

Editors' Introduction

Michael Shute and Patrick Brown

The *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis* has for the last thirteen years effectively functioned as an occasional journal. Initially we aimed for one issue a year. In fact, however, we have managed to produce but seven issues in thirteen years, to which we now gladly add this eighth issue.

It has always been our intention to publish high-quality articles on subjects related to generalized empirical method and functional collaboration; we have been less interested in meeting our targeted ideal frequency. To twist a famous phrase by G.K. Chesterton, if a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing slowly. That basic conviction has kept this venture going through various obstacles, some relating to our own workloads as academics, others to health and the demands of living. These and other factors may have slowed our projected rate of publishing, but they have not diminished our desire to provide a forum for reflection on the truly revolutionary realities of generalized empirical method and functional collaboration. We hope that the *largo*-like rhythm of our publishing schedule has not taxed the patience of those who eagerly await the arrival of the next issue.

We are pleased to present this newest issue. Our original intention had been to publish a book-length manuscript by Philip McShane on "Functional Research" as the first of a series of issues devoted to particular specialities. We have not abandoned the effort, and that manuscript is now scheduled to appear as volume 9, hopefully later this year. It seemed sensible, however, to set the stage for the series devoted to individual specialties by providing a more general introduction to functional collaboration. The contents of the present volume meet that need. They were culled from presentations over the last few years in Vancouver, Toronto, and Mexico City. In addition, we have included co-editor Michael Shute's two-part introduction to functional collaboration originally published in 2013 in print-form in *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education*.

Modern sciences are relentlessly collaborative. From astronomy through zoology, vast amounts of discovery and technical knowledge exist in disparate domains, are spread through widely separated minds, are progressively refined by innumerable contributors, and are

distributed throughout extended communities of globally disbursed specialists. In modern science, in other words, “what counts is not the learning in the individual mind but in the group.”¹ Not only scientific learning, but even scientific evidence itself, is radically and inescapably mediated by group collaboration. “Empirical science is a collective enterprise to so radical an extent that no scientist can have immanently generated knowledge of the evidence that really counts; for the evidence that really counts for any theory or hypothesis is the common testimony of all scientists that the implications of the theory or hypothesis have been verified in their separate and diverse investigations.”²

How, then, can we help the inevitably collaborative nature of scientific inquiry in the natural and human sciences to be more cumulative, efficient, and progressive? That is the question animating the quest for functional collaboration and functional specialization. Once the need for functional collaboration is grasped, and once its most efficient structure is embraced, we have no doubt that method in the human sciences will slip the traces of haphazardly structured inquiry, and functional collaboration will spread to every field of human inquiry. Even the natural sciences will benefit, perhaps enormously, from an encounter with generalized empirical method and functional collaboration. As with all significant innovation, “like an incoming tide, first it reaches the promontories, then it penetrates the bays, and finally it pours up the estuaries. In an intricate pattern of lags and variations, new ideas spread over most of the earth to bind together in an astounding interdependence the fortunes of individuals living disparate lives in widely separated lands.”³

Fully functional collaboration rests on, and draws on, generalized empirical method. But what is that? It is a method that generalizes the empirical method of the so-called hard sciences, whose relevant data are confined to the data of sense, and extends it to include the rigorous and empirical investigation of the data of consciousness as well. “Generalized empirical method operates on a combination of both the data of sense and the data of consciousness: it does not treat of objects without taking into account the corresponding operations of the subject; it does not treat of the subject’s operations without taking into account the corresponding objects.”⁴

¹ Bernard Lonergan, “Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response,” in *Philosophical and Theological Papers: 1965–1980*, ed. Robert Croken and Robert Doran, vol. 17, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 361.

² Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert Doran, vol. 3, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 727 (hereafter, *CWL* 3).

³ *CWL* 3, 239.

⁴ Lonergan, “Religious Knowledge,” *A Third Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1985), 141.

Generalized empirical method, one might say, methodically explores the vast inner continent of human consciousness, its structures, operations, levels, acts, and dynamisms. This exploration is labor-intensive—indeed, vastly difficult. Yet incremental progress is possible. Functional collaborators come as they are, so to speak. But what they are can be discovered and embraced—can be self-appropriated—to the extent that the investigators successfully investigate themselves, to the extent that they labor to evoke, identify, and thematize levels and operations of their own conscious subjectivity through “a personal reflective engagement”⁵ in mathematics, natural science, and philosophy.

Without this difficult and personal effort, understanding the basic positions on knowing, objectivity, and reality—basic positions which inform the general categories of Functional Foundations, and which reside in concrete, individual, and historically situated persons—is akin to a deaf person trying to understand sound. We perhaps too easily slip into the habit of noticing the words or formulae while neglecting both the subject who is the origin of the words or formulae and the subject who reads the words or formulas. In the words of the first sentence of the first chapter of *Insight*: “In the midst of that vast and profound stirring of human minds which we name the Renaissance, Descartes was convinced that too many people felt it beneath them to direct their efforts to apparently trifling problems.”⁶

In this spirit, we begin the volume with an essay by Meghan Allerton, “Empirical Exercise: the Dynamics of Knowing,” presented originally in 2012 at the Vancouver Lonergan Conference. The essay is directed towards the trifling problem of understanding the technique we learned in school for finding out square roots. It is fitting that an issue on functional collaboration begins with an example of the personal effort to come to terms with self-appropriation, for without such personal efforts to expand understanding of the schemes of the subject-object relation, functional collaboration remains merely technique or a sort of file cabinet for cataloguing essays.

Speaking of *Insight*, Terrance Quinn’s article, “Reaching for Collaboration in *Insight*,” explores Lonergan’s explorations in that book on the problem of collaboration. As Quinn establishes, it was Lonergan’s discussion of cosmopolis in *Insight* that prepared the ground for the discovery of functional specialization in 1965 and connected that discovery to the prior efforts of Plato and Aristotle to establish the practical, social significance of philosophy. The paper was originally presented at the Lonergan Research Institute Graduate Seminar, Toronto, Canada, in November of 2012.

James Duffy’s article, “Method, Bold Spirits, and ‘Some Third Way,’” shifts attention to the first two pages of *Method in Theology*. Duffy draws our attention to the bolder personal and collaborative efforts

⁵ Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Seabury, 1979), 262.

⁶ *CWL* 3, 27.

needed to raise up current standards of collaboration to a competency that might truly integrate the efforts of the sciences and humanities and set the stage in establishing the practical and democratic control of history, which Lonergan envisaged as cosmopolis. Duffy first presented this article in Spanish at the *Segundo Taller Latinoamericano*, 'El Bien Humano,' at the Universidad Iberoamericana in Mexico City in June 2013. Duffy has graciously provided us his translation of the original. *Muchas gracias*, James.

At the same conference Terrance Quinn presented his paper, "Community Climbing: Toward Functional Collaboration." While his companion piece in this volume explores the roots of functional specialization in Lonergan's exploration of cosmopolis, this paper takes up Lonergan's discovery of functional specialization itself. As Quinn notes, while Lonergan initially framed functional specialization as a method for theology, it is applicable to all fields of inquiry, as Karl Rahner noticed when he reviewed Lonergan's work on method. It "can be applied to the data of any sphere of scholarly human studies," and it also "can be applied to the data of any sphere of human living to obtain the classical principles and laws or the statistical trends of scientific human studies."⁷ Broadly speaking, the eight specialties are "relevant to any human studies that investigated a cultural past to guide its future."⁸

Michael Shute's two-part essay, "Functional Collaboration as Implementation of Lonergan's Method," was originally written at the invitation of Ivo Coelho, the editor of the journal *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education*. In the first part, "For What Problem is Functional Collaboration the Solution?," Shute explores the contemporary fragmentation of collaborative efforts that inspired Lonergan's effort to find a solution that would efficiently and democratically integrate those efforts. The second part, "How Might We Implement Functional Collaboration?," introduces a sketch of the solution and suggests a way to begin its implementation inspired by Philip McShane's four-decades-long efforts to jump-start functional collaboration.

This issue ends with a review of Sean McNelis' recently published book, *Making Progress in Housing: A Framework for Collaborative Research*. The publication is significant as it is one of the first book-length efforts to present a functional collaboration approach outside of the field of theology.

Finally, the editors would like to thank Michael George, Bruce Anderson, James Duffy, and Terrance Quinn for their help with copy-editing this edition.

⁷ *Method*, 364–65.

⁸ Lonergan, "Bernard Lonergan Responds," *Shorter Papers*, ed. Robert Croken, Robert Doran, and H. Daniel Monsour, vol. 20, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 274.