

*Eldorede 10***Applying Lonergan's Suggestions about Education**

It seems best to pause here over the meaning of *context*.

Assuming a simple and obvious meaning, this lecture falls within the context of the previous three lectures and provides a context for the final general sessions when we seek to glimpse ways forward.

There is a more technical meaning that is supplied by Lonergan when he writes of an actual context as "a set of questions and answers"<sup>1</sup> and this technical meaning brings us right back to the beginning of the first lecture, when we paused over the minimal point of agreement with Lonergan. Do we have the set of answer, or the broad single answer, to the question posed there about a concept: does a concept come from the effort to understand, or is it something that requires a focus on it of the activity of understanding? The first lecture invited us to answer for ourselves: to find that, until we have tried successfully to understand what is given - a wheel, a stone, a sickness - we have not got a concept, we may not even have the vaguest idea. We can have a vague idea if someone helps us to a longer ordered name of the problem: so *round* may become a vague idea by memorizing the longer name, "locus of coplanar points equidistant from a fixed point". But have you possessed, have you been possessed, by the exciting grip on the new name that comes from grappling experientially with the scatteredness of the given, the wheel whirling on the axle, the malaria prostrating the patient?<sup>2</sup>

Now if we are honest at this stage of our introduction, we can first detect that, yes, we have a vague idea of Lonergan's challenge, either in this simple instance, or

---

<sup>1</sup>*Method in Theology*, 163-4, 183-4.

<sup>2</sup>The Appendix in my *Music That Is Soundless: A Fine Way for the Lonely Bud A*, Axial Publishing, 2006, uses the study of malaria as a basic analogue in grasping the nature of developing understandings of scriptures.

even in the case of the astonishing global scope of his final suggestion: let us collaborate globally, accepting the need we little humans have to function in a teamwork that would help us out of our present shambles of effeteness and anger and arms and aids and arrogance.<sup>3</sup>

But a little honesty of learning, and self-learning, can hold us to a firm NO: to reach a serious concept of what Lonergan is suggesting is way beyond us here, perhaps way beyond our present global cultures.

This NO is very important in our efforts to implement the new view. Serious self-appreciation is a genuine science that has to emerge: it can be blocked by its closed popularization, by what Lonergan calls *haute vulgarization*.<sup>4</sup> Open popularization is quite a different thing and involves a different mentality, somewhat like the mentality of introductory Buddhism, but perhaps for us better identified by the good teaching of physics. In that area, encouragement and a view of larger horizons are built into introductory work. We need something parallel in the present area, but it is a thing of the future, to come forth in dependence on functional specialization.

But here and now, we have the problem of our own actual contexts of questions and answers, and the manner in which what we are introducing today can shift that context in slight practical ways that can gradually change the culture. That, then, is our final context of reflection today: a positively disturbed context seeking to foster -

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 10.4 of chapter 3 of gives a context for an understanding of how a culture can “become a slum”, “become effete”. A further context is *Topics in Education*, section 3.3 of chapter 1.

<sup>4</sup>Lonergan talks of *haute vulgarization*, a type of popularization, twice in volume 6 of his *Collected Works*: pages 121 and 155, The irony of that inclusion is that much of the lecturing that he did, represented there, was something of an enforced popularization. The relations between popularization and pedagogy are difficult to make dialectically precise. The present essays on education touch on them, but I do not wish to give them thematic attention in this context. However, I note here that the pressure to talk in a comprehensible way to various audiences weakened his message and both handicapped both his own work and cut down among his disciples the serious commitment to remote scientific meanings.

luminously - slight changes in ourselves and our students. You will notice, perhaps, that we are moving along from the focus of the first lecture, on reaching more than a vague answer to a what-question, to the second lecture, where our reflection was on the what-to-do? question. In that context you can think of the interest here being in changing the present menus of education and life slightly and unobtrusively, but effectively.

The present menu in education is represented largely by present texts. I have had experience in dealing with such school texts of the later grades through trying to help local Canadian highschool students in such areas as mathematics, physics, and chemistry. The mathematics texts especially are a horror story, books full of colours and summaries and bad teaching. What can one do? The reality is that you have to get students through the system, and you have to fit into that system. I recall conversations with Lonergan about teaching, especially his challenge of teaching in Rome within the system of its division of topics and its sweep through the histories of such topics. He made the point regarding slow change and talked, in his own case, of pushing for one better section - or, as he called it, *thesis* - in a year. But the system, by and large, held him down. The Latin texts of those years are now emerging in translation, and the wise can see his struggle with standard divisions of material.

I myself have had the challenge of teaching from poor texts. I recall taking over a first year philosophy course where the standard text was *Question That Matter*.<sup>5</sup> It is a good illustration of what each of you are up against in your own area. Despite its title, questions and questioners did not really matter.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ed .L. Miller, *Questions That Matter. An Invitation to Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984. Obviously, I am not recommending that book: we have a copy only because my then-future wife, Sally, was among the suffering students.

<sup>6</sup>Here, I did just now an exercise that I used recommend to my students early in the year. Go to the book store and check the indices of books on child-study, education, psychology, etc etc, under the index at *Q*, I recall now a psychology text in which the index went directly from *Pubic* to *Rat*. But back to our text, and to its index. Yes, there it is: the same type of gap: under *Q*

The dominant perspective you are up against, as I was with that text, is a descriptive conceptualism, a dedicated truncatedness. It regularly results in a text-book which asks you and the students to begin with **basic concepts** and then somehow apply them in the course. That perspective may even be so bold as to add in a chapter at the beginning or an Appendix at the end on the method of physics or psychology or literature or whatever.<sup>7</sup>

What are you to do? First, I would say that you do nothing if you are half way through a school year, or at least do very little. Indeed, I would advise those of you who are heading back soon to teach to hold to what was the pattern dictated by texts and curriculum requirements. You may be doing your teaching quite well, if you are being driven by your spontaneity. But if so, you are finding, and will find increasingly more now, that you clash regularly with the style and directions of texts. This is true even of texts in the arts, in literature and history, but there is more room to maneuver in those areas.<sup>8</sup> However, my general point here is that it is a vacation or a sabbatical task - not solitary, if collaboration is possible - to seek out how you might shift your course so that both you and your students would get a glimpse, say, of the Childout Principle in operation in some particular zone, on some particular topic.

It would be foolish of me to try for a general answer to the what-to-do questions

---

there are indexed only *Qualities* and *Quantum mechanics*. I would note that, apart from doing this exercise and keeping its results in mind as they struggled through such other courses, my advice was towards going with the terrible flow, getting the credit.

<sup>7</sup>See chapter 3 of *Beyond Establishment Economics*, ( Bruce Anderson and Philip McShane, Axial Publishing, 2002) titled "Thinking Like an Economist". The chapter title is in fact the same title as that of a chapter of a standard text on economics. You would find it useful to view the treatment of the topic in that chapter of *Beyond Establishment Economics*, since it provides a good example of what a teacher may have to do with a present text in any subject. The strategy of dealing with such texts is further illustrated in the case of Chemistry by section 4 of Cantower 28, which deals in detail with a school text in Chemistry.

<sup>8</sup>A context for reflection on these areas is *Topics in Education*, chapters 9 and 10. We could not enter into this zone here with any profit.

that would face each of us in such a vacation effort. I have, with the help of others, given the best broad answer that we could in the present context of English-speaking education in the small book, *Introducing Critical Thinking*, where suggestions are made about particular areas of highschool education.<sup>9</sup> That, certainly, could be a take-off book for some of you. The book does pause to consider functional specialization at one stage, but I would say that this is not a zone of effective interest for us here and now. I will return to that very briefly in the conclusion of the lecture.

What seems good for me to do here - my own what-to-do question answered as I prepared for this day - is to take what is undoubtedly the most troublesome and confused zone of present education, economic education, and give some pointers about educational changes that could work. The importance of this decision of mine is that it brings to the fore a part of Lonergan's practical thinking that, if we are honest in accepting his integral suggestions, we cannot personally dodge here and now. There is involved in this something of what is called a grass-roots need, like the green movements in the party-politics of some countries. I am talking, then, about a component of education that Lonergan claims to be an essential part of a new common sense of living. We would be leaving our efforts quite incomplete, indeed very truncated, headless, if I did not mention, and we did not face, Lonergan's challenge of moving towards democratic economics.

Since we have been talking about contexts, we could stay within that talking and point to three contexts of changing towards democratic economics. There is the context of present formal education, and this context, to be number [2] in our reflections here, is the central context of my few present reflections. But there are the two other contexts: [1] the context that we talked of already as you and I in the immediacy of what we **can** and **need** to do; [3] the context of the massive shift to a global economic democracy,

---

<sup>9</sup>*Introducing Critical Thinking*, by John Benton, Alessandra Drage and Philip McShane, (Axial Publishing, 2005), is a text for a grade 12 philosophy course, but it moves through the normal subjects of the school curriculum with precise critical and creative suggestions.

where functional specialization is to play a vital effective role.

There is then the context of present need for anyone who is committed to taking Lonergan seriously. It is the need to enter personally into the mentality of economic democracy. This can best be sensed, vaguely intussuscepted, by reflecting on the phrase **rational expectations** that occurs in contemporary debates about economic control.<sup>10</sup> We can get a relevant meaning to that phrase by thinking in terms of statistics, but we need a little twisting and turning to do so. What, for instance, are the rational expectations of weights of Korean men or women? The rational expectations are embedded in statistical functions, but let us simply recall what we are familiar with: what is called a Bell-curve distribution. Descriptively, we expect a reasonable sample, for example, of measured weights of adult women to fit this curve. It is a reasonable expectation, a rational expectation, held by each of us to some degree, large or small, of sophistication. Non-mathematical students, for example, know - vaguely - that their class, if big enough, will have the exam results along a Bell curve.

That gives us a first notion of a rational expectation of a result, and we can now improve on it in a helpful way. Suppose we are interested in a change downwards of weights. It would be represented by a new Bell curve with a lower average. That makes democratic sense, and even the road to it makes democratic sense, especially these days when classifications on food labels help us towards a democratic view, or might I use the phrase **microautonomic** view?<sup>11</sup> This simply means that each of us can possess, personally, the view in question of the statistics and of the change. Further, we can participate in the move towards the change: counting calories, exercising, whatever. But

---

<sup>10</sup>The “Editorial Conclusion” of my *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, (Axial Publishing, 2002) deals broadly with this topic. For the place of rational expectations in advanced economic theory see O J Blanchard and S. Fisher, *Lectures in Macroeconomics*, MIT Press, 1993.

<sup>11</sup>I developed the notion of *microautonomy* first in the tenth chapter of *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations*, 1974. The book is available on the website [www.philipmcshane.ca](http://www.philipmcshane.ca).

note the key role here of classification and a commonsense ethos that tunes the literate into that classification and its results: fats, non-fats, whatever. Let us just focus on fats and non-fats, even though we all know that the whole business of fats, and of diets, is more complex. There is a flow of fats and non-fats in the community, in city and countryside, that can be shifted by microautonomous operations. None of this is new, but its spelling out in this way helps us on our way in the more difficult area of an exchange economy.

In the new economics there is to be a key role for a fundamental classification. Instead of fats and non-fats we have consumer and non-consumer goods, where the negative simply means the positive fact that the second class is at least useful for making the first. You can grow rice or potatoes without any implements, but a historic range of implements have emerged in both cases. And now the question can be posed: can we have something parallel in economics, in the class division of consumer and producer goods, to the microautonomy that we considered in talking about fat and non-fat and changes of these in diet-flows?<sup>12</sup>

At this stage I invite you to come back to Lonergan's struggle with this question, a struggle that lasted through that decade of his life when people are considered to be in prime thinking form: the decade before his fortieth birthday in 1944. I had the privilege of researching that struggle thoroughly over the quarter century 1973-98 and found, strangely, that odds and ends that he never built into his final analysis can be the source of starting light. So, I take our start from what he writes about Robinson Crusoe in one fragment, but I take the liberty of switching to a lady, Roberta Kim, on a local deserted island off the Korean coast. Here is what Lonergan writes:

---

<sup>12</sup>Working out the details of such flows can be remarkably useful in countering people who consider the new classification too complex to be practical. I note that I am not entering into the topic of the classifications of Lonergan here: one makes a beginning in the first chapter of *Economics for Everyone* and then, by using the illustrations and exercises that are needed to ingest the meaning into themselves, a much longer pedagogical version can emerge for helping others.

“When Roberta is clearing a new field, she is incapable of the illusion that that activity enables her to have more to eat here and now. When Roberta is reaping greater harvest from more numerous fields, she is incapable of the illusion that the corn she will not care to eat can be transmogrified into the capital equipment of, say, a power plant or another cleared field.”<sup>13</sup>

Does this make initial sense?

We are here at an important final stage of the introduction to Lonergan: what do I mean by *initial*? Perhaps there is a Korean way of thinking about this: the English word is from the Latin, **to go in**. Think, perhaps, of the Korean word associated with initiation into the Buddhist tradition or perhaps talk associated with going into a soccer tradition or into a musical tradition. Then you have a glimmer of what I mean by my use of *initial*: I am talking about exercise-instructions as initiation. In the case of Roberta, you find that you have to somehow go with her in imagination, over days and weeks. Recall our previous reflections on Helen Keller. Let me use the word *doctrine* in this context: we are talking then of a doctrinal sense of words, and if you now think of Buddhist doctrine then you probably know that a full doctrinal sense is a goal, an enlightenment that you might then perhaps no longer consider as **doctrine** but **arrival**. And you can stay with soccer or music as illustrations. A good soccer coach is enlightened. Nadia Boulanger, a previous illustration of these lectures,<sup>14</sup> was enlightened. This enlightenment - Buddhist, soccer, musical - is an achievement of years. And **knowing this** is to be part of the enlightenment we seek today, whether as Buddhist novices or as novices in Lonergan studies.

---

<sup>13</sup>B.Lonergan, *For A New Political Economy*, University of Toronto Press, 1998, 151. Lonergan was, of course, writing about Robinson Crusoe at the time. I have switched the text to suit Roberta for various odd reasons, including an interest in feminist possibilities. Roberta Kim seems appropriate for these lectures: most of my Korean friends have the name *Kim* and I have begun to suspect that it is equivalent to the Irish *Murphy*.

<sup>14</sup>See *Eldorede* 9, around note 25.



But let us return to this in relation to his economics. Initiation into Roberta's seemingly simple enlightenment is a beginning of economic democracy. But to carry you forward in it, in present culture, would require a great deal more time than we have today.

However, shifting to the second context listed, [2], helps us to view the carry forward in a helpful way. That is the context of formal education: and here let us keep our reflection concrete. One of Lonergan's great statements about the solution to our economic mess is worth quoting in full here, to give us his mood of both fantasy and hope:

"It will attack at once both the neglect of economic education and the blare of advertisements leading the economically uneducated by the nose: it will give new hope and vigor to local life, and it will undermine the opportunity for speculation corrupting central government and party politics; it will retire the brain trust but it will make the practical economist as familiar a professional figure as the doctor, the lawyer or the engineer."<sup>15</sup>

So, as I shift into the second context, [2], I am thinking of some few budding village economists among you, those few among you who are involved in formal economic education. For you there is the challenge of sowing seeds in teenagers that are to blossom later into new economic menus and diets. But there is also the challenge of educating willing colleagues: part of the contemporary crisis is a crisis of such humble collaboration.<sup>16</sup>

Keeping this broader collaboration in mind, let us pause over the how-to

---

<sup>15</sup>*For a New Political Economy*, 36-7.

<sup>16</sup>Contemporary scholars have difficulty thinking in terms of collaboration of any type, much less a collaboration that is humbly functional. This is true of the tradition in which Lonergan lived, the Jesuit tradition, where individualism was something that characterized the very first generation of Jesuits. It sadly prevails among present Lonergan students, and perhaps this is a reason why functional collaboration can be misrepresented as primarily a division of topics within one's own interest.

question in the case of highschool economics. Here I am attempting to be quite immediately practical. Indeed, I am touching briefly on the topic of my present larger effort and hope: I have collected school texts in economics from various parts of the globe in order to see how their stupidities might be undermined. Let us pause over an Australian text - obviously a Korean text would be preferable, but your elegant script and language blocks me here.<sup>17</sup>

There is no introduction to the book, or to the field of inquiry.<sup>18</sup> Chapter one plunges the teacher and student right into the topic “Features of the Global Economy”. It is a very plausible presentation, with maps and charts of the world economy and the “Gross World Product”. But might you not find a clue in that word *gross*? Yes, everything lumped together: but might you not notice another grossness? Back to the first word of the chapter “nature”. In what sense does this initial page guide you towards a grasp of the “**Nature** of the Global Economy”. Well, it just doesn’t: it rambles round lists: of countries, of rates of growth already warped by grossness.

Still, it is only an introductory section: might we get to the nature slowly, pedagogically? On you might go, through trade and globalization<sup>19</sup> to move, in the second section of the book,<sup>20</sup> to Australia’s place, with more gross numbers. But don’t give up hope yet. The third section of the book, “Economic Issues”<sup>21</sup> begins with a chapter on “Economic Growth.” Now there, indeed, is an issue worth brooding over.

---

<sup>17</sup>The Australian text I am using is Tim Riley, *Year 12 Economics 2006*, Tim Riley Publications Southwood Press, New South Wales, Australia, 2006. I refer to it below as **Riley**.

<sup>18</sup>Dr.Conn O’Donovan pointed out to me more recently that there is a grade 11 text, one I have not seen. I may get it later: would it not be marvelous if Riley had a sound view at the beginning of that grade? But then why would he have all that standard stuff in this text?!

<sup>19</sup>**Riley**, 3-84.

<sup>20</sup>**Riley**, 85-148.

<sup>21</sup>**Riley**, 149-242.

But alas, on we go with the “gross,” the gross analysis: the components of aggregate demand are the standard unnatural divisions and are identified as “The Sources of Economic Growth.”

Well, the first sentence there has the appearance of a clarification by classification: “The main sources of economic growth include components of aggregate demand such as consumption spending by households {C}; investment spending by firms {I}”<sup>22</sup> etc, and the next sentence might even tilt one towards hope of an analysis of nature: “Technological change is also an important driver of growth ....” But how do they source, how does it drive, and how might these relate rhythmically to {C} and {I}? We’ll get on to towards that question when we get back to Roberta’s illustrating of the basic nature of economic process. But, to end the survey of the text, I would note that the final fourth section is on economic management and policies.<sup>23</sup> If, as I claim, there is no analysis of the nature of economic process, what are such activities as fiscal and monetary policy-making based on?

The trouble with Riley’s reflections, or rather the problem you may have with them, is that, if you do not have some glimpse of the nature, the unavoidable natural rhythms, of the productive process, you are defenseless as a student or even a teacher. You are up to your armpits in the equivalent of pre-Kepler astronomy or pre-Lavoisier-Mendeleev chemistry.<sup>24</sup>

Now that sweep through a present text is certainly not a serious initiation into the problem of learning and teaching economics: but are we beginning to recognize

---

<sup>22</sup>**Riley**, 158.

<sup>23</sup>**Riley**, 243-342.

<sup>24</sup>The difference is that pre-Kepler astronomy was extraordinarily successful, and chemistry before Mendeleev - the journals help here - had sets of spontaneous controls to keep it on track. What about the global economy or its local subdivisions? The difficulty we face is that it would take a massive contrafactual historical analysis based on the missing sound theory to reveal the horrors of misdirection, mismanagement, brutal mistakes. And **Riley** is infested with those horrors.

how-to talk? You have to do your own page by page sweep, slowly, slowly. I have been sweeping along, in a sense deceptively, making claims about a failure to reach an answer to the question, What is the **nature** of economic process? But, as I said at the end of my presumptive sweep, without your slow critical sweep, have you anything more than my talk and your undirected puzzling? Are you, perhaps, something like a Buddhist initiate with a koan?

Further, there is my problem now of sweeping, or not sweeping, through the correct view, which takes its start from Roberta Kim's land-clearing. Or, if we had much more time, from Miss Kim's pause to invent a hoe or a rake or a basket or a plough or whatever.<sup>25</sup>

What might I envisage here that would be of use to us? I envisage, in fact, a what- to-do answer of mine which is a what-to-advise-to-do answer to teachers of such texts as the Australian text. Suppose the course is to last for 50 classes. Then courageously and cunningly designate the first 5 or six classes for what we might call *Sane Economics*.

I have enlarged on that advice elsewhere at greater length and it is freely available, so you may venture there to follow up the personal exercises. It moves from Miss Kim's solitary ventures to the question of running a small business and then on to muse over a few key features of money, credit, tax, turnover periods.<sup>26</sup> And I see no point in de-compacting the hopeless naming at the conclusion of that last sentence.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Chapter one of my *Economics for Everyone* (Axial Publishing, 1999) goes into some detail on these topics.

<sup>26</sup>See, on the website, *Eldorede2*, "Core Economics for High Schools and for Lonergan Followers".

<sup>27</sup>And I have many reasons for not thus compacting. When I was about 50 years old I wrote: "As I grow older I believe less and less in summary expression" ("Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts", Lonergan Workshop 7(1984), at note 6: the essay is now available on my Website as chapter 7 of *ChriSt in History*), and illustrated hopefilled hopeless summary from Fichte's "Sun Clear" statement of Kant's view and De Quincey's compacting of

Still, one zone deserves comment in that it brings us back to the question of microautonomy and rational expectations which is the centre of our interest. It is the question of credit and banking.

Think of the phrase, certainly in my own Irish background, “I have to give you credit for that”. But it is best that I just add here below a core pointing that I gave in a recent context of plain speaking:<sup>28</sup>

“Here the interest is in plain talk, abundant in Schumpeter’s *Business Cycles*, representing another ethos than that represented by World Bank and IMF operations, perhaps even by your own local banker. Perhaps she needs talking to, over a stiff drink?<sup>29</sup> Banks are not there to “force their money upon people,<sup>30</sup> not “do they congratulate themselves of they are *loaned up*.”<sup>31</sup> A banking committee is not “an automaton” but understanding and attentive to purpose and situation, “judging the chances of success of each purpose and, as means to an end, the kind of man the borrower is, watching him as he proceeds ....”<sup>32</sup> It should be observed how important it is for the system of which we are trying to construct a model, that the banker should know, and be able to judge, what his credit is used for and that he should be an independent agent. “To realize this is to understand what banking means.”<sup>33</sup> “The

---

Ricardo. Now, at 75, I struggle towards larger meaning for that conviction of mine. It will be a driving force in *Eldorede 6* and *Eldorede 11*.

<sup>28</sup>**PPE**, 124-25.

<sup>29</sup>I am recalling her Alfred Eichner’s remark, at the beginning of *A Guide to Post-Keynsian Economics* regarding the honesty of economists that emerges after a few evening drinks.

<sup>30</sup>J.Schumpeter, *Business Cycles*, Volume 2, 1939, 640.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, 641.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, 641.

<sup>33</sup>*Business Cycles*, Volume 1, 116.

banker's function is essentially a critical, checking, admonitory one. Alike in this respect to economists, bankers are worth their salt only if they make themselves thoroughly unpopular with governments, politicians and the public. This does not matter in times of intact capitalism. In the times of decadent capitalism this piece of machinery is likely to be put out of gear by legislation"<sup>34</sup>

This quotation is full of subtle suggestions and difficulties, but the key point is that the banker should be worth his salt, should have balanced rational expectations that can focus on the individual who may have a creditable plan.

But now I want to show a contrast between where we wish to go and where standard work in economics on rational expectations tends to go.

A theory or model of rational expectations would head towards a statistics of those expectations in citizens, as an object pretty well like weight, "a technical model building."<sup>35</sup> The direction that both Lonergan and I wish to go in is the direction of the banker worth his salt. Not then, say, a Bell curve of the weight of people's spending or inclinations to spend in the present culture, but a cultivation of those people's view of spending, so that not only the banker, or the village economist, but the educated be worth their salt in viewing what is going on in the economy. This is the massive climb of education that Lonergan is writing about: almost an impossible dream, it would seem. But now, think about the invention of the first gear-shift motor: a strange innovation. Yet common sense has been educated by a century of the inventions cultivation, modifications, use. Almost anyone on a street can detect when gears are being stupidly changed. Might you fantasize about something parallel happening with regard to the changes of economic gear illustrated by Roberta Kim's to and fro from consumer to non-consumer productivity? The parallel could happen in a village, in

---

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>35</sup>See note 2 of "The Editor's Conclusion" to *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, 186: "John Muir's hypothesis of rational expectations is a technical model-building principle" ( a comment by Robert Lucas).

your few blocks of the city:<sup>36</sup> But can you reach in imagination towards it being a global ethos? And I recall here Lonergan's hope expressed above, expressed in the title of his 1942 essay, *For A New Political Economy*. Reach then, in a limit of imagining, towards a global dynamic where the basic cycle of supplying consumer goods would be so structured as to reach out to everyone,<sup>37</sup> lifting all to a better life, and even to a new global leisure.<sup>38</sup>

Part of that imagining, if it is to be realistic and effective, includes the global collaboration that was introduced in the third lecture. So far, its imagining has escaped Lonergan's disciples: it is vastly difficult as a serious enlightenment. So, we should not expect an afternoon to give us more than a glimpse and a hope. But the collaboration can begin here and now, in Korea.

That difficult enlightenment is a task of a community of collaborators who would turn aside from controversy and shift through the total past towards a foundational present that would lift imaginations round the globe to a vertical finality that "is not

---

<sup>36</sup>There is an enormously important development of sound economic education and theory and practice lurking here. Broadly, I write of mesoeconomics: something between micro- and macro- economics. This has to be the zone of concern of future text-books. We live in an extraordinary ignorance of local flows, and that ignorance is fostered by economic texts and conventions of present discussions.

<sup>37</sup>One of the central problems in economic organization is the cut-off of what Lonergan calls **the basic expansion** or its follow-up in **the static phase**. Related to this is a certain madness of both innovation and investment, and part of that is the small-minded narrowness of the expectations of so-called innovators. Relevant here is the following comment of Lonergan in 1942. "The static phase is a somber world for men brought up on the strong drink of expansion. They have to be cured of their appetite for making more and more money that they may have more and more money to invest, and so make more and more money and have more money to invest. They have to be fitted out with a mentality that will aim at and be content with a going concern and a standard of living. It is not an easy thing to effect this change, for, as the Wise Man saith, the number of fools is infinite" (*For A New Political Economy*, 98).

<sup>38</sup>This is an enormously important topic for realistic studies of the future. It is raised by Lonergan in *For A New Political Economy*: see the index there under *Leisure*.

merely obscure but shrouded in mystery.”<sup>39</sup> The foundational present, or presence, is to be a presence of enlightened rational expectations in global clusters of effectiveness round foundational persons, fulfilling the **roles** and **tasks** that Lonergan envisaged for Cosmopolis. As an **institution** it is at present horribly absent, but its possibility can be sensed and cultivated in our affective imagination, in our **capacity** and **needs**, and blossom into a beginning of a new **liberty** of **personal relations**. Where we are going “remains obscure. When the process has not yet begun, obscurity prevails and questions abound. Is it somehow intimated? Is the intimation fleeting? Does it touch our deepest aspirations? Might it awaken such striving and groaning as would announce a new and higher birth?”<sup>40</sup>

I halt here with these broad suggestive questions. But I would hope that we can move to particular and personal question in the time we have left and in the later sessions we have at our disposal. However, I would insist that we are making a beginning as a group. So, I would invite a bent in the time we have together towards asking about little steps of personal progress, of group collaboration, of community influence, of concrete educational reforms.

---

<sup>39</sup>B.Lonergan, “Mission and Spirit”, *A Third Collection*, 26.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*