

The International Institute for Method in Theology

A Vision

Robert M. Doran, S.J.

Emmett Doerr Chair in Catholic Systematic Theology

Marquette University

Acknowledgments

Our colloquium this year marks the official launching of a new stage in the life of the Marquette Lonergan Project. We are teaming with the theology faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome and the Lonergan Research Institute at Regis College in the University of Toronto to launch a new international research institute that we are calling the International Institute for Method in Theology. I wish to begin with some acknowledgments.

The Marquette Lonergan Project began at Marquette in 2007, with the assistance of funding generously provided by the University's President at the time, Rev. Robert A. Wild, S.J.

This is the first of the Project's colloquia to be supported by a donation from the Mary, Martha & Emmett J. Doerr Charitable Trust.

John (Chuck) Lamb is retiring this year from the position of Vice-President for Finance at Marquette University. He has been very supportive of the work of the Marquette Lonergan Project.

I was very happy when Dr Richard Holz, Dean of Klingler College of Arts & Sciences, accepted my invitation to attend today's lecture, in the midst of a very busy schedule.

I wish also to acknowledge the presence with us today of representatives of the Gregorian University and the Lonergan Research Institute. Fr Gerard Whelan, S.J., Professor of Theology at the Gregorian, has come all the way from Rome to be present at this colloquium, and we are honored by his presence and delighted with the connections we have made through his assistance with the theology faculty at the Gregorian University. These connections began in a conversation I had over the Christmas holidays with Fr Alan Fogarty, S.J., President of the Gregorian Foundation. Fr Fogarty alerted Fr Whelan to our conversation, and that was the start of our collaboration.

Eric Mabry is the Acting Director of the Lonergan Research Institute, Toronto. Eric is no stranger to Marquette; he has been here for a number of gatherings. Eric also assures me of the support for this venture from the Provincial of the Jesuits of English Canada, Fr Peter Bisson, S.J.

History

Both the Lonergan Project and its expansion into a partner in an international research institute are the long-term results of a suggestion that I made to a

Canadian Jesuit Provincial, Reverend William Addley, S.J., in 1984. I was living in Toronto and teaching at Regis College in the University of Toronto at the time. The suggestion led to the establishment by Fr Addley of the Lonergan Research Institute of Regis College, University of Toronto. I had no idea at the time that what started in that meeting would eventually lead me back to Marquette to carry on here the work that I had begun to do in Toronto, and to carry it on in collaboration with the Institute that I helped launch there.

Let me recount very briefly what we have been doing at Marquette under the rubric of the Marquette Lonergan Project, in order to convey where we are coming from as we now join with two other institutions.

The first tasks of the Toronto-based Lonergan Research Institute were the work of preparing and publishing the Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan and of cataloguing and making accessible Lonergan's archival papers. We began the Institute in 1985, and the first volume was published in 1988. In 2006, after more than 20 years at the Lonergan Research Institute and five years as its Director, I accepted Marquette's offer of the Emmett Doerr Chair in Systematic Theology and moved my contribution to the Lonergan 'enterprise' to Marquette. In 2007, after Fr Wild had freed some funding for a Marquette Lonergan Project, the work that I brought with me from Toronto became the central task in the mission of the Project. Since then, the bulk of the work of editing the volumes in Bernard Lonergan's Collected Works and the launching of a website containing the documents and audio materials relevant for research in the Lonergan Archive have both been done at, and sponsored by, Marquette. I have continued to be the General Editor of the 25-volume endeavor of the Collected Works, which are being

published by University of Toronto Press. 22 of the projected volumes have now appeared, three of those coming in the past year or so: *The Incarnate Word* (February 2016), *A Second Collection* (July 2016), and *A Third Collection* (February 2017). The remaining three volumes are all in process: *Method in Theology* is at the Press, and will be published in the fall. *The Redemption*, volume 9, will be submitted on or before June 15. And I have started work on the final volume, *Archival Material*, volume 25, which will be submitted at some point in 2019 or 2020. Of the 22 volumes that have appeared to date, 10 have been edited after I moved to Marquette and with the help of the support I have received from the University. God willing, I want to see this entire project through to completion by the summer of 2020.

We have also started two very active websites. The website www.bernardlonergan.com has over 5,000 registered users from every continent. Through this site we have cared for not only the preservation but also the dissemination of the Lonergan Archives. The site has become the principal source of data for several dissertations, one of which I directed here at Marquette. And since 2009 we have sponsored or assisted in sponsoring at least two annual colloquia at Marquette, sometimes three, devoted to contemporary issues from the perspective of Bernard Lonergan's work. One of those colloquia is organized by graduate student members of the Lonergan Society at Marquette University, and provides an opportunity each for year for graduate students from a number of universities to come together and share their work with one another. The proceedings of those colloquia have been made available, along with a good deal of further 'secondary' material, on another website: www.lonerganresource.com. At this moment I should point out the indispensable contributions that are being

made to our work by Greg Lauzon, without whose work of recording, restoring audio materials, and looking after the websites the websites themselves would not be functioning.

From the Lonergan Project to the International Institute for Method in Theology

I mention all this, because the vision that I presented when I suggested a Lonergan Research Institute to Fr Addley extended far beyond these preliminary steps of preserving Lonergan's work. I was vaguely aware at the time that Fr Lonergan had already developed a vision for what he called an Institute for Method in Theology, which would fulfill a dream very much present in his two major works, *Insight* and *Method in Theology*. The dream is of an interdisciplinary research effort starting perhaps with modest means but eventually conducted on a large, indeed international, scale to implement the unfolding in many fields of inquiry of the 'generalized empirical method' that he had proposed in *Insight* and dramatically developed in *Method in Theology*. Since then I discovered that many of the books that were in his possession at the time of his death in 1984 were stamped by him on the inside first page, 'Institute for Method in Theology.' We are now beginning that work, and the development of the means of electronic communication through the internet allows us to do much more work at a greatly reduced cost than would have been possible when Fr Lonergan came up with the idea. We do not need to do a great deal of travel to stay in close communication with one another.

Lonergan was a shy man, but he was not shy about claiming that his generalized empirical method could provide an important key to doing in our time for culture

and religion what Aquinas did in the thirteenth century: providing the possibility of something of a synthesis, but not in the form of a closed system of thought, not in terms of fixed and immutable content, but in the form of the results of ongoing collaborative research in theology, philosophy, and the natural and human sciences based in a generalized empirical method that he spells out in intricate detail. He also knew that this was a long-term, indeed indefinitely ongoing project, and that his own work was just a beginning.

But now that the task of publishing the Collected Works is nearing completion, I think it is time to pick up the second limb, as it were, of my original proposal: Lonergan's dream of an Institute for Method in Theology as an international network of institutions working in interdisciplinary collaboration on contemporary issues. The burgeoning collaboration with the Lonergan Research Institute in Toronto and the theological faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome is but the beginning of such a network.

To give you some background on Lonergan's dream, allow me to quote part of one paragraph from the preface to *Insight*, a book published in 1957.

... it ... will be urged that what I have attempted could be executed properly only by the organized research of specialists in many different fields. This, of course, I cannot but admit ... But ... **[my] aim was to seek a common ground on which [people] of intelligence might meet** ... What had to be undertaken was a preliminary exploratory journey into an unfortunately neglected region. Only after specialists in different fields had been given the opportunity to discover the existence and significance of their insights could there arise the

hope that some would be found to discern my intention where my expression was at fault, to correct my errors where ignorance led me astray, and with the wealth of their knowledge to *fill the dynamic but formal structures* I tried to erect. *Only in the measure that this hope is realized will there be initiated the spontaneous collaboration that commonly must precede the detailed plans of an organized investigation.*

Notice that there are three steps outlined here: the preliminary exploratory journey into the occurrence and significance of human acts of understanding, followed by a spontaneous collaboration on the part of those who had made that journey, and culminating in ‘the detailed plans of an organized investigation.’

Where are we now in terms of those three steps? Some 60 years after the publication of *Insight* and some 45 years after the publication of *Method in Theology*, some spontaneous collaborations have already been initiated – so step 2 is already in play – and it is time now to follow these with more organized investigations – step 3. In promoting the International Institute for Method in Theology, we are offering to found this common research project. It is time to renew Lonergan’s dream of an Institute for Method in Theology as the initial step in what could (and I hope will) become an even larger international network of institutes for interdisciplinary methods.

The Foci and the Coordinators

The International Institute for Method in Theology envisions at its beginning a series of collaborative research projects oriented to the ongoing and cumulative

construction of a developing synthetic integration of religion and culture in our day. The basis of that synthetic integration will be Lonergan's proposal of an integral scale of values. [Diagram] The scale of values has already become the central category in my book *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, but further development of its potential integrating capacities will be forthcoming as the work of the Institute develops appropriate categories for filling in the heuristic structures provided by Lonergan and myself. Lucas Briola's lecture tomorrow afternoon makes ample use of the scale of values, and will provide a helpful introduction for those new to the idea. And I will lay out the basic scheme in a moment.

I have decided that this initial venture be marked by five foci of interdisciplinary research, at the beginning of its work: (1) systematic theology, (2) philosophy, (3) economics, with a focus on a humanized globalization, (4) the promotion of an ecological culture, and (5) the promotion of a critical realist exegesis and history of religious sources, beginning with but not necessarily limited to the biblical resources of the Hebrew and Christian scriptures. Eric Mabry asked me over lunch this past summer how I hit on these five areas. Well, the first three are obvious: systematic theology, philosophy, and economics are the principal fields in which Lonergan did his own work. I selected the fourth area, the promotion of an ecological culture, partly because as a Jesuit Lonergan was always ready to promote matters that were at the heart of the messages of the successors of Peter as bishop of Rome, and the notion of an ecological culture is central to Pope Francis's encyclical *Laudato Si'*. I also believe that Lonergan's notion of the authentic and creative tension in many areas of human life between limitation and transcendence, a notion of which I made great use in *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, could well prove to be central to what Pope Francis calls an ecological conversion. As for

hermeneutics and critical realist exegesis especially of the scriptures, Lonergan has already inspired a movement among biblical exegetes that I believe deserves our attention and collaboration.

I have enlisted five ‘point persons’ as organizers or coordinators for these areas, and they are all with us today: Darren Dias, University of St Michael’s College, University of Toronto, for systematic theology; Brian Bajzek, doctoral candidate at Regis College, University of Toronto, for philosophy; Joseph Ogbonnaya, assistant professor of theology at Marquette University, for economics and globalization; Lucas Briola, doctoral candidate at Catholic University of America, for ecological culture; and Joseph Gordon, assistant professor at Johnson University, for critical-realist hermeneutics. Each of these group leaders will gather a team of women and men to pursue collaborative research projects in their respective areas and to make the results of their work available either on a new website that will be begun in Toronto, with the help of significant input from Greg Lauzon, who has a great deal of experience regarding what to do and what not to do with such websites, or perhaps in some other venue yet to be determined. We will make that decision as a team.

I would like to speak to each of the five foci, to some in greater detail than others. I have been helped in putting together these remarks by some of the coordinators of the different areas. We begin with philosophy, for Lonergan’s understanding of what the functions of philosophy are is key to the entire enterprise.

Philosophy

The primary function of philosophy, Lonergan writes, is ‘to promote the self-appropriation that cuts to the root of philosophic differences and incomprehensions’ (*Method in Theology*). And its secondary functions consist in such things as the ongoing clarification of the various realms of meaning – common sense, theory, interiority, scholarship, transcendence, art – in order to distinguish, relate, and ground these realms and also ground the methods of the sciences and promote their unification.

These are ongoing functions. They are not complete when one arrives at what Lonergan calls ‘the self-affirmation of the knower.’ At that point one has just begun. Embracing his response to three basic questions – What am I doing when I am knowing? Why is doing that knowing? What do I know when I do that? – is the beginning of the movement to the self-appropriation of conscious intentionality.

As is well known, Lonergan distinguished two other levels of consciousness beyond those that one affirms in answering the question, What am I doing when I am knowing? Beyond experiencing the data of sense and consciousness,

understanding these data, and judging whether or not I have understood the data correctly, there is a fourth level of decision, and there is a fifth level of love, or more generally, of 'we' consciousness, of collective responsibility, solidarity, and, at its best, the self-sacrificing charity of persons in love with God. And he acknowledged as well the significance of the transition from the neural to the psychic in such events as dreams, free images, and spontaneous associations of feelings.

The objective of the fourth level, decision, is the integrity of the entire scale of values. And the scale of values will be a central focus of the work of the Institute.

The ascending order of the scale – vital, social, cultural, personal, religious – is determined by the degree of self-transcendence to which we are carried in responding to values at each level. The exceptional validity of the scale and its heuristic fertility for understanding historical events and the interrelations of human sciences are due, in my view, to its isomorphism with the levels of consciousness affirmed in self-appropriation. The scale of values is the social objectification of human authenticity: the social objectification of women and men being collectively and together attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible, and loving human beings.

While my work in *Theology and the Dialectics of History* has articulated in some detail the dynamics of the scale, a great deal more work remains to be done to fill in the formal structure with the help of ongoing work in philosophy and the human sciences, and especially to clarify the relations between cultural values and the 'dialectic of community' that structures social values: technological, economic, and

political institutions in dialectical tension with spontaneous intersubjectivity. It is the integrity of that dialectic of community that alone will guarantee a recurrent equitable distribution of vital goods to the human community. We are today in need of a profound shift in cultural values, in the meanings and values that inform our ways of living and acting. We will speak later of an ecological culture and of a humanized globalization of resources governed not by purely economic motives of maximized profit but by a commitment to the integrity of the scale of values for all peoples.

In *Method in Theology* Lonergan states the function of culture to be one of discovering, expressing, validating, criticizing, correcting, developing, and improving the meanings and values that inform a given way of life. *Insight* makes it clear that the ulterior purpose of such refinements lies in the integrity of the dialectic of community, or, in the language of the scale of values, integrity at the level of social values: a just social order. More concretely, the development and implementation of new technological, economic, and political institutions, as well as the refinement of spontaneous intersubjectivity, may prove impossible short of a transformation of the cultural values informing a society's way of life.

Culture functions at the two levels of everyday transactions and reflexive, superstructural objectification. But for it to function with integrity at either level there is required the integrity of self-transcending persons who originate values in themselves and their milieu, and inspire and invite others to do likewise, through the incarnate meaning of their lives, through their art and language and writing, and through their incorporation down to the molecules in their bodies of the genuine values left to us by those who have gone before us.

And that sustained personal integrity is impossible without a living relationship of partnership and love with the absolutely transcendent source and goal of the human exigence for true meaning and real goodness, and so without the effective realization of religious values, without being in love with God.

In theological terms, the relevant 'religious values' are what have come to be known as operative and cooperative grace, both sanctifying and actual. These are what condition the possibility of personal integrity. Personal integrity conditions the possibility of the integrity of culture at both the superstructural and the infrastructural levels. The integrity of culture conditions the possibility of a just social order. And only such a social order renders possible the effectively recurrent distribution of vital goods to the whole community.

The very existence of a so-called fifth level of consciousness (love, solidarity, collective responsibility, interpersonal consciousness, and participation in a graced communication of divine life) has been a matter of some controversy among Lonergan's students, but his own position, as expressed particularly in sessions at the Boston Lonergan Workshops in the 1970s and early 1980s, is unmistakable. This has been demonstrated definitively in a dissertation written at Marquette by Jeremy Blackwood, now available on the website www.lonerganresource.com, and soon, in revised form, as a book published by Marquette University Press.

Ongoing explorations of the fifth level of consciousness will link Lonergan students to the alterity or diversity that defines postmodernity, and will open the

history of meaning upon what John Dadosky has called a fourth stage of meaning: beyond common sense, beyond theory, beyond interiority, and into a fourth stage marked by alterity and diversity. This is wide open territory at the present time, with a great deal of creative philosophical work being done and remaining to be done. It will be the principal area for the work of the philosophical component of the Institute, and because Brian Bajzek is working in this area and has already shown that he can work in it with distinction, I have asked him to coordinate this component. We will hear some of Brian's initial reflections tomorrow morning.

(Skip to 'Systematic Theology').

Furthermore, as my own work over the years has emphasized, there is another dimension to consciousness besides the operations of intentional consciousness: namely, the psychic, affective, sensitive stream whose integration with intentional operations is a life-long task and a function of what I have called psychic conversion.

Much remains to be done in filling out the heuristic structure constituted by the interrelations of these two dimensions of consciousness. This is the sphere where what Lonergan called dramatic bias can introduce complications and distortions. I have come to see the importance for illuminating dramatic bias of both René Girard's mimetic theory and Max Scheler's notion of *ressentiment*. The latter has

been appropriated by Lonergan in the light of a more accurate notion of the scale of values than is found in Scheler's proposal, in my view. Lonergan's scale of values is isomorphic with the structure of intentional consciousness, and as that structure consists of movements both from below upwards and from above downwards, so the scale of values exhibits parallel dynamic relations in both directions. It is not a static hierarchy of eternal essences, as it tends to be portrayed in Scheler's own thinking. Moreover, the full integrity of the scale of values is the objective of moral conversion, not the allegiance to the higher realms or levels at the expense of the lower, as would seem to be the objective of Scheler's presentation. Scheler's position unfortunately remains aristocratic in a manner that Lonergan's commitment to education for democracy would not countenance.

The insistence that the whole of this philosophical movement that begins with self-appropriation is still in its initial phases of development means that we must stress the outwardly collaborative nature both of the institute and of Lonergan's project as a whole. Lonergan was a very generous reader of others' work, constantly advancing the positions in that work and thus helping it realize its full potential. Unfortunately his students have not always manifested the same generosity. I hope I have been insistent over the years with the graduate students I have encountered that the Ignatian principle of always being more ready to respect than to suspect the proposition of another person is the only way to proceed in collaborative efforts to find what is true. Lonergan's own appropriation of Scheler's notion of *ressentiment* is a clear example of his procedure: not a mention of the shortcomings that I just indicated, but an incorporation of the notion itself into a context in which

its genuine contribution can be manifest. Moreover, notions like psychic conversion and John Dadosky's fourth stage of meaning are advancing Lonergan's work, but they are doing so because they have filled in lacunae in that work by appropriating the contributions of others. To quote Brian Bajzek, who assisted me in writing this portion of the vision, 'New data emerge constantly, and Lonergan's method is designed to account for, openly accommodate, and expand in light of this. This openness and data-oriented dynamism is built into Lonergan's whole project, and it is the very thing that prevents that project from stagnation and calcification. It is a unique thing to be utilizing a framework which has the conditions for its own constant rejuvenation and expansion built into it from the very beginning.'

Systematic Theology

The systematic theology of the future will sublimate the philosophical explorations just discussed into an ongoing effort at creating an engagement of faith with culture, based in the integrity of the scale of values.

Lonergan mentions one of the tasks of such a theology, when he writes in his chapter on Doctrines in *Method in Theology*: 'if modern theologians were to transpose medieval theory into the categories derived from contemporary interiority and its real correlatives, they would be doing for our age what the greater Scholastics did for theirs.' Here he is speaking of making the permanent contributions of previous theologians accessible to people of our own time. But the

categories derived from contemporary interiority are still being developed. Again, we are standing at the beginning of a major cultural movement whose expansion and development we can barely foresee. Lonergan's views on the magnitude of the task are clear. He likes to use the word 'Herculean.' Thus: 'The breakdown of classical culture and, at last in our day, the manifest comprehensiveness and exclusiveness of modern culture confront Catholic philosophy and Catholic theology with the gravest problems, impose upon them mountainous tasks, invite them to Herculean labors' ('Dimensions of Meaning'). Again, there is a 'Herculean task of creating a new context' ('The New Context,' appendix 1 in the CWL version of *Method in Theology*).

Thus the theology that will emerge even from these transpositions of the past he explicitly calls a 'future theology.' It does not yet exist. It is the task of contemporary systematic theologians to begin the work of bringing it into being. And this has to be done one step at a time, on the part of 'a perhaps not numerous center, big enough to be at home in both the old and the new, painstaking enough to work out one by one the transitions to be made, strong enough to refuse half measures and insist on complete solutions even though it has to wait' ('Dimensions of Meaning'). In my view it will be the task of several centuries to establish this form of theological culture. We have just begun. Our own efforts will be regarded by future generations as remarkably primitive, and yet as a starting point.

But the work of systematics is not limited to the extensive transposition of the permanent achievements of the past. Questions for systematics can arise also from contemporary communications, and so the elaboration of the categories of such a theology will entail and demand an appropriation and at times a transformation of

the categories of the human sciences, under the purifying work of the ‘theological foundations’ that express the horizon constituted by religious, moral, intellectual, and psychic conversion. Communications, moreover, will propose questions of diversity that earlier systematic theologies avoided but that the systematics envisaged here must engage.

An analogy may be drawn with the Thomist appropriation of Aristotle’s metaphysics, but the task incumbent on contemporary theologians is far more complex. The human sciences of sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science, and economics will take the place of the Aristotelian metaphysics that provided for medieval theology the general categories, that is, the categories that theology shared with other disciplines. Metaphysics will remain, of course, and work will continue to be done establishing metaphysical equivalence with the new categories, but metaphysics will provide nothing more than a basic semantics required for unifying the various other sciences in a new and constantly developing synthesis.

I am happy to say that the work of composing in collaborative fashion the basic tenets of a new systematic theology has already begun, and this is happening at two levels, both of which have been stressed by the Marquette Lonergan Project and will be carried on and supported by the new Institute.

At a basic or foundational level there is the kind of work represented, for example, by what may be called ‘basic research.’ This is work that is attempting to generate the very categories, both special and general, that will be employed in the new systematics.

But a more accessible effort is also being made at expressing, at an A.B. or M.Div. or M.A. level, an ongoing theological view that would communicate some of the results of the more basic research. Darren Dias (Toronto) is heading up this project, as part of the work of our Institute. The project will, like everything else that is being proposed here, be an ongoing work needing constant updating, revision, and supplementation.

(Skip To Economics) Work has to continue to go on at these two levels, with each of them feeding the other. Moreover, there must be brought forward into systematics the basic fruit to date in the hermeneutical and historical work of some of those who represent what has been called the third quest for the historical Jesus, and notably the work of those who rely on Lonergan's critical realism in the quest, particularly Ben F. Meyer and N.T. Wright. I hope through work that I am doing now to show how basic advances in exegesis and history can bear fruit in a contemporary systematic synthesis. Lonergan intended such integration when he described his functional approach to theological specialization as articulating the process from data (including primarily biblical sources) to results (systematics and contemporary communications).

I cannot emphasize too strongly, though, that all this work is in the initial stages. We are not used to doing systematics in the way that Lonergan and I are calling for it to be done, and it will take considerable time for the systematic work to swing into some sort of ongoing genetic sequence of schemes of recurrence. Catholic theology is being reconstructed, as Lonergan says in *Method in Theology*, and we are in the initial stages of that work. Moreover, the contemporary interreligious context for all such work demands that we create, step by step, an entirely new

language in which to speak about the work of divine grace in human history. Herculean labors, indeed!

Economics

In a 2012 article in *Huffington Post*, Pierre Whalon singled out Lonergan's approach to macroeconomics as a truly scientific advance that just might enable us to articulate a moral dimension that could guide capitalism, a dimension that would promote flourishing in an equitable fashion. I have long suspected that this is the case ever since I first began to study Lonergan's economics and to listen to at least some of those who understand it better than I do. But it also seems to me that a massive job remains to be done to develop the implications of his macroeconomics in areas that he did not touch on in a substantial way, and particularly in the whole area of finance, and also in finding a way to communicate to a wider public (and even to economists) his insights into the two phases of the economy and the moral dimension inherent in their interrelations.

Part of that work, I think, has to entail dialogue with ongoing economic developments, including Thomas Piketty's proposals in *Capital in the Twenty-first Century* and *Economics of Inequality*. Lonergan and Piketty, I believe, acknowledge the same problem, though they express it in different terms and suggest different solutions. I have already asked Paul St. Amour, whom I regard as perhaps the clearest exponent of Lonergan's economics, to present a paper at the spring 2018 colloquium relating Lonergan and Piketty.

For the remainder of this section, my comments have been contributed to by Joseph Ogbonnaya, whom I have asked to head up the work of the Institute in the area of economics and globalization.

Globalization as the reality and intensification of worldwide interconnectedness made possible by information technology has come to stay, no matter how much various nationalist populist movements may complain about its present functioning. In the words of Pope St. John Paul II, globalization is neither good nor bad. Much depends on what we make of it. Its various forms, when they are functioning at their best – whether those forms be religious (evangelization of peoples and the dialogue of world religions), economic (integration of the world economy), political (uniting of world governments or regions through ideas, norms, and values), cultural (imbibing of common meanings through various means of communication), or environmental (efforts at protecting the global ecology) – aim at creating common ground for human interrelatedness, prosperity, and sustainable development.

In the view of Joseph Ogbonnaya, Lonergan did grasp the dynamics of globalization to the extent that was possible by the time he completed his work. He repudiated both the idea of infinite progress with no limits to growth inherent in neoliberal capitalism and the Marxist reduction of cultural values to class struggle. On the contrary, he, like other Christian ethicists, held that history always remains open, open to sin, susceptible to destruction, and capable of responding to redemption. Thus he fashions a heuristic structure of history with the help of the three basic categories of progress, decline, and redemption. He calls for a radical criticism of economics as human science in its three principal variants – the

traditional market economy, the Marxist-inspired socialist economy, and the new transnational economy constituted by the giant corporations. In 'Healing and Creating in History' he observes that globalization is characterized by global governance, the use of large capital, quests for cheap raw materials, a global market network, and stiff competition. He recognizes the adverse effects of globalization on developing and developed countries due to the multinational companies' quest for maximization of profit.

The further dimensions of globalization in its current multifaceted forms – the many visions of development, alternative paths, the ethics and politics of change, the emergence of post-colonial and de-colonial discourses, the new critical traditions such as feminist and/or ecological economics, etc. – did not come into play until after Lonergan's time. And so Lonergan studies and Lonergan's students continue to engage the various discourses of globalization and development.

Joseph Ogbonnaya has kindly noted that in *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (1990) and some of my later writings, the notions of a world-cultural humanity and the integral scale of values as responses to globalization serve not only to counter the tendency to imperialism on the part of the stronger, more developed countries against the developing countries, but also to foster perseverance in the duality in tension of limitation and transcendence.

The challenge that globalization poses, then, is one of coming to grips with the reality of greater human interconnectedness in such a way that globalization becomes a factor that promotes human progress and development without leading to mechanomorphic instrumentalization of the human person, human communities, and the cosmos. In other words, the question is, How do we give globalization a

human face, make it serve humanity, promote greater human belongingness and participation in the world in ways beneficial to humanity crossculturally and beneficial to the cosmos as a whole? How does Christianity respond to the contemporary globalized lifeworld by sustaining a genuineness that enriches the world-cultural community? The project of humanizing globalization is not just an external process about reform but involves a transformation of human subjects so that they abide by the inner law of the human spirit responsible for authentic existence: attentiveness, intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility, as well as being in love. The project of humanizing globalization will draw from Christian anthropology and cultural and religious studies, to dialogue with human and social sciences engaged in global political and economic issues, with the aim of bringing about conversion and social transformation, progress and development.

Ecological Culture

I believe that the basic tension of limitation and transcendence cuts through all of the dimensions or foci of the Institute's work and integrates them with one another. Nowhere is this more the case than in the elaboration of a scientific ecological viewpoint that would support and encourage implementation of the emphases of Pope Francis's encyclical *Laudato Si'*. The encyclical has underscored the indispensable ecological responsibility entailed by the Christian vocation. Further, Pope Francis's scathing critiques of the moral bankruptcy of current schemes of recurrence have been placed in bold relief in light of ever-worsening cycles of environmental degradation. To reverse these cycles of decline and to mediate redemptive recovery, Pope Francis has called for a renewal of politics and economics (LS 189-198).

In the last century, writing with a worldwide depression and two world wars as part of recent memory, Lonergan articulated an account of redemption that aimed to reverse the ‘reign of sin’ – personal, social, and general bias – that led to such decline. At the heart of his account and as this account has been developed by interpreters such as Neil Ormerod and myself, lie *conversion* and the *integrity of the scale of values*.

Indeed, central to the vision of *Laudato Si'* are the notions of ‘ecological conversion’ and ‘integral ecology.’ The parallels are hardly coincidental. Ecological conversion, ‘whereby the effects of [Christians’] encounter with Jesus Christ become evident in their relationship with the world around them’ (LS 217), is buoyed by an entire set of religious, moral, intellectual, and psychic conversions.

On ten occasions in *Laudato Si'*, Pope Francis employs the phrase ‘integral ecology’ to remind readers that ‘It cannot be emphasized enough how everything is interconnected’ (LS 138, a phrase itself repeated four times). My own exploration of Lonergan’s scale of values affords one way of sorting out how precisely everything is interconnected, an essential task that is implied by Pope Francis’s call. This includes the connection between environmental degradation and the ongoing and increasing victimization of the poor. Even more, much of the possibility of an enduring implementation and reception of *Laudato Si'* rests on both a proper differentiation and integration of religious, personal, cultural, social, and vital values. The emerging cultural values that need to be implemented on a global scale must contain an ecological balance of limitation and transcendence in all human endeavors: hence, talk of an ecological culture.

On this front I have engaged the work of a doctoral student at Catholic University of America, Lucas Briola, to present a paper at this colloquium in which the emphases of *Laudato Si'* are integrated with Lonergan's work, with my work in *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, and with Neil Ormerod's further explorations of the reach of the scale of values and their relation to ecological conversion. I have also asked Lucas to head up the task of organizing the portion of the work of the Institute devoted to the promotion of an ecological culture. I am grateful to him for helping me put together this part of my talk today.

Critical Realism and the Quest for the Historical Jesus (as the beginning of a hermeneutical project)

Lonergan writes in *Method in Theology* (276): 'Scholarship builds an impenetrable wall between systematic theology and its historical religious sources, but this development invites philosophy and theology to migrate from a basis in theory to a basis in interiority. In virtue of that migration, theology can work out a method that both grounds and criticizes critical history, interpretation, and research' (that is to say, the scholarship that built the impenetrable wall). That method then allows functional specialization, which is the core of the method itself, to redraw the map of theology in its entirety. Functional specialization slowly tears down the wall, and a theology is constructed through an ongoing collaboration that displays a cumulative process from data, that is, from historical religious sources and especially from biblical sources, to results, to a renewed systematic theology and to communications that are rooted in both sound exegesis and history and in coherent systematic understanding.

Vis-à-vis the impenetrable wall, Peter Laughlin proposes another image: ‘Theology and historical Jesus studies could be compared to estranged cousins who through some strange turn of events happen to arrive at the same family party unbeknownst that the other was going to be there. Having seen each other across the room, much effort is then expended on both sides ensuring that a sufficient number of other guests remain between them so as to prevent a direct confrontation. For their part, theologians tend to decry the various quests for the historical Jesus as misplaced adventures into history that result in nothing but irrelevances for faith. On the other hand, historical Jesus scholars are quite critical of the theologians’ practice of playing ostrich – willfully hiding their head in the sand, hoping that the flurry of historical activity around them will go away without disturbing their carefully laid and systematized nest.’

The wall that modern scholarship built between sources and system was impenetrable until a cognitional theory was proposed that could ground and criticize critical history, interpretation, and research, that is to say, until exegetes, historians, and scholars became critical realists. A few exegetes, historians, and scholars have been influenced, directly or indirectly, by Lonergan’s cognitional theory, and to that extent have led the way, have migrated to a basis in interiority, and in so doing have begun to recover the historical religious sources in a manner that allows a cumulative process from data to results to go forward. They have begun to tear down the wall.

One of the first dominant figures in this movement, in my view, the real pioneer, was the late Ben F. Meyer. Pages 76-110 in *The Aims of Jesus*, that is, the two chapters entitled ‘Jesus and Critical History’ and ‘History and Faith,’ begin to tear

down the wall. Joining Meyer, adding to his accomplishments, and when necessary revising them is N.T. Wright. James D.G. Dunn has also made significant contributions, especially to the understanding of the movement from the historical Jesus to the earliest Christian communities.

Wright, I find, proposes what in effect may be a needed addition to Lonergan's cognitional theory, in terms of the specific kind of knowledge contained in and expressed through symbols, stories, and praxis. My hope is that the Institute would help this movement of critical realism in New Testament exegesis to continue to go forward. There is a great deal of resistance to it in some quarters, and yet at the same time the potential for an integration of the two phases of theology, for a sequence of steps in the process from data to doctrinal and systematic results, is enormous. I have asked Joseph Gordon, who completed a doctoral dissertation at Marquette last year on material closely related to these issues, to head up this portion of the Institute's work. As the work of this group goes forward, I hope they can incorporate scholars of other religious traditions in an ongoing critical-realist assembly of the basic data needed for the process that would result in the emergence of a world theology, where all the major religious traditions of the world collaborate in meeting the issues that must be met if a truly humanized globalization is to take place in a manner that is informed by the values of an ecological culture.

There's the dream. Let the work begin!