

LAST JUDGEMENTS

Of A Messianic Philosopher

A volume of aphoristic philosophy by
JOHN O'LOUGHLIN



Last Judgements published 2008 by Centretruths Digital Media
All rights reserved
Copyright © 2008 John O'Loughlin

PREFACE

This is the final (and shortest) volume of what I now like to loosely think of as 'The Omega Octet', i.e. all the volumes of supernotes (aphoristic essays and essayistic aphorisms) stemming from *Devil and God - The Omega Book* (1986), and, not surprisingly, it tends to sum up or refine upon a number of the principal theories already discussed, as well as lay the foundation for the next stage of my philosophical advance, which was to be more purely aphoristic and, hence, metaphysical.

John O'Loughlin, London 1993 (Revised 2008)

LAST JUDGEMENTS

1. To see amorality not as a middle ground in between immorality and morality, but as a tendency to alternate between such extremes, so that the amoral man is both immoral and moral by turns.
2. To distinguish between the absolute immorality of noumenal objectivity and the relative immorality of phenomenal objectivity on the one hand, and between the relative morality of phenomenal subjectivity and the absolute morality of noumenal subjectivity on the other hand. Thus a distinction, broadly, between the absolute immorality of science and the relative immorality of politics, as against the relative morality of economics and the absolute morality of religion. Diabolic to masculine in the one case, that of the objective (both noumenal and phenomenal), feminine to divine in the other case, that of the subjective (both phenomenal and noumenal).
3. The Devil separates, but God unites. Science separates, or reduces matter to its basic components in an attempt to dominate it, whereas religion unites, or brings people together in order that they may transcend their phenomenal selves through the noumenal self of God. Similarly politics separates, or divides people from one another on the basis of party allegiance, whereas economics unites, or brings people together in pursuit of common economic goals. The only difference between science and politics, however, is that whereas science separates absolutely, on the basis of noumenal objectivity, politics separates relatively, on the basis of phenomenal objectivity. Likewise the significant difference between economics and religion is that whereas economics unites people relatively, on the basis of phenomenal subjectivity, religion unites them absolutely, on the basis of noumenal subjectivity. Marx may bring phenomenal selves together into unions of the working class, the class of the World (and hence economics), but only God can bring the noumenal self of an absolute unity to pass.
4. Hell is the noumenal separateness (disunity) of a proton-particle absolutism; Heaven, by contrast, the noumenal joinedness (unity) of an electron-wavicle absolutism. The former is absolutely

cursed and the latter absolutely blessed. Purgatory is the phenomenal separateness (disunity) of a neutron-particle relativity, the World the phenomenal joinedness (unity) of an atomic-wavicle relativity. The former is relatively cursed and the latter relatively blessed.

5. Freedom, which is commensurate with particle objectivity, is cursed, both absolutely (through science) and relatively (through politics), whereas binding, which is commensurate with wavicle subjectivity, is blessed, both relatively (through economics) and absolutely (through religion). Freedom is a curse of the unbounded star (noumenal) and of the unbounded cross (phenomenal), whereas binding is a blessing of the bounded star (phenomenal) and of the bounded cross (noumenal). Hence whereas the Father and Christ are both, relative to religion, cursed, the Mother (Blessed Virgin) and the Holy Spirit are alike blessed - the former relatively and the latter to an absolute degree.
6. Individualism is a thing of the Devil, collectivism a thing of God. The Devil separates into individuals, God unites into collectives. Satan was himself a fall from the binding to the primal heavenly collectivism into the freedom of hellish individualism, and was thereby accursed. Yet if the Devil is absolutely accursed in his noumenal individualism, then Purgatory is relatively accursed in its phenomenal individualism, the individualism or, rather, individuality (for the 'ity' differs from the 'ism' as phenomenal from noumenal) of the lunar as opposed to solar, and hence politics as against science. Contrasted to this individuality, however, we find the collectivity of the World which, in its phenomenal subjectivity, strives to unite the People against their individualistic oppressors, and from which we can extrapolate the noumenal subjectivity or, rather, subjectivism (for the same criteria relating to the distinction between the 'ity' and the 'ism' apply here) of God ... in an absolute collectivism which transcends the World in and through the Saviour, Who is One with God. Thus whereas individualism and collectivism are noumenally absolute, individuality and collectivity are phenomenally relative, the relativity of Purgatory and the World as against the absolutism of Hell and Heaven.
7. If the Devil is individualism, or noumenal objectivism, and God collectivism, or noumenal subjectivism, then the Devil is public and God private, like, be it noted, science and religion, the former

absolutely outer and the latter absolutely inner. Yet in between the absolute public and the absolute private we find the relative public and the relative private, the relativity of politics and economics, the former of which is relatively outer and the latter relatively inner, with objective and subjective distinctions in regard to their respective masculine and feminine essences. We can no more speak of the bounded star as public than of the free cross as private; for the one appertains to the collectivity of phenomenal subjectivity and the other to the individuality of phenomenal objectivity. The bounded star of the World is no more public because the free star (superstar) of Hell is public, than the free cross of Purgatory is private because the bound cross (supercross) of Heaven is private. The private begins where the public ends, and the private is always subjective, and therefore economic or religious, where the public is objective, and therefore scientific or political.

8. What is the difference, you may wonder, between a public school and a private school? For, assuredly, there *is* one, and it is nothing less than a distinction between the Devil and God, science and religion, alpha and omega, noumenal objectivism and noumenal subjectivism, individualism and collectivism. Quite simply, the public school has a secular bias and the private school a religious bias, the former staffed by teachers of a scientific persuasion, the latter by priests and/or nuns, so that we may infer a sort of English/Irish dichotomy between the two extremes, which makes for a diametrically contrary approach to the World. And yet, in between, we find the vertical axis, as it were, of grammar and state schools, the former purgatorial where the latter are worldly, a distinction, quite clearly, between politics and economics, phenomenal objectivity and phenomenal subjectivity, individuality and collectivity, which tends to the production not of soul and spirit, as in the public/private dichotomy, but of intellect and will; not of heat and light but of coldness and darkness, and which thereby establishes or, rather, confirms a middle-class/working-class dichotomy, as against the upper-class/classless distinction existing between public schools and private schools. Of course, we should not forget that this middle-class/working-class dichotomy is not absolute, like the upper-class/classless one, and that grammar schools and state schools can accordingly draw together into comprehensives, which confirm the relativity of the phenomenal in a sort of educational parallel to bourgeois republicanism, that mid-point between

liberal democracy and social democracy, parliamentarianism and People's republics.

9. No less than 6 is the number of the World and 9, its polar antithesis, the number of Purgatory ... so 3 is the number of the Devil and 12 the number of God, since 3 is no less horizontally antithetical to 12 than 9 is vertically antithetical to 6. We speak of 3 in connection with triangles, triads, troikas, trinities, trios, tridents, and other such threefold phenomena, and even treble 6, the Biblical number of the Beast, is only conceivable as diabolic on account of the factor of three, which constrains the 6, viz. the World, to the Devil's will, whether that Devil be Lenin, Stalin, Mao, or whoever. Conversely, a double 6 would point in the direction of the World coming under God's will, since two sixes are twelve, and twelve, being a divine number, is the number of Christ's disciples, of the twelve days of Christmas, the twelve months of the year, the twelve signs of the zodiac, the twelve stages of life which both precede and succeed the human stage, and so on.
10. To speak not of a fundamentalist/transcendentalist dichotomy between the alpha and omega of the divine spectrum, but of the divine spectrum being transcendental in both its alpha (Jehovah) and omega (Universal Spirit) manifestations, with negative and positive, false and true implications respectively. Hence the false transcendentalism of the alpha ... as against the true transcendentalism of the omega, whether one thinks of such a dichotomy in traditional naturalistic terms (old brain), as between Judaism and Taoism, or in contemporary artificial terms (new brain), as between Marxism and Social Transcendentalism.
11. Formerly, I would have thought not only of Judaism in terms of fundamentalism, but of Judaism and Islam being roughly equivalent and therefore appertaining to the same God - one extrapolated, needless to say, from the central star of the Galaxy. Now I have good reason to doubt the validity of such a viewpoint; for it seems to me that the historical friction between Judaism and Islam, not to mention Jews and Arabs, owes more than a little to the fact that Islam is *not* commensurate with Judaism but, being a much younger religion, appertains, through Mohammed, to an omega extrapolation from, and therefore antithesis to, the sun, so that it effectively has less to do with illusion and sadness than with strength and pride, standing in direct opposition,

traditionally, to oriental despotism, that autocratic equivalence whose quantitative and qualitative concomitants are weakness and humiliation, the concomitants of the Satanic Fall from Jehovah which make for a species of fundamentalism as false and negative as Islamic fundamentalism is true and positive. Yet what applies to oriental despotism would also apply to Bolshevism or Sovietism, that diabolic fall from Marx, which is to the modern world what despotism was to the ancient one, a sort of false fundamentalism which Islam rightly perceives as a threat to its own omega-biased integrity, and against which it has accordingly revolted through the upsurge of Islamic Fundamentalism, the contemporary form of Islam which is no less of the new brain than the traditional, pre-Soviet form was of the old brain. Hence whilst Islam is assuredly fundamentalist rather than transcendentalist, it signifies the true fundamentalism of positive soul as against the false fundamentalism of negative soul, a positive ritual-based creed which fights shy of both negative ritual (false fundamentalism) and negative/positive devotion ... in, traditionally, the Judaic/Taoist polarity of the old brain and, contemporaneously, the Marxist/Social Transcendentalist polarity of the new one, where transcendentalism is either false or true, particle or wavicle, in relation to alpha or omega spirit. Thus where transcendentalism is spiritual, and hence of the electron, fundamentalism is soulful, and hence of the proton. Whether transcendentalism is negative or positive, it is of the Divine, whereas fundamentalism is of the Diabolic even in its positive, or Islamic, manifestation.

12. Unlike transcendentalism and fundamentalism, Christianity has its roots in the World, since it derives from a more evolved or, depending on your standpoint, devolved background that had both Grecian and Germanic pagan traditions with which to contend. The Father of Christianity is neither commensurate with Jehovah nor Allah, spirit nor soul, but, rather, with worldly will, and has its basis less in the Cosmos than in the scrotum, with a trinity of the 'Three in One' that would seem to derive from the scrotum, the penis, and semen, so that the penis, or Christ, is apperceived as the channel through which the semen, or spirit of the Father, reaches the World, viz. woman, from its base in the scrotum, or Father. Hence, as a religion of the will, Christianity affirms the World even when it would appear to be denying it, and I would guess that of the three main traditional branches of Christianity, viz. Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, and Anglicanism,

Eastern Orthodoxy is closer to the Father, and hence the scrotum; Roman Catholicism closer to the semen, and hence the Holy Spirit; and Anglicanism closer to the penis, and hence the Son, the channel through which the Holy Spirit ... of the Father ... reaches the World. Although, that said, we must allow for the rather more puritanical forms of Christianity which reject the World in favour of an intellectual bias for the Word, and are accordingly lunar in their more evolved Protestant integrities. For if Anglo-Catholicism is half-way up the lunar limbo, as it were, in its worldly affirmation of the Son, then Nonconformist Protestantism is right up it ... in an ethical rejection of the World, and hence the will, which makes the Cross the symbol of its revolt, a revolt against Christianity which is effectively anti-Christian. For the Cross by itself is no worldly sentience but existential, not realistic but materialistic, and thus a symbol of phenomenal objectivity, the very thing upon which Christ, with his subjective doctrine of the 'kingdom within', was crucified by the Romans, and crucified precisely because, unlike the Jews (whose allegiance to Jehovah was symptomatic of noumenal subjectivism in its negative manifestation) they could only relate to the 'kingdom without', the objective kingdoms of the World. No, the Cross by itself is a terrible symbol, and only those who are anti-Christian, and thus anti-Catholic, would uphold it ... to the detriment of the World. Rest assured, however, that the Second Coming will know how to tell the living from the dead, terrestrial life from lunar death, and will judge accordingly! The light within of the superstellar Beyond will be cultivated to a divine peak ... once the World is saved from its mundane sin and elevated to God, wherein scrotum, penis, and semen will have no place. In fact, so irrelevant would the World be to God ... that something more drastic than circumcision may be required to safeguard the moral standing of the saved People and prevent their backsliding into worldly sin.