

SURF O

Prologue

The series is directed towards making a beginning in functional collaboration. A few preliminary remarks are useful here, though some are repeated in SURF 1 and SURF 2. So, I should start with the announcement of the project as it appeared in the *Loneragan Newsletter* of December 2008:

Project: Global Functional Collaboration

The term *Global* indicates both omnidisciplinary and geohistorical intent. The collaboration is that discovered by Loneragan in 1965, and published first in 1969: *Gregorianum* 50, 485-505. The fortieth anniversary of its appearance seems an appropriate time to take seriously the task of implementing that discovery of Cosmopolis, an effective move against decline. It is to be a cyclic global antifoundational collaboration that lifts both Richard Branston's popular Elders and *Wikinomics'* aspirations into a effective operative context. The effectiveness will take several generations to emerge but a beginning has to be made on developing the new differentiations of consciousness and language involved. A first meeting of interested parties was held at Concordia University in November 2009, and a first Conference was arranged for July 6th - 10th at St. Mary's University, Halifax (on this, see elsewhere in the Newsletter). Further gatherings round the globe are contemplated, but attendance at such gatherings is peripheral: what is essential is a community committed to this massive shift of Loneragan studies. The first Project director is Russell Baker of Concordia University, (e-mail: rsslbkr@citenet.net) with secretary Philip McShane. Expressions of interest should be sent to McShane at pmcshane@shaw.ca. **Website Collaborations will emerge gradually and be identified.**

This project was also announced at the beginning of SURF 2, which was the first of these essays to be written. There I note my own failure, since 1966, to tackle seriously

the task set by Lonergan through his discovery of 1965. Our task is to messily puzzle out and try out how we might shift to what I now call *Fusionism*, a dedicatedly collaborative empirical effort of luminous global reaching for humanity's well-being. The term, *Fusionism*, comes from the end of the second paragraph of Lonergan's description of "The Canon of Explanation" where he writes of how our search can "fuse into a single explanation."¹ But we will share more about that as we move along together. As we proceed you will note that Russell and I have taken up the challenge of having a shot at two specialties, Research and Communications. My effort is towards being a functional researcher; Russell is attempting to fulfil certain tasks of functional communication. I make no attempt here to spell out the character of our stumblings: we find that out together as we go along, beyond this series, in a series titled *Fusion*.

There are thirteen essays in this series, and I make no apologies for their stumbling character. They emerged as a project - within The Project - on November 1st, when a gathering in Concordia University showed interest in functional collaboration. The present essay, oddly labeled zero, was written at the end, and at the end of January 2009, as an effort to steer readers through the stumblings. I would claim, however, that the stumblings are not inaccuracies but merely disordered or non-ordered directions for collaboration. I do not see any other way to go in a present effort to initiate functional collaboration.

But what emerged clearly towards the end - should it not have been obvious to me all along? - was that if collaboration is to be seriously undertaken then it demands luminous decisions to collaborate. You need not collaborate with Russell and me, but it seems to me that Lonergan followers have to come explicitly to a decision about Lonergan's discovery of the solution to the problem of cosmopolis, a decision that involves some move to serious collaborative community as well as a move to finding one's **role** in the **tasks** of the **institution** of functional collaboration. Lonerganism has,

¹*Insight* 610[587].

for too long, dodged the brutally clear invitations of *Method in Theology*, 250.

At the end of these two months I am clearer - more fused! - regarding the moves forward, and could well cut out entirely the weaving effort needed to set up a context for a communal effort. Yet the weaving - it has two meanings - is worth including. It gives leads to that single-page Surf 11, which is like a university calendar description of a new higher-level course. And, indeed, from that viewpoint of calendar description, you might well move now right to the final essay, Surf 12, where I push your imagination to climb through the calendar descriptions of a new subject called *Fusion*. The new subject turns out - a conclusion of section 5 of Surf 12 - to be the heart of any subject, thus redefining both university and broader culture.

It seems best, then, for you to pick and chose, with some light from these introductory remarks. My notes for those remarks grew to be quite extensive, until it eventually dawned on me that brevity was called for. What of those notes, those directions? Optimistically I think of them as emerging from collaborative questing with me in these next years, and in these next millennia within the global community. The next few billion years are on our side!

So: a few further helpful comments. Yes, Surf 12 is a good starting place, then the two single-page essays Surf 6 and Surf 11: then Surf 1 and Surf 5, two other introductions. Surf 2, on Indian thinking, and Surf 4, on economics, are both heavy and specialized. Surf 3 is a broad reflection relating to contemporary spiritual reaching, evidently connecting to Surf 6. Surf 7 makes the point of the value of taking Lonergan as the subject of functional collaboration, tying in with my role of functional researcher. But this needs lots of collaborative thinking and talking and stumbling. Surf 8 and Surf 10 connect the effort to chapter 17 of *Insight*, and were in fact related to the beginning of a collaboration with a Montreal group.

Surf 9 seems to me to be of central importance in that it homes in on the positional problem. It points to an optimism of the slow cyclic lift of the Tower

Community into the position and the poosition, a new elite² home to be shared by Jack and Jill in their searchings for humanity's meaning. I struggled towards this pointing when writing *Cantower IX*, "Position, Poission, Protopossession" but had only a vague view of what I wrote of then as protopossession. I am much clearer on it now, but halt here. There is the pilgrim protopossession and there is the eschatological protopossession. On these, yes, I have something to say. Yet, with a grin, I recall Fermat's Last Theorem and his marginal comment. In various earlier writings I joked about Philmacs Last Theorem, which has to do with the eschatological dynamics of being. Fermat's last theorem can take its start from theorems about Galois representations and elliptic curves.³ Philmacs last theorem might take its start from theorems about the human minding of the existentially-dispersed incarnate Word: much more difficult to comprehend than those initial theorems of Wiley. Best leave the hundred page essay to a later woman writing in the fourth stage of meaning.

²*Method in Theology*, 14, 350-1, "quite difficult to be at home" "to be on the level of one's time" "at home in modern science" "elitist".

³See the early pages of Andrew Wiles, "Modular elliptic Curves and Fermat's Last Theorem", *Annals of Mathematics*, **142** (1995), 443-551.