

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Theology Faculty Research and Publications

Theology, Department of

11-2013

Lonergan and Integral Development

Joseph Ogbonnaya

Marquette University, joseph.ogbonnaya@marquette.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ogbonnaya, Joseph, "Lonergan and Integral Development" (2013). *Theology Faculty Research and Publications*. 339.

https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac/339

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Theology Faculty Research and Publications/College of Arts and Sciences

This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION; but the author's final, peer-reviewed manuscript. The published version may be accessed by following the link in the citation below.

Irish Theology Quarterly, Vol. 78, No. 4 (November 1, 2013): 351-367. [DOI](#). This article is © SAGE Publications and permission has been granted for this version to appear in [e-Publications@Marquette](#). SAGE Publications does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from SAGE Publications.

Lonergan and Integral Development

Joseph Ogbonnaya

Department of Theology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

Abstract

The dichotomy engendered by the hegemony of globalization as economic growth over other aspects of globalization calls for an integration that accounts for development and globalization as a phenomenon or a process that encompasses the reality of the various aspects of the human being, society, peoples, and institutions. This work examines how Lonergan's philosophical anthropology promotes the concept of integral development as one of the ways of integrating the different forms of globalization so as to benefit the human person and to enhance the development and progress of nations.

Keywords

development, economy, globalization, Lonergan, values

Often, discussions on development end up as a debate on globalization, especially on the free market or neo-liberal economic policies. However, development equally means the integration of various economies into the world economy, as well as the effect of technology—especially informatics and communication—on peoples and cultures. Globalization deals further with social issues like the provision of basic needs: food, clothing, shelter;

public services like education, health services, transportation, etc. Globalization is also dealing with the basic meaning and value upon which people base their lives, the dynamic evolution of these values, and the various epochal changes in the course of history (such as the movement from traditional to modern societies). Globalization is also religious, as world religions are found in every part of the globe arising from the movement of people across international borders. Globalization is, therefore, social, info-technological, economic, cultural, military, and political with personal as well as religious implications.

The relationship between development and globalization is complex. It is characterized by greater integration of human histories, creating global consciousness in such a way that, as the saying goes, the world has become a village. According to Neil Ormerod and Shane Clifton:

Globalization theory seeks to describe the nature of society given worldwide social relations, and in this sense globalization can be understood as a heuristic label intended to encapsulate the complex and globally ranging set of experiences, relationships, structures, technologies, institutions, and cultural symbols, which are determinative for life in a compressed world. In this light, it is readily apparent that economic views of globalization, which often dominate public discourse (and theological analysis), are inadequate. Globalization extends to the personal, structural (economic, technical and political), cultural, and religious spheres of life, where personal and corporate identities are framed by the reflexivity arising from social engagement (and conflict) in a global public space.¹

Globalization, therefore, is a phenomenon that one cannot but take cognizance of in its totality. An over-emphasis of any one of its aspects to the neglect of others marginalizes human existence, meaning, and values.

In the wake of the development decade of the 1960s leading up to the financial crisis of the 1970s, Pope Paul VI in the encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, 'On the Development of Peoples,' emphasizes integral development. He writes: 'Development cannot be limited to mere economic growth. In order to be authentic, it must be complete: integral, that is, it has to promote the good of every man and of the whole man.'² By this, Paul VI means, a development of the whole human person; one that takes care of the various dimensions of human life. Such development, cognizant of the interdependence of the economico-social, politico-cultural, as well as religio-psychic, and environmental factors in development, emphasizes sustainable human development. Integral human development recognizes the uniqueness of each human person and wishes to make sure that nobody is left behind or is denied opportunities for human fulfilment. Equally recognized is the possible impact of development measures and policies. Therefore, an attempt is made to protect the human person from potential danger, deprivation, marginalization, and injustice. Since the human person is the beneficiary of development, integral development emphasizes development not only for the members of the existing generation of human beings but also for the coming generations.

Integral development is important especially in view of the hegemony of economic globalization which, ignoring the interdependence of its complex variables and the unity of the constituent institutions of societies, turns the globe into a grand utopia that is one-dimensionally pigeon-holed in an unrealizable strait-jacket structure. Using aspects of Bernard Lonergan's philosophical approach, this article emphasizes the need for integral development that takes into account the various dimensions of globalization, especially as it affects the human person. By highlighting the various phases of development, and giving a brief excursus on the mechanisms of globalization and its more often negative consequences on societies and peoples, this article seeks, through a Lonerganian approach, a corrective to the one-dimensional approach with its over-emphasis on the economic globalization. It argues that development and globalization, if they are to benefit people and impact positively on the human person, societies and environment, must be integral, that is, promote the development of each person, the whole human being, and creation in general.

Development and Globalization

While various dates have been given for the emergence of globalization, development studies reveal three distinct phases.³ The first phase that marks the beginning of modern-ity starts with the significant shift in production and consumption that began in the late 18th and early 19th centuries—Europe’s industrial revolution. The decades following the process of emancipation occasioned by the struggle and resistance to colonial rule and decolonization led to a notion of development as a way of incorporating the former colonies of Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, and other European countries’ colonies in Asia, Africa, and Latin America into the world economy. The creation of the Bretton Woods financial institutions of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in 1944 facilitated this process, thus establishing the decade of development and globalization. Initially, these international financial institutions were only to help nation-states provide the basic necessities of life for the progress and well-being of their citizens.⁴

The second development phase began as a consequence of President Truman’s Four Point speech in 1949 urging the use of US scientific and technological machinery to kick-start the economies of underdeveloped peoples. Truman’s vision of prosperity for all parts of the planet (which has become, according to William Easterly, the ‘White Man’s Burden’) was foreseen to be unrealizable, as it would inflict so much pain on people.⁵ In spite of this, the implementation of the ‘dream of prosperity for all’ went ahead. A modernization theory of development, popularized by W. W. Rostow’s stages of growth theory recommends progression from traditional society to modern industrialized societies for economic development.⁶

The financial crises of the early 1970s marked the beginning of the third phase of the development project and turned the focus away from nationalization and state intervention in the economy to an emphasis on free-market economy and the attendant loss of sovereignty of nation-states to the international financial institutions and corporations. In the third phase of development, neo-liberalism ‘accords the market rather than the state the main role in resolving economic and other problems.’⁷ The increasing burden of debt assumed by many developing countries, especially Latin America in the 1980s, necessitated sets of economic reforms tagged the Structural Adjustment Programme imposed by the IMF and the World Bank. These reforms foisted neo-liberal economic policies on countries, and was characterized by a reduction in the involvement of the government in its own development, including social services like health care and education. Government institutions were turned into private agencies. Trade was liberalized to increase competition in order to enhance optimum growth, and the currency was devalued. According to Richard Jolly et al., ‘Beginning in the 1980s neo-liberal economic and financial policies were introduced practically worldwide with mixed and in many ways negative results. The IMF and the World Bank made loans conditional upon the adoption of these policies. Financially constrained developing countries resisted only meekly largely because of the debt crisis that started at the outset of the 1980s.’⁸ The effects of the structural adjustment programme in developing countries amounted to heavy hardship, which even the Washington Consensus (economic globalization and market integration) proponents observed, leading to heavy criticism by members of the consensus themselves. This is the brand of globalization that we see in the works of such economists as Joseph E. Stiglitz and Jeffery Sachs.⁹ Joseph E. Stiglitz, for one, confessed: ‘I have always been interested in economic development and what I saw radically changed my views of both globalization and development. I have written this book because while I was at the World Bank, I saw firsthand the devastating effect that globalization can have on developing countries, and especially the poor within those countries.’¹⁰ In effect, with the third development phase, the development project per se had crashed.¹¹ In actual fact, many of the beneficiaries of the free-market economy are actually those who did not follow strictly the structures of neo-liberal capitalism, but attended to other factors like social programs that promote human well-being. As David Held observes:

Today, there are strong grounds for doubting that the standard liberal economic approach delivers on promised goods and that global market integration is the indispensable condition of development. The

implementation of such policies by the World Bank, IMF, and leading economic powers has often led to counter-productive results, at national and global levels. Countries that have benefited most from globalization are those that have not played by the rules of the standard liberal market approach, including China, India, and Vietnam.¹²

It would be wise to study the secret of the success of what was later to be termed the East Asian Miracle.¹³ Thus, according to Arturo Escobar, instead of the dream of material prosperity and economic progress, the development project 'produced its opposite: massive underdevelopment and impoverishment, untold exploitation and oppression.'¹⁴

Available statistics prove that globalization benefits the rich and impoverishes the poor. According to Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud,

Global economic inequality increased dramatically between 1960 and 1990: in 1960, the wealthiest 20 percent of the world's population received 30 times the income of the poorest 20 % in 1997, the richest 20 percent received 74 times as much ... By the late 20th century, the world's 200 wealthiest individuals had assets equal to more than the combined income of 41 percent of the world's population; the assets of the three richest people were more than the combined GNP of all least developed countries ... Debt levels as a percentage of export earnings in poor nations doubled between 1970 and 1986, and by 1986 more money flowed to the West in debt repayments than went to the Third World in loans and investments.¹⁵

The structure of globalization places developing countries at the margins and hardly gives them any room for development through the very structures that benefit the industrialized countries. Because they have so little room to manoeuvre in international finance and are disadvantaged in international trade negotiations, the poorest and least developed countries of the world end up raking in debts over and above their gross national output. As Jose Ocampo observes,

The main features of the present globalization and the resulting distributive tensions reflect the political economy of the world today. Indeed, the imbalance of the current globalization agenda reflects the greater influence exerted by the more powerful states and the large multinational firms. It is also the result of the disorganization of other actors, particularly developing countries, in international debates.¹⁶

Let us examine briefly the mechanisms of globalization and their impact on development.

The Mechanisms of Globalization

The mechanisms of globalization swing the pendulum of state involvement in the public forum, and this is especially so in the control of the free-market economy ruled by the neo-liberal market fundamentalism. While the process of economic globalization has weakened the effectiveness of nation-states in controlling the economy, nation-states are still expected to play a leading role in the development of societies. For instance, though the production of goods and services in the free market is in private hands, corporations operate under rules and regulations made by government laws.¹⁷ In the emerging markets of BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China), the free-market economy struggles with the now increasing problem of government involvement in what usually is reserved for the private sector, especially in the wake of the financial crisis in the form of sovereign wealth funds or other fully financed corporate arms of the state. These could possibly be used as a 'foreign policy tool' in order to coerce companies to toe the line of government economic policies, thus indirectly interfering in the freedom of the markets. At times, sovereign wealth funds are used to pursue political goals, especially in developing countries, where the incumbent uses these funds for political purposes in

order to coerce and intimidate the opposition. In developed economies, sovereign wealth funds are often used to buy up financial institutions in troubled economies overseas. There is also the fear that the establishment and the prosperity of sovereign wealth funds might reverse the trend of free-market economy and place even more companies under state control—thus, possibly giving rise to another brand of mercantilism, whereby the government controls almost all investments, in both the public and the private sector of the economy, through various forms of state ownership.

The mechanism of globalization equally cuts across the dynamics of international relations, reflecting the multifaceted institutional structures of governance in different countries of the world. This is evident in the emerging markets and in the developing countries of the third world. Here one faces not only the stiff competition with multinationals, operating within emerging markets, but also the moral dilemma of doing business, where corruption and bribery may form part of the very costs. The Halliburton bribery scandal in Nigeria involving high-ranking officials of the Nigerian government and executives of Halliburton, and the corporate corruption of Siemens and Volkswagen in South Africa bring to the fore the challenges of business ethics, especially when tinged with dirty politics.¹⁸ These, once more, raise the difficult problem of the relationship between the free market and various governments' business policies. According to *The Economist's* Special Report on Globalization:

Then there are the more humdrum uncertainties about emerging-market governments' attitude to the rule of law. Will theft of intellectual property be punished? Will lax regulatory enforcement allow your company's supply chain to be contaminated? ... Might the Government issue a decree that alters the fundamentals of your business, without consultation or recourse, as often happens in China? Will it decide suddenly to break up local monopolies, or alternatively encourage their formation? On top of all this, there is the traditional game of guessing whether governments will abandon sound fiscal and monetary policy at the first sign of economic turbulence—i.e., any day now.¹⁹

These risks are worrisome to multinationals with large amounts to invest in emerging markets and developing countries, and they adversely affect economic growth, which is the mainstay of economic globalization. However, at present, the involvement of the emerging markets of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, and China), as well as the already progressing and more advancing markets like South Korea and Mexico plus the booming economies of the Arab states like the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, etc., is transforming the mechanism of globalization from competition to collaboration understood in increased risk-sharing. There has also been greater trust among multinationals in promoting efficiency, including the relocation of the headquarters of some multinational companies to the emerging markets. For instance, Halliburton, an energy services firm, moved its capital from New York to Dubai in 2007.²⁰

Also, the regular tension between government involvement in the market and the free market economy is decreasing. Not only do multinational corporations require laws to protect and promote free trade, they also join with governments for various businesses by involving government officials and leaders in the various training programmes that they offer. Multinational corporations cooperate also in providing the infrastructure through which they (the multinationals) will benefit by selling their products and improving relations with government and host communities.

Another mechanism of globalization is the multinationals' promotion of social programmes—called 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR)—in their host communities and in the developing poor countries of the world. Here, multinational corporations promote social responsibility by showcasing the good that they contribute to the community to which they belong. This ranges from making philanthropic provisions such as scholarship schemes for indigent, bright students to saving the environment through energy-saving projects. 'For example, \$1 out of every \$9 under professional management in America now involves an element of "socially responsible

investment,” according to Geoffrey Heal of Columbia Business School.²¹ The decision to be involved and to promote corporate social responsibility derives from the increasing numbers of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that are ready to do battle with multinational corporations over their failure to contribute to the host communities or states. Also, involvement in corporate social responsibilities is seen as necessary in managing the risks often encountered in countries with a poor human rights’ record, where multinationals collude with government in committing various forms of atrocity. A case in point is Yahoo, the technology giant, which colluded with the government by handing data to Chinese authorities leading to the jailing of two Chinese dissidents. Yahoo later settled out of court with the families of the jailed dissidents.²² Also, as a result of greater scrutiny of their activities, especially in the wake of such disasters as oil spillages and explosions, multinational corporations get involved in social responsibility as a strategy for risk management. ‘Much of the rhetoric on CSR may be about doing the right thing and trumping competitors, but much of the reality is plain risk management. It involves limiting the damage to the brand and the bottom line that can be inflicted by a bad press and consumer boycotts, as well as dealing with the threat of legal action.’²³ Another reason for corporate social responsibility is the potential it has for increasing profit, that is, the value it adds to a company’s competitive advantage. Therefore, “‘Doing well by doing good” has become a fashionable mantra. Businesses have eagerly adopted the jargon of “embedding” CSR in the core of their operations, making it “part of the corporate DNA” so that it influences decisions across the company.’²⁴ Thus, the corporation’s involvement in social responsibility is another way of promoting their self-interest.

Global governance is another mechanism of development that might be mentioned. It emerges through the institutionalization of market rule that is consequent upon acceptance of a free-market economy that emphasizes the freedom of the market in determining trade within and among nations. Through global governance, global institutions (like the World Bank and IMF) take a more powerful governing role through various multilateral protocols.²⁵ Thus, global governance manages the world economy ‘as a single entity’ through such regimes as the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), leading to the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995.²⁶ In order to promote the free movement of goods, capital, and other items of trade across borders, the WTO establishes protocols that regulate free trade.

Especially disadvantaged in this process of global governance are the debtor countries of the Third World (now developing countries of the South), whose political and economic policies are determined by the major loan financing institution (the World Bank) as they have to restructure their economies in order to earn foreign exchange. Furthermore, the bipolar structure of global governance, with the industrialized countries of the North having the decision-making power, does not reflect the present multilateral world structure.

Appraisal of Globalization

Although globalization is multifaceted and expected to promote human well-being, increase human fulfilment, and make the world a better place for human beings, the emphasis on development has been essentially one-sided. This is true of the trade rules, of various efforts to share our planet (including preserving it for the forthcoming generations), and of measures to promote sustainable human development. The hegemony of economic globalization and the continued perpetuation of trade liberation through the invisible hand of the market even in the face of deepening financial crisis (as in 2008) are worrisome. In order to reflect the various aspects of human existence (economic, political, social, cultural, and religious), globalization must be integral, incorporating the multifaceted dimensions of the cosmos (economic, ecological, and human sustainability). In the light of this, the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization recognizes the importance of a shift of emphasis from merely economic globalization to globalization that is pro-people, that caters to the well-being of people, to their political stability and material prosperity. In their report, entitled *A Fair Globalization*, the Commission asserts:

We believe the dominant perspective on globalization must shift more from a narrow preoccupation with markets to a broader preoccupation with people. Globalization must be brought from the high pedestal of corporate board rooms and cabinet meetings to meet the needs of people in the communities in which they live. The social dimension of globalization is about jobs, health and education—but it goes far beyond these. It is the dimension of globalization, which people experience in their daily life and work: the totality of their aspirations for democratic participation and material prosperity. A better globalization is the key to a better and secure life for people everywhere in the 21st century.²⁷

Interestingly, what the Commission is calling for is a shift away from the hegemony of economics (within the context of societal institutions) to the inclusion of the technological, social, cultural, and political orders that are established to improve the quality of life in human societies.

Karl Polanyi's classic book, *The Great Transformation* (1944), for one, forewarned that economics divorced from the rest of the constituents of society is impracticable. According to Joseph E. Stiglitz,

Among his [Polanyi's] central theses are the ideas that the self-regulating markets never work; their deficiencies, not only in their internal workings but also in their consequences (e.g., for the poor), are so great that government intervention becomes necessary; and that the pace of change is of central importance in determining these consequences. Polanyi's analysis makes it clear that popular doctrines of trickle-down economics—that all, including the poor, benefit from growth—have little historical support.²⁸

The financial crises (since 2008) likened to the Great Depression (1929–39) arising mainly from an over-emphasis on economic growth, makes it clear, as Polanyi observes,

That the idea of a self-adjusting market implied a stark utopia ... Nothing could seem more inept than the attempt to reduce a civilization, its substance and ethos, to a hard-and-fast number of institutions; to select one of them as fundamental and proceed to argue the inevitable self-destruction of civilization on account of some technical quality of its economic organization.²⁹

The mechanisms and strategies of globalization as economic growth marginalize and distort the integral dialectics of society, wrongfully prioritize the accumulation of capital and consumption as the essence of development, and make other societal institutions subservient to economics. Of course, as Polanyi observes, it does not work. 'Such an institution could not exist for any length of time without annihilating the human and natural substance of society; it would have physically destroyed man and transformed his surroundings into a wilderness.'³⁰

Alternatives are being sought, and measures are being taken to reconfigure development, to free people from the clutches of the Bretton Wood experts, and to deconstruct neo-liberalism (as it has become evident that the market cannot solve every problem). People have come to know that the dominant neo-liberal free market economy is not natural and inevitable, that they were products of historical processes, which could equally be reversed so as to free humanity from the clutches of economic subordination and from the domination of one aspect of the dialectic of the community. The effort now, as the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization highlights, is to make development and globalization pro-people.

Lonerganian Approach

Lonergan's engagement with integral development dates to his early call for a *summa sociologica* in the paper 'Panton Anakephalaiosis: A Theory of Human Solidarity' that emphasizes the importance of the unity of the economic, political, cultural, and religious dimensions of human existence in progress and

development.³¹ *Insight*, his study of human understanding reiterating the dialectics of community, advanced his position, concentrating on the importance of the human person as a rational being who experiences, understands, judges, and decides for the promotion of the common good.³² *Method in Theology* emphasizes meaning and value, especially the scale of values by which the human person contributes to the human good through recurrences of schemes.³³ In Lonergan's early works in economics, one sees an effort to promote progress and development that reintegrate the dialectics of community and, by integrating the scale of values, that have potential for humanizing globalization by making it people-oriented.³⁴

Lonergan locates the economy within the practicality of common sense as one of the constitutive elements of the dialectic of community. It comprises spontaneous intersubjectivity and practical intelligence, obeying the law of limitation and transcendence.³⁵ The relationship of the products of practical intelligence (technology, the economy, and polity in a social order) is one of interdependence, 'an intelligible pattern of relationships' that bring about the good of order.³⁶ Lonergan writes:

In its technological aspect the social order generates the distinctions between scientists and engineers, technicians and workers, skilled and unskilled labor. In its economic aspect it differentiates the formation of capital from the production of consumer goods and services, distinguishes income groups by offering proportionate rewards to contributions, and organizes contributors in hierarchies of employees, foremen, supervisors, superintendents, managers, and directors. In its political aspect it distinguishes legislative, judicial, diplomatic, and executive functions with their myriad ramifications, and it works out some system in which the various offices are to be filled and the tasks performed.³⁷

In the Lonergan corpus, these constitutive elements of society, through patterns of cooperation, interdependently bring about the good of order, that is, the recurrence of the schemes of events that make it possible for the constant realization of the human good in society. The economy benefits from technology; the economy engenders politics which harmonizes the variables of the social process by integrating the economy and technology. Robert Doran articulates this clearly:

Thus insight evokes in turn the technological formation of capital, the economic system, and the political specialization of common sense. Technology meets the problem of recurrent desires. The economy meets the problems set by technology. And politics meets the problems occasioned by the tension of the economic and technological orders with the intersubjective spontaneity of the groups who compose the society. When it is functioning integrally, politics meets these problems by giving each pole of the tension its due in determining the unfolding history of the community. But when it displaces its function, politics becomes the instrument, not of the common good, but of one or other of the groups constituted by the economic order. Thus in an economic system where the function of capital is the maximization of profit, rather than use values for the whole community, such a distortion can develop more or less along the lines suggested by Marx in his analysis of the capitalism of his day. But when the proposed solution itself ignores the integral unfolding of the dialectic of community in accord with the normative scale of values, it is liable to embody structurally the same defect, as has occurred in centralized state socialism.³⁸

Such distortion is at the heart of the crisis of governance and is destabilizing globalization today. According to the World Commission on Social Globalization, 'They arise from a fundamental imbalance between the economy, society, and the polity. The economy is becoming increasingly global, while social and political institutions remain largely local, national, or regional. None of the existing global institutions provide adequate democratic oversight of global markets, or redress basic inequalities between countries.'³⁹ An instance of such distortion in his own time led Lonergan to research on how to accelerate production so as to improve standards of living.

Loneragan's economics, written within the context of the Great Depression of the 1930s, aim at the restoration of the good of order, which had collapsed as a result of the credit crunch. Deeply saddened by the inability of workers to earn adequate wages and perplexed at the level of poverty making it difficult for the provision of the standard of living, Lonergan delved into the question of ethics and economics. He was concerned at its mechanistic approach that neglects human freedom. At the same time, however, he insisted that the economy be not run by the government but by the people. What was required, therefore, and which he set out to do, was to enable people to understand the dynamics of macroeconomics as it fits into the larger practice of economics.

Loneragan recognizes the crucial importance of production to the standard of living in his general theory of the cycle of innovative growth. Within production in a free-market economy, he equally appreciates the role of finance in the different phases of production and in the market system for economic growth and innovation. He divided production into two circuits: the basic circuit and the surplus circuit. The basic circuit refers to the firms that produce goods and services for the standard of living. The surplus circuit refers to the firms that produce machinery, tools, and equipment that are needed to produce goods in the basic circuit. The basic unit includes all that is needed for production such as all market activities that are connected with the direct production of both final consumption goods and services and the intermediate inputs that are needed to produce the final goods. These would include equipment, machinery, tools, stocks, labour skills, and the employment of technological knowledge. The surplus circuit encompasses all those market activities that are involved in the direct production of capital goods and intermediate inputs that are needed to produce capital goods. Both circuits require a constant flow of money, interaction, and relationship in order to function in producing a standard of living in an economy. Both circuits are interdependent for the production of human good. Goods produced by basic circuit firms are needed by workers, who are employed in surplus circuit firms, and goods that are produced by surplus circuit firms are needed by basic circuit firms. Money payments must flow between the two circuits for these transfers of production to be effected.

The circuit that produces consumer goods that enter directly into the standard of living (the capitalist phase) and the circuit that produces the means of production that accelerate the flow of the basic circuit (the materialist phase) constitute the factors of production in an economy. Both represent the infrastructures of culture: technology, the economy, and the polity. From these infrastructures of culture as products of practical intelligence emerge the superstructure of culture as the cultural phase that is responsible for social transformation through improvement of the cultural dynamics of a society, nation, or people.⁴⁰ Notice once more the interrelationships of the constituents of society for integral development. What we gather from this is that not only the economy, but the rest of the institutional structures of society work for the overall well-being of society, for the common good. They interrelate to bring about the human good through the good of order, that is, through patterns of cooperation by which each member of a society contributes to the common good by cooperating with one another and contributing each person's inventiveness and creativity into a commonwealth of resources that together promote the human good of all the members of society. In the interdependency of the products of practical intelligence, 'technological institutions, the economic system, the political order, and culture,' money is only a means and not an end.⁴¹ It is an instrument of account, not a commodity; it is not self-regulating but regulated by the intrinsic intelligibility of the economic good of order and in relation to a normative scale of value. In its role of oversight, politics bears in mind the economic good of order that is aimed rightly at the standard of living and, therefore, does not seek to advance the political interests of any party's manifesto, or through autocratic or unnecessary bureaucracy, interfere in the economic process. In such interdependent mutual relationship of the constitutive elements of the society, where the economic process is correctly understood, 'politics is freed to be the mediator between the civil community's highest cultural values and its concrete solution to the problem of living together. For example, it would judge, direct, and guide the economic process in the service of ends that transcend the economy, such as the arts, liberal education, and religion, which have to do with truths by which humanity can flourish.'⁴²

However, the social order can be distorted by bias: the individual bias of the egoist (self-interest); the group bias of a dominant class; and finally, and especially, the general bias of common sense, that is, 'a refusal to acknowledge the significance of the reflexive level for the well-being of the social order,' precipitating the 'longer cycle of decline.'⁴³ Specialists in their various fields, technology, the economy, or politics, can begin to operate without recognizing and appreciating 'the significance of other fields.'⁴⁴ The hegemony of economic globalization with its subjugation of technology and politics appears to be a concrete manifestation of the longer cycle of decline, of the distortion of the economic process, making economics, money and capital an end in themselves, thus subjugating the human person as an instrument designed ordinarily to assist in building the standard of living. Doran asserts:

When the integral scale of values is neglected, the legal and political institutions slip out of the infrastructure and become the lowest rung of a mendacious superstructural edifice erected to preserve a distorted economic order in which intersubjective interaction in its autonomous capacity is overlooked and instead is twisted through group bias into becoming an ally of a practicality distorted by general bias. ... Culture itself then becomes an instrument of distorted practicality, and the superstructure becomes absurd when the political invades its domain. As culture retreats, morality and religion follow suit: personal values are ignored or amputated, and religious values are either explicitly denied or twisted into supports for a distorted culture and society. The entire structure is upset by the derailment of the political, a derailment rooted in the loss of the tension of practicality and intersubjectivity that is the responsibility of culture to inform and of politics to implement.⁴⁵

However, as value, the economic process is guided by the normative scale of values, which according to Lonergan are structured in a hierarchical order as vital, social, cultural, personal, and religious.⁴⁶ Therefore, the specific Lonerganian approach to integral development demands an understanding and application of the integral scale of value. The interconnectedness and the interdependence of the scale of values from above downwards and from below upwards will remain the measure of assessment of sustainable human development and globalization that improves standards of living and human flourishing. This is so as long as development and globalization are a deliberate pursuit of values that are aimed not only at human fulfilment, but also at the sustainability of the environment and the enthronement of peace, justice and freedom.

Integral Scale of Values

Robert Doran's appropriation of Lonergan's scale of values and his adoption of an integral scale of values through what he calls analogy of dialectics, linking the three dialectics of the subject, the community, and culture in accordance with the laws of limitation and transcendence, broaden Lonergan's scale of values and make its application concrete in daily life.⁴⁷ Neil Ormerod and Shane Clifton's use of Doran's integral scale of values specifies the relevance of Doran's work in this important area of Lonergan's studies in relation to globalization and the mission of the Church. According to them: 'globalization is a heuristic label that names the compression of the world, the intensification of supraterritorial relations beyond merely the economic realm, encompassing the vital, social, cultural, personal and religious values that constitute the infinitely complex reality of global human society.'⁴⁸ Presupposing and building upon these works, it is clear that Lonergan's contribution to integral development demands attention to the scale of values, for on these relationships depends the progress or decline of societies and nations. Doran notes:

In our current situation, in the situation that a contemporary systematic theology must address, the problem of the effective and equitable distribution of vital goods is global, and so its solution must call for new technological, economic, and political structures on a global scale, and for new visions of intersubjective and interpersonal flowering. Moreover, the socioeconomic relations and political realities, as well as the new interpersonal ethics, that would constitute a globally interdependent

commonwealth, will call for the generation of cultural values that are themselves cross-cultural. The culture that is adequate to the proportions of a globally interdependent technological, economic, and political order in dialectical relationship with a cross-cultural intersubjectivity is at best emergent in our present situation, and the obstacles to its truly effective emergence and survival (some of them, unfortunately, working from within the church) are monumental in scope and power.⁴⁹

Cognizant of the internationalization of global affairs and the mutual interdependence of cultures, peoples, and nations, Doran's assertion makes integral development an imperative. In the light of the interconnectedness of the world—made possible by info-technological advancements, scientific inventions, industrialization and trade, cross-cultural currents arising from immigrations, and the cross-pollination of ideas resulting from commingling of peoples and cultures—relations determined by domination and power are no longer tenable. A one-dimensional development that objectifies and 'thingifies' human beings no longer satisfies the inner longings of the human spirit that yearns for wholeness. We must do all in our power to overcome structures that keep human beings from integral development.

Concluding Remarks

In the light of Lonergan's philosophy, theology, and economics, integral development demands development directly aimed at human well-being. That is, development aimed at human fulfilment, not just generically referring to human beings as a mass but for each and every single individual person, for the good of the present generation, and that of the next. It demands an overhaul of the structures of international politics and trade, of global governance, and of international financial institutions and organizations in such a way that every human being counts and human values are very well represented and protected. These include the religious, personal, cultural, social, and vital values from above and from below.

Concretely this implies a recognition that development and globalization arise from the good intentions of human beings to better and improve not only their lives but that of humanity as a whole. The process of globalization and development, as actions of human agents, must not exclude the interest of human beings. Its aim will be defeated if human progress, understood as providing conditions for human fulfilment, is ignored. The mechanism of globalization politically (the relation of the market and the state), economically (the maximization of profit), socially (corporate social responsibility), administratively (global governance), when it furthers the interest of the rich and the powerful to the detriment of the weak and the poor, fails in its intended goal of making human life better.

Often, the mechanistic philosophical and theological anthropology underlying development and globalization traps its process in a one-dimensional quest for profit to the neglect of the well-being of humanity as a whole. It skews development and leaves globalization at the mercy of the structures of an unjust world-order, where decisions in international trade regimes (like the GAATS and WTO) are made by the superpowers that alone have veto powers. Of course, their decisions benefit their countries and peoples. Development can only be integral and respectful of the scale of values, when it is constructed in a philosophical anthropology that is conscious of the basic *humanum* (human) that all human beings share irrespective of their creed, code, cult, colour of their skin, their economic condition, education, and level of development.

Lonergan's philosophical anthropology has the prospect of humanizing globalization. It is pro-people and does not have the potential to denigrate or hold any human being in contempt. All human beings experience, understand, judge, and decide. Inherently the laws of the human spirit (attentiveness, intelligence, reasonableness, and responsibility) abide in the human subject irrespective of differences in creed, code, cult, race, etc. It is respectful of human dignity. This is not surprising as its foundation and goal are social transformation, and Lonergan himself was influenced by important sociologists, who were concerned with

human well-being. Since the challenge of integral development is the integral dialectic of community, and this is evidently distorted by the one-dimensional hegemonic corporate globalization, the solution is a philosophical anthropology that fosters human well-being as a whole, by fulfilling the human scale of values. Lonergan's philosophical anthropology, therefore, stands as an example of such anthropology and a conception of the human person that is destined one day to humanize globalization and promote integral human development.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- 1 Neil J. Ormerod and Shane Clifton, *Globalization and the Mission of the Church*, Ecclesiological Investigations (London: Continuum, 2011), Kindle edition.
- 2 Paul VI, *Populorum progressio*, no. 14; Joseph Gremillion, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice: Catholic Social Teaching Since Pope John* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), 391.
- 3 Ifeanyi Ezeonu, 'Crimes of Globalization: Health Care, HIV and the Poverty of Neoliberalism in Sub-Saharan Africa,' *International Journal of Social Inquiry* 1 (2008): 113–34; Jose Antonio Ocampo, 'Rethinking Global Economic and Social Governance,' *Journal of Globalization and Development* 1 (2010): 1–27. Gilbert Rist, 'Is "Development" a Panacea? How to Think Beyond Obsolete Categories,' *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 30 (2010): 345–54.
- 4 On the institution of the World Bank in this first phase of development, see Susan George and Fabrizio Sabelli, *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire* (London: Penguin, 1994).
- 5 William Easterly, *White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2007).
- 6 See Walt Whitman Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1960).
- 7 Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, eds, *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 7.
- 8 Richard Jolly, Louis Emmerij, and Thomas G. Weiss, *UN Ideas that Changed the World* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University, 2009), 13.
- 9 See Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (London: W. W. Norton, 2002); Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work* (London: W.W. Norton, 2007); Jeffery Sachs, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities of Our Time* (London: Penguin, 2006); Jeffery Sachs, *Commonwealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet* (London: Penguin, 2008).
- 10 Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents*, ix.
- 11 John Cavanagh and Jerry Mander share this view and argue that the dissatisfaction in every continent is an indication 'of the failure of the present global economic system and its ruling institutions' (John Cavanagh and Jerry Mander, eds, *Alternatives to Economic Globalization: A Better World Is Possible* [San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2004], 2).
- 12 David Held, 'The Changing Face of Global Governance,' *Social Europe Journal*, 8 January 2010, <http://www.social-europe.eu/2010/01/the-changing-face-of-global-governance-between-past-strategic-failure-and-future-economic-constraints> (accessed June 3, 2013).
- 13 The East Asian Miracle, as reluctantly studied by the World Bank, reveals the role of government in growth of the economy and the success of the Asian Tigers because they did not abide by all the recommendations of the IMF.
- 14 Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and the Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1995), 4.
- 15 Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, eds, *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 9.

- 16 Jose Antonio Ocampo, 'Rethinking Global Economic and Social Governance,' *Journal of Globalization and Development* 1 (2010): 1–27, at 15.
- 17 Eileen de Neeve, *Decoding the Economy: Understanding Change with Bernard Lonergan* (Montreal, QC: Sherbrooke-Valois, 2008), 19.
- 18 According to the report of the British Broadcasting Corporation, KBR (2009) pleaded guilty to paying \$180m (£115m) in bribes to Nigerian officials prior to 2007, when it was a subsidiary of Halliburton. The firm agreed to pay \$579m (£372m) in fines related to the case in the US (see, 'Dick Cheney Faces Bribery Scandal in Nigeria,' <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-11902489>, accessed June 3, 2013).
- 19 'Special Report on Globalization,' *The Economist*, 20–26 September 2008, 18.
- 20 See 'Special Report on Globalization on the Changing Trends on Globalization,' *The Economist*, 20–26 September 2008, 20.
- 21 'A Special Report on Corporate Social Responsibility,' *The Economist*, 19 January 2008, 4.
- 22 See Jeremy Kirk, 'Yahoo Sued Over Jailing of Chinese Dissident,' *CIO magazine*, http://www.cio.com/article/104857/Yahoo_Sued_over_Jailing_of_Chinese_Dissident (accessed June 3, 2013); See also Juan Carlos Perez, 'Yahoo Settles Chinese Dissident Lawsuit,' *PCWorld*, http://www.pcworld.com/article/139619/yahoo_settles_chinese_dissident_lawsuit.html (accessed June 3, 2013).
- 23 'A Special Report on Corporate Social Responsibility,' *The Economist*, 19 January 2008, 12.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 4.
- 25 The principal protocols of the WTO include the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs), Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) (see Philip McMichael, *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective* [Los Angeles: Pine Forge, 2008], 169).
- 26 *Ibid.*, 155.
- 27 World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, *A Fair Globalization: Creating Opportunities for All*, 2004, vii, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/docs/report.pdf> (accessed June 3, 2013).
- 28 Joseph E. Stiglitz, 'Foreword,' in Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon, 2001), vii.
- 29 Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, 3, 4.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 31 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, 'Panton Anakephaliosis (The Restoration of All Things): A Theory of Human Solidarity,' *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 9 (1991), 134–72.
- 32 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, 5th ed., in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 3, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2000).
- 33 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990).
- 34 Bernard J.F. Lonergan, *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, in *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, vol. 15, ed. Frederick G. Lawrence, Patrick H. Byrne, and Charles C. Hefling, Jr (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1999).
- 35 Lonergan, *Insight*, 234.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 238.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 247.
- 38 Robert Doran, *Theology and Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), 104.
- 39 World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, *A Fair Globalization*, no. 12.
- 40 Michael Shute, *Lonergan's Discovery of the Science of Economics* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), 154.
- 41 Robert Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2005), 189.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 13.
- 43 Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* 190.
- 44 Lonergan, *Insight*, 251.
- 45 Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* 194.
- 46 Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 39.

- 47** See Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990), 144–50, 378–82, 720; Doran, *What is Systematic Theology?* 172–74; Doran, *The Trinity in History: A Theology of the Divine Missions*, vol. 1, *Missions and Processions* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2012), 104–7.
- 48** Ormerod and Clifton, *Globalization and the Mission of the Church*.
- 49** Doran, *What Is Systematic Theology?* 201.