

Q. 11. This question is really an amalgam of questions stemming from the Halifax gathering and Skipper Site members: **how might we proceed?**

A. 11 (August 12th)

Greetings All,

Since the Halifax N.S. July gathering I, and others, have been pondering over how to proceed in the matter of sowing seeds for a future to functional collaboration and generalized empirical method. Both John Raymaker and I are convinced that a key element in this sowing is the fostering of structures, definable groups working towards the beginning of globalization. Others share this view: Chae Young Kim, Bob Henman, Conn O'Donovan, and various groups in different ways.

[I would note that such people share – to various extents – my discontent with the way Lonergan studies have gone in the past 50 years. My discontent, however, is more discomfiting to myself and other “elder Lonergan students” in that it leads “a senior Lonergan scholar” to taking a stand against old friends and colleagues. The discomfort is eased through my claim that I am following, in the somewhat loose fashion that the times demand, the requirements of dialectic as sketched in the second half of *Method* 250. So, for example, regularly I am loosely “indicating the view that would result from developing what he has regarded as positions and by reversing what he has regarded as counterpositions” (250: lines 26-28).]

A major difficulty – and I shall follow that up below or with individuals - is the general busyness of people. Various previous efforts have failed on that account. A second major difficulty is that the X called functional collaboration, and its component generalized empirical method, are quite remote in meaning and almost non-existent in practice.

So the full issue is, how can small groups like those on the Skipper site or those gathered at Halifax, foster either GEM or FS? Each of us can continue both to ponder these questions and to try, in personal ways, to do some fostering.

My own conclusions from a month of musing and writing are as follows:

Others may well tackle the task of pushing forward present or new groups – like Skipper, SGEME - but I personally don't have the energy to meet such demanding tasks. So, my own agenda emerges now and others may either cooperate or take the agenda as a model for, or just a nudge towards, different personal reachings.

So, first, it has become my priority not to further seek to influence old sub-groups but to focus my attention on re-orientating the full but loose group covered by the name “Lonergan Studies” by bringing together some few willing to struggle towards supporting a definite new orientation within that loose group. Of course, my invitation is open. I invite members of the Halifax Group or the SGEME team, or those associated with them, to join my efforts in promoting what I call – casually but pointedly – **Fusionism**. Casually? Pointedly? In the long run the name Lonerganism is not viable, for reasons I won't

bother listing here. BUT the new name is not important. What is important is the re-orientation **or its explicit, articulate, rejection.**

The re-orientation is a matter of both infiltration and standard-raising.

The key standard-raising is, as I see it at present threefold: [a] get the elements of meaning connected with their neurochemical under-layers; [b] push into functional collaboration the “eigenfunctions” (*Insight*, 603, third last line) development of interpretation; [c] get going some acknowledgment of the tasks of the second half of *Method* 250. These three are central discomforts, gaps, of present Lonergan studies. I already have collaborators preparing to venture into those zones. But I would note that there are a host of other zones screaming for development and in particular I would note [d] the central thesis of the book, *The Road to Religious Reality*, which brings together the problem of the meaning of *Comparison* (*Method*, 250) with the problem of “a treatise on the mystical body of Christ” (*Insight*, 763); [e] the problems in economics raised in the appendix of that book.

My Strategy?

I add to my up-front Website effort of Q. and A. re functional talk a new “Posthumous” series: *Posthumous* 1 and 2 are already posted there. I am pushing front-line territories here in perhaps a style that should annoy settled Lonergan students. To this strategy I add the possibility – relating to infiltration – of offering workshops in “Lonergan Locations”.

After a good deal of musing I have decided that I must curtail myself to this limited complex of strategies. But they obviously include collaboration with others, and, as indicated, I invite others – to whom I send this out, and to others reached by them, or to casual readers - for this effort also goes as an answer to a Q.11 on my Website – to join me in my efforts in an explicit way: sign in with me as this new group fostering *Fusionism*. This is a fresh start for me and I would hope in the autumn to identify members publically [with their permission], and, further, to add, as the year flows on, direct appeal to particular people within Lonergan studies.

I plead for serious discernment in joining the Fusionism effort. First, there is the broad warning: don’t rock the boat on doctorate studies or employment. Next I would note that some great people just don’t have the time: to these I say, Survive and Stay Sane, feed – in every sense - yourself and your dependents. Then I would suggest that some people just don’t have the background for the effort and would best operate in fostering general interest in related projects - e.g. [e] above, or local problems in their own disciplines or locations.

And all of us can push in supporting innovative established zones: Skipperweb, the new Marquette *Lonerganforum*, SGEME, the *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*, etc, and also in being effectively alert to out-reaching zones such as are fermenting in Korea, China, Columbia, Australia, the Philippines, etc. Obviously, too, there are settled zones of Lonergan journals and meetings that need shaking up. Who says they need shaking up? Well, that is certainly my undisguised claim in both the Q. and A. site and in the new series, *Posthumous*.

So, I halt abruptly. I am interested [i] in others expressing their stands publically or privately to me or each other on the Skippersite, or in the Lonerganforum, or in Questions to my site; [ii] in the emergence of collaborators with time to climb; [iii] most importantly, in the public expression of opposition to my views and efforts. **It would be a fresh start if people would publically detail why they consider that I am quite wrong in this push beyond conventional Lonergan studies.**