

Assembling $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$

There are two ways of facing this exercise in Assembling, two ways that parallel a similar challenge in physics. I think of two familiar shifts in physics: that from Newton to Einstein, and that of the Standard Model without or with the Higgs field.¹

My own preferred parallel is the latter and it would be nicely tied in here by my writing my title *Assembling $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$ (2020)* to get the parallel with the Higgs field Standard Model and *Assembling $\{M (W_3)^{\theta\Phi T}\}^4$ (2019)* to signify the—or an—earlier theological or philosophical Standard Model.

The tricky disturbing word of this shocking first paragraph is *familiar*. Then there is the odd “or an” that precedes the five last words. My audience is neither familiar with the shifts in physics nor is the suggested Standard Model (2019) anything close to the low-grade model of present theological and philosophical discourse. We are back at the problem of the end of the second paragraph of the first chapter of *Method in Theology*, in the trivial but well-disguised pursuit of “academic disciplines,”² and Lonergan’s new beginning symbolized by his beginning

¹ The problem of adding the Higgs field is a tricky one, as is further discussion of the field and the particle and its mass. You may get an impression from Roger Penrose’s writing in 2005 (Vintage: *The Road to Reality. A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, 628). “There is also the shadowy Higgs particle – stiff unobserved at the time of writing – whose existence, in some form or other (perhaps not as a single particle), is essential to present-day particle physics, where the related Higgs field is held responsible for the mass of every particle.” In note 73 (p. 33) of my *The Road the Religious Reality*, (Axial Publishing, 2012), I point to various pop-fashion ways “to get a lead on the Higgs’ Boson” (*ibid*, note 73). As you move on through this little essay you will get a sense of my preference for this “jump” in the Standard Model. What of G_{jk}ⁱ’s Bo’s’n, [short for *Boatswain*], Jesus, responsible for the mass and momentum of every person? “Christ the man knew everything that pertained to his work” (*The Incarnate Word*, CWL 8, 677). How should one converse with such bright-eyed competence? It is not enough to gaze up at the statue of the Sacred Heart. Your friend Jesus is in the field, luminously and self-luminously minding the field. “The field is the universe, but my horizon defines my universe.” (*Phenomenology and Logic*, CWL 18, 199). Does my horizon of piety echo with “the arrogance of omnicompetent common sense”? (“Questionnaire on Philosophy: Response,” *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1965–1980*, CWL 17, 370.) Dare I suggest that you pause “over the image of me poised over the word *pious* at note 53 of the third chapter of the book [*The Future: Core Precepts in Supramolecular Method and Nanochemistry*], a chapter that touches on the issue of mature piety in terms of the poise of *pious Aeneas*” (*Ibid.*, iii).

² The end words of the second paragraph of the first chapter of *Method in Theology*.

of the next paragraph: “clearly enough, these approaches to the problem of method do little to advance”. There is no point in my going on regarding that mess: my aim after all, is simply presenting an exercise of the Duffy type that may be taken up in the future.

That take-up sadly involves a massive catch-up and throw-beyond. The center-piece of my (2019) heuristic image goes back to my sublating the work on Fisher and Markov³ into a flow of world maps that, at, say, various intersections of latitudes and longitudes, has a statistics of recurrence-schemes of progress and probable “situation room” components of progress.⁴ The centerpiece of my (2020) shift, pointed to in the previous essay, is the cyclic conception, affirmation, and implementation⁵ of a glocal lift of global intersubjectivity which includes the subjectivities of G_{jk}^i ,⁶ where the “i” points to the dual consciousness of the Christoffer tensor, a

³ See my *Randomness, Statistics and Emergence* (Gill, Macmillan and Notre Dame, 1970), p. 237. The book is not easily available – I must remedy that – so a quotation there from F.M. Fisher (“On the Analysis of History and the Interdependence of the Social Sciences,” *Phil. Sc.*, 27, 1960) may flex your imagination. Think of a flat global map moving along the time axis: Fisher calls the consequent box of heuristic control a *tensor*. “The typical element of the tensor, say $M_{i_1 i_2 i_3 \dots i_{n+1}}$, is defined as the probability that Nature will be in state i_1 at time t_1 given that at the time $t - n$ to $t - 1$ she was successively I states $i_{n+1}, i_n, \dots i_3$ and i_2 .” (op. cit., 149). “Toynbee’s Study of History can be regarded as an attempt at a great Markovian reduction of the historical process to a very few variables and very large subdivisions and the consequent description of the process by a multiple Markov tensor of manageable rank.” (op. cit., 156). My own imaging shifts this tensor into an earth-sphere expanding out along a radial axis t —this helps to glimpse—think longitude and latitude for θ and Φ —my meaning of $\theta\Phi T$. The geohistorical imaging gives a new level of control of Lonergan’s “ongoing, overlapping, etc etc contexts.” Think of the $\theta\Phi T$ weave of pairs like Antioch and Alexandria, Luther and Lainez, Descartes and Dilthey, whatever. Useful here, from the website series, [Questions and Answers](#), is *Question 36*: “An Appeal to Fred Lawrence and Other Elders.”

⁴ I introduced the heuristic reach towards Tower and town control of global situations in chapter 12, “*The Situation Room: The Stupid view of Wolf Blitzer*,” of [Profit: The Stupid View of President Donald Trump](#) (Axial Publishing, Amazon, 2016).

⁵ Follow up musings on the two previous notes with some fantasy about effective “implementation.” Follow up? “The meaning and implications of this statement have now to be explored” (*Insight*, 416: end lines): indeed! “Theology possesses relevance” (*Ibid.*, 766, line 29). It does not. It needs a massive Dionysian shift of the characters of communication, lusting after “fruit to be borne” (*Method in Theology* 355[327]). That lusting has to produce, in these next centuries, a full countervailing heuristic imaging of the objectives of sciences, arts and technologies in situations large and small, to bring us to progress towards the flowering of humanity. How do you stand in regard to this flowering? In the work mentioned in the previous note (see there page 85), I bring forth the question of a global Amendment to any type of constitution. Here, then, is your question: “do you view humanity as possibly maturing – in some serious way – or just messing along between good and evil, whatever you think they are?”

⁶ G_{jk}^i represents a massive challenge to what I may call vegetable thinking, chatter in terms of “God of Abraham or the God of the philosophers,” God thus thought of as a substance of common sense. First, the God of section 9 of *Insight* chapter 19 is not that God, but a God towards which one “comes about”

tensor weaved molecularly into humanity's wavering potential of a unified collaboration towards oneness.

That molecular weaving becomes, for the searcher, personally and poignantly manifest in the self-upgrading necessary for reaching the statistically-effective meaning of the title to the final section of the final essay of the 2019 *Divyadaan* effort, "Developing Characters of Craving."⁷ How are we all to stretch forward, in these next millennia, *sun-flower-wise*, beyond a religious "vegetative living"?⁸ I stay here with Christian religion and its Pauline sloganizing. "What is immediate in us is that de facto we are temples of the Spirit, members of Christ, and adoptive children of the Father, but in a vegetative way. That can move into our conscious living, into our spontaneous living, into our deliberate living."⁹ It can! It can edge us seedingly and seethingly, in this century, to effective fantasy of the supermolecular Eschaton, with, yes, memories of pets and plants,¹⁰ but no such reality, nor food nor drink in any normal sense, but

(*Insight*, 537, line 29) though the *sun-ani-mated* analogically-self-luminous conversation of the "In" (first word of *Insight's* first chapter), Inn, Inn, of each fresh intersubjective "spooky" (*A Third Collection*, "Mission and the Spirit, section 3) recycling of *Insight*. The vegetable reading of this masterpiece of Lonergan is a disgusting reality of his vegetating followers. One reaches the 26th place of *Insight* 19.9 and then joins Aquinas, but in a deeply new context, in the *Summa's* Question 27. On this struggle see my "Embracing Luminously and Toweringly the Symphony of Cauling," [Seeding Global Collaboration](#), edited by Patrick Brown and James Duffy (Axial Publishing, 2016), 221–240. The nudge towards the discomforting symbol comes from Lindsay and Margenau, *Foundations of Physics*, 362, where there is consideration of the Christoffel Tensor.

⁷ *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy and Education* vol. 30, no. 1 (2019), edited by James Duffy and titled by him "Religious Faith Seeding the Positive Anthropocene," contains five essays of mine focused on weaving Whitson's *The Coming Convergence of World Religions* towards what I would now call a *sun-shattering* acceptance of *Insight* as a book of common prayer. The core challenge in the prayer is the reach for luminosity regarding The Beyond as intimate friendship, this in the bright dialogue of affirmation sheltered from muddiness by bowing to negation and eminence.

⁸ *Philosophical and Theological Papers 1958–1964*, "The Mediation of Christ in Prayer," *CWL* 6, 179, line 10.

⁹ *Ibid.*, lines 25–29.

¹⁰ This is obviously a complex heuristic issue, pivoting on Thomas's meaning of "*possibilia esse et non-esse*" (*Summa*, Ia, q.2, a. 3, *Tertia Via*). See my popular presentation (1958) of that *Via* and the references to Thomas given in the notes all reproduced in [Cantower 19](#). Further there is my *The Everlasting Joy of Being Human* (Axial Publishing, 2013), where, in chapter 4, (36–43), I reflect on Thomas's eschatology. See especially notes 10 and 11 there. The conclusion of note 11 (*Summa Contra Gentiles*, IV, ch. 97) is echoed in my text above. "But the other animals, the plants, and the mixed bodies, those entirely corruptible both wholly and in part, will not remain at all in the state of incorruption." See also, the final note of the book, note 86 of page 125, where I wrote of "Son-lit everlasting Saplings in a circumincensing Field without flowers or trees or fauns or bees. Thomas was quite on the ball when he

supra-living in the radiant sharing of Jesus' romping galactic molecules.¹¹ "Is this to be taken literally or is it figure? It would be fair and fine to think it no figure."¹²

Sun, flowers, Son-flowered,
Speak to us of growth.
Seed cauled, cribbed,
Kabod yet confined,
Crossed with dark earth, Light-refined,
Rill open-ends a trill
Annotaste of Throat.

wrote..." And I leave you there, as I am reminded now of Lonergan using such a phrase "Thomas was quite on the ball," re Thomas' eschatology, in an Easter walk we had in Dublin in 1961.

¹¹ The end poem here, from the beginning of my [Cantower](#) climb (that climb began with *Cantower 2*, where the poem emerged), is strangely intersubjective, where nature is cognized cyclically as "God's silent communing with man" (*Topics in Education*, 225, *CWL* 10, line 2). Add, then, the next question in the text above. This is no fancy, but a fact of a finitude in which "God is not an object." What what what is this Complex Subjectivity, in which we are cauled, that we may call Them OM?

¹² The end of Lonergan's 1934 *Essay in Fundamental Sociology*.