

*Eldorede 2***Core Economics for High Schools and Lonergan Followers****1. A First Context**

I continue with my shot at plain speaking, and my aim is to stir some interest, especially among teachers of economics, but also among interested Lonergan people, in breaking from the abomination that is standard in first courses in economics.

Depending on your background and interests, you might skim or skip this section and home in on the third section, which gets to the point in what I hope is plain doctrinal writing: what is to be done in the first weeks of an introductory course?¹ My title and my first sentence indicate my initial reach. The first audience is obviously the most likely present readership of those who respect Lonergan's viewpoint. Through them I would hope to reach the teachers: friends, colleagues, whatever. Perhaps, indeed you have a daughter or a son suffering through grade 12? Then, with some degree of cunning, you might invade the teacher's mind.

Perhaps I can cater to the various audiences by putting my problem this way for you: "What might I do if took a month to introduce myself to Lonergan's economic perspective?". What is my problem, your problem? My problem is to persuade you to take that month; your problem is to take the month, or its equivalent, during the next year, or even decade.

First, let me assume that you respect Lonergan. The assumption would include that you respect what he says about economic democracy. However, that respect would be for most readers, at present, mainly a doctrinal respect. I am inviting you to a comprehending respect. Not an easy task, and to quote Lonergan on the topic, "Experto

¹*Eldorede 10* gives a simpler perspective on this, the fourth of four readable lectures (*Eldorede 7-10*) on education, given in Korea, March 2007.

Crede.”² In 1968 Lonergan invited my interest in his 1944 typescript: ten years later, after much mental gymnastics, I was sufficiently tuned in to present his view twice, in seminars in Boston College.³ In the following spring he invited me to attend his first presentation of his view: mainly to have a friendly comprehending face in the audience. What did the audience make of the stuff? I would say, not a great deal. It was, and still is, altogether too strange, and there is the paradox, noted by Hefling in his comments on those years of Lonergan’s economic lectures, that Lonergan tended to condense rather than expand.⁴

There has not been much progress since in promoting Lonergan’s economic views effectively: scholarly interest, yes, even theses, and some publications, my own among them. Recently I was external examiner of Darlene O’Leary’s thesis of Lonergan’s economics and contemporary Christian perspectives. Gentle as she was, it was pretty evident that there was no serious economic theory backing up the various pseudo-theoretic or practical suggestions about economic justice. One of my questions to her was about the effectiveness of the thesis. At least I got a smile for it: neither of us have an answer to my question. The answer, indeed, requires at least the beginnings of functional specialization: the emergence of a sub-group sufficiently versed in Lonergan’s approach to talk it and take it into local cultures. But that is an old issue of mine, to which I have so far got little response.

²I quote the end of the short chapter 7 of *For a New Political Economy*. I would note that, when I helped him prepare for his first presentation of what is now Part Three of that book, this was the only piece of his earlier writings that I encouraged him to include in his presentation.

³These were given in the summer of 1977, one during the workshop, the second for a special group after the workshop. This throws light on why the question-sessions to Lonergan that Summer were laced with questions on economic. During the rest of that year I was pre-occupied with hunting down relevant readings for his seminar of Spring 1978. Late in 1977 he greeted me one day with a relieved grin about his decision regarding how to handle that seminar: I am going to read it [the manuscript of 1944] at them twice!”

⁴See Hefling’s Preface to Volume 15 of Lonergan’s *Complete Works, Macroeconomic Dynamics*, University of Toronto Press, 1999, xv, xix..

Have I at least stirred a new interest, or freshened an old one? Indeed, you might take an easy way out and, on the basis of the third section here, by-pass the personal challenge of democratic economics and just nudge others, perhaps in the next generation, towards disturbing grade 12 classes in the manner suggested below.

2. Other Contexts

Or should I say Con Texts, texts that con the students, persuading the acceptance of an illusion? For this section is limited to comments on two texts, brief comments that aim at being helpful. The texts are random in that I am Irish, living in Canada, dealing this year with education in a school in Australia.⁵

But it is useful to preface my few reflections on these texts with a favorite quotation from that bright lady, Joan Robinson.

“The student of economic theory is taught to write $O = f(L, C)$ where L is a quantity of labor, C is a quantity of capital and O a rate of output of commodities. He is instructed to assume all workers alike, and to measure L in man-hours of labor; he is told something about the index number problem involved in choosing a unit of output; and then he is hurried on to the next question, in the hope that he will forget to ask in what units C is measured. Before ever he does ask, he has become a professor, and so sloppy habits of thought are handed on from one generation to the next.”⁶

The brain-wasting continues, and detailed criticism of it seems of no or little

⁵Eventually I decided to use here only the Australia text: *Year 12 Economics 2006*, by Tim Riley, Tim Riley Publications, Southwood Press, New South Wales. I will quote it below simply as **Riley**. There seemed little point in illustrating the problem, which is pretty uniform, from texts not easily available to listeners or readers. I hope to provide commentaries on other national texts to other audiences. In the “Editorial Conclusion” to *Beyond Establishment Economics. No Thank You, Mankiw* I reflect on a current Irish University Text. I have to hand the current Irish school text by Dennis O’Grady, and would be happy to share my view on it with whomever - including Dennis!

⁶Joan Robinson, “The Production Function in the Theory of Capital”, *Review of Economic Studies*, 2 (1955), 81.

avail. Bruce Anderson and I took on such a detailed effort in regard to Gregory Mankiw, who got \$1.4 to churn out his abominable text and later got a job with George Bush: need I say more? Our text is still worth tackling as a learning process, a lifting out of present traditions of teaching. But it is tough work. However, I would recommend some parts within the present context.⁷

What am I to say about the two texts that I have to hand? Certainly they could be criticized in detail, but why repeat the effort we made with Mankiw? It seems best to restrict myself to some key comments on their contents, comments that help us to get a better sense of the revolution that Lonergan was pushing for in 1942.

Let me begin with the Australian text.

There is no introduction to the book, or to the field of inquiry. 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 globalization⁸ to move, in the second section of the book,⁹ to Australia’s place, with more gross numbers. But don’t

⁷The text by Anderson and myself is *Beyond Establishment Economics. No Thank You, Mankiw*, Axial Publishing, 2002. The especially recommended chapter is chapter three “Thinking Like an Economist”, which steals the title from the parallel chapter of Gregory Mankiw’s book mentioned above, *Principles of Economics*.

⁸Riley, 3-84.

⁹Riley, 85-148.

give up hope yet. The third section of the book, “Economic Issues”¹⁰ begins with a chapter on “Economic Growth.” Now there, indeed, is an issue worth brooding over. 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}”¹¹ 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.¹² 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.¹³

¹⁰**Riley**, 149-242.

¹¹**Riley**, 158.

¹²**Riley**, 243-342.

¹³The 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

3. Invasive Core Contents

I am writing of some ways of invading, with some small hope of success, the teaching and learning of economics. I have previously written on the matter in a reasonable practical manner.¹⁴ Here, obviously, the focus is on the beginnings of disturbances. At best, I would hope that the points I raise would be aired by some enterprising and safely-established teacher who is trapped in teaching the contemporary junk.¹⁵

Below I have six chapter headings with some comments under each. I am certainly interested in them blossoming in some form as books or texts, preferably for particular areas, groups of schools, whatever, and would be quite willing to further assisting anyone who would so venture. Indeed, this is a clear case of the need for functional specialist collaboration, but I won't go into that here.

It would be a help now, or when you have had a read of this and considered getting involved, to follow up my various leads. So, immediately I refer you to my discussion of "Talk of a Primer" in *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*.¹⁶ It helps locate your effort in the context of Lonergan's failed efforts to

reveal the horrors of misdirection, mismanagement, brutal mistakes. And **Riley** is infested with those horrors.

¹⁴The elementary book, *Economics for Everyone*, Axial Publishing, 1999, is practical in the sense that it gives simple illustrations to help the struggling beginner forward. More direct pointers towards cultural and economic interventions are given in chapter 6, "Proximate Pragmatics" of my *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, Axial Publishing, 2002.

¹⁵One has to think out the realisms of the revolt. There is the need to hang on to one's job; there is, further, the absence of alternate texts. And even with alternate introductory texts, where does the subject go from there? I recall a decade ago teaching the chair of a department of economics the basics and thus successfully convincing her that, yes, this the right economic theory. But what was to be done with the department?

¹⁶Axial Publications, Cape Breton, 2002, 114-119. I refer to this text below as **PPE**. This chapter is worth working through seriously with an eye on your personal possibilities, contacts etc. The opposite is the case with the Editorial Conclusion to the book, "The Hodics of Rational

produce such a work and also to show you the need for localization. Also it illustrates the manner in which I comment here. Certainly I could push towards a full six chapters as Lonergan seemed to be attempting at the same age, 75. But it seems to be that I have given enough clues elsewhere for younger folk to push on. I may appeal to an image of the dynamics of collaboration which I use elsewhere.¹⁷ I am running forward with the baton, poised to hand it on to people who are, as it were, leaning out from the functional specialty of communication towards the schools. Except, of course, at the present time there is no 8th functional specialty to back up the communicative effort.

A major problem of this “leaning out” is, How much competence do you have already in Lonergan’s Economics? Competence is not a necessity. Indeed, my simplest strategy here is to assume no competence. So I am thinking of two willing groups of people, neither competent in Lonergan’s analysis: [1] simply interested disciples of Lonergan and [2] others interested in making the analysis available to highschool students. Either of these groups may be “up” on contemporary economics, but obviously, if you are already a grade 12 teacher, then you have to have that background. So let us think of another division [3] Lonergan disciples competent in contemporary economics but interested in Lonergan’s view [4] teachers of grade 12 competent in contemporary economics but interested in tuning the students into Lonergan’s view, [5] parents of grade 12 students who are suffering through the standard course - or others relevantly related, e.g. elder siblings. This group [5] may not be competent in the contemporary stuff.

First, I must remark that I have a suspicion that competence in contemporary economics can be a handicap: somehow, you have to battle against yourself. Section 2 has, perhaps, made that point, but it is worth brooding over, checking your own

Expectations” (155-162): that is heavy stuff about microautonomy which gets us into a deeper context.

¹⁷See, for example, the beginning of chapter 5 of *ChrISt in History*. The diagram is a set of oval tracks overlaid on the functional specialties.

background and experience. In my own case, I tried contemporary economics in the mid-1960s and really could not tune into it. Perhaps it was the literature I ventured into: I could not make head nor tail of stuff like savings being equal to investments. But this did not make the Lonergan stuff easier: When Lonergan sent me his 1944 typescript in 1968 it baffled me; a decade of struggling and imagining push me at least to see, as I expressed to Fred Lawrence in conversations during the 1970s that Lonergan had gone from Tycho Brahe to Laplace: a paralleling of astronomy and economics.

But let us begin. I write below as if my audience was mainly group [4] and secondarily for group [5], but it reaches out to all groups. So, primarily, I think of the concrete strategy of a teacher who is stuck in the system, and has to teach the standard stuff. What might she or he do? Section 4 is about this challenge, but note that the challenge is a double challenge: reaching for personal competence; stirring up suspicions about the need for the new view in the students. I would note that these two work together: I learned a great deal about new view by trying to communicate it.

Finally, a comment on stirring up suspicion. I recall my years of teaching philosophy in Mt. St. Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, where the psychology department was, in the main teaching junk. I wanted the student to grasp that: but I also wanted them to pass their exams in Psych. 100, etc. Their challenge was not to import self-appreciation into their public participation the other classroom or examroom.

4. Elements of a Core Content

What do I mean by a core content under the circumstances that I have been talking about?

I mean stealing a piece of the beginning of the standard required course - one session? six sessions? - in order to invite students to notice "The Irrelevance of " My advice would be NOT to try to connect up the two views: simply aim at a fresh and refreshing "imaginative" approach, starting with Roberta Crusoe. I have six chapters

or sessions but they are arbitrary. I order them in a way that seems convenient. Chapter 2, on Money, was and is a problem: money turns up as soon as Roberta is joined by other folks and barter begins. It is tough work getting fully to grips with it, so it should be taken in suitable stages. The key challenge is to climb to sections 18 and 19 of Part One of *For A New Political Economy*, and THEN, to push for the meaning of Concomitance: see the end of my introduction to the index of that book, and the index itself under *Concomitance*.

It is evident that what I write below is the plain speaking of how-to language. This, with the turn to subjectivity illuminated by linguistic feedback¹⁸ that Lonergan, reaches towards a new culture of communication and language that is quite foreign to us: we have to learn it and cultivate it through messing forward.

The how-to talk below is however, pretty orthodox, and I would hope, pretty obvious. The six chapters would need to be expanded enormously to lift either a grad 12 student or an interested Lonergan student into a decent comprehension. My own previous effort at writing Economics for Everyone is still too compact: it need lots of illustrations, numbers instead of symbols, etc etc. So, no, the rambles below cannot be mistaken for the beginnings of a text book. That is the challenge of some you young folks!

Chapter 1 Roberta Crusoe

“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

¹⁸See note 34 of *Method in Theology*, 88

another cleared field.”¹⁹

This is, I would say, a great start for a grade 12 class, one that Loneragan could have developed at great length. A teacher, or someone trying to get to grips with Loneragan’s distinction of two circuits, should take time with this, imagine the island etc etc. Even get as far as bringing out the indeterminacy of the connection between e.g. a basket and the fruit gathered. The point is to get as far as one can without introducing the money aspect. Once you add in Man Friday helping Roberta - now there’s a twist toward women’s liberty! - you are on the edge of the “dummy” problem. No harm in pointing that out, even going on to the prison camp illustration, where cigarettes could become “the equalizers”. When you switch to “real money” later, or even in this context, you have a nice distinction between the “equalizer” and the “dummy”, a useful gasped-for cigarette and, say, an I O U which cannot be puffed.

But this fantasy should not be rushed. No more, of course, than any of these chapters! What about the prescribed course? A good teacher can juggle with that in a manner that gets the students through the foolishness. I recall once teaching a first year university course to commerce students who were not exactly bursting with mathematical talent. In the final week we studied examination structures and dodges by which the course could be passed. So, here, perhaps a teacher could spend even half the year doing proper economics, then nail down the text’s junk-bonds in a masterpiece of compendious selection!

Chapter 2 Providing Bread

We are into the money problem here, but basic problems can be avoided. I am thinking of a realistic analysis of a family business. Again, I am pretty well leaving it at

¹⁹B.Loneragan, *For A New Political Economy*, University of Toronto Press, 1998, 151. Loneragan was, of course, writing about Robinson Crusoe at the time. I have switched the text to suit Roberta for various odd reasons, but especially there is my hope of the feminist surge bringing forth a Roberta, perhaps a Roberta Kim or Chin.

that, by quoting a longer version of the same suggestion from the beginning of the first chapter of that rather difficult book *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics*:

“I think back to my family’s little bakery business in Dublin of the 1940s. There was one motorvan and on horsevan - with the horse of course - for delivery; inside the bakery were dough containers, mixers, old-style ovens with their long-handled bread-movers, the likes of which I was amused to find on display as historical in Nova Scotia’s Louisbourg Museum. On our tight little earnings it was always a problem when a horse aged or a dough-mixer cracked; we really weren’t into replacement funds.

I am asking you, of course, to forget about Keynes - and post-modernism - and to cast your mind’s eye around your family experience, or to a local tavern or farm or shop or whatever. A large automobile industry is just as good. All are in the same boat of business: there is always the paddle of replacement.”²⁰

The adventuresome or informed teacher can pull in illustrations from e.g. third world women’s micro-enterprises, but I would advise emphasizing the credit-worthiness that turns up as a topic in chapter 4. There is a current interest in micro-investment that is very much tied to standard economic thinking, a perspective that does not really meet the basic issues.

Money has entered in now. It is up to the teacher, you as teacher, even you as teacher of yourself,²¹ to see how far to push for a notion of money as a dummy, as a sign of trust, as a vast traveling population of paper and/or coin that flows in the direction opposite to the flow of goods and services [you need to pause over the services idea].

²⁰*Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics. A Fresh Pragmatism*, 11. Referred to below as **PPE**.

²¹I was a solitary teacher of myself in the 1970s. It was a tough task, knowledge making “a bloody entrance” (*Insight* 186[210]). I would hope that such behavior is history, that community lifts forward young people towards the luminous economic microautonomy that is to make each educated adult an instance of “rational expectations” in an embraced globe [the topic of the Editor’s Conclusion to **PPE**, “The Hodics of Rational Expectations”, *not* the stuff of these introductory rambles].

How do you, or a teacher, go on from there? My how-language here is quite simple: you yourself must work through that first chapter of **PPE** and mesh it with the effort required to climb up into the perspective of chapter 1 of **Economics for Everyone**. Both chapters are far too short.²² Nor will I even attempt illustrative pointers: when I use this for the first time it will be to a Korean audience and so would need to build in at this stage an instance of innovation that would vibe with, say, rural member of that audience. With contemporary urban teens you might tune yourself into the i-pod. But it is important to be able to be thoroughly concrete. And - something I was not thinking of when I wrote *Economics for Everyone* - use ordinary but plausible numbers. I notice now, in my first teaching-version of that book, that I wrote in what is now available on **PPE** page 23: plausible numbers.

Chapter 3 Money

Chapters 3 and 6 here are problem-zones for me. The chapter 6 problem is one of both opening out and of the detailed work required to begin to glimpse that opening out. But the problem here is one of turning in, not opening out, and it is not a matter of detail but grappling patiently with one very basic point: caught well by Lonergan in the word **dummy**. The dummy is given meaning by the community's belief. It is no harm to recall here a concomitant context that must emerge if grade 12 is to be a serious beginning of economic wisdom: the context of self-appreciation pointed to by *Wealth of Self and Wealth of Nations. Self-Axis of the Great Ascent*.²³

²²I touch here on the complex topic of popularization, summary, etc etc. I have written on it previously in "Systematics, Communications, Actual Contexts", Lonergan Workshop, 7 (1987), at and in notes 5, 6. This essay is now available (on the website) as chapter 7 of *ChrISt in History*. See also the conclusion of Chapter 3 of *Lack in the Beingstalk*, Axial Publishing, 2007.

²³The book, published in the early 1970s, is now available free on the Website. It was the basis of a first year university course in philosophy. For grade 12, there is now the book by Alessandra Drage, John Benton and Philip McShane, *Introducing Critical Thinking*, Axial Publishing, 2005.

In that book, chapter 7, on belief, is titled “The Economy of Truth”, and the reality of the future is that the context described there will be a luminous presence in a later stage of meaning. That chapter begins with a quotation from the economist Heilbroner. “Behind all the symbols, however, rests the central requirement of faith. Money serves its indispensable purposes as long as we believe in it. It ceases to the moment we do not. Money has well been called the promise men live by.”²⁴

A large part of the difficulty the teacher faces here is a personal difficulty of self-appreciation that would give him or her a clear and present answer to the question, What do I and we mean by a promise, a belief? Further, I would say that this is part of that problem of education that Lonergan wrote about so challengingly. “Coming to grasp what serious education really is and, nonetheless, coming to accept that challenge constitutes the greatest challenge to the modern economy”²⁵

But what am I going to write here that is a plain, clear and present guide to the 3 basic required insights regarding the dummy called money (from **mint**, to fabricate)? My plain guide, my how-to talk, is to guide you to a larger spread of words that is still not large enough in our defective culture to get you into the ball park. You, as teacher or student, have to nurse forward the generation of that spread of words which eventually is to fade - or rather blossom - into an ethos. Meantime, there is need for some solo climbing.

You need to gear up into the climb represented by [1] the index entries under *money* in *For a New Political Economy*, [2] the index entries there under *Concomitance*, [3] the single section 49 (pp. 100-6) titled “the Financial Problem”.

Surely, you say, this cannot be all you have to say about the problem of reaching and conveying to a class or a culture a radical new meaning of money?

²⁴R.L.Heilbroner, *The Economic Problem*, New Jersey, 1972, 352.

²⁵*Macroeconomic Dynamics. An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, University of Toronto Press, 1999, 119.

Of course, if you pose the question like that you are already on my side, on Lonergan's side, in the admission that it is a radical and remote new meaning of money. But back to your question.

And my answer is, Yes, that is all I am going to say. If I were to say anything worthwhile it would be at much greater length than Lonergan's stuff mentioned under [1], [2], [3].

Chapter 4 Credit

Think of the phrase, certainly in my own Irish background, "I have to give you credit for that". But best just add here a core pointing that I have done previously:²⁶

"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?²⁷ Banks are not there to "force their money upon people,²⁸ not "do they congratulate themselves of they are *loaned up*."²⁹ 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"³⁰ 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

²⁶PPE, 124-25.

²⁷I am recalling her Alfred Eichner's remark, at the beginning of *A Guide to Post-Keynesian Economics* regarding the honesty of economists that emerges after a few evening drinks.

²⁸J.Schumpeter, *Business Cycles*, Volume 2, 1939, 640.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 641.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 641.

independent agent. "To realize this is to understand what banking means."³¹ "The 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"³²

That short section goes on through a more complex point to end with the comment: "Now that is worth talking about in Senate, street and seminar."³³ And I surely have no need to repeat the manner in which this has to be chatted out, even acted out, in a classroom.

Chapter 5 Tax

"As well as the academic economist there are government economists. Might we talk to them? Might we question government effectiveness? Recall the point raised in chapter one³⁴ about defining circuit taxation, T' and T'' , so that we could know what was going on. Last night I watched Jim Lehrer lead two candidates for American president through a pretty pathetic evening. Wouldn't it have been hilarious had Lehrer asked either of the chaps "What effect would your taxation suggestions have on the two circuits? This surely would, in Lonergan's words, "make conversion a topic."³⁵ But again, I divert into humour."³⁶

³¹*Business Cycles*, Volume 1, 116.

³²*Ibid.*, 118.

³³**PPE**, 125.

³⁴See **PPE**, 19, where I bring in Kalecki's shrewd advertence to the need of the distinction Lonergan makes.

³⁵*Method in Theology*, 253.

³⁶**PPE**, 122.

Yet humour is needed about the gross ignorance that prevails at those levels of life. Nor, of course, is it to be restricted to the topic of tax: think of the fun that can be made of those profound minuscule shifts of bank-rates. So, one can move to any zone of the economy and find that if one does not have a heuristic grip on two circuits then one is literally, just not in the ball park.

Chapter 6 Turnover

The final suggested topic here is a neglected one in contemporary macroeconomics: you have only to check indices on texts to glimpse that. Yet it is central to a serious perspective on economic process. Here I wish you at least to notice how it introduces a realism into business structures.

I had an acquaintance once who made guitars. He enjoyed making guitars to such an extent that he lovingly gave his entire energy to making a single guitar, sometimes over a period of months. Then he would sell, it reluctantly. Obviously, he was not in business seriously: he had another source of income. What would the business of making guitars look like?

We are back to the topic of chapter 2 above, the reality of running a small business. And there is no way that I can do more here than talk very compact how-language about getting yourself and your students and friends into this area. From my own experience it takes a great deal of imagining to come to grips with, for example, the ship-building illustration that Lonergan presents. This could turn out to be a very large and relevant chapter of a book and to that end I would advise you to keep your scribbles. So you mess around with questions like, How does borrowing money figure in making ships of guitars. You can make 8 ships in all sorts of different ways, from one at a time - like my guitar acquaintance - to all eight in parallel. But which strategy is good business practice? Here, of course, you connect in potential and actual sales. Etc etc etc: exercises to becoming at home in this zone and to get students towards a sense of its economic relevance.

Going further is not on for present class-work in economics. But there is no harm in pointing you further toward a glimpse of the genius of Lonergan. Lonergan was very aware of the need to thinking of the problem of measurements and control of economic process. One feature of the control for him was thinking out as precisely as possible the concrete money-flow that would tie in with the aggregate of businesses in the reality of there turnover decisions. Associated with this is what is called the oldest problem in economics.³⁷ Lonergan battled his way towards a quite precise solution, but it can be detected only in a few stray sentences. I spell those sentences out sufficiently in the Appendix both the *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics* and *Beyond Establishment Economics*. The Appendix gives plenty of exercises in envisaging turnover decisions in the lawnmower business.

5. Further Contexts

Obviously, there are contexts that lift us into a large number of creative efforts. In *Pastkeynes Pastmodern Economics* I conveyed a central aspect of this lift in the compact remark, “The massively innovative primers that would meet millennial needs, 500 page texts of empirically-rich, locally-orientated, normatively-focused non-truncated writing, are distant probabilities.”³⁸ And perhaps that is the open-ended place to halt my suggestions.

My further reflections on the problems of implementing Lonergan’s economics belong within my present creativity and, with luck, some of them may be shared by private communications to a new courageous generation. My fantasy of implementation reaches forward to a quite new global dynamic of care, and would certainly include elements of Lonergan’s fantasy of 1942, such as the following:

Mark Blaug, “Why is the quantity theory of money the oldest surviving theory in economics?”, chapter 2 of Mark Blaug et al, *The quantity Theory of Money from Locke to Keynes and Friedman*, (Brookfield, VI: Edward Elgar Publishers, 1995)

³⁸PPE, 114.

“Nor is it impossible that further developments in science should make small units self-sufficient on an ultramodern standard of living to eliminate commerce and industry, and to transform agriculture into a superchemistry, to clear away finance and even money, to make economic solidarity a memory, and power over nature the only difference between high civilization and primitive gardening.”³⁹

Within such developments there is to be an emergence a new leisured luminousness of the contemplative dynamics of human living in pre-mortem and post-mortem patterns that go quite beyond the struggling searchings of, say, Thomas Aquinas on temporal and eschatological realities. A later lady of contemplative reach will how-talk the eternal weaving of dark energy into the seamless garb of the Cosmic Word made ever-fresh.

³⁹**FNPE**, 20. It seems worthwhile to draw attention to other fantasies of global supply mentioned at the end of a complementary writing, the fourth lecture on education - mainly to teachers - given on March 24 2007 in Seoul, but written, as the above was, during January 2007. See, then, the concluding paragraphs of *Eldorede 10*.