

## Fusion 10

### Structuring Fusionism I

The evening of April 27<sup>th</sup> 2009 is for me a startling time. Quietly it has all fallen into place, at least in some heuristic : both Lonergan’s problem of writing *Method* as he spoke to me of it in the 1960s, and the controlling structure of future global collaboration as it falls into place now, but is to be spelled out during this Summer. The day began with talking to my sister Nancy, whose 84<sup>th</sup> birthday it was, in the pre-dawn Vancouver light. It ended as I was half-way through *Knots and Crosses*, a novel by Ian Rankin,<sup>1</sup> but the leap had occurred during my reading of Part Two of that novel, titled “For Those Who Read Between The Times”. I am not about to spoil the book for potential readers, but I find it curious to think of my labour in the Alphabet Soup of Fusion 5, fermenting along afterwards through the three Fusions on *Method in Theology*, 153, note 1, the fermenting really being about the shift, over nearly twelve years - Summer 1953 to Spring 1965 - in Lonergan’s meaning of *audience* as he expressed it in *The Sketch* of chapter 17 of *Insight*.<sup>2</sup>

I am amused now as I write at the end of this April day, thinking of my recent<sup>3</sup> mentioning of the 40+ years it took me to figure out Lonergan on **energy**, and now to think myself slower than that - 44 years - in thinking out, well, the obvious. The title of

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the first (1987) of Ian Rankin’s John Rebus books. It is first of three in the volume I have to hand: Ian Rankin, *Rebus: The Early Years*, Orion 1999.

<sup>2</sup>*Insight* 580[602]. This, for me, is a key text in the struggle to understand Lonergan’s struggle, his “reading between the times”, and it is worth being repetitive about it. “ .... they are pure formulations if they proceed from an interpreter that grasps the universal viewpoint and if they are addressed to an audience that similarly grasps the universal viewpoint.” Twelve years later the audience is split up functionally, and fifty years later I would think of the operations and the addressing in terms of the **Operator** and the operations that I try to describe briefly in this Fusion and in Fusion 14.

<sup>3</sup>See note 9 of *Fusion 13*.

Part One of *Knots and Crosses* is "There are Clues Everywhere". Only, as the novel presents it, if you are tuned in, and that, indeed, primarily on the neurodynamic level, are the clues lit up and the answer obvious. When I asked Lonergan, in his room in Regis College, Bayview Avenue Toronto - it was the Summer of 1966 - about his new discovery, he remarked, "Well its obvious: you just double the structure". He went on, sitting facing me, with his two sets of four fingers not quite touching, to give me a ten-minute lecture. It was at a later date that he paced his room talking energetically about his problem: "What am I to do? I cannot put all of *Insight* in to chapter 1 of *Method*". Nothing was obvious to either of us, and what he finally did was a descriptive introduction with patched-in essays that really were not pointedly functional. But I am repeating myself of previous writings.

What I puzzle about now is, How much of the future science of global collaboration was obvious to him in that Summer of 1966? Or even in the Summer of 1971, when he lectured for the last time on *Method*, in Dublin, during which he once claiming to me, as we walked to the lecture hall that the stuff of the day before, on the good, "was much better than *Method*": he had finished the typescript, and I was about to undertake the job of indexing. I leave the larger subtle question to later researchers etc, but it seems to me that he was not then thinking seriously of the lift to be given to *Method* by bringing in the explanatory power of *Insight*; he was thinking contextually of improved description. This is true even of his later remarks about the much-more he could have done in chapter 6 on *Research*. I do not think that he was thinking of research then in the full richness that fermented forth for me in the last ten years: the richness that would come from thinking forward his pointing to the value of leaning on successful science.<sup>4</sup> Nor is this surprising, granted his sickness and his tiredness, and the age - just over 61 years - at which functionality fell into place for him. It took me more than thirty years to notice that obviousness.

---

<sup>4</sup>*Method in Theology*, 3-4.

Yet, having noticed and developed that obviousness, should I not have got the main point I joy in now, since the clues were everywhere. Again, that is the problem of clues, the problem of “unlit phantasm” - where, of course, I would have you think of *unlit phantasm*, in the fullness of cosmic neurodynamics, but let us not get into that.<sup>5</sup> A little experiment helps here. I can say now that my puttering towards a better terminology for the Standard Model in Fusionism was generating clues before my face - or behind my spectacles if you are really tuned into the position! When I worked out the symbolism represented by W3 over twenty years ago,<sup>6</sup> the common piece normatively shared by all specialties was UV. But I would note that UV was not a vague thing, but an empirical bent within a content.

Again, I do not wish to repeat myself on this zone’s development, but I would note that, in the initial stages of development, UV can be expected to be something worked forward, “with cumulative and progressive results,”<sup>7</sup> by the people attempting Dialectic within “The Structure” sketched by Lonergan, *Method*, 249-250, even staying with his conventional three conversions, “intellectual, moral and religious.”<sup>8</sup> And

---

<sup>5</sup>This is a large and complex topic that I have touched on before, one increasingly attended to in neurodynamics, and one related to my final comments in the present essay.. My last two copies of *The Economist* talk of recent work on “the aha! moment itself” (April 18<sup>th</sup> 2009: p.87 of a brief article on “The Incognito”) and, in “Wired” talks of “Connectomics aims to map the atlas of the brain”(April 11<sup>th</sup> 2009, 82). The pointings are in Lonergan, and one can notice his efforts at refinements: see e.g. the change on page 205 of *The Triune God: Systematics* (1964 version) from the early view of *Divinarum Personarum* (late 1950s), found in *The Triune God: Systematics*, 745. The later view talks of “wondering arising” prior to formation of phantasm. Think of this, as best you can, within a chemodynamic context and connect it with the cosmic longing of energy for infolding. Then entertain the statement, “Dr Sheth thinks this may be capturing the ‘transformational thought’ (the light-bulb moment, as it were ) in action, before the brain’s ‘owner’ is consciously aware of it” (*The Economist*, April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2009, 87).

<sup>6</sup>W3 is available in various publications, but perhaps most immediately on the Website, with other such Metagrams, in *Prehumous 2*, “Metagrams and Metaphysics”.

<sup>7</sup>*Method in Theology*, 4.

<sup>8</sup>*Method in Theology*, 250.

indeed, I would not expect the initial effort to be too serious about the “further objectification .... from developing ....by reversing what he [or she] has regarded as counter-positions.”<sup>9</sup> So, we would get people collaborating about positionings that are conventional, but moving towards precessions and sophistications: I think here of the work Mark Morelli has done, on Hegel and on Stewart towards such sophistication.<sup>10</sup> And Stewart is a good pointer towards a shift in sophistication, in that he gives the interest, and Plato, a methodological twist.<sup>11</sup> That methodological twist will gradually lean the searching away from common sense thinking towards those that influence or are directly involved in science, taken in its broadest meaning. I mention this shift in Fusion 13 and do not wish to go much further about it here, beyond my little final nudge here about our meaning of *emergent probability*. But what is important in the methodological shift is the lean it gives to the character of reflection, a lean towards pragmatism: “How does this view work out in our search for our global future?” That lean towards pragmatism is to get into the blood of the Tower Community: again, a regular topic in my reflections on the new culture of care.

Back to the topic of reversing counterpositions. It is a tricky task that relates not only to interpretation but to history both as a counterposition effects what “goes on” and as its reversal might have effected goings-on. We are in the zone here of contrafactual history, indeed of a statistics of events that surrounds facts with possibilities. I would note that this last phrase “**a statistics of events that surrounds facts with possibilities**” helps us to get discomfoting light on the challenge of moving

---

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup>Mark Morelli has presented his view on Hegel over the past few years at Conferences in Melbourne and Boston. The Melbourne papers are still in process of publication, as also are the boston papers, to emerge in the usual format. The Stewart book, however, is available and brilliantly opens many doors. MarkD.Morelli, *At the Threshold of the Halfway House. A Study of Bernard Lonergan’s Encounter with John Alexander Stewart*, The Lonergan Institute at Boston College, 2007.

<sup>11</sup>See especially pages 167-73 of the book mentioned in the previous note.

toward an adequate Standard Model of Tower collaboration in these next generations. And I would prefer to dwell on that here<sup>12</sup> rather than getting into the fruit of reversing counterpositions, which is a regular enlargement, indeed a genetic enlargement, of that component of the Standard Model that I have named *GS*. Still, perhaps I should pause here to identify that division of the Standard Model as I now see, but identify it in a helpful way, in my stages of discovering of it.

The nature of the seventh specialty was a problem for me right through the 1960s and 1970s. In the late 1970s I pushed into the Lonergan typescript *De Intellectu et Methodo*<sup>13</sup> and I was lifted forward to envisage the systematics of the seventh specialty as a genetic systematics, an integral system of systems. I was still two decades away from thinking symbolically of this in the full sense of a Markov<sup>14</sup> global image that included a full geohistory of non-overlapping, overlapping, merging, etc etc contexts, so let us leave that aside. From conversations with philosophers and theologians I have found that the simple genetic thing is already quite a challenge. One has to imagine, for a start, that each great thinker is a slice of the genetic structure, with, say, Aristotle an early slice and Aquinas coming later in the growing frog of systematic meaning. Now think of getting new slices by picking up on what is good in, say, Plotinus or Bonaventure: the “picking up” is of the style of a reversal of counterposition. So, for example, the emphasis on darkness in both these chaps is picked up as important, as to be thematically included.

But - to hurry on - what is important now is to notice that this genetic systematics

---

<sup>12</sup>I return to the topic after some distractions, after note 19 below.

<sup>13</sup>There is a translation of this text, titled “Understanding and Method”, by Michael G.Shield (1990) available from the Toronto Lonergan Centre. I quote the relevant section on pages 12-13 of *Cantower 7*, “Systematics and General Systems Theory”. That Cantower puts the issue in a larger context.

<sup>14</sup>See P.McShane, *Randomness Statistics and Emergence*, Gill Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1970, 237.

becomes part of what is circulated, supplementing the empirically-enriched UV. Further, there is what I mean by *F*. The community shares a meaning for *F*, for functionality, one that has a concomitant growth. So we have a breakdown into components of the standard model: **UV + GS + F**. This is a growing thing [and think!] and a scientific thing [and think!] in the Tower community, which is - normatively - the community of culture and not some theological ghetto or philosophic monarchy. This is the contemporary cosmopolis, the best we can do. I would note that this cyclic collaboration is out of touch with old science and non-science and nonsense: physics does not take seriously the flat earth society. Physics can rejoice in the memory of epicycles, and if it bows to Archimedes and Newton it does so in various limited fashions. One of those limited fashions is a subset of the dealings that are the task of the eighth specialty, on which I do not delay here.<sup>15</sup> But the mention of a specialty-task gives me a fuller<sup>16</sup> lift of symbolization of the system that is fusionism: **(UV + GS + F) $F_i$** . **(UV + GS + F)** is, in a parallel with present progress and usage in physics, an **operator**. It is an open operator, taking its meaning for contemporary achievement but remaining tuned thematically to its own incompleteness.<sup>17</sup> It operates on  $F_i$ , where *I* runs from 1 to 8, or, if you like there is recycling with  $9 = 1$ .  $F_i$  represents one of the focused contemporary pieces of the recycling process that is handing on and round present possible progressive results. What does the operator do? Physics people will be

---

<sup>15</sup>Comparison and contrast are activities that find a place in the output of the eighth specialty, but I would not that there is a meaning of *Comparison* determined by the structure of methodical collaboration, described on *Method in Theology* 250, that gives it a solidly constructive scientific sense.

<sup>16</sup>The operator is enough for the moment: we'll see further about its density and development in *Fusion 14*. The concluding comments in this essay give hints about the need to view it in a way that parallels, e.g. looking at Einstein's equation for spacetime structures, which looks deceptively simple.

<sup>17</sup>This is a remote and complex problem. In an axiomatics, theorems of incompleteness would occur at various levels and junctures.

with me immediately when I say that it is a raising operator: its effect on  $F_i$  is to make it  $F_{i+1}$ . "Make it", yes, there is the problem of the inner dynamics of the mature operator, where now I think of the operator as the one in whose mind and blood the **Operator** is. Best to leave more on that to Fusion 14.

Let me now return, briefly, to my initial reflections on Lonergan's puzzle about writing *Method* and on related matters. They will be shared and supplemented by discussions at the Halifax meeting of July 6-10, 2009, when we are to make a serious effort to sense collaborative living. It was in preparation for the 2008 meeting in Halifax, the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Lonergan's *Insight* lectures that I began to sense the pressure on him, from that year on, to go some way towards *haute vulgarization*. I was to hear him for the first time in Dublin, Easter 1961, less than three years later, and in that first lecture he told, with some vigour, the story of Einstein having tea and being asked by his companion to put his relativity theory "in my own simple words, without equations."<sup>18</sup> I watched, sensed, that pressure on him - and on his writings - in the five decades since, but I make no attempt here to give any account of it.<sup>19</sup> But what I wish to do is pause discomfotingly over the phrase **boldfaced** above, regarding statistics, and then end abruptly till we take up the problem of structure and function in fusion 14.

Let me repeat the phrase: "**a statistics of events that surrounds facts with possibilities**". How do you read it? Is it satisfactory, in the way in which "relativity in my own simple words, without equations" would have been satisfactory to Einstein's tea-companion? This needs an honest pause, the sort of pause that should occur when one is a serious dialectician working through the invitation of page 250 of *Method*, forced to admit, perhaps as here, that the world of serious understanding, called *theory*,

---

<sup>18</sup>The first lecture of the Dublin lectures of Easter 1961 is not available; the other four can be had from the Toronto Lonergan Centre.

<sup>19</sup>I suspect that I will need to write more about it when I come to write the Introduction to the book by Pierrot Lambert and Philip McShane, *Bernard Lonergan: His Life and Leading Ideas*, which should be ready for publication in 2010, in English and French.

is quite foreign, that you fit uncomfortably well under Lonergan's long and telling description<sup>20</sup> of what, I would claim, is the vast majority of contemporary intellectuals, "Lost in some no man's land between the world of theory and the world of common sense."<sup>21</sup>

The boldfaced phrase is not a fringe thing in Lonergan's view: it points to the heart of his view of history, of his full heuristic **form**<sup>22</sup> of history, which is a "realization in accord with successive schedules of probability."<sup>23</sup> The discomfiting pause is a pause in which one may realized that it the phrase is little more than words, even worse, that your notion of probability is a standard commonsense erroneous one.<sup>24</sup> I surmise, at any rate, that you are not up to writing down any single sample of a probability schedule, with its fractioned range of possibilities. Am I right? If I am wrong, then you are can at least scribble down the Normal Law expression and perhaps even talk of the estimates and significance of variance: then you are definitely the exception to the normal law of Lonerganist competence. Indeed, the relevant law in that competence would seem to be, not the Normal Law, but the Poisson Distribution. And, tell me, or rather, tell yourself, how much of *Insight* is like that? Did you skim past Archimedes on the first page, "without equations"?

The big difficulty with functional collaboration is the failure of several generations of Lonergan followers to follow. In terms of the operator expression I gave above, the problem is not  $F_i$ , but the missing operator,  $(UV +GS + F)$  of which  $F$  is not

---

<sup>20</sup>*Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 121. See also there, p. 155, and in Volume 10, see p. 145.

<sup>21</sup>*Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 121.

<sup>22</sup>**Form, essence, quiddity**, whatever. There is "the ever recurrent danger of discoursing on quiddities without suspecting that quiddity means what is to be known through scientific understanding."*(Insight*, 509[533]).

<sup>23</sup>*Insight* 125[148-9].

<sup>24</sup>On this, see *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence*, chapter 4, "Reasonable Betting".



at all serious as a problem zone.<sup>25</sup> But what was Lonergan to do when he tackled writing about this in the late 1960s? “Put all of *Insight* into chapter one of *Method*”? Perhaps what he did through tiredness and sickness was, after all, not too bad as a strategy: invite the operations of collaboration to begin, and in a generation or two, the weak grip, in the operators, on the necessary **operator** would be revealed by the stumbling global omnidisciplinary operating.

---

<sup>25</sup>Again, this topic is best left to *Fusion 14*. It is useful to consider, in an elementary fashion, how Functional Collaboration, the meaning of **F** as a component of the standard model, fulfils the needs described by Lonergan as Cosmopolis in the concluding part of *Insight* chapter 7. See *Joistings 22*, “Reviewing Mathews’ *Lonergan’s Quest*, and Ours.” See also note 2 above.