

Editors' Introduction

James Duffy and Bruce Anderson

The Origins of the Journal

In his 2001 "Introduction: The *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*,"¹ Mike Shute recounted how the journal came about and what its aim would be. The idea for the journal emerged from a series of conferences in Nova Scotia, Canada, in 1997, 1999, and 2000. Those conferences focused on Lonergan's macroeconomic dynamics, the relevance of this analysis to issues of social justice, and the long-term challenge of transforming methods and approaches prevalent in the contemporary academy. After the final conference, the decision was made to move forward with the journal, and the three articles published in volume 1 came from individuals who participated in the conferences and the discussion leading up to the decision to launch the journal.²

In his introduction to volume 1 Shute wrote this about the name of the journal:

'Macrodynamics' pertains to the long-term and large-scale dynamics of human process, the elements of which are relevant to any specific inquiry. 'Analysis' is theoretic understanding which explicitly takes into account the intermeshing of the operations of the subject with the object of investigation. 'Macrodynamical analysis' then would explore the 'upper blade' or macro-context governing 'lower blade' or micro-inquiry in any field.³

The concern for the big picture (total process) brings with it a personal challenge to generalize empirical method, to double attend, double understand, and double affirm while studying flows of goods and services, the free fall of a body, or the genetic sequence of understandings of

¹ *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*, 1 (2001): 3–8.

² Those papers were: Bruce Anderson, "Foreign Trade in the Light of Circulation Analysis," Patrick Brown, "System and History in Lonergan's Early Historical and Economic Manuscripts," and Philip McShane, "Underminded Macrodynamical Reading."

³ "Introduction: The *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*," 4.

Narcissus pseudonarcissus, commonly called trumpet narcissus or simply daffodil.⁴

The hope for the journal was that it would be a step towards an “academic revolution, a quixotic long shot that shifts the way we do business both in the economy and in the academy.”⁵ Shute was aware that a change in academic business would be slow and present a challenge to the way those of us in academia were trained, perhaps even call into question our orientation. Since its inception, the journal has weaved in and around the macro-challenge *functional collaboration*⁶ as well as different aspects of two-flow economic analysis. In his introduction to the first volume, Shute acknowledged a clear debt to Bernard Lonergan, but added a simple explanation for not including his name in the journal title: Lonergan developed a method, but normally we do not call scientific method ‘Galilean method.’

The Genesis of Volume 12

In the same introduction to volume 1, Mike writes about encouraging and welcoming contributions that fit into the broad sketch of macrodynamic analysis. Not only was the aim to publish papers that were ‘finished and polished,’ but he also wanted to provide a venue for experimental and cutting-edge work that was likely to be neglected by established journals. Hence he invited contributions, commissioned articles, and generously helped others develop their ideas and edited their texts. He believed that people with differing interests, perspectives, and levels of expertise had valuable contributions to make. And with his interests and expertise ranging from music, literature, history, art, political science, economics, biology, philosophy, and ethics to theology he successfully lead, published, and promoted the journal for eighteen years. In many ways this was ‘Mike’s journal.’

Volume 12 is no different. Mike decided it would be a good idea to devote an issue to dialectic, and he called for submissions. He received and accepted a number of articles.⁷ Sadly, in August 2019 Mike was

⁴ Shute cites the following definition in footnote #2: “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.” Bernard Lonergan, “Religious Knowledge,” *A Third Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 129–145, at 141. Frank Braio’s contribution to this volume explores the possibility of genetically sequencing understandings of a flower.

⁵ “Introduction: The *Journal of Macrodynamic Analysis*,” 7.

⁶ Five of the first eleven volumes have “Functional” in the title: volumes 4, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

⁷ “Our next issue on Dialectic (Volume 11) will appear in late 2019. In addition to contributions from previous contributors to the journal, we will be

diagnosed with progressive bulbar palsy. He resigned as editor in chief and forwarded the papers to Bruce Anderson. The articles in this volume were subsequently refereed by members of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* and published under the leadership of James Duffy.

Making a Start

“So we will start badly and take our knocks.”⁸ Mike wrote that in the Introduction to the first volume of the *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*. Now, nineteen years later, we are publishing eight essays in volume 12 in accord with his most recent outreach and wishes. Throughout the essays there are allusions to starting poorly or starting over.

The first three papers are about dialectic. In his paper “Dialectic and the Emergence of Explicit Metaphysics,” David Oyler reminds the reader that explicit metaphysicians implement heuristics, and he elaborates on how dialectic might not only lead to transformations of pronouncements, but also of persons. John Raymaker writes of a nuancing of method and a transformation of the notion of dialectic in *Method in Theology*.⁹ He appeals to those aspiring to adopt generalized empirical method and functional specialization to coordinate efforts in a “dialectical-foundational fashion.” In the first part of his paper, William Zanardi asks the reader to reflect on scholarly habits and to make their expectations explicit when comparing and evaluating interpretations. He also asks what the basis might be for evaluating and ranking interpretations. Frank Braio reflects on “Positioning,” an essay he wrote eight years ago, concerned with genetically ordering understandings which he argues is the key to efficiently making comparisons. James Duffy intimates the demands of such a shift in “MacIntyre and Lonergan’ Revisited,” a self-evaluation of what, how, and why he compared Alistair McIntyre and Bernard Lonergan nineteen years ago. The papers by Zanardi, Braio, and Duffy form something of a trio insofar as they each are trying to make sense of the shift from conventional comparison to genetic thinking. Finally, in “Reinterpreting the Motor Car Analogy in Bernard Lonergan’s *For a New Political Economy*,” Hugh Williams writes about how he and a colleague had at one point misconstrued the central analogy between the importance of respecting the mechanics of motors and the importance of understanding how an economy works, and is working. Their

welcoming articles from Frank Braio, Catherine King, David Oyler, John Raymaker, and Hugh Williams.” “Editor’s Introduction,” *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis* 10 (2015), 2. In fact, volume 11 made available eight essays from “Do You Want a Sane Economy?” originally published in print in *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy & Education* volume 21, no. 2 (2010). The “next issue on Dialectic” turned out to be the current Volume 12.

⁸ “Introduction: The *Journal of Macrodynamical Analysis*,” 8.

⁹ Raymaker writes that Lonergan “nuanced his method as he moved from *Insight* to *Method in Theology*” on page 24 below.

misinterpretation was a block to grasping why a new viewpoint is needed in economics, one that preserves the democratic spirit of older approaches to (political) economy and also accounts for data and facts overlooked by contemporary economic models focused on statistics or psychological motivations for making exchanges.

Various authors in this volume have alluded to significant, difficult challenges facing the global group of those trying to come to terms with the macrodynamics of human process and the demands of generalized empirical method. A pivotal challenge is to understand and implement the norm of dialectical collaboration, a central piece of efficiently taking and giving knocks, instead of simply knocking about. Volume 13 will take up this challenge by presenting essays, some of them co-authored, grappling with the extraordinary procedure that is the structure of dialectic.¹⁰ That procedure is an invitation to individuals to take a stand on some basic issues and make explicit their expectations and viewpoints.¹¹ The co-editors and the growing number of those participating in various exercises following the procedure of dialectic believe that it is an efficient way to transform the way we meet and greet one another in print and in person into something vaguely resembling a control of cyclic collaboration, thereby increasing the odds of “yielding cumulative and progressive results.”¹²

¹⁰ The procedure is described in the section “Dialectic: The Structure,” *Method in Theology*, pages 249–250 [234–235]. “Such an objectification of subjectivity is in the style of the crucial experiment. While it will not be automatically efficacious, it will provide the open-minded, the serious, the sincere with the occasion to ask themselves some basic questions, first, about others but eventually, even about themselves.” *Method in Theology*, 253 [237–38].

¹¹ See further “Great Expectations” in William Zanardi’s essay, on pages 45–48.

¹² *Method in Theology*, 4 [8]

