

ALPHA AND OMEGA - Diabolic Beginning and Divine End

By

John O'Loughlin

Of Centretruths Digital Media

CDM Philosophy

This edition of *Alpha and Omega* published 2012 by
Centretruths Digital Media

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

CONTENTS

PREFACE

PART ONE

1. Who Precedes What or What precedes Whom?
2. Returning to One's 'Maker'
3. Fathers and Sons vis-à-vis Mothers and Daughters
4. The Dualities of both Soma and Psyche
5. Posthumous Fates of the Genders in relation to Class
6. The Gender Basis of Conflicting Freedoms
7. The Relationships between Work and Play
8. As in the Beginning, so Not Quite in the End

PART TWO

1. Devolution and Evolution in Perspective
2. The Subversion of Knowledge
3. Alternative Afterdeath and Afterlife Experiences
4. State Soma and Church Psyche
5. Contrasting Freedoms of Barbarism and Culture
6. Empiricism and Rationalism Reviewed
7. Failed Alternatives to the Liberal World
8. Returning to Self

PART THREE

1. Concrete and Abstract Revaluated
2. Fictional Knowledge and True Knowledge
3. Factual Primacy vis-à-vis Truthful Supremacy
4. Primacy and Supremacy in the Elements
5. Divisions in both the Self and the Not-Self
6. The Many and the One

7. [The Tune and Dance of the Many](#)
8. [Returning \(progressively\) to the One](#)

PART FOUR

1. [Contrary types of Virtue and Vice](#)
2. [Psychic Virtue vis-à-vis Somatic Vice](#)
3. [Fictional and Illusory Hegemonies](#)
4. [Evil or Wisdom, the Gender Choice](#)
5. [Sin and Punishment](#)
6. [The Virtue of Self-promotion](#)
7. [The Prerogative of Man](#)
8. [The Prerogative of God](#)

Biographical Note

Copyright © 2012 John O'Loughlin

PREFACE

This book of aphoristic philosophy, divided into four evenly-structured parts, takes a closer look at such age-old questions as to whether mind precedes matter or matter mind and answers them in a way that does equal justice to both, as well as throwing new light upon the distinction between 'the Father' and 'the Son' which amounts, for me, to a complete rejection of my previous standpoint and a reappraisal of their respective standings on the basis of a logically incontrovertible insight such that I had been building towards all along, not least of all in relation to the dissimilar ratios and levels of significance attaching to soma and psyche according to gender. It is *Alpha and Omega* above all other books that, when the contents of all four parts have been taken into account and their conclusions carefully analysed, will expose the humbug of conventional wisdom and morally challenge all who would stand in the way of evolutionary progress and seek to undermine that very sharp distinction between right and wrong, honesty and cowardice, sincerity and hypocrisy, truth and lies.

John O'Loughlin, London 2002 (Revised 2012)

PART ONE

WHO PRECEDES WHAT OR WHAT PRECEDES WHOM?

1. Soma and psyche, the nature and nurture, the not-self and self of life as it devolves on the female, or objective, side of things from most soma and least psyche, most particles and least wavicles, in the Cosmos to more (relative to most) soma and less (relative to least) psyche, more particles and less wavicles, in Nature, and evolves on the male, or subjective, side of things from more (relative to most) psyche and less (relative to least) soma, more wavicles and less particles, in Man to most psyche and least soma, most particles and least wavicles, in the Cyborg; which is to say, regresses from the Devil to Woman in fire and water, but progresses from Man to God in vegetation (earth) and air, as we plot an overall elemental chronology, both within and without historical time, from the noumenal objectivity of metachemistry in space-time devolution and the phenomenal objectivity of chemistry in volume-mass devolution to the phenomenal subjectivity of physics in mass-volume evolution and the noumenal subjectivity of metaphysics in time-space evolution, as from the somatic freedoms of will and spirit to the psychic freedoms of ego and soul.
2. Hence things could be said to proceed, whether regressively or progressively, in devolutionary descent or evolutionary ascent, from the metachemical context of appearances to the metaphysical context of essences *par excellence* via the chemical context of quantities and the physical context of qualities *par excellence*, as from power to content(ment) via glory and form, doing to being via giving and taking, will to soul via spirit and ego, though always with 'everything within everything' in different ratios and with different emphases according to the gender and/or class status of the element concerned, be it fiery, watery, vegetative, or airy.
3. In literary terms, this would be like plotting a regression from poetry to drama on the one hand, that of a female objectivity necessarily affiliated to or stemming from a vacuum, and plotting a progression from fiction to philosophy on the other hand, that of a male subjectivity necessarily centred in or appertaining to a plenum, the context in which, contrary to vacuums, psyche precedes soma rather than *vice versa*.
4. For when we ask ourselves, in somewhat Wildean fashion, whether matter precedes mind or mind precedes matter, we are obliged to

answer, if wise and truly insightful, that the distinction which Wilde himself drew between matter over mind in relation to females and mind over matter (or, rather, morals, but unlike him we shan't be facetious!) in relation to males obliges us to concede a place to both tendencies, since a somatic predominance, as in the Cosmos and Nature, is only possible on the objective basis of particles preceding wavicles, whereas a psychic predominance, as in Man and (to anticipate the future) the Cyborg, is only possible on the subjective basis of wavicles preceding particles, so that the answer to the age-old question as to whether matter precedes mind or mind precedes matter can only be accurately answered on the basis of the precedence of mind by matter, of psyche by soma, in regard to the objective, or female, elements of fire and water, in contrast to the precedence of matter by mind, of soma by psyche, in regard to the subjective, or male, elements of vegetation and air.

5. Hence the ability to draw a gender distinction on the above objective/subjective, vacuum/plenum, particle/wavicle basis is the beginning of all wisdom and guarantor of philosophical truth, of a more comprehensively exacting and credible perspective, since it saves one from projecting, consciously or unconsciously, a single gender perspective on to the answer and, indeed, question in the first place, thereby enabling one to distinguish between those contexts, necessarily vacuously objective, in which soma precedes psyche, the not-self the self, and those contexts, by contrast, in which, due to subjective attributes deriving from a plenum, psyche precedes soma, the self the not-self, which gives us a clear-cut gender-based distinction between the femaleness, in metachemistry and chemistry, of those elements by which, on the basis of a particle hegemony, it can be categorically maintained that matter precedes mind, and the maleness, in physics and metaphysics, of those elements by which, on the basis of a wavicle hegemony, it can be maintained with equal categorical assurance that mind precedes matter, although the use of such facile terms as 'matter' and 'mind' is of less value, philosophically, than the more clinical distinction between soma and psyche, not-self and self, will and/or spirit and ego and/or soul, since mind is less purely psychic than a consequence of what happens when egocentric psyche is free, in male vein, to condition and modify the will of the relevant subjective order of soma towards consciousness, thereby establishing conscious will, which is the somatic counterpart to the modification of spirit by soul in such contexts, which I have hitherto - and I believe correctly - characterized as 'subspirit', or subconscious spirit.
6. For will, spirit, ego, and soul do not exist as equal components in

every element, be it female objective or male subjective, but either will and spirit condition ego and soul, as in those female contexts where soma is free, in hegemonic particles, to maintain the psychic determinism of id and superego, instinctualized soul and spiritualized ego, or, by gender contrast, ego and soul condition will and spirit, as in those male contexts where psyche is free, in hegemonic wavicles, to maintain the somatic determinism of mind and subspirit, intellectualized (conscious) will and emotionalized spirit.

7. Therefore whilst will and spirit are very much factors of a somatic predominance, ego and soul are only genuinely possible in relation to a psychic predominance, the sort of predominance which follows from a plenum, in due subjective vein, and enables us to infer the precedence of soma by psyche, of not-self by self, the former of which is accordingly modified by the latter in relation to a male hegemony.
8. But when psyche is modified by soma, as in the objective contexts of a female hegemony, we have to infer the precedence of psyche by soma, of self by not-self, since particle hegemonies are only authentically possible in relation to a vacuum, and such a vacuum characterizes both the most particle and least wavicle absolutism of the Cosmos and the more (relative to most) particle and less (relative to least) wavicle relativity of Nature, conceiving of the former in a mainly metachemical light and the latter in a mainly chemical one, so that the elements of fire and water are respectively preponderant.
9. Therefore it can only be said that 'God created matter' in relation to the metaphysical self and its association with the metaphysical not-self, the 'matter', or soma, of the airy context in question, be it sensual or sensible, foolish or wise, of the ears or of the lungs. It cannot even be said of the physical self and its association with the physical not-self, the soma of a vegetative mean, be it phallic or cerebral, since that is not a context of God but, more phenomenally, of Man, even though the notion that 'Man created physical matter' is logically valid, and follows from the tendency of a free psyche centred in ego to fashion things in its formal image in respect to the development of civilization through knowledge, the masculine equivalent of the development, by the godly, of culture through truth.
10. But when we turn to the other side of the gender fence, the objective side of a vacuous predilection for a particle hegemony, it cannot be said that either God or Man created or preceded 'matter', meaning the not-self or soma, since neither God nor Man are relevant there, but either the Devil or Woman, of whom it has to be said that in neither case did they create matter but that, judged in relation to the self,

matter created or preceded them, though, in contrast to the primacy of God and Man in relation to the self on the male side of life, it is not the self which is primarily identifiable with either the Devil or Woman, even though secondary manifestations of each most certainly apply, but the not-self, which is the soma from out of which psyche emerged, albeit on a subordinate basis, given the vacuously-conditioned objective bias of the female gender for not-self over self or, in Wilde's proverbial phrase, 'matter over mind', viz. soma over psyche.

11. Therefore if it could be said - and this contrary to how I used to think - that the Father takes precedence over the Son with both Man and God, physics and metaphysics, it would also have to be the case that, in parallel terms, the Mother takes precedence over the Daughter with both the Devil and Woman, metachemistry and chemistry, since the Daughter is the subordinate psychic factor in contexts where soma, and hence the Mother, must predominate in view of their objective nature and consequent tendency to put the not-self above the self.
12. Consequently the Daughter stems from the Mother, psyche from soma, in regard to both the metachemical fieriness of the Devil and the chemical wateriness of Woman, while the Son stems from the Father, soma from psyche, in regard to both the physical vegetativeness of Man and the metaphysical airiness of God, who, for us, is less a bona fide contemporary reality, higher-man exceptions to the general rule notwithstanding, than something or, rather, someone who will only come properly into his own in the more metaphysical future, when history moves beyond the dominion over the earth of Man and embraces the dominion beyond the earth of the Cyborg, who will bring godliness to a more authentic pitch than that at which it has ever existed in the past.
13. For God is not in the Beginning, with the Cosmos, but in the End, with the Cyborg, and until we officially embrace the coming age of the Cyborg through 'Kingdom Come', as defined by me in previous texts, we shall continue to live with either the hype of Man as God, as in the Christian tradition, the hype of Woman as God, as in the Marian and Heathen traditions, or the hype, worse again, of the Devil as God, as in all those Creator-worshipping paganistic traditions which, in their identification of God with a fiery 'First Mover', unwittingly accord divinity to that context in which the diabolism of most particle and least wavicle, most soma and least psyche, is scientifically uppermost - namely, the Cosmos.
14. We have a lot to do, especially those of us who are less than partial to

any of the three false traditions noted above, before proper justice can be done to God and the concept thereof! We have to reject the hype, the falsehoods, the subversions of Godliness by Cosmos-slaving devils, Nature-worshipping women, and Man-affirming men, before any prospect of Cyborg-oriented gods can be expected to come to pass in heavenly contrast to both Hell and the World. Whereof 'Judgement' has its place as the electoral pathway to 'Kingdom Come'.

RETURNING TO ONE'S 'MAKER'

1. There is a sense in which 'As in the Beginning, so in the End' has some relevance to life, though not, I contend, in relation to the distinction between the alpha and omega of things, the Cosmos and the Cyborg, since we hold with the view that the former is more characteristic of the Devil and the latter of God, and that no greater distinction, amounting to a noumenal (absolute) antithesis in time and space between objectivity and subjectivity, could be imagined.
2. No, rather the worth of this biblical proverb is to be discerned in the distinction between psyche-out-of-soma on the one hand, and soma-out-of-psyche on the other, as between that which is female in its particle-hegemonic objectivity and that, by contrast, which is male in its wavicle-hegemonic subjectivity, so that both the Devil and Woman, the Cosmos and Nature, could be said to represent a tendency to return to soma in the end, whereas both Man and God, Civilization and the Cyborg, could be said to represent the contrary tendency to return to psyche in the end, since what began in soma must return to soma no less surely than what began in psyche must return to psyche.
3. There is even a biblical saying about 'ashes to ashes and dust to dust', and if I am not mistaken in my interpretation of this, it would seem to reflect acknowledgement of a gender distinction between female 'dust' and male 'ashes', between soma and psyche, primacy and supremacy, objectivity and subjectivity, whether in relation to devils and women in the case of females, or in relation to men and gods in the case of males, given the class distinctions which exist between those whose principal affiliation is to time and space, viz. devils and gods, and those, by contrast, whose principal affiliation is to volume and mass, viz. women and men.
4. Therefore whether one is primarily of the metachemical objectivity of space-time devolution, like upper-class females, or primarily of the chemical objectivity of volume-mass devolution, like lower-class females, dresses and skirts of respectively eyes-to-heart devils and tongue-to-womb women, one will return to soma in the end, as 'dust to dust', since females represent the triumph of matter over mind, of soma over psyche, whether scientifically, as it were, in relation to the most particles and least wavicles of metachemistry or politically ... in relation to the more (relative to most) particles and less (relative to least) wavicles of chemistry, with apparent and quantitative

distinctions between upper-class doing and lower-class giving, the will and the spirit, with only a subordinate psyche characterized by the id and the superego, respectively, of the Daughter.

5. Conversely, whether one is primarily of the physical subjectivity of mass-volume evolution, like lower-class males, or primarily of the metaphysical subjectivity of time-space evolution, like upper-class males, trousers (or pants/jeans) and zippersuits of respectively phallus-to-brain men and ears-to-lungs gods, one will return to psyche in the end, as 'ashes to ashes', since males represent the triumph of mind over matter, of psyche over soma, whether economically, as it were, in relation to the more (relative to most) wavicles and less (relative to least) particles of physics or religiously ... in relation to the most wavicles and least particles of metaphysics, with qualitative and essential distinctions between lower-class taking and upper-class being, the ego and the soul, with only a subordinate soma characterized by the mind and the subspirit, respectively, of the Son.
6. Consequently it takes no great stretch of the imagination to see that what returns, having begun in soma, to soma in the end is unlikely to have much by way of afterlife experience, whereas what returns, having begun in psyche, to psyche in the end is almost sure to experience an afterlife, since such experience is only possible in relation to psyche, to the self, and never more so than in regard to that self which was partial, in upper-class male vein, to metaphysics in life and therefore primarily concerned with the well-being of the soul. For it is in the context of most wavicles and least particles, most psyche and least soma, that the soul comes most alive and lives the life eternal through metaphysics.
7. In almost absolute contrast to that context of most particles and least wavicles, most soma and least psyche, in which the will is predominant and one has a sort of eternal death through metachemistry, through the darkness of soma which, no matter how superficially bright the psychic surface may appear in its id-like radiance, is chiefly characteristic of the context in question.
8. Therefore while gods can expect to go into the light of a metaphysical eternity in the Afterlife, devils can expect nothing more than the darkness of a metachemical eternity, since what began in soma must return via a brief flare-up of instinctualized soul, viz. the id, to soma and fade-out into *nothingness*, whereas what began in psyche must return via the giving-up of emotionalized spirit, viz. the subspirit, to psyche and rise up into *somethingness*, the somethingness that owes its being to a soulful plenum as opposed, like the somatic nothingness

of eternal death, to a wilful vacuum.

9. But what applies to devils and gods, genuinely upper-class females and males of a space/time highness, also applies, if to a lesser extent, to women and men, genuinely lower-class females and males of a volume/mass lowness, whose soma-over-psyche in the feminine case and psyche-over-soma in the masculine case means that, in the comparative relativity of their phenomenal integrities, soma returns to soma as, in some sense, 'maternal dust to dust' less quickly and completely with women while, conversely, psyche returns to psyche as 'paternal ashes to ashes' less quickly and completely with men, as each gender rots away in relatively intermediate afterlife states which we may characterize as purgatorial in the one case and earthly in the other, since neither women nor men are so somatic or psychic as to warrant either the hellish extreme of virtually total darkness or the heavenly extreme of virtually total light, psychic extinction or somatic irrelevance, but must needs fade-out via the extinction of superego or flare-up via the extinction of mind more modestly in the contexts of a temporal death.
10. Of course, the afterlives or afterdeaths of the respective genders and classes are really somewhat limited in duration, since extensive decomposition of the corpse does not accord with infinite duration of either somatic negativity or psychic positivity, whether on an absolute or a relative basis. I believe I have dealt adequately with this subject in previous texts, and the reader familiar with my work should recall that the prospects for a Christian-type burial these days are not what they used to be, and are hardly likely to improve in the course of time.
11. Neither, of course, is Christianity as relevant as was formerly the case, and many people would choose not to be buried but, rather, incinerated at their local crematorium. In view of the female-dominated nature of the age, of the sensual hegemonies that owe more to objectivity than to subjectivity, including the prevalence of cathode-ray-tube popular culture, this need not surprise us, even though it may be cause for alarm as far as males are concerned, since if, as I believe, they are more likely to experience an afterlife than females, given their psychic predominance, then they must surely be the ones who would have most to lose by opting for cremation instead of burial.
12. And yet, one cannot reverse time and undo existing technologies (though modify and overhaul them one assuredly can), nor expect most people to return to criteria more relevant to a suburban and even town-like culture than to what is chiefly characteristic, in our cosmopolitan metropolises, of the age, as though Christianity was

still more applicable than the patently heathenistic and even paganistic parallels which underlie so much contemporary secular culture. The solution to this dilemma has, I believe, already been posed, and it will require that the cities - and therefore the majority of people - take full responsibility for their religious future and opt, democratically and urbanely, for an alternative to crematorial perdition in which, by degrees, the cyborgization of life, commensurate with a more evolved age, will provide the means by which life may continue virtually indefinitely and reach peaks of eternity that not even posthumous eternal life could provide or rival, thereby swinging things back in the male's favour and allowing him to dictate the terms not merely of psychic survival but of the enhancement of psyche in relation to a variety of synthetic and yogic practises.

FATHERS AND SONS VIS-À-VIS MOTHERS AND DAUGHTERS

1. Genuine philosophy can be a wonderful thing, a marvellously liberating and mentally enriching procedure. But it can also be a real problem when one is obliged, through enhanced logic, to review and even revise a long-held position, no matter how justified it may have seemed in the past. My own recent rethink in relation to the respective positions of the Father and the Son is a case in point, for I have long been arguing in favour of the identification of the Son with the self and of the Father with the not-self, thereby according pride of place, so to speak, to the former.
2. How wrong and misguided I was! For as psyche precedes soma with males, so it must follow that the Father precedes the Son, that the Father is what comes first and the Son afterwards, since fathers and sons are like that, and this whether in physics, where we can distinguish between manly modes of each, or in metaphysics, where the distinction between them is rather more godly.
3. Granted, further, a distinction between foolish and wise, sensual and sensible manifestations of both the manly and godly modes of the Father and the Son, we should also allow for their earthly and heavenly counterparts in unholiness and holiness, sensuality and sensibility, with respect to both the spirit and the soul, as before.
4. Hence, in sensible metaphysics, which is the salvation of the godly from the folly of its sensual counterpart, we must allow, contrary to how I used to think, for a distinction between God-the-Wise-Father and Heaven-the-Holy-Soul in relation to the self, to psyche, on the one hand, and God-the-Wise-Son and Heaven-the-Holy-Spirit in relation to the not-self, to soma, on the other hand, so that it is the Father and not the Son of the context in question which should be identified with the ego, with ego-through-spirit-via-will equalling soulful recoil, as one consciously plunges, as God-the-Wise-Father, into the will of the lungs to breathe (as God-the-Wise-Son) and is borne aloft on the out-breath (of Heaven-the-Holy-Spirit) only to recoil, in self-preservation, to self more profoundly, as Heaven-the-Holy-Soul, wherein one's redemption, or resurrection from ego to soul, is complete, and one achieves a state of joy, the reward of truth.
5. But both God-the-Wise-Father and Heaven-the-Holy-Soul are graceful

in their different ways, the former in relation to the more (relative to most) wavicles and less (relative to least) particles, more psyche and less soma, of the relevant ego, the latter in relation to the most wavicles and least particles, most psyche and least soma, of the relevant soul, since the metaphysical self is, in contrast to the metaphysical not-self, alone graceful in its psychic predominance, and to the self in question is granted the sacredness of truth and joy, which contrasts with the falsity and woe of the not-self wherein profanity has its sinful throne in a somatic predominance, in the most particles and least wavicles, most soma and least psyche, of God-the-Wise-Son, and in the more (relative to most) particles and less (relative to least) wavicles, more soma and less psyche, of Heaven-the-Holy-Spirit, both of which, existing in relation to a particle hegemony, are always negative, even in the inner metaphysical context in question where, of course, they have reference to the lungs and the breath.

6. Therefore even in the saved context of Godliness and Heavenliness, wherein absolute wisdom and holiness have their respective places, we have to distinguish between the gracefulness of God-the-Wise-Father and Heaven-the-Holy-Soul, and the sinfulness of God-the-Wise-Son and Heaven-the-Holy-Spirit, psyche and soma, sanctity and profanity, primary and secondary orders of God and Heaven, since only in contexts of a wavicle hegemony is there anything positive, whether in relation to ego or to soul, the qualitative and essential manifestations of a quadruplicity dependent upon the utilization of wilful appearances and spiritual quantities.
7. Hence, in inner metaphysical psyche, the sensible truth of God-the-Wise-Father and the sensible joy of Heaven-the-Holy-Soul, as opposed, in the inner metaphysical soma of lungs and breath, to the sensible falsity of God-the-Wise-Son and the sensible woe of Heaven-the-Holy-Spirit, all of which contrast, in absolute salvation, with the sensual truth, in outer metaphysical psyche, of God-the-Unwise-Father and the sensual joy of Heaven-the-Unholy-Soul vis-à-vis the sensual falsity, in outer metaphysical soma, of God-the-Unwise-Son and the sensual woe of Heaven-the-Unholy-Spirit, viz. ears and airwaves.
8. But hence, too, in inner physical psyche, the sensible knowledge of Man-the-Wise-Father and the sensible pleasure of Earth-the-Holy-Soul, as opposed, in the inner physical soma of brain and thought, to the sensible ignorance of Man-the-Wise-Son and the sensible pain of Earth-the-Holy-Spirit, all of which contrast, in relative salvation, with the sensual knowledge, in outer physical psyche, of Man-the-Unwise-Father and the sensual pleasure of Earth-the-Unholy-Soul vis-à-vis the

sensual ignorance, in outer physical soma, of Man-the-Unwise-Son and the sensual pain of Earth-the-Unholy-Spirit, viz. phallus and sperm.

9. But then, too, on the opposite side of the gender fence, in contexts where soma takes precedence over psyche, with the inner chemical soma of womb and amniotic fluid the sensible weakness of Woman-the-Good-Mother and the sensible humility of Purgatory-the-Unclear-Spirit, as opposed, in inner chemical psyche, to the sensible strength of Woman-the-Good-Daughter and the sensible pride of Purgatory-the-Unclear-Soul, all of which contrast, in relative damnation, with the sensual weakness, in the tongue and saliva of outer chemical soma, of Woman-the-Evil-Mother and the sensual humility of Purgatory-the-Clear-Spirit vis-à-vis the sensual strength, in outer chemical psyche, of Woman-the-Evil-Daughter and the sensual pride of Purgatory-the-Clear-Soul.

10. And last and, from a divine standpoint, avowedly least, in the inner metachemical soma of heart and blood, the sensible ugliness of Devil-the-Good-Mother and the sensible hatred of Hell-the-Unclear-Spirit, as opposed, in inner metachemical psyche, to the sensible beauty of Devil-the-Good-Daughter and the sensible love of Hell-the-Unclear-Soul, all of which contrast, in absolute damnation, with the sensual ugliness, in the eyes and optical light of outer metachemical soma, of Devil-the-Evil-Mother and the sensual hatred of Hell-the-Clear-Spirit vis-à-vis the sensual beauty, in outer metachemical psyche, of Devil-the-Evil-Daughter and the sensual love of Hell-the-Clear-Soul.

THE DUALITIES OF BOTH SOMA AND PSYCHE

1. We have argued that soma returns to soma and psyche to psyche, so that 'as in the beginning, so in the end', but this is not invariably in terms of Mother to Mother or Father to Father, since while such a return can and does happen, one must also allow for the spiritual manifestation of soma and the soulful manifestation of psyche, neither of which have anything to do with mothers or fathers, the former of which appertains to the will and the latter to the ego.
2. Therefore one can no more argue exclusively in favour of a return of soma to soma in the instinctual terms of the Mother than argue exclusively in favour of a return of psyche to psyche in the egocentric terms of the Father, for each element has a different fulcrum, or most characteristic attribute, and no two elements - and therefore class or gender parallels to them - are the same.
3. That which, as metachemistry, is almost absolutely somatic in its most particle/least wavicle subatomic ratio, is also, on that account, most wilful, most of the will, whereas that which, as chemistry, is only relatively somatic in its more (relative to most) particle/less (relative to least) wavicle ratio is also, on that account, most spiritual, or most of the spirit. Consequently, females whose principal affiliation, in upper-class fashion, is to the former will be ..,