

ANTHOLOGICAL MORPHOLOGIES

Collected Sequentially Structured Maxims



JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

ANTHOLOGICAL MORPHOLOGIES

Collected Sequentially Structured Maxims
(2014 – 2019)

JOHN O'LOUGHLIN

This edition of *Anthological Morphologies* first published 2019
and republished (with revisions) 2022 by Centretruths Digital
Media

Copyright © 2019, 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: 978-0-244-46759-3

CONTENTS

Introduction

From *The Fourfold Composition of Elements and pseudo-Elements in Axial Perspective*

From *Atoms and pseudo-Atoms in Subatomic Perspective*

From *Stations of the Supercross – Attraction and Reaction in Gender Perspective*

From *Supercrossed*

From *Black Sabbaticals*

From *Prophet over Profit*

From *B.O.R.T. (Book of Replicated Thought)*

From *Keys to the Kingdom of Truth*

From *So There: Civilization – Its Betrayers and Enemies in Perspective*

From *Instru-mental*

From *Shut Down and Open Up – A Biconical Extravangza*

From *Agape Like an Ape*

INTRODUCTION

With this anthology of my 'sequentially structured maxims', as I like to think of them, I may well have arrived at the *ne plus ultra* of my philosophical publications, which combines all the most logically consistent material from the last twelve original titles (2014 – 2019) in one definitive volume that, on account of the comprehensively exacting nature of the mainly quadripartite structures and the way their theorizing evolves, must rank at or near the apex of my philosophy, if not of all philosophy of a metaphysical persuasion, that yet allows for all the other categorical persuasions (metachemical, chemical, etc), both atomic and pseudo-atomic, to be accounted for in such fashion that everything is, as it were, nailed into place the better to support the overall morphology of its unrelenting logic.

As to the challenges of putting together such an immense anthology from diverse sources that necessarily also embraced a fair amount of aphoristic discursiveness, whether independently or as introductory material to the maxims, I have endeavoured, so far as possible, to technically standardize the text; though this has not always been easy or, indeed, desirable, in view of the inevitable stylistic and thematic variations that accrue to the original source material, whether for better or, occasionally, for worse!

Even so, the discerning reader will discover that the

stylistically heterogeneous of the former has, to a significant extent, been transformed into the stylistically homogeneousness to be found in this project, which logically encapsulates virtually the entirety of my mature thought, 'spicy' parts not excepted, in one volume, even at the risk, in such a large undertaking, of an inescapable degree of thematic reiteration as one proceeds through the twelve titles from which these maximistic sequences chronologically – and without exception – collectively derive.

John O'Loughlin, London 2020 (Revised 2022)

From The Fourfold Composition of Elements and pseudo-Elements in Axial Perspective

- The polarity between intentionality and pseudo-instinctuality, the former hegemonically noumenal and the latter subordinately phenomenal, is primary state-hegemonic/church-subordinate (overall female), whereas that between intellectuality and pseudo-emotionality, the former hegemonically phenomenal and the latter subordinately noumenal, is secondary state-hegemonic/church-subordinate (overall male).
- The polarity between emotionality and pseudo-intellectuality, the former hegemonically noumenal and the latter subordinately phenomenal, is primary church-hegemonic/state-subordinate (overall male), whereas that between instinctuality and pseudo-intentionality, the former hegemonically phenomenal and the latter subordinately noumenal, is secondary church-hegemonic/state-subordinate (overall female).
- Just as metachemistry over pseudo-metaphysics is axially polar, on state-hegemonic/church-subordinate terms, to physics over pseudo-chemistry, with a same gender polarity between metachemistry and pseudo-chemistry on the one hand (overall female) and pseudo-metaphysics and physics on the other hand (overall male), the former primary and the latter secondary, so a like polarity exists, in overall axial terms, between autocracy over aristocracy and plutocracy over meritocracy, with autocracy and meritocracy polar on overall female terms (primary state-hegemonic/church-subordinate) and aristocracy and plutocracy polar on overall male terms (secondary state-hegemonic/ church-subordinate).

- Just as metaphysics over pseudo-metachemistry is axially polar, on church-hegemonic/state-subordinate terms, to chemistry over pseudo-physics, with a same gender polarity between metaphysics and pseudo-physics on the one hand (overall male) and pseudo-metachemistry and chemistry on the other hand (overall female), the former primary and the latter secondary, so a like polarity exists, in overall axial terms, between theocracy over technocracy and democracy over bureaucracy, with theocracy and bureaucracy polar on overall male terms (primary church-hegemonic/state-subordinate) and technocracy and democracy polar on overall female terms (secondary church-hegemonic/state-subordinate).
- The more autocracy/aristocracy the less, on similar albeit lower order gender structural terms, democracy/bureaucracy, and, correlatively, the more plutocracy/meritocracy the less, on similar albeit higher order gender structural terms, theocracy/technocracy, since the one type of structure necessarily excludes the other.
- The more theocracy/technocracy the less, on similar albeit lower order gender structural terms, plutocracy/meritocracy, and, correlatively, the more democracy/bureaucracy the less, on similar albeit higher order gender structural terms, autocracy/aristocracy, since the one type of structure necessarily excludes the other.
- It is logical that metachemistry/pseudo-metaphysics should form an axial polarity with physics/pseudo-chemistry, in order to guarantee for both autocracy/aristocracy and plutocracy/meritocracy as little interference or competition as possible from their respective lower or higher order structural counterparts, whether the disciplinary or elemental parallels happen, in the one case, to be female over pseudo-male or, in the other case, male over pseudo-female.
- It is logical that metaphysics/pseudo-metachemistry should

form an axial polarity with chemistry/pseudo-physics, in order to guarantee for both theocracy/technocracy and democracy/plutocracy as little interference or competition as possible from their respective lower or higher order structural counterparts, whether the disciplinary or elemental parallels happen, in the one case, to be male over pseudo-female or, in the other case, female over pseudo-male.

- I have tended, in the past, to equate aristocracy with pseudo-theocracy and technocracy with pseudo-autocracy, so that we have had an antithesis between autocracy/pseudo-theocracy and theocracy/pseudo-autocracy, which would correspond to the above distinctions between autocracy/aristocracy and theocracy/technocracy.
- I have tended, in the past, to equate bureaucracy with pseudo-plutocracy and meritocracy with pseudo-democracy, with a cross-axial antithesis between democracy/pseudo-plutocracy and plutocracy/pseudo-democracy corresponding to the above distinctions between democracy/bureaucracy and plutocracy/meritocracy.
- Another way of making such distinctions would be to equate autocracy with science and aristocracy with pseudo-religion on the one hand, and theocracy with religion and technocracy with pseudo-science on the other hand, which would neatly tie-in with our long-established antithesis between metachemistry/pseudo-metaphysics and metaphysics/pseudo-metachemistry.
- Likewise one could equate democracy with politics and bureaucracy with pseudo-economics on the one hand, and plutocracy with economics and meritocracy with pseudo-politics on the other hand, which would just as neatly tie-in with the long-established antithesis between chemistry/pseudo-physics and physics/pseudo-chemistry.

- Autocracy is only genuine in a metachemical context characterized by scientific freedom, not in a pseudo-metachemical context characterized by the binding of science pseudo-scientifically, or technocratically, to religious freedom in metaphysics. Or put the other way around, theocracy is only genuine in a metaphysical context characterized by religious freedom, not in a pseudo-metaphysical context characterized by the binding of religion pseudo-religiously, or aristocratically, to scientific freedom in metachemistry.
- Democracy is only genuine in a chemical context characterized by political freedom, not in a pseudo-chemical context characterized by the binding of politics pseudo-politically, or meritocratically, to economic freedom in physics. Or put the other way around, plutocracy is only genuine in a physical context characterized by economic freedom, not in a pseudo-physical context characterized by the binding of economics pseudo-economically, or bureaucratically, to political freedom in chemistry.
- Metachemistry/pseudo-metaphysics, corresponding to autocracy/pseudo-theocracy (aristocracy), is a pairing characterized by the dominance of competitive individualism in relation to science over pseudo-cooperative collectivism in relation to pseudo-religion.
- Metaphysics/pseudo-metachemistry, corresponding to theocracy/pseudo-autocracy (technocracy), is a pairing characterized by the dominance of cooperative collectivism in relation to religion over pseudo-competitive individualism in relation to pseudo-science.
- Chemistry/pseudo-physics, corresponding to democracy/pseudo-plutocracy (bureaucracy), is a pairing characterized by the dominance of competitive individualism in relation to politics over pseudo-

- cooperative collectivism in relation to pseudo-economics.
- Physics/pseudo-chemistry, corresponding to plutocracy/pseudo-democracy (meritocracy), is a pairing characterized by the dominance of cooperative collectivism in relation to economics over pseudo-competitive individualism in relation to pseudo-politics.
- Spatial space, or space *per se*, over sequential time, or pseudo-time, is equivalent to science over pseudo-religion, which is in turn equivalent to autocracy over pseudo-theocracy (aristocracy), and that is of course equivalent to metachemistry over pseudo-metaphysics.
- Repetitive time, or time *per se*, over spaced space, or pseudo-space, is equivalent to religion over pseudo-science, which is in turn equivalent to theocracy over pseudo-autocracy (technocracy), and that is of course equivalent to metaphysics over pseudo-metachemistry.
- Volumetric volume, or volume *per se*, over massed mass, or pseudo-mass, is equivalent to politics over pseudo-economics, which is in turn equivalent to democracy over pseudo-plutocracy (bureaucracy), and that is of course equivalent to chemistry over pseudo-physics.
- Massive mass, or mass *per se*, over voluminous volume, or pseudo-volume, is equivalent to economics over pseudo-politics, which is in turn equivalent to plutocracy over pseudo-democracy (meritocracy), and that is of course equivalent to physics over pseudo-chemistry.
- I can find no logical reason to contest the contention that the competitive individualism of science and the cooperative collectivism of religion are noumenally incompatible, as incompatible, in effect, as space *per se* and time *per se*, the former spatial and the latter repetitive.
- I can find no logical reason to contest the contention that the pseudo-cooperative collectivism of pseudo-religion and the pseudo-competitive individualism of pseudo-science,

the former subordinate to science and the latter to religion, are pseudo-noumenally incompatible, as incompatible, in effect, as pseudo-time and pseudo-space, the former sequential and the latter spaced.

- I can find no logical reason to contest the contention that the competitive individualism of politics and the cooperative collectivism of economics are phenomenally incompatible, as incompatible, in effect, as volume *per se* and mass *per se*, the former volumetric and the latter massive.
- I can find no logical reason to contest the contention that the pseudo-cooperative collectivism of pseudo-economics and the pseudo-competitive individualism of pseudo-politics, the former subordinate to politics and the latter to economics, are pseudo-phenomenally incompatible, as incompatible, in effect, as pseudo-mass and pseudo-volume, the former massed and the latter voluminous.
- The state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis presents us with evidence of a gender hegemonic polarity between art and literature, as between metachemistry and physics (corresponding, in simple elemental terms, to fire and vegetation), with a gender subordinate polarity between pseudo-music and pseudo-sculpture, pseudo-metaphysics and pseudo-chemistry (corresponding to pseudo-air and pseudo-water, or air subverted by a fiery hegemony and water subverted by a vegetative one).
- The church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis presents us with evidence of a gender hegemonic polarity between sculpture and music, chemistry and metaphysics (corresponding, in simple elemental terms, to water and air), with a gender subordinate polarity between pseudo-literature and pseudo-art, pseudo-physics and pseudo-metachemistry (corresponding to pseudo-vegetation and pseudo-fire, or vegetation subverted by a watery hegemony and fire subverted by an airy one).

- In the case of the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis, this gives us a primary (overall female) polarity between art and pseudo-sculpture, metachemistry and pseudo-chemistry (corresponding to fire and pseudo-water), with a secondary (overall male) polarity between pseudo-music and literature, pseudo-metaphysics and physics (corresponding to pseudo-air and vegetation).
- In the case of the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis, on the other hand, we have a primary (overall male) polarity between pseudo-literature and music, pseudo-physics and metaphysics (corresponding to pseudo-vegetation and air), with a secondary (overall female) polarity between sculpture and pseudo-art, chemistry and pseudo-metachemistry (corresponding to water and pseudo-fire).
- Art begins in metachemistry, to which, as a noumenally objective art form, it properly pertains, and is once bovaryized in chemistry, twice bovaryized in physics, and thrice bovaryized in metaphysics, regressing from the absolute concrete to the absolute abstract via the relative concrete and relative abstract.
- Sculpture begins in chemistry, to which, as a phenomenally objective art form, it properly pertains, and is once bovaryized in metachemistry, twice bovaryized in metaphysics, and thrice bovaryized in physics, regressing from the relative concrete to the relative abstract via the absolute concrete and absolute abstract.
- Literature begins in physics, to which, as a phenomenally subjective art form, it properly pertains, and is once bovaryized in metaphysics, twice bovaryized in metachemistry, and thrice bovaryized in chemistry, regressing from the relative abstract to the relative concrete via the absolute abstract and absolute concrete.
- Music begins in metaphysics, to which, as a noumenally subjective art form, it properly pertains, and is once

bovaryized in physics, twice bovaryized in chemistry and thrice bovaryized in metachemistry, regressing from the absolute abstract to the absolute concrete via the relative abstract and relative concrete.

- Soul can only be hegemonic over pseudo-will, the weakest (compared to will *per se*) manifestation of will; as in the case of electronica over dance, metaphysics over pseudo-metachemistry.
- Ego can only be hegemonic over pseudo-spirit, the weakest (compared to spirit *per se*) manifestations of spirit, as in classical over romantic, physics over pseudo-chemistry.
- Spirit can only be hegemonic over pseudo-ego, the weakest (compared to ego *per se*) manifestation of ego, as in pop over rock, chemistry over pseudo-physics.
- Will can only be hegemonic over pseudo-soul, the weakest (compared to soul *per se*) manifestation of soul, as in jazz over blues, metachemistry over pseudo-metaphysics.
- One can contrast the pairing, on a hegemonic/subordinate basis, of jazz and blues with the pairing, on a like basis, of classical and romantic on the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis stretching from the northwest to the southeast points of the intercardinal axial compass, with jazz and romantic corresponding to the primary (overall female) state-hegemonic polarity of metachemistry and pseudo-chemistry, but blues and classical corresponding to the secondary (overall male) state-hegemonic polarity of pseudo-metaphysics and physics, metachemistry of course being hegemonic over pseudo-metaphysics on the one hand, and physics hegemonic over pseudo-chemistry on the other.
- One can contrast the pairing of pop and rock at the southwest point of the intercardinal axial compass with the pairing of electronica (trance) and dance at the northeast point thereof on the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate

axis affords us a primary (overall male) polarity between rock and electronica, corresponding to pseudo-physics and metaphysics, but a secondary (overall female) polarity between pop and dance, chemistry and pseudo-metachemistry, chemistry of course being hegemonic over pseudo-physics on the one hand, and metaphysics hegemonic over pseudo-metachemistry on the other.

- In the case of the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis one would have a primary (overall female) state-hegemonic polarity between drama and pseudo-poetry, metachemistry and pseudo-chemistry, but a secondary (overall male) state-hegemonic polarity between pseudo-philosophy and prose, pseudo-metaphysics and physics, so that one could contrast the pairing of drama and pseudo-philosophy, metachemistry and pseudo-metaphysics, with that of prose and pseudo-poetry, physics and pseudo-chemistry – pseudo-philosophy being as much subject to the hegemonic influence of drama as pseudo-poetry to the hegemonic influence of prose.
- In the case of the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis, one would have a primary (overall male) church-hegemonic polarity between pseudo-prose and philosophy, pseudo-physics and metaphysics, but a secondary (overall female) church-hegemonic polarity between poetry and pseudo-drama, chemistry and pseudo-metachemistry, so that one could contrast the pairing of poetry and pseudo-prose, chemistry and pseudo-physics, with that of philosophy and pseudo-drama, metaphysics and pseudo-metachemistry – pseudo-prose being as much subject to the hegemonic influence of poetry as pseudo-drama to the hegemonic influence of philosophy.
- I like to think that the photon is most particle and least wave, corresponding to most soma, as it were, and least psyche, whereas the proton, by contrast, I would conceive

to be most wavicle and least particle, corresponding to most psyche and least soma, since such an elemental dichotomy would underpin the noumenal objective/subjective antithesis between metachemistry and metaphysics, or absolute vacuum and absolute plenum, corresponding, on a more evolved basis, not just to the respective absolute ratio distinctions between soma and psyche, as noted above, but to the aforementioned distinctions between the representative, or non-bovaryized, forms of art and music, space and time, commensurate, at any stage of devolution/evolution, with what is most alpha on the one hand and most omega on the other.

- I like to think, in descending from the elemental to the molecular, that the electron was more – relative to most – particle and less – relative to least – wavicle, corresponding to more soma and less psyche, but that the neutron, by contrast, was more – relative to most – wavicle and less – relative to least – particle, corresponding to more psyche and less soma, since such a molecular dichotomy would underpin the phenomenal objective/subjective antithesis between chemistry and physics, or relative vacuum and relative plenum, corresponding, on a more evolved basis, not just to the respective relative ratio distinctions between soma and psyche, as noted above, but to the aforementioned distinctions between the representative, or non-bovaryized, forms of sculpture and literature, volume and mass, commensurate, at any stage of devolution/evolution, with what is more – relative to most – alpha on the one hand and more – relative to most – omega on the other.
- Pseudo-metaphysical pseudo-heat unequivocally subordinate to metachemical light, as pseudo-time to space;
- Pseudo-metachemical pseudo-light unequivocally subordinate to metaphysical heat, as pseudo-space to time;
- Pseudo-physical pseudo-force equivocally subordinate to

- chemical motion, as pseudo-mass to volume;
- Pseudo-chemical pseudo-motion equivocally subordinate to physical force, as pseudo-volume to mass.
- The unequivocal subordination of pseudo-soul to will at the northwest point of the intercardinal axial compass on the apex of the state-hegemonic/church-subordinate axis.
- The unequivocal subordination of pseudo-will to soul at the northeast point of the intercardinal axial compass on the apex of the church-hegemonic/state-subordinate axis.