



D(R)EAD ENDS

Or

Revelation Resurrection

John O'Loughlin



Centretruths Digital Media

D(R)EAD ENDS

Or

Revelation Resurrection

This edition of *D(r)ead Ends* first published 2022 by
Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2022 John O'Loughlin

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

ISBN: 978-14716-6446-5

* * * *

CONTENTS

Preface

First Section: 1 – 25

Second Section: 26 – 50

Third Section: 51 – 75

Fourth Section: 76 – 100

Fifth Section: 101 – 125

Sixth Section: 126 – 150

Seventh Section: 151 – 157

D(r)eadendix

Emblematic Revelations

Preface

Following on from *End Station J J*, my previous collection of notational aphorisms, this project brings my philosophical journey to a conclusive peak, as it both sums-up and enlarges upon my recent thinking in relation to modern/post-modern criteria and the frankly dreadful pass to which reason (stemming from the so-called 'Age of Enlightenment') has come, and why it must be opposed from a kind of 'third way' beholden to the resurrection of revelation, if what amounts to the opposite of true enlightenment is eventually to be consigned to the 'rubbish bin' of regrettable history, and civilization accordingly be enabled to move-on towards a universal resolution owing little or nothing to the current 'dark ages' which, directly or indirectly, characterize the contemporary world. There are a number of possible interpretations of the pun-like title to this book of original thought, but the discerning reader – if, in future, I am fortunate enough to have any – will sooner or later draw the most credible conclusions from it and think accordingly, joining me in my opposition to everything that 'flies in the face' of godly truth from standpoints that are more usually, these days, not even directly beholden to the 'Devil' (a generalized term for what exists 'up back' in Quasar-derived fashion), but are demonstrably human-all-too-human in their secular audacities and profanities. Finally I should confess that, since I am not beholden to triangles, as to the moral limitations of 'tripartite' thinking, to use a term associated with Arthur Koestler,

but represent a kind of 'fourth dimension' beyond anything triangular (and thus rooted, in a manner of speaking, in the 'Devil'), I am, as a serious thinker, a self-taught philosopher, obliged to publish myself, since self-publishing is really par for the course of being 'beyond the pale' of 'Devil'-rooted or derived triangularity, ruled over, as it usually is, by persons for whom rectilinear pediments and the like are taken for granted and anything approximating the curvilinearity of a dome is only acceptable if it prostrates itself, so to speak, before the said pediment in subordinate – one might even say 'sonofabitch'-like – vein, thereby confirming the hegemonic rule of autocracy in all too 'once-born', God-denying fashion (although, since the people will never, so we are told by no less a luminary than Eugene Ionesco, 'demystify themselves', God-denial would be the last thing to which they would ever admit!). Be that as it may, self-publishing is only to be expected for thought that is, to any extent, true and honest and, hence, more genuinely philosophic. And therefore whilst anyone can, in theory, read me, only the best will appreciate what I have to say and – who knows? – even undertake to review this book and spread the 'good news' that not every branch of literature exists within the commercially-orientated moral constraints imposed by triangular control, and that if philosophy is to be true to its vocation as both a truth-seeker and revealer of 'higher truths' not altogether dissociated from a credibly comprehensive interpretation of the world, it must continue to distance itself from the 'market place' of those who knowingly exploit writers – particularly poets, novelists, and dramatists – for self-enrichment through the various channels of worldly commerce. For few if any

commercial writers escape the rectilinear pediment other than via the debasement of the dome, and that is a fate I can happily leave to what certain other notable independently-minded free-lance thinkers of the past would have identified with the 'professors of philosophy'!

John O'Loughlin, London 2022

First Section

1

The weaker cling to the stronger, as the ignorant to the knowledgeable, the ugly to the beautiful, and the false to the true. For the negative is always inferior to the positive.

2

A tolerant indulgence of and even sentimental deference towards those who cannot be expected to fully – or even partly – understand one, whether from gender, class, age, occupation, species, or any other limitation characteristic, to varying extents, of their simple natures, is not without its advantages; for it isn't necessary to be understood by all and sundry, particularly since, as Baudelaire observed, the world 'only goes around through misunderstanding'.

3

As things stand, one can only get to the Afterlife via life and the termination of life at death; but it helps to have had an ecclesiastic as opposed to a secular bias, if one is to have any faith in such an eventuality at all, and most

especially as a male adult, for whom psyche should take precedence over soma, or the mind over the body, on properly subjective terms.

4

The Divine achieves Otherworldly peace by neutralizing the Diabolic, whereas the feminine achieves worldly peace by neutralizing the masculine ... in what is a distinction, after all, between ecclesiastic and secular, noble and plebeian values.

5

I, unlike most writers (particularly those of a narrative prose cast), do not sacrifice content – and hence contentment – to form, any more than Heaven would or should be sacrificed to God, even while the earth is being sacrificed to man! On the contrary, I override the rectilinear form characteristic of most books to the extent that my thought is centralized and thus effectively presented in a kind of curvilinear light closer, in effect, to a dome than to a (rectilinear) pediment.

6

When one is all 'fucked up' and 'pissed off', it is usually because of other people and/or the machines and programmes they have made which are either letting one

down or getting the better of one, as and when one's nerves are driven to the brink – if not over it – by soulless automata.

7

The thing I most detest after noisy and troubling workmen in close proximity to one is ... noisy and troubling neighbours thereof! Obviously, one would be better off without them, since such workmen and neighbours are, for the most part, a nuisance, and the idea that one should, never mind could, love either of them, in such circumstances, is frankly bizarre!

8

One tries to avoid hate as far as possible, since it is an intensely disagreeable thing that often interferes with one's physiology; but sometimes circumstances leave one with no alternative but a hatred for what is troubling and even tormenting one, particularly when it is recognized as being the product of low-calibre persons and/or machines, and drags-on for weeks if not months on end!

9

Anyone who is a 'cut above' the average man or woman does not believe in equality but, rather, leaves rhetorical notions of that sort to the average if not sub-average men

and women for whom it is convenient to reduce everything to their own lowly levels, for want of an above-average and sensibly discriminating disposition!

10

Only democratic or plutocratic types write for the masses, as opposed to writing independently of them and, as it were, in spite of them, with a view, at least in the theocratic case, to their eventual 'overcoming', to use a term reminiscent of Nietzsche.

11

A great country full of petty people ... Any thoughts?
Not Ireland, at any rate!

12

There are two kinds of people in this world that I particularly dislike: the nosey and the noisy, although experience has taught me that they are often one and the same, since superficiality has a common origin.

13

There are also those, including the above, who are

allergic to thought, and who react from a standpoint rooted in soma (as opposed to psyche), with physical implications. In other words, the common man and/or woman who is either, according to gender, a son-of-a-bitch or a bitch. One cannot bring oneself to like such people, try as one might; for they simply stand in opposition to anyone who can think, particularly when he happens to live in close proximity to them in some communal dwelling or other through no particular fault of his own but as the product, not unusually, of ostracism and neglect. Are they being 'freaked out' by a sensitivity to thought, or are they just waiting for an opportunity to, as it were, physically pounce on a sensed thought out of some philistine if not predatory instinct, rooted in nature, to react to culture. I guess it would depend on the kind of (simple) person.

14

How often is educated and cultivated sensibility 'put upon' and effectively brutalized by the barbarous doings of manual workers and/or builders in close proximity to where one lives and/or works! One begins to wonder whether such sensibility (as one still possesses) isn't a liability, since society makes no effort, it would appear, to protect it from just such impositions as are at loggerheads with it from standpoints rooted, more usually, in material gain.

Anybody who is for life is an enemy of God or, at any rate, of the godly, as epitomized, in the Western tradition, by Christ on the Cross and, more specifically, by the Catholic concept of the 'Mother of God', God, of course, being Christ on the Cross and not the so-called Father ... of attenuated Creatorism (Jehovah) in back of the world, where a Supermother/Subfather superlative dichotomy (3:1, or most:least) between Superscience and Subreligion, or the Superdevil/Subgod (whether unequivocally as Supersatan/Subjehovah or, in attenuated extrapolation, as Supermary/Subjoseph) would be the atomic reality according with the Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics of the context in question, which only gradually changes, in overall terms, from regressive negativity to progressive positivity, as from the devolution of negativity in the Cosmos and Nature to the evolution of positivity in Mankind and Cyborgkind, the latter of which has still to, as it were, transpire ... in what would have to be a post-Christian and therefore properly global framework according with a true concept of Universality, a concept antithetical to everything Cosmic, including the unequivocal Creatorism of Supersatan/Subjehovah in relation, I would imagine, to the Quasar/Black Hole configuration at the roots of the Galaxy, as, presumably, of any galaxy in the so-called Universe ... if one is to extend one's concept of this particular reality back to pre-'monotheistic' – and therefore avowedly 'polytheistic' – contexts, irrespective of whether or not one endorses such terms or simply

dismisses them as just another example of cosmic hype.

16

Catholic priests, who have a vocational duty to remain celibate (and usually do) are truly godly and therefore against life as a reproductive offshoot of diabolical intent in Quasar-stemming vein. The ecclesiastic amorality of the Church acquiescing in monogamy – that 'monotheistic' parallel – is of course unavoidable in relation to the generality of people, even those who are other than Catholic, but should not be confounded with ecclesiastic morality, which 'fights shy' (in the 'good fight') of worldly compromises between the genders in the interests, needless to say, of true spirituality and, hence, of a properly religious orientation such that requires the celibacy alluded to above. Nothing like that, of course, can be got or expected from Protestants, never mind those who are anterior to them in respect of Fundamentalist and/or Pantheist allegiances with regard to the Cosmos and Nature.

17

So-called 'political correctness' may be on the side of life, but religious correctness won't be, least of all when such correctness is vocational and, hence, a spiritual rejection not only of sensuality but of the instinctuality, so to speak, intellectuality over which sensuality tends to preside, whether directly or indirectly, in due triangular

fashion.

18

Neutrality, whereby a country 'sits on the fence' rather than takes sides in war or diplomacy or whatever, is effectively amoral, since amorality can be found in between immorality on the one hand and morality on the other hand, which have little or nothing in common and stand, in consequence, on opposing sides of the proverbial fence, the one behind amorality and the other beyond it.

19

The Father, as a Christian concept, can have no place in Judaism, since this term corresponds to the notion of an attenuated Creator that, unlike Jehovah, allows for both a Mother and a Son, which, in the Catholic – and particularly Irish Catholic – context is habitually transformed into the 'Mother of God' saying that, unlike with Protestantism (and root Protestantism in particular), makes no bones about identifying God with Christ or, more specifically, with the Crucified Saviour, whose death on the Cross paves the way for Eternity. But just as the term 'Father', used in this religious sense, can have no place in Judaism, so the term 'Hallelujah', which some truncate to 'Jah', can have no place in Catholicism, whether Irish or otherwise, since it is a term used in praise of the Hebrew God, Jehovah ('jah' and 'vah' having

similar if not identical implications), and thus would be irrelevant even to the so-called Father ... of the Son via the Mother ... as a Creator-esque concept unique to Christianity; even though, in reality, this Father is but the least aspect of the atom 'up back' in which, as previously described, the main aspect (most:least) corresponds to a Mother and, specifically, to a Supermother vis-à-vis a Subfather that, whether negatively identified, in Judaic vein, with Supersatan/Subjehovah or positively identified, in Christian vein, with Supermary/Subjoseph, is effectively a Superscientific/Subreligious extrapolation, directly or indirectly, unequivocally or equivocally, from the Quasar/Black Hole configuration at the ('monotheistic') roots of the Galaxy, such that I would atomically identify (on 3:1 superlative ratio terms) with Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics or, indeed (if we make a clinical distinction between a negative and a positive approach to this atom), with Anti-Supermetachemistry/Anti-Submetaphysics on the one hand, and Supermetachemistry/Submetaphysics on the other hand, as between Judaic and Christian, Primal and Supreme, alternatives deriving from devolutionary and evolutionary distinctions. Be that as it may, it would be as ethnically illogical for a Jew to cite the 'Father' as for a Christian to sing or chant 'Hallelujah', bearing in mind the difference between Judaism and Christianity, an unequivocal take on the Creator and an equivocal take that, though largely extrapolated – for pagan solar precedent cannot be entirely ruled out – from the former, permits, in its attenuated Creatorism, of precisely that which Judaism rejects: namely a Mother and, more importantly, a Son, with the latter, as Christ, being the actual focus of Christian devotion, and one that, not least

in the Irish Catholic context becomes identified with God via the Mother, so that Transcendentalism not only trumps Pantheism but effectively relegates Fundamentalism to the margins, together with any undue (Puritan) emphasis on Humanism, as on the 'Son of Man', which would otherwise bog Christianity down in what, with Nonconformist Protestantism, becomes an emphasis on 'the Word', and hence the Bible from a standpoint polar, in the New Testament, to the Old Testament bias favoured by root Protestantism, with its anti-Catholic fundamentalism as ample testimony to a heretical departure from Christian transcendentalism, and hence from what is, in consequence, properly religious, and most especially so in the Supermetaphysical aspects of the Supermetaphysical/Submetachemical atom to which genuine religion subscribes when truly positive and not only world-rejecting, but a rejection, not least, of whatever is behind the world on, again to be ratio specific, either primally negative (Supersatan/Subjehovah) or supremely positive (Supermary/Subjoseph), Anti-Supermetachemical/Anti-Submetaphysical or Supermetachemical/Submetaphysical terms, the former therefore arguably Anti-Superfundamentalist/Anti-Subtranscendentalist, and the latter Superfundamentalist/Subtranscendentalist.