chosen to be of ultimate value for members of the civilization. Fundamental institutional change is in effect a clash of terminal values being played out in society at large—but particularly within the specialized institutions that deal with the distribution of power and authority. This leads us into the fourth part of working out a common language for cosmopolis practice: politics.

Politics may be considered as a 3rd level human good (terminal value) played out between participants and stakeholders that are—to say the least—less than free to do what is needed or imposed by the conditions of the time. This theory proposes that all political action is grounded in the 3rd reflective level where the key choices are over what is or is not to be of terminal value. When not mediated by long-established political conventions that regulate not only the question for power but the problem of succession political “debate” can degrade to “fighting with a naked blade.”

This concludes what is little more than an introduction to what might be achieved by future generations if they start with such foundations as Friedman's professional practice and Lonergan's methodological control over meaning.

Volume 3

Building the Structure: Making Cosmopolis a Reality

The next logical task in this sequence involves clarifying our intentions by working out a detailed mission statement that places this work within the fundamental changes going on within our institutional framework. Such a statement would not

only define the concrete interests and intentions of the institute as well as the relationships between such an institute and other organizations, but serve as a public document proclaiming our rather specialized services to both the public as well as other educational bodies.

This starts with making clear the problem in such a way that it is understandable to the world at large. For the world is full of problems, some known and some lying outside our collective horizon. For us the key question involves diving through what may turn out to be superficial problems in the search for the truly fundamental issues that require our attention. A failure to answer this correctly may mean wasting all one's time and effort on fixing a situation that will soon not be important because of far deeper and more deadly institutional changes taking place.

Like the need for Volume 2, *the* fundamental root problem involves the control of meaning so that the public sphere can rest on facts rather than speculations, illusions, and the results of mass hysteria. Our collective failure to control meaning not only leaves individuals devoid of the human relationships that would give them life but creates a world where reason has to place to rest its head, where emotions trump wisdom and intelligence. Some of this can be attributed to common sense bias or pathological egotism. But the root problem leading to long term decline and eventual a dark age is the result of intelligent people of common sense, in coping with the ongoing list of things that need to be done, fail to take into considered long term implications, philosophical wisdom, or theological concerns with the transcendent. The cumulative outcome of all these local plans and policies constructed on different appreciative systems is the ongoing fragmentation of meaning at a cultural level, a degradation in collective wisdom that can only end in a Tower of Babel.

The problem is that there exists no natural solution to this problem of common sense bias. Egotists soon run into opposition, as does any group expressing a deep bias to its own well-being. But not this tendency of intelligent people of common sense to go their own way when it comes to dealing with their immediate problems.

But not all is lost; there is a possible solution. While there are no inbuilt responses that could correct such a long-term degradation of history due to common sense bias, Lonergan does theorize a potential solution named "cosmopolis." And this brings us to our mission statement:

It is our mission to actualize Lonergan's notion by working out the basic modes of operating and key linkages to the world at large through a Cosmopolis Institute that among other things bridges the world of theory to that of common sense, links the varied disciplines within a unified whole, and takes into account the importance of God not only in the problem of liberation but in the problem of knowing reality itself.

The first part in meeting this task was to develop a short handbook for prospective team members, a simple laying out the essential roles and tasks necessary for participants to both know and practice when it comes to being a part of any cosmopolis team. This work would include such things as:

1. The Project. We are not concerned with either egotism or group bias, since both have self-corrective mechanisms. What we do work on are the roots of long-term decline due to the tendency of common sense people to justify their actions without taking into account long-term consequences or philosophical and theological realms of meaning.
2. Required Knowledge. Current affairs, fundamental institutional change especially at the global level, general and specific geographies and histories, the control of meaning via transcendental method and functional specialization, and a transdisciplinary framework for understanding key variables.
3. Team Players. In a general sense, team players are responsible for content while team leaders attend to the process. Players may shift their roles according to their own talents and interests, but do so within an awareness of the overall functioning of the team under the direction of the leader. Always the focus is on the mission at hand.
4. Leading. Leaders are responsible for the running of such an intentional cosmopolis group in the sense that they are responsible for the choice of methods best suited to achieving the desired results. They are also responsible for maintaining an atmosphere of "creative wonder."
5. Coaching. Coaches work at assessing and enhance the performance of the team. This may be done on a particular basis, i.e., acting as an observer and post-event critic, or as general critique with remedial work that takes advantage of what has been gained while working on areas that could be improved.
6. Mentoring. Mentors act on a one-to-one basis, where they work with a specific team member to actualize his or her ability to function within the team. Mentoring takes place outside of all primary work.

All this is a first step understanding what it means to be a "Cosmopolis" Professional. This involves a personal challenge of becoming a specialized worker dedicated to the problem of long-term decline due to common sense bias. To achieve such a status requires mastering the following stages before promoting rational change in unique time-and-space-specific socio-political situations during times of fundamental institutional change when all seems to be in flux.

1. Fundamental Institutional Change. There are many different scales used in understanding human reality, from local to regional, regional to global. But fundamental institutional changes have their roots in the widest possible scale that set the context for regional and local enterprises. Such changes at this level provide the broad historical and geographical conditions that define an era; all lower scale operations exist within this broad context.

2. Taking a Stand. The difference between a technician and a professional is that the former takes no personal responsibility for the exercise of his or her expertise while the latter does. The standards for a “cosmopolis” professional are set by the objectives of such an institution, specifically by the need to counter the inbuilt bias of people of common sense to consider themselves as the ultimate authority on what needs to be done. At the core of such a stand are the three primary aspects of any foundational stance: intellectual, moral, and religious.
4. Orientation. Such a professional’s orientation is first of all grounded in Lonergan’s transdisciplinary method and its implications for metaphysics, ethics, and the possibility of transcendental knowledge and secondly in the method and tools of professional practice as drawn by Friedman. These are a specialized highly technical areas brought together around the common task of countering long-term bias due to the rationalizations and justifications of power seekers and holders contaminating meaning.
5. Evaluation. Fundamentally different foundational stances lead to different orientations that in turn affect what is or is not a problem. The professional not only has tools to work out the different orientations and subsequent evaluations, separating positions from counter-positions, but relies on his or her own capacity of discerning one from the other. Ultimately, the professional has to make his or her own evaluation derived from available tools.
6. Diagnosis. Recognizing that there is a problem is one thing; but identifying the source, the root cause(s) of these symptoms is another. Lonergan’s approach places the source of all insights or oversights reside within the individual, the subject. His transcendental method applies to individual understanding, while his functional specialties provide the grounds for communal understanding.
7. Prognosis. There are two broad strategies for initiating change: an appeal to a gain in value, or to potential loss. Laying out a prognosis is to infer what is likely to happen if no action is taken, an extrapolation that depends on the previous stages of the inquiry. Technically speaking, this is part of any diagnosis.
8. Scope and Constraints. Any unique time-and-space-specific socio-political situations contain a mix of rational and irrational factors. So any professionally based recommendation grounded in prior steps has to be implemented among people with quite different interests and intentions. So part of any professional practice lies in identifying what constraints are bound to be brought into play but also what scope for action opens up during times of fundamental institutional change. All that, any working out ways to expand the latter while down-scaling the former.

Our mission, then, is to lay the foundations for a Cosmopolis Institute capable of tapping into the universal perspective of the Triune God while working with education institutions to provide an integrative perspective to a proliferation of specialized disciplines that in turn provide critical resource material to the Institute, putting all this to use within the larger culture where intellectual, moral, and religious conversion can be promoted and the fragmentation of meaning healed. The participants in this project are:

1. The transcendent realm of Judeo-Christian ways of living and loving.
2. The current educational institutions with their down-grading of the humanities, including history and theology, in favor of theoretical knowledge that aids in practical skills and knowledge.
3. The public at large, some of whom may appreciate the foundational nature of the work if only for the simple reason that it helps them to make better sense of things.

Volume 4

Outfitting the Building: Adding Core Programs

What is need for practitioners to meet the objectives of such a mission statement? To date we have dealt with the need for ongoing intellectual, moral, and religious conversion has been established through a consideration of foundational stances, a communal technical language has been developed and tested suitable for any cosmopolis group, and a mission statement has been compiled as a “universal” set of recurring schemes of operations for any Cosmopolis Institute facing the realities of our times. Now it is time to flesh out the internal details of creating and sustaining such an institute.

First of all, we need a specialized in-house research library. Such an information center would cover four basic areas of research: current affairs, with a special interest in fundamental institutional change; world history and geography, with a special interest in Western civilization; Friedman’s transdisciplinary variables and stages of professional practice, with a focus on the social interaction paradigm; and Lonergan’s transcendental method and functional specialization, with a special interest in ongoing intellectual, moral, and religious conversion within foundations.

Second we need a way of monitoring ongoing fundamental institutional changes within the broad historical and geographical context worked out in Volume 2. These inquiries would take two forms: a broad system-wide understanding of what was currently in play using the three level model of transcendental-institutional-energy/material sublating/conditioning emergent probability world process, and a series of specialized investigations that would target local areas of special concern such as military flash-points or the impact of progressive utopian thinking.

Third in line is an in-house training/mentoring Program so that people who are interested in joining such a collaborative effort could be brought up to speed concerning what is involved in a professional practice geared toward a functional cosmopolis. It is here that the invariant structure of the human life-cycle can be put to use to work out that which the prospective team member has achieved, what still has to be actualized, and his or her potential for such actualization.

The fourth core program involves a “cosmopolis” reading of *Insight* and *Method*. *Insight* was written to argue for a specific transdisciplinary philosophy capable of an intentional understanding of human understanding. *Method* extends this by focussing on the fragmentation of meaning and the need for some form of control other than a normative culture or a reliance on hard science methodologies. The point is that we at the Institute accept Lonergan’s work as foundational, so our reading of both methodological works has more to do with using these works to enhance the work of a cosmopolis team than trying to persuade others to his approach. In doing this we do not rely on secondary material, only these two primary works.

At the core of such an Institute lies a series of foundational exercises involving a communal commitment to ongoing intellectual, moral, and religious conversion through reflective intelligence at the third level of the human good that is concerned with freedom, personal relationships, and terminal value. It is only in the pursuit of such conversion that an adequate foundational stance may be achieved and hence a sound initial starting point for understanding doctrines, systematics, and communications.

Finally, we extend our notion of a general theory of history into the area of ethics expressed in the need for an evaluative history typical of higher order operators in the functional specialty of Dialectics. It is not only that history has become a forgotten subject, allowed to slip into oblivion so as not to challenge current beliefs, but that history sorts through what can be determined to be true about the past and craft it all into a narrative drama that plays out over time. But there is another history that needs to be written, one not subject to a general relativism and denial of the very idea of truth, one in which terminal values play themselves out. And that history, within the functional speciality of dialectic, is evaluative.

Volume 5

Open for Business: Going Public

Any business has a product to sell. Ours is a method not only to control meaning but to free human beings from a variety of conscious and unconscious biases, especially those blind spots in human collective intelligence that have come about through a multitude of attempts by power seekers and holders to justify and rationalize their own drive to rule without undo resistance. It is to counter the fragmentation brought about in history by highly intelligent people of common sense putting their

own specialized common sense realm of knowing and doing above any long-term philosophical and/or theological interests and concerns.

Any organization cannot survive for long if it does not have the effective support of those who take advantage of what it has to offer. So one task, when going public, is to acquire the resources to sustain the core functions of a cosmopolis. These resources are acquired through services rendered. With this in mind, there appear to be three primary sources of revenue. The first is the public at large and includes such things as selling books and articles, providing a source for the public to draw upon such as an in-depth analysis of fundamental institutional changes, and running dedicated cosmopolis “workshops” for interested groups. The second are the cultivation of connections with educational institutions that could not only draw upon the institute’s ability to pull together different disciplines within a higher perspective of what it means to be human but use such specialized knowledge to clarify inter- and transdisciplinary issues current plaguing university life. The third involves religious groups who might wish to expand their reach through supporting the kinds of encounters that lead to intellectual, moral, and religious conversion.

One major difficult is that modern industrial society now encompasses such a vast field that no one person could ever come close to mastering what is already known. Lonergan’s functional specialties provide a solution to this by providing an opportunity to shift to a higher perspective than our current fragmented and highly distorted horizon. It is not a matter of being convinced of Lonergan’s argument but of accepting his work as the beginning of a new start. This type of work involves directed reflections on both *Insight* and *Method* that can be of great use in by participants to make sense of whatever question has seized them. For example, his world view of emergent probability is a major step forward in our understanding of world processes that has yet to be incorporated in how we think about things.

Yet another opportunity arises with the current issue of “fake news.” Here we have developed a three-phase project that introduces people who are interested in current affairs to an intentional analysis of contemporary news cycles by applying Lonergan’s and Friedman’s methodologies to the task of sifting wheat from chaff. Phase one introduces participants to the tools they will later master; phase two runs the groups through a case study to familiarize participants in how these tools are to be employed; and phase three turns the investigation over to the participants, leaving the team leader free to move into the role of a critic. Core to such a study is the application of the world view of emergent probability to understanding institutional change conditioned by and sublating energy/material cycles while in turn sublating and conditioning the role of the transcendental in human affairs.

The notion of an encounter with other in a process of mutual self-mediation offers the possibility of a series of courses and/or workshops dealing with the problem of living in the pivot point between the issues and concerns exposed in the functional speciality of Dialectics and the discernment and stand-taking of that of Foundations. In Lonergan’s scheme of functional specializations, there exists a “pivot point” between dialectics and foundations where one no longer is caught in the web of

multiple orientations often in conflict with each other to take a person stand as to which are counter-positions and which are positions. This is an exercise in formation, a form of spiritual discernment when it comes to distinguishing clearly and distinctly between what is or is not true. Such a public offering starts not with a desired position but with the type of questioning and mutual encounters among a number of people who have to make a choice. We offer a method: the options are laid out in dialectics; the choice is made in foundations.

However the core output of such a cosmopolis are literary and other works of art that accept what is currently in play but extends it by just that much to offer the possibility of intellectual, moral, and religious conversion as experienced radical shifts in how a person comes to know who they really are. One such example is *JesusLand: A "Novel" Solution*, where the reader is asked whether it is possible and even desirable to shift one's concept of self from one's socio-political role to the type of person whose self-identified function is to reach up to the transcendental injunctions. It explores the roots of the contemporary existential crises as an abyss that opens up with God is removed from the equation and proposes that while it might not be possible to restore faith communities to their former glory it might be possible to have people pay attention to their role in creating sound worlds mediated by meaning.

Last but not least is the value in standing witness to a project that any intelligent person of immense common sense would consider impractical ivory-tower day-dreaming. For common sense people are loath to take up a project that has never before been tested in the field. So perhaps the most important contribution such an institute might make is to demonstrate that such a dedicated cosmopolis group can and does work in such a way that work gets done and things actually improve. If that is the groups only contribution to society, that might be enough to justify any work carried out to make a cosmopolis a living reality in human affairs.

Russell C. Baker
Montreal, Canada
August 31, 2019