

ONTOLOGICAL PERMUTATIONS

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



ONTOLOGICAL PERMUTATIONS

Aphoristic Philosophy by
JOHN O'LOUGHLIN
Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This title first published as an eBook 2024 and republished (with revisions) 2025 by John O'Loughlin of Centretruths Digital Media

Copyright © 2024, 2025 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

ISBN: 978-1-291-87433-4

* * * *

CONTENTS

Concerning the Contrary Dispositions of Light and Heat

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

Ontological Permutations

The Best People

* * * *

Concerning the Contrary Dispositions of Light and Heat

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 were to ask oneself as an original thinker and literary artist, an artist-philosopher whose original thought takes an aphoristic form, 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've 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've 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's 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's 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 giving rise 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've 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 isn't 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 origins in one kind of gaseous conflagration or another, one kind of star favouring light over heat and the other kind favouring 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's commonly termed flame, which requires oxygen to feed upon and, in a sense, to breathe, so that its appearance is altogether distinct from what's commonly regarded as light.

9

Admittedly, some heat is present in what's predominantly light and, conversely, some light in what's preponderantly heat, but that wouldn't diminish the extents to which light and heat were 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's no logical reason why an acceptance of daylight, of natural light pumping through one's windows, should lead one to dismiss the coexistence – 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's 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's 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's superficially difused on the one hand, and protonic gravity that's 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, the phallic connotations of which would be difficult to ignore.

17

Looking like what, in earlier writings, I've described as jean- or trouser-wearing 'lesser men' vis-à-vis the 'greater men' who're *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're not the equals, in broad male-biased terms, of their male counterparts, being likely, if anything, to regard themselves as their gender superiors, since, despite pretensions to the contrary, women have 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 gender 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's 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's an overwhelmingly male environment where, in keeping with urban artificiality, only male kinds of sartorial norms would seem to be 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 pre-worldly 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

can't be surprised that things are now antithetical to how they once 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's 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 can't 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 overlappings 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' vis-à-vis their more genuinely male counterparts, 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 isn't generally inhaled, doing less damage to the lungs and bronchial tubes than other forms of tobacco consumption, and they're to be admired, in a sense, 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're 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 isn't 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 ...

END OF PREVIEW