

ONTOLOGICAL PERMUTATIONS

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



ONTOLOGICAL PERMUTATIONS

Aphoristic Philosophy

by

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Ontological Permutations* first published 2024 by
John O'Loughlin of Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2024 John O'Loughlin

All rights reserved. No part of this title may be reproduced in any form or
by any means without the prior written permission of the author/publisher

* * * *

CONTENTS

Concerning the Contrary Dispositions of Light and Heat

*Why the Modern World should be Overcome from
Transvaluated Standpoints*

Ontological Permutations

* * * *

Concerning the Contrary Dispositions of Light and Heat

(An Essay in Aphoristic Sections)

1

A good thing about philosophy is that one can speculate to an extent that neither science nor religion would encourage, combining imagination and reason, intuition and logic, in such fashion that something quintessentially philosophical emerges that would be beyond the capacity of scientists and against the dogma of theologians but, for that very reason, capable of furthering channels of investigation that neither the scientists nor the theologians would care to enter upon, arguably to their own cost!

2

So if one, as an original thinker and literary artist, an artist-philosopher, if you will, whose original thought takes an aphoristic form, were to ask oneself how the Cosmos began, one would speculate along lines likely to run independently of both contemporary science and traditional religion. Like, for instance, making the contention that different kinds of gases somehow came into existence in the Void in different places, only to rub up against one another or, at least, against those that were of a contrary disposition or origin, and spark frictions that ignited and eventually flared into the rudiments of stars, which would have been more than their gaseous instigators, insofar as they were likely a combination of photons and protons rather than either

proto-photonic or proto-protonic, like, one could argue, the principal kinds of gases.

3

But some of these rudimentary stars, or flaming balls of subatomic fission, would have had either considerably more photons than protons or, conversely, considerably more protons than photons, according to where and how they were ignited, by what quantity of a particular gas that emerged from the conflicting pressures of an intensely cold Void, and therefore the former were destined, at some point, to dominate the latter, insofar as the one type of star, being mostly superficial, would have an expressively objective advantage over the other type of star, whose comparative profundity would suggest an impressively subjective disposition likely to be attracted by the superficial star and to end-up orbiting around it, like proto-male victims of a proto-female seductive appeal not unconnected with rudimentary power.

4

To that extent, the notion of regular stars orbiting around a quasar-type star, so much brighter than them even if somewhat smaller, comes readily to mind, and perhaps even the beginnings, in consequence, of some kind of galactic structure? Of course, you may, as a scientist or even as a theologian, think all this speculation to be crazy, and even a bit mad. But that is your prerogative from being either overly empirical or overly clerical, and I would tend, as an imaginative thinker, to ignore your contrary kinds of oppositions and carry on regardless, since it is both entertaining and possibly enlightening, as an artist-

philosopher, to have one's own independent opinion in such matters.

5

So one kind of star can be presumed to 'lord' or, rather, 'lady' it over another kind, in a sort of thesis vis-à-vis antithesis situation, the superficial star being most light and least heat, but the profound star most heat and least light, since that would seem to accord with the distinction between most photons and least protons on the one hand, and most protons and least photons on the other hand, in what might be regarded as a kind of superlative absolutism (3:1, most:least).

6

Other subatomic elements, like neutrons and electrons, may well have transpired from the clashings and/or fusings of the earlier ones, most photons and least protons giving rise to neutrons, most protons and least photons to electrons, and so on, with these, like more neutrons and less electrons or, conversely, more electrons and less neutrons, in turn engendering yet other subatomic bodies, in what could be taken for a kind of comparative relativity ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$, more:less), in consequence of its subsequent derivation from the superlative absolutisms alluded to above.

7

Certainly, we should allow for a particle vis-à-vis a wavicle differentiation between the stars I have described as superficial

and those of a profounder tendency, since an expressive objectivity requires, it seems to me, a *vacuous* precondition such as one finds in subatomic *particles*, whereas its impressive antithesis is likely to be based or, rather, centred in a *wavicle plenum*, and such a differentiation would appear to pit not only photons against protons but, lower down the creative chain, neutrons against electrons, making it likely that neutrons would have a particle-based leaning, even an axial orientation, towards photons and, in contrary vein, electrons a wavicle-centred leaning, not to mention axial orientation, towards protons, which is not uncommon, it could be argued, of more evolved contexts, including the human.

8

Be that as it may, I should like to take the contrast between light and heat beyond their origin in one kind of gaseous conflagration or another, one kind of star favouring light over heat and the other kind heat over light, to what happens in the Cosmos and, for that matter, on earth when a categorical distinction exists between light passing through a vacuum (space) and being exposed, or 'shown up', by the earth's atmosphere and, conversely, heat emerging from what is commonly termed flame, which requires oxygen to feed upon and, in a sense, to breathe, so that its appearance is altogether distinct from what is commonly regarded as light.

9

Admittedly, some heat is present in what is predominantly light and, conversely, some light in what is preponderantly heat, but that would not diminish the extents to which light and heat are

separate entities appertaining to different subatomic manifestations of gaseous conflagration, as of the basic elements in the Cosmos which permeate it on a variety of levels.

10

But only on earth – and then comparatively recently – does a distinction exist between natural light and/or heat and artificial light and/or heat, with the former antithesis appertaining to the existences of daylight and, say, a roaring or, at any rate, room-warming open fire and/or wood-burning stove, and the latter antithesis appertaining, by contrast, to the existences of a conventional electric light-bulb on the one hand and, say, a two- or three-bar electric fire on the other hand, each of which, whether natural or artificial, are commensurate with one another on what I argue to be an antithetical basis.

11

Certainly, there is no logical reason why an acceptance of daylight, of natural light pumping through one's windows, should lead one to dismiss the co-existence – within its rightful season – of an open or other form of natural fire, since the two contexts are as naturally equivalent as would be those, on an artificial basis, of an electric light-bulb and an electric fire, whatever other technologies may now be possible or even, for some people, preferable.

12

Of course, when I speak of a conventional electric light-bulb, I

have in mind an electric filament that transmits energy within the
vacuous enclosure of the bulb itself, the ensuing energy that
emerges from them being exposed as artificial light within the
oxygenated room in which one happens to be at the time. For
light, remember, requires a vacuum if it is to travel at incredible
speeds to where it can be exposed, by dint of the prevalence of a
breathable atmosphere.

13

Which is precisely the kind of atmosphere that enables flame to
feed on flammable materials and remain distinct, *as fire*, from
light, even in the artificial context of an electric fire, the thick
filaments or coils of which are exposed to the air we breathe,
enabling them to transmit heat as their primary function which,
in this context, is arguably a cut above central heating or any
other form of artificially generated heat that is less than fiery

14

Hence our basic antithesis between light and heat (fire), whether
natural or artificial, amounts to a distinction between photonic
energy that is superficially difused on the one hand, and protonic
gravity that is profoundly infused on the other hand, and all
because the underlying element is either conditioned by a
vacuum or a plenum, by a void or by oxygen, in what amounts to
an antithesis between the alpha and the omega of vacuum-
conditioned photons and plenum-conditioned protons, which
exist in nature and are replicated in such species as similarly
divide, like humans, into two gender camps – the one female and
the other male.

15

To be sure, females and males are no less antithetical than light and heat, superficial vacuums and profound plenums, even when environmental and technological pressures are busily undermining societal conditioning without, however, making all that much difference to what are basic biological distinctions between the genders, transgender and/or androgynous exceptions to the general rule notwithstanding!

16

Social pressures may insist on gender equality, not least in extensively-urbanized societies that ethnically derive, by and large, from heretical freedoms, but the underlying biological reality is nonetheless existent and tends to persist across *all* classes, even where sartorial distinctions between the genders have been rejected in favour of what are effectively male-biased kinds of unisexual attire, including pants and jeans, joggers and zipper-suits.

17

Looking like what I have, in earlier writings, described as jean- or trouser-wearing 'lesser men' vis-à-vis the 'greater men' who are *literally* male, it would be illogical to discriminate against such socially-transposed females *as women*; although, by a contrary token, it would be illogical for a female who habitually dressed in female kinds of vacuous attire, like dresses and skirts, to expect to be regarded, much less treated, as man's equal, as a 'lesser man' to a 'greater man', when she made no real effort to

look like one, preferring to maintain a sartorial contrast to anything male in the interests of her sense of female purpose or dignity, which required a vaginal as opposed to a phallic symbolism.

18

Such women indubitably exist, but they are not the equals, in broad male-biased terms, of their male counterparts, being likely, if anything, to regard themselves as their gender superiors, since women have, despite pretensions to the contrary, historically got the better of men and effectively continued to dominate them, within the family context, from the vacuous standpoints of expressive objectivity, and particularly so under the rule of autocratic criteria, which historically tend to favour the dominance of females over males in the interests of reproduction.

19

Be that as it may, it would be extremely disingenuous of a female who maintained a sartorial barrier between herself and your average male to expect to be treated, albeit on a 'lesser' to 'greater' male basis, as the equal of men, when she made no effort to appear so but, rather, emphasized her own gender as one who, from a male standpoint, can only look like the opposite sex and even be subjected to a degree, albeit within respectable social bounds, of so-called sexism. For a sartorial vacuum, symbolized by dresses and/or skirts, is in no way equivalent to a sartorial plenum, as symbolized by trouser suits and/or pants, jeans, etc., and has absolutely no business pretending otherwise!

Sexism *can* be justified, and it would be disingenuous to overlook the long tradition behind it which has served the perpetuation of the human race. But so, too, can an equalitarian opposition to sexism, as to gender differentials, be justified when what is nominally or biologically female elects – or is obliged by environmental or other circumstances – to dress and even to some extent behave in a male manner, having been pulled across the boundary between female and male, as, indeed, between rural and urban contrasts, into what is an overwhelmingly male environment where, in keeping with urban artificiality, only male kinds of sartorial norms are truly relevant.

There was, to be sure, a time, many centuries or even millennia ago, when men dressed, as it were, like women, wearing the ancient world's equivalents of dresses and skirts, call them by what names you prefer, and likely because nature considerably predominated at civilization's artificial expense, no balance between the rural and the urban, as between skirts and trousers, having come to pass on what some would contend to be a quintessentially worldly (even bourgeois) basis, the forerunner, it can only be concluded, of contemporary urban lopsidedness.

Such an Alpha-based extreme set of circumstances, however, has little or no place in the modern world, which is effectively post-worldly in its urban bias, and consequently we cannot be

surprised that things are now antithetical to how they were in the ancient world; that the middle-ground, quintessentially heterosexual compromise between skirts and trousers is being slowly squeezed out of existence by a pants-like totalitarianism that some might regard as being constitutive of an omega-oriented extreme in which gender parity is confirmed by similar if not identical sartorial norms that, far from expressing a female bias, tend, on the contrary, to affirm what is male, and sometimes to a quite impressively subjective extent, the phallic having, as it were, eclipsed the vaginal!

23

But it would be foolish to assume that all males are the same, just as we cannot reasonably reduce all females to a kind of womanly skirt-wearing lower-order social position. There *are* class differences and even axial distinctions which both run contrary to each other and involve subordinate as well as hegemonic pairings on both traditional and contemporary, ecclesiastic and secular, terms, with disjunctive overlapping between the two main contexts inevitably transpiring.

24

Even so, females and males are broadly divisible between light and heat, with the former expressing speed or quickness and the latter, by contrast, lightness, since just as speed is the principal attribute of light (186,000 miles a second, if you can get your head around such a scientific claim), so lightness is the principal attribute of heat, which rises from it like smoke from a pipe or steam from hot coffee, to give but two examples of what usually tends to exist, in effect, on the male side of the gender divide.

Smoking was formerly a male preserve, until females, increasingly looking and acting as 'lesser men', began to take up the habit, if less in terms of pipes and cigars than of cigarettes. But nowadays tobacco smoking is much less fashionable than it used to be, at least where the smoking of cigarettes is concerned, since science has demonstrated a causal link with cancer and other debilitating diseases, which has somewhat diminished the prevalence of tobacco smoking in the so-called developed world, even if other substitutes, such as vaping, have gathered social momentum among the sort of people who might formerly or otherwise have smoked cigarettes.

Doubtless, most pipe-smokers have continued to puff away regardless, since pipe tobacco is not generally inhaled, doing less damage to the lungs and bronchial tubes than other forms of tobacco consumption, and they are, in a sense, to be admired for their persistence in illustrating the correlation between heat and lightness, a correlation not lost upon those who regularly drink steaming coffee as a substitute, it may be, for tobacco and even as a safeguard, in the case of some males, against whatever forms of oncoming light may be threatening to disturb their equanimity.

For the struggle or battle between light and heat is as old as the hills, whatever transformations it may recently have undergone,

and such a struggle comes down to gender, to the so-called 'war of the sexes', as to the outgoing dispositions of vacuous females and the self-regarding dispositions of those males who often 'fight shy' of being overwhelmed by too much light, as by female seductions and, more persistently, eavesdropping impositions of the kind that can all-too-frequently degenerate into mere stalking, time having little respect for space in the face of regular periods on a monthly basis!

28

Males who are truly self-respecting, and hence genuinely male, tend to prefer baths to showers – indeed, will avoid taking a shower if the possibility of a hot bath presents itself, since showers are akin to the light in their superficial diffusion of thin water jets, whereas bath water is inevitably 'all of a piece', holds together in the bath the way flame usually does when not unduly subjected to external pressures, but simply burns on whatever sustains it at the time, like the wax of candles for candle-flame.

29

Of course, candle-flame is often referred to as candlelight, granted that it gives off some light and is not used to heat a room or indoor area. But it still requires oxygen to nourish it, unlike the light from a light bulb, and is therefore technically a tiny flame that, when used in certain churches or other religious buildings, serves to illustrate the intangible nature of spirituality, illuminating the space in a way that no electric light ever could, given its fundamentally vacuous nature.

The Sun is rightly described as providing sunlight, since it transmits light energy through space which is reflected back from the earth's surface into the lower atmosphere, where it is perceptible to us as daylight. But its light can, of course, be eclipsed by the degree of heat that may be felt at certain times of the year, principally of course in summer, as well as, more generally, in countries which, for geographical reasons, are mainly hot throughout much of the year. But it is still fundamentally light, not heat, even if capable of generating heatwaves and conditions of such high temperature that fires are ignited on earth, causing much damage to life and property, as well as devastating whole stretches of land whose natural growths are reduced to ugly heaps of smouldering ash.

So there is a sense in which the Sun is both light *and* heat to different extents – arguably most light and least heat in winter and, conversely, most heat and least light in summer, making it appear and feel somewhat androgynous in character, alternating, over the seasons, between female and male characteristics to an extent that conditions both the form and nature of life on earth, which is actually responsible for the apparent changes alluded to above as it either tilts away from (winter) or towards (summer) the Sun, thereby giving the (false) impression that the Sun is inconstant.

One can argue that if the Sun appears most female in winter and most male in summer, gravitating from most light and least heat to most heat and least light, then it could be described as being pro-male in spring and pro-female in autumn, descending in the one to more – compared to most – light and less – compared to least – heat (autumn), and descending in the other case to more – compared to most – heat and less – compared to least – light (spring), a theory which would seem to confirm the intermediate or transitional natures of spring and autumn.

Therefore being intermediate between the extremes of winter and summer, most light:least heat and most heat:least light respectively, the contexts of more light:less heat (spring) and more heat:less light (autumn) would suggest the probability of a correlation with what is Fundamentalist/Untranscendentalist on the one hand, and Transcendentalist/Unfundamentalist on the other hand, as though they were merely transitional phenomena extrapolated from Superfundamentalist/Subtranscendentalist and Supertranscendentalist/Subfundamentalist ecclesiastic extremes.

However that may be, there is nothing secular – and hence properly lower order – about such extrapolations, since still associated with antithetically Comparative degrees of Light and Heat, as opposed to being of motion and force on such terms.

One would still be alluding to Time and Space on antithetically Comparative dichotomous terms, rather than to anything associated with volume and mass. Therefore thinking of the seasons in this way would suggest an ecclesiastic correlation, whether representatively ... in terms of Superfundamentalism/Subtranscendentalism in the case of the most light:least heat of winter, and of Supertranscendentalism/Subfundamentalism in the case of the most heat:least light of summer or, by extrapolation, in terms of Fundamentalism/Untranscendentalism in the case of the more light:less heat of spring, and of Transcendentalism/Unfundamentalism in the case of the more heat:less light of autumn, as argued above.

Such traditional, or ecclesiastic, theories would probably not carry much weight with secular modernity, the criteria of which – certainly in the hegemonic lower-order atomic contexts – are decidedly based in a naturalist/unrealist opposition to Fundamentalism/Untranscendentalism and, antithetically, in a realist/unnaturalist opposition to Transcendentalism/Unfundamentalism, with implications that contribute towards climate change and a steady erosion of conventional expectations with regard to clearly-defined seasonal variations.

It is as though the ecclesiastic correlations of winter and summer have been turned upside down, via spring and autumn, by secular opposition to the latter, which, however, has not restored the representative antithesis so much as further undermined and even negated it via its own extrapolations, making the modern-cum-postmodern-world a two-faced unstable rejection of traditional clear-cut Time/Space norms in pursuance of some newfangled, amorphous commitment to volume and mass, to motion and force, at the expense of Light and Heat, with a concomitant erosion of gender demarcations and, by association, an enhanced appetite for equalitarian alternatives which, if pursued to their logical or, rather, illogical extents, would condemn humanity to extinction even without planetary assistance!

Why the Modern World should be Overcome from Transvaluated Standpoints

1

Western civilization was fated to endorse female domination over society from the moment it accepted the Hebrew correlation of God with the Light.

2

A genuine 'transvaluation of all values' (Nietzsche) will only transpire at the expense of such a correlation in favour of the association of Divinity with the Heat or, more correctly, with the Force in Heat equivalence of God in Heaven, which is antithetical to the Motion in Light equivalence of Hell in the Devil.

3

Heaven itself is not about God but about the transcendence of the Heat by Lightness, which is as far removed from Light as it is possible to be.

4

The ultimate equation of Superheat/Sublight with Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry, the Superior and Inferior

fulcra of the Superlative (3:1) Atom in question, presupposes the subordination of pseudo-Subheat/pseudo-Superlight in pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, the pseudo-Superior and pseudo-Inferior fulcra of what, in relation to the hegemonic Atom, is a pseudo-Superlative (1:3) pseudo-Atom.

5

More comprehensively, Superforce in Superheat/Submotion in Sublight would equate with the hegemony of Superphysics in Supermetaphysics/Subchemistry in Submetachemistry over pseudo-Subphysics in pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Superchemistry in pseudo-Supermetachemistry, which is equivalent to pseudo-Subforce in pseudo-Subheat/pseudo-Supermotion in pseudo-Superlight.

6

Hence, positively considered, Supergod in Superheaven/Subhell in the Subdevil would be hegemonic, on Superior Secondary and Primary/Inferior Secondary and Primary terms, over pseudo-Subgod in pseudo-Subheaven/pseudo-Superhell in the pseudo-Superdevil, the subordinate pseudo-atom's pseudo-Superior and pseudo-Inferior sides, divisible, unlike the hegemonic atom, between pseudo-Secondary and pseudo-Primary Aspects respectively.

7

That is to say, Supertruth in Superjoy/Sublove in Subbeauty would be hegemonic over pseudo-Subtruth in pseudo-

Subjoy/pseudo-Superlove in pseudo-Superbeauty.

8

Which is equivalent to Supermass in Superspace/Subvolume in Subtime being hegemonic over pseudo-Submass in pseudo-Subspace/pseudo-Supermotion in pseudo-Superlight.

9

As also to Supertaking in Superbeing/Subgiving in Subdoing being hegemonic over pseudo-Subtaking in pseudo-Subbeing/pseudo-Supergiving in pseudo-Superdoing.

10

Which can only be equivalent to the Superego in the Supersoul/the Subid in the Subwill being hegemonic over the pseudo-Subego in the pseudo-Subsoul/the pseudo-Superid in the pseudo-Superwill.

11

Which may even be equivalent to Superneutrons in Superprotons/Subelectrons in Subphotons being hegemonic over pseudo-Subneutrons in pseudo-Subprotons/pseudo-Superelectrons in pseudo-Superphotons.

12

Since the equation of Superneutrons with, say, Superforce and Superprotons with Superheat/Subelectrons with Submotion and Subphotons with Sublight would presuppose the subordinate equation of pseudo-Subneutrons with, say, pseudo-Subforce and pseudo-Subprotons with pseudo-Subheat/pseudo-Superelectrons with pseudo-Supermotion and pseudo-Superphotons with pseudo-Superlight.

13

Universalism is the antithesis of Cosmopolitanism, which is centrifugal as opposed to centripetal.

14

So-called 'multiculturalism' vitiates cultures and is – to varying extents – the negation of Culture.

15

True Culture can only be monocultural, because it relates to the 'One God' in the 'One Heaven', so to speak, and not to a plethora of competing gods and heavens, or supposed gods and heavens.

16

Relating to the 'One God' without consideration of the 'One Heaven', which transcends godliness, would fall short of True Culture because of its emphasis upon Force to the exclusion of Heat and, more importantly, the transcendence of Heat through Lightness.

17

Hence any notion of the 'Almighty' which is self-sufficient is fundamentally false, because it excludes the actual *raison d'être* of godliness, which is Heaven and, hence, the transcendence of Heat by Lightness.

18

But (if I may be permitted to continue generalizing non-ratio specifically) Heat requires Force if it is to materialize, since God is a means to a heavenly End, *not* an End in Himself.

19

And a heavenly End presupposes the transcendence of Force-generated Heat by Lightness – at least in Life as opposed to the transcendence of Life by Death and the termination, in consequence, of Energy.

20

Death goes beyond Religion and its presuppositions by transcending its own Joy at the release from Energy, or Truth, or God, by successive stages of Peace in relation to the subsidence of Gravity.

21

Hence both the Energy of God and the Gravity of Heaven, both the Force and the Heat, are abandoned in relation to the Lightness which is released in conjunction with the Spirit of Holiness, whose residence is in the Spine.

22

For Spinal Fluid is the last mode of Life as Womb Fluid was its first, the so-called 'Afterlife' contrasting, the far side of Life, with what can be termed the 'Beforelife' that precedes it, the Alpha and Omega of fluidal Spirituality.

23

Water, or fluid, is the 'stuff of life', without which life, as we know it, would not have transpired, and therefore would be inconceivable.

24

Hence that which spiritually *generates* life in the womb also spiritually *regenerates* it in the tomb, if on diametrically antithetical terms which appertain not to the Corporeal Alpha but to the Ethereal Omega, not to the Will (to continue generalizing non-ratio specifically in relation to atomic dichotomies) but to the Soul.

25

Hence from the Spirit of Superficiality (the Will) to the Spirit of Profundity (the Soul), with Life itself divisible, by and large, between the instinct of anti-Superficiality in the id and the intellect of anti-Profundity in the ego, neither of which amount to more than somatic and psychic opponents of the Corporeal Will and the Ethereal Soul, the Spirit of Superficiality, which is Sensual, and the Spirit of Profundity, which is Sensible and which, like its antagonist, derives, by Comparative extrapolation, from what is Superlative on both Superior and, for that matter, Inferior terms.

26

For Life itself, whether female or male, is not particularly interested in the upper-order extremes of existence, whether Representative or Extrapolative, Superlative or Comparative, but only in the battles to resist extremism in the interests of gender compromise, which can be termed moderation or even relativity, two attributes of the 'world' which are alien to both the Netherworldly and the Otherworldly kinds of upper-order

extremism and their respective types of Superlative absolutism.

27

It is as though the one type of extremism, rooted in Corporeal Sensuality, were all female (despite superficial gender appearances to the contrary) whilst the other type of extremism, centred in Ethereal Sensibility, were all male (despite profound gender essences to the contrary), in contrast to the moderate and, in a sense, intermediate gender compromises between female and male criteria that conduce – or can conduce – towards reproduction within a 'worldly', and hence amoral, context.

28

For the 'world', whether ecclesiastically imposed upon from either extremism above or 'true' to its secular relativity, *is* at bottom amoral, albeit on either reproductive (ecclesiastically determined) or anti-reproductive (secular promiscuity) terms, and thereby contrasts with what is either fundamentally Immoral (and corporeal) or essentially Moral (and ethereal), neither of which are strictly germane to its somatic or psychic, instinctual or intellectual, criteria, despite whatever impositions of a sensual or a sensible order may be ecclesiastically at large at any given point in time.

29

The 'world', in short, is democratic and plutocratic, not Autocratic or Theocratic, and will duly resist those impositions 'from above' which stem (even if necessarily imperfectly) from

both female-dominated Netherworldly and male-dominated Otherworldly criteria, deeming such ecclesiastic impositions to be an infringement of its basically secular dispositions.

30

Such secular dispositions are necessarily lower order, or plebeian, and therefore stand in sharp contrast to such upper-order impositions as bear the hallmark of nobility, whether it be mainly Autocratic (and corporeal) or mainly Theocratic (and ethereal), based in Birth or centred in Death either side, on Beforelife and Afterlife terms, of worldly life.

31

Therefore an age or stage of civilization in which democracy and plutocracy are the principal antagonists will be inimical to both Autocratic and Theocratic impositions 'from above' or 'on high', and can be characterized as having plebeian values in quintessentially worldly vein, according to whether the id or the ego, instinct or intellect, happens to be uppermost in any given society.

32

One can call such an age or stage of civilization a 'mobocracy'; for that is what it basically is, since opposed to either the rule (autocratic) or the lead (theocratic) of nobles or noble elements in what could be termed a 'nobocracy', whereby the upper orders, whether upper-class landowners or upper-middle-class clerics, determine the fate of society and often act as 'puppet masters' to

the masses, holding them up from a descent into themselves which, in the nature of such descents, can only go from bad to worse, with ever-more anarchically-oriented equalitarian 'falls' from worldly relativity into either subworldly or superworldly absolutism or, more correctly, totalitarianism.

33

But such subworldly or superworldly forms of totalitarianism can only be inimical to what is properly absolutist and, hence, authoritarianism in the opposing upper-order extremes of Autocracy and Theocracy, which will consider it their duty (whether immoral or moral) to defend themselves against the possibility of being partially or even entirely eclipsed by plebeian values or, rather, the want of higher values.

34

For higher values, whether beautiful or true, stem from the upper-order extremes, not from extreme forms of lower-order encroachment, whose origins were either anti-Autocratic or anti-Theocratic and, hence, rooted in the sorts of antivalues that lead to democracy and plutocracy, the id and the ego, the lower values of strength and knowledge, at the expense of the Will and the Soul, Beauty and Truth (to generalize non-ratio specifically).

35

Worldly amorality, in short, is a sort of limbo (or compromise between purgatory and the earth) both 'down below' and intermediate between the Beautiful and the True, Autocracy and

Theocracy, that falls well-short of both the Immorality of the Corporeal Will and the Morality of the Ethereal Soul, which will result, if not checked, in the downfall of civilization through an overestimation of the significance of strength and knowledge, and a correlative underestimation, in consequence, of the necessity of Beauty and Truth, of Rule and Lead, to preclude the 'world' from sinking into itself and eventually destroying itself for want of upper-order control and an excess, by contrast, of lower-order freedom (from such control).

36

For the 'world' is not supposed to exist for its own sake, any more than women and men, but in relation to either the rule of Beauty or the lead of Truth, depending on the bias of any given civilization, since there can be no Life without the 'Beforelife' and no 'Afterlife' without Death-transcending faith in it, but only an unceasingly self-destructive limbo in which either finity strives to exclude Eternity (as democracy excluding Autocracy) or temporality strives to exclude Infinity (as plutocracy excluding Theocracy), and neither are any good for the planet, much less for Life itself!

37

In fact, an anti-Birth disposition fuelled by democracy in the one case will lead as surely to a decline in population as an anti-Death disposition fuelled by plutocracy to a foolhardy endeavour to prolong such life as exists way beyond its natural span for want of faith in an 'Afterlife'.

However, an indefinite extension of ego-based existence would not suffice to redeem life but only to prolong it, presuming that a want of faith in the 'Afterlife' had not simply resulted in what could be called a crematorial annihilation of that which is deepest in oneself – namely, the Soul – for want of a technological or biological capacity to bring about the possibility of 'living for ever'.

Such a theoretical extension of Life, even if it were possible, would not be equivalent to the 'Afterlife', but merely a further example of secular arrogance, which opposes anything ecclesiastic, whether autocratically closer to Birth or theocratically closer to Death, from the contrasting lower-order standpoints of the id and the ego, finity and temporality, volume and mass.

Whether they know it or not, people are 'children', to varying extents, of both the Devil and God, Beauty and Truth (to continue emphasizing the positive at the expense of their negative preconditions in non-fulcrum specific parallel terminological vein), since all people tend, irrespective of gender, to have both heart/blood and spinal fluid/spinal cord, which correspond to what is upper order on effectively antithetical ecclesiastic terms.

41

There is, of course, a gender bias which conditions the one gender towards the heart/blood and the other, when not overly beholden to female dominance, towards the spinal fluid/spinal cord, with extrapolations along the lines of periodic menstruation and spermatic ejaculation respectively, but, even so, the refusal to identify with what are effectively representative and extrapolative ecclesiastic alternatives can only lead to self-delusion and, eventually, to self-harm, in overly secular – and hence lower-order – vein.

42

Whether the birth rate falls or the death rate rises, an overly secular society is both in trouble and a cause of trouble in the world, given its amoral focus on either woman or man, democracy or plutocracy, if not both to differing extents. It results in a society which is in retreat from Birth and Death, one that exists in a state of self-denial and an overly partial emphasis upon Life lived for its own sake without reference to 'higher powers' which, particularly in the case of republics, it strives to deny and, so far as possible, to marginalize if not exclude.

43

Most especially is this so of Protestant-derived liberalism and its more equalitarian offshoots, socialism, feminism, and even communism, not to mention the various forms of sexual sterility that owe much, if not everything, to contraceptive and other anti-pregnancy rights extending to abortion.

Contrasted to which – and probably owing more to plutocracy than to democracy – is the secular emphasis upon film, particularly within the context of cinema, which one can't help but equate with an influence likely to encourage or conduce towards cremation at the expense of burial, thereby excluding any meaningful association with the 'Afterlife', which people of an overly secular cast, lacking in ecclesiastic faith, would likely equate with superstition.

In the 'throw away' society of modern secularity, it is virtually inevitable that Death will be downplayed, and therefore reduced to the level of a mere cessation of life, to be disposed of as quickly and economically as possible, since what remains is to it, this 'throw away' society, a mere thing, devoid of soul and incapable of transcendence, neither of which, in any case, would be acknowledged, much less endorsed, from lower-order secular standpoints!

So what should or could have been left, so to speak, to its own devices, to pass from Life into the 'Afterlife' of its spinal fluid or, if you prefer, Soul or, better, Supersoul (the representative upper-order theocratic position), the Holy Spirit (of heavenly transcendence of the 'flesh', including the heart, and even the spinal cord itself), is snuffed-out in the crematorium's furnace and, following due pulverizing reductions of what remains by

way of bone fragments, a pile of ashes is all that will remain, to somehow tie-in with the depressing concept of 'ashes to ashes, dust to dust' in Self-negating vein.

47

Neither amniotic fluid, which leads to birth, nor the spinal fluid, which outlasts mortal death (being that which is deepest within the overall skeletal framework of a human being), are wanted, much less encouraged, by the overly secular, whether democratic or plutocratic, who merely live for life's sake in a sort of art-for-art's-sake amoral manner, fighting shy, in their respective moderations, of the extremes of existence that both precede and succeed them, and are somehow above them.

48

They have reduced existence, these secular equalitarians, to the 'world', albeit to one lacking in ecclesiastic approval but solely in and of itself, and that 'world' has become increasingly meaningless, empty, devoid of real purpose, decadent, degenerate, and, what's worse, a dangerous place in which to live, both socially and environmentally.

49

It is a 'world', in short, earmarked, by the very people who relate to it, for self-destruction; for it has neither a past nor a future but only a finite-cum-temporal present which hems it in and reduces it to the base levels of its democratic and plutocratic pretensions; as though strength and knowledge, pride and pleasure, when not

compounded by their negative counterparts, were somehow superior to Beauty and Truth, Love and Joy!

50

The womanly id and the manly ego have eclipsed the devilish Will and the godly Soul, the Light and the Heat, with the motion of volume and the force of mass, and neither Time nor Space are given their dues; for volume is no-less against Time than mass is against Space, and whilst mass may indirectly defer to Time, as contemporary plutocracy to traditional Autocracy, and volume indirectly defer to Space, as contemporary democracy to traditional Theocracy, in reality both are in denial of the overly ecclesiastic control of society that formerly presupposed either a volume-denying or a mass-denying extrapolation from the representative ecclesiastic alternatives along the lines of Time/Unspace ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$, more:less) from Supertime/Subspace (3:1, most:least) or, antithetically, Space/Untime ($2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$, more:less) from Superspace/Subtime (3:1, most:least), as, in other words, an extrapolation of the ecclesiastic Comparative from the ecclesiastic Superlative, together, it should not be forgotten, with their subordinate counterparts along the lines of Untime/Space ($1\frac{1}{2}:2\frac{1}{2}$, pseudo-less:pseudo-more) from Subtime/Superspace (1:3, pseudo-least:pseudo-most) or, antithetically, Unspace/Time ($1\frac{1}{2}:2\frac{1}{2}$, pseudo-less:pseudo-more) from Subspace/Supertime (1:3, pseudo-least:pseudo-most), as, in other words, an extrapolation of the pseudo-ecclesiastic pseudo-Comparative from the pseudo-ecclesiastic pseudo-Superlative.

51

The 'world' (and, by implication, the 'worldly'), was elevated to

an ecclesiastic deference that precluded its slide into mere secularity and, hence, into overly lower-order freedoms 'from above' of the sort that favoured either volume or mass, motion or force, democracy or plutocracy, woman or man, purgatory or earthliness at the expense of Time and Space, Light and Heat, Autocracy and Theocracy, the Devil and God, Hell and Heaven (to continue generalizing non-ratio specifically).

52

Thanks in large part to Protestant heresy, which set things back towards Science on a contrary axial basis to Religion, the West was destined to 'go to the dogs' of secularity, in which everything low and plebeian, lower class and lower middle class, from liberalism on down to socialism and even communism and, contrariwise, from capitalism up back to corporatism and even fascism, came to the fore at the expense of what had antithetically prevailed 'On High', making for the 'world' as we currently know and, in some cases, regret if not despise it.

53

For much as they may boast of their progress, these proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, little do they realize that progress and, for that matter, regress are merely relative to themselves, since whilst it may have been 'right' to be democratically against Autocracy (to emphasize only the 2½ ratio side of each atomic position, whether ecclesiastically extrapolative or representatively secular), as against what is mostly 'Bad' or 'Immoral', and 'wrong' to have been plutocratically against Theocracy (emphasizing, once again, only the 2½ ratio side of each atomic position, whether ecclesiastically extrapolative or

representatively secular), as against what is mostly 'Good' or 'Moral', such progress and regress as antithetically ensued can never be more than amorally relative to either the id (progress) or the ego (regress).

54

In other words, progress is no more than a democratically-biased proletarian lower-order civil retort to Devolution, which is barbarously autocratic, while regress is no more than a plutocratically-biased pettyt-bourgeois lower-order philistine retort to Evolution, which is culturally theocratic.

55

It is the distinction between the upper-order-derived Corporeal Will and the lower-order somatic id on the one hand, that of democratic progress as a rejection of Autocratic Devolution, coupled to the distinction between the upper-order-derived Ethereal Soul and the lower-order psychic ego on the other hand, that of plutocratic regress as a rejection of Theocratic Evolution.

56

To *democratically progress* from Autocratic Devolution is to progress to increasingly radical stages of equalitarianism, as from liberalism and socialism to communism, since what is effectively a lower-class retort to the upper-class control of society can only go in one direction, and that forwards and diagonally down.

57

To *plutocratically regress* from Theocratic Evolution is to regress to increasingly radical stages of entrepreneurialism, as from capitalism and corporatism to fascism, since what is effectively a lower middle-class retort to the upper middle-class control of society can only go in one direction, and that backwards and diagonally up.

58

In rejecting the Will in favour of the id, the Corporeal in favour of the somatic, the one side, avowedly of a female-dominated character, progressively descends towards cooperative totalitarianism along broadly socialist lines.

59

In rejecting the Soul in favour of the ego, the Ethereal in favour of the psychic, the other side, avowedly of a male-dominated character, regressively ascends toward competitive totalitarianism along broadly capitalist lines.

60

There is a kind of wavicle/particle, subjective/objective, collectivist/individualist contrast between the somatic plenum (the id) and the psychic vacuum (the ego), between democracy and plutocracy, civility and philistinism, that leads to each form of lower-order secularity approaching worldly amorality from

effectively contrary gender standpoints, which remain either anti-Birth or anti-Death in their opposite manifestations of life.

61

For being anti-Birth, and hence anti-Autocratic, is no closer to being pro-Death ... than being anti-Death, and hence anti-Theocratic, is closer to being pro-Birth, even if the one side are 'right' to be anti-Devolutionary, and therefore 'progressively civil', and the other side, by contrast, 'wrong' to be anti-Evolutionary, and therefore 'regressively philistine'. Neither the Alpha of Autocratic Barbarity nor the Omega of Theocratic Culture figure in their secular calculations; for they are neither of the Devil nor God, but only, to all intents and purposes, of woman and man, and, hence, they remain amorally 'human-all-too-human'!

62

One can, indeed, despise them from contrary upper-order points-of-view; though, speaking as a self-proclaimed Social Theocrat, I can only do so on Theocratic grounds, preferring to identify with the Soul or, more correctly, with *the Ego in the Soul* of God in Heaven, *the Force of Mass* in the Heat of Space, which might commonly be associated with Metaphysics.

63

But, as the keen student of my work may know from various of my previous texts, such generalizations do not 'cut it' with my logic; since not only is the upper-order atom I have in mind

Superlative in terms of most Ethereal to least Corporeal, it is actually Supermetaphysical/Submetachemical on such terms, and therefore further divisible between Supergod in Superheaven and Subhell in the Subdevil, which is equivalent to *the Superego in the Supersoul vis-à-vis the Subid in the Subwill*, or, in other words, to *the Superforce of Supermass in the Superheat of Superspace vis-à-vis the Submotion of Subvolume in the Sublight of Subtime*.

64

One can, of course, extrapolate from this Superphysical in Supermetaphysical/Subchemical in Submetachemical atomically Representative Superlative dichotomy along the Comparative terms of Physics in Metaphysics/Unchemistry in Unmetachemistry, with God in Heaven on its Superior side (2½) and Unhell in the Undevil on its Inferior side (1½), with more:less as opposed to most:least ratio implications.

65

But I am far less interested in any such traditional extrapolation from a revolutionary Social Theocratic standpoint than in reminding the reader that in all hegemonic atomic cases there has to exist – and will have existed – a subordinate atomic case along the lines, in relation to the above for instance, of pseudo-Subphysics in pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Superchemistry in pseudo-Supermetachemistry, where one would find pseudo-Subgod in pseudo-Subheaven coupled to pseudo-Superhell in the pseudo-Superdevil, or the pseudo-Subego in the pseudo-Subsoul vis-à-vis the pseudo-Superid in the pseudo-Superwill, which would be equivalent to *the pseudo-Subforce of pseudo-Submass*

in the pseudo-Subheat of pseudo-Subspace being paradoxically pseudo-Superior, in its pseudo-freedom to defer upwards (concerning Supermetaphysics), vis-à-vis *the pseudo-Supermotion of pseudo-Supervolune* in the pseudo-Superlight of pseudo-Supertime, which happens, as the pseudo-Inferior corollary of the above, to be pseudo-bound, and therefore not in a position to inhibit or dominate what is paradoxically pseudo-Superior.

66

Be that as it may – and granted that I have already discussed the reverse ratio standings of the subordinate atoms to their hegemonic counterparts in previous books, texts, writings, or whatever – the objective of any genuine Theocracy being not only to stymie what is contrary to itself and, as it were, 'bring it to heel' on a subordinate basis (neutralized Dragon-like), but, as would certainly be the case with Social Theocracy, to 'overcome' those who would perpetuate worldly secularity, and thus put an end to what is an amoral danger both to theselves and, by extrapolation, to everyone else, including their traditional upper-order opponents.

67

Overcoming the 'world' can only be achieved on an axial basis relative to the overcoming, from a Superphysical in Supermetaphysical/Subchemical in Submetachemical coupled to a pseudo-Subphysical in pseudo-Submetaphysical/pseudo-Superchemical in pseudo-Supermetachemical gender-pairing standpoint, of those who are effectively metachemical in chemical/unmetaphysical in unphysical and, subordinately,

pseudo-unmetachemical in pseudo-unchemical/pseudo-metaphysical in pseudo-physical, which is to say, autocratic in democratic/untheocratic in unplutocratic and pseudo-unautocratic in pseudo-undemocratic/pseudo-theocratic in pseudo-plutocratic (on reverse ratio subordinate terms).

68

For these are the lower-order people for whom, on superior fulcrum-specific terms, democracy trumps plutocracy, whose republican freedoms likely derive from Catholic preconditions or from preconditions similar, if anterior, to Catholicism that, as with Catholicism, still ecclesiastically exist in the shadows, so to speak, of contemporary secularity.

69

Such ecclesiastic 'shadows' may yet have a role to play in encouraging the democratically-oriented masses of certain republics to endorse Social Theocracy, which upholds the concept of religious sovereignty in the masses as *the ultimate form* of mass sovereignty that, necessarily having to transcend the 'human-all-too-human', would open the evolutionary way to 'man overcoming', to adopt the Nietzschean gender-neutral expression, and more particularly to 'woman overcoming', by way of entitlements to substance-motivated cyborgization of an increasingly communal nature for purposes not only of 'turning the tables' on any untransvaluated or alpha-stemming context, like film or jazz, but also in the interests of both pragmatic and moral security (thereby hopefully avoiding the kind of violently individualistic heavily-armed behaviour by the robotically-enhanced brain of Cain that transpired in the 1990 film *Robocop*

2, if memory serves).

70

Man, believe it or not, *is*, in Nietzsche's memorable phrase, 'something to be overcome', and bearing in mind the state of contemporary society, with its progressive delusions as to the overall significance of civility compounded by the life-endangering philistine effects of unbridled plutocratic regression, the sooner this can be got under way the better!

71

For the 'world' is not going to desist from the contrary secular paths it is on, even if a semblance of liberal centrality still obtains in most Western societies by dint of their religious – and particularly Protestant – traditions. The 'world' cannot 'overcome' itself but only perpetuate what already exists and characterizes the class limitations of its lower-order secular alternatives.

72

That is why, ultimately, a form of Messianic Interventionism is necessary if some are to be axially saved and others counter-damned (to grossly oversimplify my eschatology) in order that yet others – appertaining to a contrary axial disposition – can be damned and counter-saved (if temporarily with regard to what already exists in polarity to them), until their respective representatives or so-called leaders, wishing to avoid a total collapse into anarchy and chaos, secure the moral entitlement of

the ethnicities concerned to positions beneath those who had already been delivered from the 'world', by judging the perpetrators of somatic licence and the financing and profiteering from said licence *as they deem fit*, without which the pragmatic pluralism of what I have, in previous texts, termed a 'triadic Beyond' could not transpire, nor, indeed, anything in the nature of centro-complexification (a de Chardinesque term) thereafter, with the ultimate transcendence of any such pragmatic plutalism.

73

Those who have already studied texts in earlier publications which deal with this subject will know what I am alluding to and of how I envisage subsequent developments of an evolutionary character, so I will not repeat myself or elaborate further on these eschatological considerations, which of course complement my well-documented ontology.

74

Delivering people from one axis in order to put another axis 'out of business' would suffice, in the short term, to justify such Messianic Interventionism as I allude to above, since the 'world' is not there to be worshipped or taken for granted, from a truly Christian, never mind Social Theocratic point-of-view, but simply to be 'overcome' before it either destroys itself (as it very nearly did in the Second World War, when civility and philistinism came to a totalitarian head in both Russia and Germany) or destroys everything else, including the planet itself and all life upon it, human and non-human.

The fate of the planet cannot be left in the hands of the lower orders; for it is they who, in large measure, have brought about the present perilous situation, polluting and abusing everything around them, and there is no way that, with their inherent amoral limitations of a secular order, they would be capable of remedying it, having dug themselves into a worldly dead-end which has no intention of 'overcoming itself', least of all from a plutocratic standpoint which, in most liberal societies, particularly those deriving from Protestantism, hides behind a democratic façade in order to woo the broad masses of an inherently more political stamp to acquiesce in, if not tacitly, endorse, its plutocratic licence.

Even the Republic of Ireland, of which country I am a reluctant if still (at the time of writing) exiled citizen, has taken its inherently democratic predilections to unprecedented levels of radical civility, whilst being subject to foreign plutocratic pressures favourable to corporate or multinational capitalism, with its philistine disregard for indigenous traditions, as it pursues its counter-progressive or even bluntly regressive course, obliquely deferring to Devolution as a counter-measure to any prospect of progress deferring – albeit with traditional values in mind - to Evolution.

It is as though socialism and corporatism pair off in an uneasy

compromise that stretches the boundaries of secularity towards a totalitarian nemesis of the sort that would take civility and philistinism beyond the bounds of liberal tolerance into outright conflict – something, as twentieth-century European history demonstrates, that should to be avoided at all costs, since neither type of lower-order extremism would make for a better world.

but only for mutual destruction or, worse, an enhanced entrenchment of secular radicalism of one kind or another that marginalized, if not outlawed, both Devolution *and* Evolution, Autocracy *and* Theocracy, from unequivocally democratic or plutocratic standpoints deriving from communism or fascism.

78

No, there can be no fascist or communist solution to the world's amoral predicaments, but only, as I contend, that 'world overcoming' solution which hails from theocratically 'On High', and would deliver the appropriate peoples from their predatory enemies and inaugurate an entirely new approach to existence, one centred not in civility, still less rooted in either philistinism or Barbarity, but centred in and led by an altogether new approach to religious Culture, such that would require not only an administrative aside to itself to monitor and service what the people had elected, under Social Theocratic persuasion, to endorse, but the subordination of what can be termed pseudo-scientific pseudo-Barbarity, without which there could be no gender pairing between Superphysics in Supermetaphysics/Subchemistry in Submetachemistry on the one hand, and pseudo-Subphysics in pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Superchemistry in pseudo-Supermetachemistry on the other hand, making for an enhanced rendering of the Medieval 'Saint' and (neutralized) 'Dragon' paradigm that is also implicit – if not explicit – with

iconographic depictions of the 'Mother of God' down on her knees at the foot of the Cross upon which Her Son, Jesus Christ, limply hangs on His way to, if not actually in, the 'Afterlife' of that Paradise which transcends mere earthly mortality.

79

The Superlative and pseudo-Superlative dichotomies involved with this gender pairing would ensure that Superphilistinism in Superculture/Subcivility in Subbarbarity would remain forever hegemonic over pseudo-Subphilistinism in pseudo-Subculture/pseudo-Supercivility in pseudo-Superbarbarity, in a credibly atomic and pseudo-atomic full complement of factors or aspects, Superior and Inferior, Secondary and Primary, on both hegemonically representative and subordinately pseudo-representative terms, that allowed for lasting stability and, no less importantly, lasting feasibility throughout the ensuing centuries of Otherworldly/pseudo-Netherworldly partnership.

80

There would, of course, be Supergod in Superheaven/Subhell in the Subdevil, but there would also have to be pseudo-Subgod in pseudo-Subheaven, pseudo-Superhell in the pseudo-Superdevil subordinately, if one was to avoid mere wishful thinking and a false sense of how things ultimately 'stack up' from standpoints posterior to the administrative duties of those destined to be tasked, in amost Robocop-like vein, with the service of said pairings in what I would regard as the future structural nature of 'Kingdom Come', that upper-order controlled approach to Evolution which I would, of course, equate with Social Theocracy and/or Social Transcendentalism, distinguishing, in a

manner of speaking, between its political and religious manifestations within the overall politico-religious context of the 'Centre', the dichotomous centrality in which a balance would obtain between, in fulcrum-specific vein,

Supermetaphysics/Submetachemistry and, subordinately, pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, as though in a contrast between what, in its Superethereal/Subcorporeal atomic integrity, is Superleft/Subright and what, in its pseudo-Subethereal/pseudo-Supercorporeal pseudo-atomic integrity, would have to be pseudo-Subleft/pseudo-Superright, given the distinction between the 'left' nature or, rather, nurture of wavicle plenums and, antithetically, the 'right' nature of particle vacuums.

Ontological Permutations

1

Just as one cannot have Science without *Doing* or economics without *taking* or politics without *giving*, so one can't have Religion without *Being*, which is at the core of its disciplinary concerns, being that which appertains to the Soul or, if you prefer, the Supersoul (to be upper-order ratio specific).

2

For the Supersoul is that mode of 'Soul' appertaining to the Primary Superior Aspect (the superior fulcrum) of Supermetaphysics, in which there is most Soul, the kind of Soul in question existing on a 3:1 basis vis-à-vis the Primary Inferior Aspect (the inferior fulcrum) of Submetachemistry, thereby making for a most:least overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'more' in 'most', namely the Superego in the Supersoul (Supergod in Superheaven, Supertruth in Superjoy, Superneutron Superparticles in Superproton Superwavicles) as the Secondary Superior Aspect of Superphysics in relation to Supermetaphysics, together with what is 'less' in 'least', namely the Subid in the Subwill (Subhell in the Subdevil, Sublove in Subbeauty, Subelectron Subwavicles in Subphoton Subparticles) as the Secondary Inferior Aspect of Subchemistry in relation to Submetachemistry.

By Extrapolation from the Supermetaphysical/Submetachemical Superior and Inferior fulcra of the Representative Atom outlined above, we shall find that the Soul is that mode of 'Soul' appertaining to the Primary Superior Aspect (the superior fulcrum) of Metaphysics, in which there is more – compared to most – Soul, the kind of Soul in question existing on a $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$ basis vis-à-vis the Primary Inferior Aspect (the inferior fulcrum) of Unmetachemistry, thereby making for a more:less overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'less' in 'more', namely the Ego in the Soul (God in Heaven, Truth in Joy, Neutron Particles in Proton Wavicles) as the Secondary Superior Aspect of Physics in relation to Metaphysics, together with what is 'more' in 'less', namely the Unid in the Unwill (Unhell in the Undevil, Unlove in Unbeauty, Unelectron Unwavicles in Unphoton Unparticles) as the Secondary Inferior Aspect of Unchemistry in relation to Unmetachemistry.

Switching from the mainly male side of the gender fence to its mainly female side, we shall find that the Subsoul is that mode of 'Soul' appertaining to the Primary Inferior Aspect (the inferior fulcrum) of Submetaphysics, in which there is least Soul, the kind of Soul in question existing on a 1:3 basis vis-à-vis the Primary Superior Aspect (the superior fulcrum) of Supermetachemistry, thereby making for a least:most overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'less' in 'least', namely the Subego in the Subsoul (Subgod in Subheaven, Subtruth in Subjoy, Subneutron Subparticles in Subproton Subwavicles) as the Secondary Inferior Aspect of Subphysics in relation to

Submetaphysics, together with what is 'more' in 'most', namely the Superid in the Superwill (Superhell in the Superdevil, Superlove in Superbeauty, Superelectron Superwavicles in Superphoton Superparticles) as the Secondary Superior Aspect of Superchemistry in relation to Supermetachemistry.

5

By extrapolation from the Submetaphysical/Supermetachemical Inferior and Superior fulcra of the Representative Atom outlined above, we shall find that the Unsoul is that mode of 'Soul' appertaining to the Primary Inferior Aspect (the inferior fulcrum) of Unmetaphysics, in which there is less – compared to least – Soul, the kind of Soul in question existing on a 1½:2½ basis vis-à-vis the Primary Superior Aspect (the superior fulcrum) of Metachemistry, thereby making for a less:more overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'more' in 'less', namely the Unego in the Unsoul (Ungod in Unheaven, Untruth in Unjoy, Unneutron Unparticles in Unproton Unwavicles) as the Secondary Inferior Aspect of Unphysics in relation to Unmetaphysics, together with what is 'less' in 'more', namely the Id in the Will (Hell in the Devil, Love in Beauty, Electron Wavicles in Photon Particles) as the Secondary Superior Aspect of Chemistry in relation to Metachemistry.

6

Hence, in overall Atomic terms, we have a descent from *most* Being, or Soul, in Supermetaphysics to *least* Being in Submetaphysics via *more* – compared to *most* – Being in Metaphysics, and *less* – compared to *least* – Being in Unmetaphysics.

Hence from Supermetaphysical Superjoy to Submetaphysical Subjoy via Metaphysical Joy and Unmetaphysical Unjoy, the 'Soul', in its various permutations, always has to do with one degree or another of 'Metaphysics', whether on Superior Primary terms or, effectively on the opposite side (pseudo-male) of the gender fence, on Inferior Primary terms, where 'Soul' is merely a bound concomitant of one degree or another of 'Free Will'.

However, wherever Representative and Extrapolative Ecclesiastic Atoms are found, there, too, will one encounter their subordinate counterparts, beginning with the pseudo-Supersoul as that mode of 'pseudo-Soul' appertaining to the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect (the pseudo-inferior fulcrum) of pseudo-Supermetaphysics, in which there is most pseudo-Soul, the kind of pseudo-Soul in question existing on a 3:1 basis vis-à-vis the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect (the pseudo-superior fulcrum) of pseudo-Submetachemistry, thereby making for a pseudo-most:pseudo-least overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'pseudo-more' in 'pseudo-most', namely the pseudo-Superego in the pseudo-Supersoul (pseudo-Supergod in pseudo-Superheaven, pseudo-Supertruth in pseudo-Superjoy, pseudo-Superneutron pseudo-Superparticles in pseudo-Superproton pseudo-Superwavicles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Inferior Aspect of pseudo-Superphysics in relation to pseudo-Supermetaphysics, together with what is 'pseudo-less' in 'pseudo-least', namely the pseudo-Subid in the pseudo-Subwill (pseudo-Subhell in the pseudo-Subdevil, pseudo-Sublove in pseudo-Subbeauty, pseudo-Subelectron pseudo-Subwavicles in pseudo-

Subphoton pseudo-Subparticles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Superior Aspect of pseudo-Subchemistry in relation to pseudo-Submetachemistry.

9

By pseudo-Extrapolation from the pseudo-Supermetaphysical/pseudo-Submetachemical pseudo-Inferior and pseudo-Superior fulcra of the pseudo-Representative pseudo-Atom outlined above, we shall find that the pseudo-Soul is that mode of 'pseudo-Soul' appertaining to the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect (the pseudo-inferior fulcrum) of pseudo-Metaphysics, in which there is more – compared to most – pseudo-Soul, the kind of pseudo-Soul in question existing on a $2\frac{1}{2}:1\frac{1}{2}$ basis vis-à-vis the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect (the pseudo-superior fulcrum) of pseudo-Unmetachemistry, thereby making for a pseudo-more:pseudo-less overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'pseudo-less' in 'pseudo-more', namely the pseudo-Ego in the pseudo-Soul (pseudo-God in pseudo-Heaven, pseudo-Truth in pseudo-Joy, pseudo-Neutron pseudo-Particles in pseudo-Proton pseudo-Wavicles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Inferior Aspect of pseudo-Physics in relation to pseudo-Metaphysics, together with what is 'pseudo-more' in 'pseudo-less', namely the pseudo-Unid in the pseudo-Unwill (pseudo-Unhell in the pseudo-Undevil, pseudo-Unlove in pseudo-Unbeauty, pseudo-Unelectron pseudo-Unwavicles in pseudo-Unphoton pseudo-Unparticles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Superior Aspect of pseudo-Unchemistry in relation to pseudo-Unmetachemistry.

Switching from the mainly pseudo-male side of the gender fence to its mainly pseudo-female side, we shall find that the pseudo-Subsoul is that mode of 'pseudo-Soul' appertaining to the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect (the pseudo-superior fulcrum) of pseudo-Submetaphysics, in which there is least pseudo-Soul, the kind of pseudo-Soul in question existing on a 1:3 basis vis-à-vis the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect (the pseudo-inferior fulcrum) of pseudo-Supermetachemistry, thereby making for a pseudo-least:pseudo-most overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'pseudo-less' in 'pseudo-least', namely the pseudo-Subego in the pseudo-Subsoul (pseudo-Subgod in pseudo-Subheaven, pseudo-Subtruth in pseudo-Subjoy, pseudo-Subneutron pseudo-Subparticles in pseudo-Subproton pseudo-Subwavicles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Superior Aspect of pseudo-Subphysics in relation to pseudo-Submetaphysics, together with what is 'pseudo-more' in 'pseudo-most', namely the pseudo-Superid in the pseudo-Superwill (pseudo-Superhell in the pseudo-Superdevil, pseudo-Superlove in pseudo-Superbeauty, pseudo-Superelectron pseudo-Superwavicles in pseudo-Superphoton pseudo-Superparticles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Inferior Aspect of pseudo-Superchemistry in relation to pseudo-Supermetachemistry.

By extrapolation from the pseudo-Submetaphysical/pseudo-Supermetachemical pseudo-Superior and pseudo-Inferior fulcra of the pseudo-Representative pseudo-Atom outlined above, we shall find that the pseudo-Unsoul is that mode of 'pseudo-Soul' appertaining to the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect (the

pseudo-superior fulcrum) of pseudo-Unmetaphysics, in which there is less – compared to least – pseudo-Soul, the kind of pseudo-Soul in question existing on a 1½:2½ basis vis-à-vis the pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect (the pseudo-inferior fulcrum) of pseudo-Metachemistry, thereby making for a pseudo-less:pseudo-more overall dichotomy that also includes what is 'pseudo-more' in 'pseudo-less', namely the pseudo-Unego in the pseudo-Unsoul (pseudo-Ungod in pseudo-Unheaven, pseudo-Untruth in pseudo-Unjoy, pseudo-Unneutron pseudo-Unparticles in pseudo-Unproton pseudo-Unwavicles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Superior Aspect of pseudo-Unphysics in relation to pseudo-Unmetaphysics, together with what is 'pseudo-less' in 'pseudo-more', namely the pseudo-Id in the pseudo-Will (pseudo-Hell in the pseudo-Devil, pseudo-Love in pseudo-Beauty, pseudo-Electron pseudo-Wavicles in pseudo-Photon pseudo-Particles) as the pseudo-Secondary pseudo-Inferior Aspect of pseudo-Chemistry in relation to pseudo-Metachemistry.

12

Hence, in overall pseudo-Atomic terms, we have a descent from *most* pseudo-Being, or pseudo-Soul, in pseudo-Supermetaphysics to *least* pseudo-Being in pseudo-Submetaphysics via *more* – compared to *most* – pseudo-Being in pseudo-Metaphysics, and *less* – compared to *least* – pseudo-Being in pseudo-Unmetaphysics.

13

Hence from pseudo-Supermetaphysical pseudo-Superjoy to pseudo-Submetaphysical pseudo-Subjoy via pseudo-

Metaphysical pseudo-Joy and pseudo-Unmetaphysical pseudo-Unjoy, the 'pseudo-Soul', in its various pseudo-permutations, always has to do with one degree or another of 'pseudo-Metaphysics', whether on pseudo-Inferior pseudo-Primary terms or, effectively on the opposite (pseudo-female) side of the gender fence, on pseudo-Superior pseudo-Primary terms, where 'pseudo-Soul' is merely a pseudo-bound concomitant of one degree or another of 'pseudo-Free Will'.

14

With, in fulcrum-specific terms, the Supermetaphysical/Submetachemical Representative Atom being hegemonic over pseudo-Submetaphysics/pseudo-Supermetachemistry, it follows that the *pseudo-Subbeing* of the latter's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect will defer to the *Superbeing* of the former's Primary Superior Aspect in the ratio of 1:3.

15

With, again in fulcrum-specific terms, the Metaphysical/Unmetachemical Extrapolative Atom being hegemonic over pseudo-Unmetaphysics/pseudo-Metachemistry, it follows that the *pseudo-Unbeing* of the latter's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect will defer to the *Being* of the former's Primary Superior Aspect in the ratio of 1½:2½.

16

With, in fulcrum-specific terms, the

Supermetachemical/Submetaphysical Representative Atom being hegemonic over pseudo-Submetachemistry/pseudo-Supermetaphysics, it follows that the *Subbeing* of the former's Primary Inferior Aspect will defer to the *pseudo-Superbeing* of the latter's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect in the ratio of 1:3.

17

With, again in fulcrum-specific terms, the Metachemical/Unmetaphysical Extrapolative Atom being hegemonic over pseudo-Unmetachemistry/pseudo-Metaphysics, it follows that the *Unbeing* of the former's Primary Inferior Aspect will defer to the *pseudo-Being* of the latter's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect in the ratio of $1\frac{1}{2}:2\frac{1}{2}$

18

Hence whereas on the male-dominated side of the gender fence the Subordinate pseudo-Atom's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Superior Aspect defers upwards to the Hegemonic Atom's Primary Superior Aspect whether in the Superlative or the Comparative ratio contexts, on the female-dominated side of the gender fence, by contrast, it is the Hegemonic Atom's Primary Inferior Aspect that defers downwards to the Subordinate pseudo-Atom's pseudo-Primary pseudo-Inferior Aspect on both Superlative and Comparative terms.

19

There is no equality of 'Being' across the Representative

Hegemonic Atoms and their Subordinate counterparts, nor, indeed, across the Extrapolative Hegemonic Atoms and *their* Subordinate counterparts. Deferring upwards stands in marked – even antithetical – contrast to deferring downwards; any deference from the inauthentic pseudo-free mode of 'pseudo-Being' to the authentic free mode of 'Being' can only be ontologically – and therefore religiously – superior to whatever defers from an authentic bound mode of 'Being' to an inauthentic pseudo-bound mode of 'pseudo-Being', particularly as what is free and pseudo-free in the latter contexts has nothing whatsoever to do with 'Being' and 'pseudo-Being', since indubitably associated with the respective modes of 'Doing' that appertain not to the 'Soul' and/or 'pseudo-Soul' but, on the contrary, to the 'Will' and/or 'pseudo-Will' (to generalize non-ratio dichotomously).

20

Neither can there be any genuine spritual transcendence with the Inferior and pseudo-Inferior modes of 'Being' and 'pseudo-Being', which are respectively bound and pseudo-bound to the free and pseudo-free modes of 'Doing', wherein the 'Will' has Corporeal ascendancy, in both its Superior and pseudo-Superior Aspects, over the Ethereal alternatives which effectively exist as a 'transcendentalist' by-product, so to speak, of the various modes of Corporeal Fundamentalism.

21

Only where 'Being' is free and, subordinately, pseudo-free in 'pseudo-Being' ... can there be anything properly resembling Ethereal Transcendentalism, which confirms the genuinely

religious nature or, rather, nurture of their Superior and pseudo-Superior modes of Spirituality in relation, hegemonically, to the 'Soul' and, indeed, to the 'Ego' that lies behind this 'Soul' as, in effect, 'God in Heaven' or, more bluntly, 'Force in Heat' in relation to 'Mass in Space' (to generalize non-ratio specifically and independently of subordinate, or pseudo-atomic, considerations).

22

I could, in concluding this section of ontological considerations, allow for the secular 'being' (note the lower case) of 'pleasure' in its various atomic and pseudo-atomic permutations. But since such 'being' is secondary to the primary – and fulcrum-specific – aspects of what will be the various manifestations of 'physics' and 'pseudo-physics', representative and pseudo-representative, extrapolative and pseudo-extrapolative – namely, the 'taking' of an 'egocentric' or, better, 'egotistic' fulcrum in 'knowledge', I shall refrain from further elaboration in view of what, with 'pleasure in knowledge' and/or 'pseudo-pleasure in pseudo-knowledge' should primarily lend itself to epistemological considerations outside the scope of this ontological focus.

23

Nor do I wish to end this section on an anti-climax, as would surely be the case if I were to outline the various negative preconditions and, in some sense, precursors of both positive 'Being' and pseudo-positive 'pseudo-Being', whereby one would have to allow for all the woefully antithetical modes of 'Antibeing' and 'pseudo-Antibeing' in both hegemonic and subordinate contexts.

Better that I end on an ontological 'high' by citing the Spiritual Transcendence of the Soul's or, more specifically, the Supersoul's heated Gravity in the guise of that Lightness of Spirit that wings its way heavenwards, like the perfumed smoke, or incense, from a priest's burning censer as, in godly vein, he swings it to and fro, applying just enough force to the heat to enable the incense to atmospherically rise into the surrounding space in a perfect metaphor of spiritual transcendence, the raison d'être of religious truth in the resolution of authentic Being or, rather, Superbeing that carries the Supersoul aloft towards its final destination in the heavenly Beyond, the culmination of godly Evolution in the Joy-transcending resurrected Peace of Spatial Infinity.

END

John James O'Loughlin was born in Galway, Co. Galway in the Republic of Ireland, to an English-born mother of mixed Irish descent (who was only in Ireland because her Athenry-born mother returned there, after a lengthy absence, following the death of her Donegal-born husband) and an Irish father the son of National School Teachers, and, having been removed from his homeland as a young child by his grandmother and mother who, following social and financial difficulties, were unable to remain in Galway, grew up first in Hampshire and then in Surrey, in south-east England, where he attended a variety of state schools, both Catholic and, subsequently, Protestant.

Most of his adult life has been spent at different addresses in the north London Borough of Haringey, to which he was obliged to move – rather reluctantly – from Surrey in 1974, and all but a few of his books have been written there, the majority of which are, like this one, of a calculatedly and even intensely aphoristic character deriving the basis of their ideological bias from the four Elements (fire, water, earth, and air), which are considerably enlarged upon in relation to a variety of quadruple structures that, embracing a 'fourth dimension', put his work beyond the narrow confines of both dualistic and tripartite thinkers, as evidenced by a succession of ever-more comprehensively exacting perspectives in his writings, which make no apologies to common usage as they logically and categorically expose the expedient generalizations that, passing for fact if not truth, most people naively take for granted. In that respect, he fulfils what he regards as his duty as a thinker – a self-taught artist-philosopher, if you will – to an extent rarely if ever encountered in writings of a serious philosophical character, not even by the likes of Bertrand Russell, Theilhard de Chardin, Oswald Spenger, John Cowper Powys, Aldous Huxley, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and Arthur Koestler, to name but a handful of those twentieth-century authors whom he regards as having been most influential on his early development as a boldly original and serious writer who aphoristically climbed not just upon but over the shoulders of such literary giants, in order to restore philosophy to the aphoristic heights principally achieved by Schopenhauer, Heine, and, in particular, Nietzsche in the nineteenth century, before its essayistic decline and virtual eclipse by secular prose thereafter – a situation, alas, which has continued into the twenty-first century under pressures from what this author holds to be lower-order

criteria, which fight shy of truth and sometimes even of facts, as their proponents muddle their way through the relativity of the various illusions and fictions with little or no capacity for anything better and no desire, on the whole, for evolutionary, much less devolutionary, change, the totalitarian falsehood of constant progress and the just retort of totalitarian regress forming the extremist boundaries of their world-view which, by and large, adheres to the centrist middle-ground of their inherent moderation.

ONTOLOGICAL PERMUTATIONS

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

