

## FuSe 17 AA 1: A First Anonymous Position

I am grateful to Professor McShane for the opportunity to write anonymously, and indeed it seems best to write about an unidentified graduate school as well. The situation in that graduate school is certainly one of enthusiasm about Lonergan but I find that some serious topics do not seem to come up or be welcome. How might I express my position here? I take the easy way out by simply re-reading the suggested list of positions given by McShane in FuSe 17 AA. I do the expected thing: agreeing with the even numbers and disagreeing with the odd numbers. I would not have thought this out in these terms, but in the graduate school not mentioned by me there is very little serious talk about implementation and certainly no serious talk about functional specialization. Talk, yes, sometimes about the topic being foundations or doctrines or systematics. There is very little mention of science of any type: physics, psychology, economics. I have brooded over – in some horror I can say – McShane’s chapter 5 of *Wealth of Self*, about being “inside”. It is a fascinating and frightful problem and I suppose I can say YES to the answer of the previous chapter 4, on the Is-question. But am I really there? The professors do not seem puzzled by it, or really involved in talking about it. Again, topics are chosen from Lonergan but we don’t delay too much on Lonergan: we go on to check other views. Really, then, Lonergan seems to be just the first view in a list of views. All this, I suppose, sounds just like a graduate student groaning. So maybe I should just stop, and make my lazy selection of where I stand from the list of positions that McShane gives in Fuse 17 AA. Here I go:

My position is

Agreement with

[2] I accept existentially Lonergan’s suggestion re implementation as essential to philosophy.

[4] I have begun to see reasons why we need functional collaboration as described by Lonergan.

[6] I take Lonergan seriously when he stands against “pseudometaphysical mythmaking” (*Insight*, 528)

[8] Lonerganism is dishonest in using the name while rejecting Lonergan’s program of *Cosmopolis*.

[10] Lonergan’s search for an effective *Cosmopolis* brought him to functional collaboration.

[12] Lonerganism’s mode of progress is a disgraceful mess.

My position is

one of disagreement with:

[1] I believe that metaphysical interest is one of interested observer: it is not intrinsically practical.

[3] I see little reason why philosophic efforts should be twisted into any collaborative structure. I prefer working on my own, in my own interested fashion.

[5] I think that good description, even haute vulgarization, is sufficient in philosophic discourse.

[7] Lonerganism, as it has moved in the past 50 years, shows progress towards changing culture.

[9] Lonerganism is working its way successfully towards an individualistic answer to Cosmopolis.

[11] Lonergan conferences etc devoted to scattered individualism, is our best option.